

Ms. Nora Skaburskienė  
Director  
Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (SKVC)  
A. Goštauto g. 12  
01108 Vilnius, Lithuania

Dublin, 14 July 2017

**Subject: Membership of the SKVC in ENQA**

Dear Nora,

I am pleased to inform you that, at its meeting of 21 June 2017, the Board of ENQA agreed to reconfirm the SKVC membership of ENQA for five years from that date.

The ENQA Board concluded that SKVC is in substantial compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015) and the Board would like to receive a follow-up report on the recommendations in the panel report (as outlined in the annex attached) within two years of its decision, i.e. by June 2019.

Furthermore, the Board would like to encourage SKVC in strengthening its capacity to enable it to focus on an enhancement-led approach in its quality assurance procedures.

In addition, the Board recommends that you consider taking advantage of the new ENQA procedure, i.e. a progress visit. The visit would take place after the submission of the follow-up report, in about two years' time from this decision. The ENQA Secretariat will be in touch with you in about a year's time to discuss this possibility. The costs of this visit have already been included as part of the review fee and are non-refundable except for the travel costs of the experts. More information about the progress visit can be found in the [Guidelines for ENQA Agency Reviews](#).

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact the ENQA Secretariat.

Please accept my congratulations for the re-confirmation of membership of SKVC.

Yours sincerely,



Padraig Walsh  
President

Annex: Areas for development

---

## **Annex: Areas for development**

As outlined by the review panel, SKVC is recommended to take appropriate action, so far as it is empowered to do so, on the following issues:

ESG 3.4 – The agency should develop a procedure for the production of thematic analyses with the sole aim of contributing to the enhancement of the quality of higher education. Analyses need to focus on key issues relevant to a well-defined target audience. The agency might also want to reconsider the resources needed, both in human and financial terms, given the rather ambitious goals.

ESG 3.5 – SKVC is recommended to develop a financial plan as a joint effort of both council and management. This financial planning demands an analysis of the current financial situation, realistic financial goals and priorities, well-considered conclusions and strong implementation. This plan might have far-reaching consequences but it would help the agency to at least guarantee the funding of its core activities.

ESG 2.2 – SKVC is recommended to revise its methodologies starting from HEIs' full responsibility for the quality of their programmes. A move from quality control towards an enhancement led peer-review is required, also in support of the development of a quality culture. Furthermore, SKVC should take the initiative for a more integrated approach of programme and institutional evaluations. Further integration and simplification of the various procedures will also help reducing bureaucracy and make procedures more fit for purpose.

ESG 2.5 – It is necessary to reinforce the trust in the outcomes of external evaluations performed by experts with the assistance of SKVC staff, and to recognise the director's responsibility in taking consistent and evidence-based decisions. As a consequence, SKVC needs to reconsider the position of the advisory commissions in the decision-making process.

ESG 2.5 – SKVC could further support experts in applying criteria consistently by providing definitions for the scores, illustrative examples and assessment rules. These should be included in the methodologies and guidelines.

ESG 2.7 – SKVC should publish a more specific complaints procedure as part of its quality assurance system. Information about the complaints procedure should be made easily accessible to HEIs.