

Consolidated version effective as of 01/09/2016 until

Law published in the Official Gazette, 2011, No 147-6925, ID 111207CISAK1-01-157

APPROVED

By Order No 1-01-157 of 28 November 2011

Of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education

METHODOLOGY FOR DRAFTING THE DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPOSED STUDY PROGRAMMES AND FOR CONDUCTING EXTERNAL EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION THEREOF

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The Methodology for drafting the descriptions of proposed study programmes and for conducting external evaluation and accreditation thereof (hereinafter – the Methodology) shall define the requirements applicable to descriptions of proposed first cycle, second cycle, full-time and non-degree awarding study programmes (hereinafter – description) that higher education institutions, or branches of foreign higher education institutions operating in Lithuania, are required to produce to the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereinafter – the Centre), as well as the procedure for examining applications and other documents pertaining to the accreditation of a proposed study programme (hereinafter – programme) by the Centre, external evaluation process and criteria and the appeal procedure.
2. The Methodology has been developed in the course of implementing the provisions of the Description of the procedure for external evaluation and accreditation of study programmes approved by Order No ISAK-1652 (*Official Gazette*, 2009, No 96-4083; 2011, No 100-4702; 2012, No 144-7439 (hereinafter – the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure).
3. The terms used in the Methodology shall be the same as used in the Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania (*Official Gazette*, 2009, No 54-2140), the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure, and other legislation setting out the general and special requirements for study programmes.
4. At the request of a Lithuanian higher education institution, or a branch of a foreign higher education institution operating in Lithuania (hereinafter – branch), the Centre makes decisions pertaining to the accreditation of programmes and external evaluation thereof in accordance with the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure and this Methodology.
5. Decisions pertaining to the accreditation of a programme may be adopted:
 - 5.1. Following an evaluation as provided for in item 17 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure;
 - 5.2. Following an evaluation in cases provided for in item 18 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure:
 - 5.2.1. At the Centre;
 - 5.2.2. At some other agency for the assessment of quality in higher education listed on the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) (hereinafter – Agency).
6. The development of a programme shall be initiated by a higher education institution. The programme shall be developed with the following considerations in mind:
 - 6.1. The need for professionals to be trained under the programme on a national or regional level and the possibilities of graduates to find employment;
 - 6.2. Scientific and (or) professional capacity to deliver studies in the study field proposed;

6.3. Resources available and expected (human, material and methodological) to deliver studies in the study modes proposed (researches and lecturers, adequately equipped classrooms, spaces for artistic creation and activities, laboratories, computers, including essential software, scientific and professional periodicals, new literature and (or) art work collections, proper means of communication, etc.).

7. Any programme shall be developed in line with the general and special requirements (for the descriptions of study fields, group of study fields or area of studies) for study programmes and provisions of other legislation.

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED

8. A higher education institution wishing to have a programme accredited shall submit to the Centre the following:

8.1. Application to accredit the programme specifying the desired start of the accreditation process and the end date of the academic year at the higher education;

8.2. Programme description developed in accordance with the provisions of section I of Chapter 2 of the Methodology;

8.3. Declaration by the Senate (academic council) of the higher education institution, or by an appropriate management body of a private higher education institution, regarding programme compliance with the study programme requirements in the form provided in Annex 3 to the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure;

8.4. Endorsement from an authorised authority with regards to the professional qualification proposed (if a qualification is to be awarded);

8.5. Endorsement from the Ministry of Health, if the study programme proposed is in the study field of biomedical sciences (except for programmes classified in the study fields of life sciences and agriculture and veterinary sciences).

9. In the event that the programme submitted to the Centre for accreditation may be accredited only having conducted an external evaluation thereof as provided for in item 18 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure and this evaluation was done by the Agency as opposed to the Centre, the higher education institution concerned shall submit to the Centre the following:

9.1. Documents specified in sub-items 8.1, 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5 of this Methodology;

9.2. Study plan of the programme (if the programme is to be delivered in both full-time and part-time modes, the study plan shall be submitted for each mode of studies) and details required under the Description of the procedure for registering objects in the Register of studies, training programmes and qualifications as approved by the order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania that are required in order to register the programme in the Register of studies, training programmes and qualifications;

9.3. Report of the evaluation (a copy thereof) conducted by the Agency in accordance with the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure that needs to cover evaluation of the programme in 6 evaluation areas, including points per each of the areas as specified in Annexes 1 and 2 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure. Should the evaluation report be drafted in a language other than the official language, a translation of the report into the official language shall be provided to the Centre as required under applicable legislation.

10. Any branch wishing that the Centre conducts an external evaluation in accordance with the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure shall submit to the Centre all documents listed in sub-items 8.1 and 8.2 of the Methodology.

I. REQUIREMENTS FOR PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION

11. The purpose of a study programme description is:

11.1. To inform future students of the aim(s) of the programme, intended learning outcomes, curriculum, study methods and assessment;

Amendments to the sub-item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016 published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

11.2. To inform future students of what they will have to know, be able to do and understand after graduating from the programme (course) and what assessment criteria, methods and forms will apply;

11.3. To inform employers of the learning outcomes, curriculum of the programme and graduate qualification;

11.4. To create premises for communication between the programme participants and social partners;

11.5. To create premises for programme accreditation.

12. A programme description shall consist of the following: cover page (including the name of the higher education institution proposing the programme, name of the programme with a remark that the programme is a proposed programme, title of the higher education institution head and title of the manager of the team in charge of developing the study programme description, signature, academic appointment and (or) academic degree, name, surname, year and month the description was developed in), programme description and any annexes to the description. The description shall provide all information required to make the accreditation decision.

13. The components of a programme description shall be the following: the need for the programme, the aim(s) of the programme and intended learning outcomes, curriculum design, teaching staff, facilities and learning resources, study process and its evaluation and programme management.

Amendments to the item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

14. The section dedicated to the programme aims and intended learning outcomes shall provide the following information:

14.1. The aim(s) and intended learning outcomes of the programme shall be provided in the form of Table 1 presented in the annex to the Methodology with a specification of the links between the programme aim(s) and intended learning outcomes and courses (modules) implementing the same. Programme aim(s) have to be based on the requirements applicable to studies of the appropriate cycle and type and to the activities of professionals to be trained under the programme linked to the acquired learning outcomes (knowledge and competences) by the person graduating that programme, needs of the state, society and labour market, and match with the mission, goals and (or) strategy of the higher education institution. If a qualification is awarded at the end of studies, the requirements for which are set out in national or international legislation, the aim(s) and intended learning outcomes of the programme should also satisfy the said requirements. When wording the intended learning outcomes, it is recommended to identify knowledge and its application, ability to conduct research, special competences, social competences and personal competences based on the description of learning outcomes for a particular study cycle and type provided in the Descriptor of study cycles; due consideration should also be given to the requirements for a particular level of qualification in the Lithuanian Qualifications Framework (does not apply to study programmes delivered by branches of foreign higher education institutions).

Amendments to the sub-item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

14.2. The list of pieces of legislation setting out the requirements for the (professional) qualification to be awarded (if to be awarded).

15. In the section dedicated to the need for the programme, the higher education institution shall provide an analysis of the need for the programme conducted by the institution tying it to career opportunities of professionals to be trained. For purposes of the said analysis the institution may use findings of research and surveys conducted by the programme developers, employers and other social partners and other institutions, employment data of graduates similar study programmes delivered by the institution, data about the same or similar professionals trained at other higher education institutions, national human resources monitoring data, and other information justifying the need for professionals to be trained. Precise sources of information shall be indicated. This section of the description is designed to justify the need for the programme to the higher education institution, region or state, if the programme is focused on the existing or expected demand for particular professionals in a certain territory. If the programme targets certain groups of students (e.g., foreign nationals; the employed who wish to expand their professional activities; the employed who are focused on the acquisition/deepening of professional knowledge and competences; etc.), then there should be a justification of the need for the programme to a particular group of applicants. There should also be a description of the expected graduate professional and (or) scientific career opportunities tying those to the demand for these professionals.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

16. The section dedicated to the curriculum design shall contain a study plan in the form defined by the higher education institution itself. If the institution intends to offer the programme in both full-time and part-time modes, an intended study plan shall be provided for each mode separately. The study plan for the programme shall cover the structure of the programme, courses (modules) in each semester and course volume in credits. The courses (modules) shall be distributed in the plan based on their classification, i.e. whether these are study field courses, general university (college) courses or courses of other study fields, if the aims of the programme are related to interdisciplinary studies. Any such plan shall include practical training, volume of optional courses students may choose (if any), final thesis, and the number of credits to be allocated to courses of minor studies (study field).

Amendments to the item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

17. The section dedicated to teaching staff shall include a list of proposed lecturers in the form of Table 2 provided in the annex to the Methodology.

18. The programme description shall provide information about facilities and learning resources required to deliver the programme and available to the higher education institution (and resources available to its partner(s) in the event of a joint study programme), such as library collections, laboratories, computers and specialised software, classrooms and similar, as well as teaching materials.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

19. The section dedicated to study process and its evaluation shall provide the requirements applicable to applicants. In the event of a master degree programme, a specification shall be given of the study fields of first cycle studies graduates of which may be enrolled in the programme proposed and of the admission criteria. Should the programme admit graduates of other study fields, or graduates of college studies, subject to certain additional requirements (for example, bridging studies), then these requirements shall be described and justified. There shall also be a specification

of special requirements with regards to certain competences, physical qualities and similar, if the institution intends to apply these requirements at the time of admission. There shall also be a description of the measures the institution intends to enforce in order to ensure honest studies, non-discrimination and consideration of student appeals. In the event of a joint study programme being proposed, there shall be a description of how student and teacher mobility shall be ensured. This section shall also cover the intended methods of studies and the system for student achievement assessment, as well as student support (academic, social) system.

Amendments to the item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

20. The section dedicated to programme management shall detail the processes of planning, organisation, supervision and improvement of studies and how stakeholders (employers, students, graduates) had been or will be involved in these processes, what kind of procedures had been applied in order to develop and approve the study programme proposed, and the measures of internal quality assurance of studies.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

21. *Annulled:*

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

22. When accreditation decision may be made in accordance with the procedure set out in item 17 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure, a programme description shall meet the requirements covered in item 12–20 of the Methodology. The following annexes shall be provided together with the programme description:

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

22.1. Descriptions of courses (modules) (including of practical training and final thesis) in an electronic format. These descriptions shall be provided in the form established by the higher education institution with a specification of this essential information: name of the course (module), volume of the course (module) in credits and hours (including contact work hours and independent work hours), aims, links between the programme learning outcomes, course (module) learning outcomes, study methods and student achievement assessment methods (form of Table 3 in the annex of the Methodology), assessment criteria, course (module) syllabus and main references;

22.1.¹ A prospective plan for improvements to facilities and learning resources based on the needs of the programme and financial possibilities of the higher education institution; the plan may also be integrated into the description of facilities and learning resources;

Supplemented with a sub-item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

22.2. Details required under the Description of the procedure for registering objects in the Register of studies, training programmes and qualifications as approved by the order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania that are required in order to register the programme in the Register of studies, training programmes and qualifications;

22.3. A copy of the agreement for the delivery of a joint study programme signed by all partnering higher education institutions in Lithuanian or English in the event of a joint study programme.

Amendments to the sub-item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

23. When accreditation decision may be made only after having conducted an external evaluation in the cases provided for in item 18 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure, a programme description shall meet the requirements covered in items 12–20 of the Methodology and the following additional requirements: in the teaching staff section, information about staff experience in the study field of the programme proposed. This experience has to be evidenced by articles prepared and published by lecturers in scientific and (or) professional journals, projects developed and successfully implemented (with a list of articles, projects implemented, etc.), consulting or science promotion activities. The following annexes shall be provided together with the programme description:

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

23.1. Descriptions of courses (modules), including of practical training and final thesis. These descriptions shall be provided in the form established by the higher education institution with a specification of this essential information: name of the course (module), volume of the course (module) in credits and hours (including contact work hours and independent work hours), aims, links between the programme learning outcomes, course (module) learning outcomes, study methods and student achievement assessment methods (form of Table 3 in the annex of the Methodology), assessment criteria, course (module) contents and main references;

23.2. CVs of lecturers expected to teach the programme. Any CV of a lecturer shall include the following information: name and surname of the lecturer, educational attainment, places of employment (with an indication of the title and the nature of work), key scientific (artistic) and methodological works within the past 7 years, foreign language skills. Lecturer CVs shall be provided as an annex to the programme description in alphabetical order (by surnames);

23.2.¹ A prospective plan for improvements to facilities and learning resources based on the needs of the programme and financial possibilities of the higher education institution; the plan may also be integrated into the description of facilities and learning resources;

Supplemented with a sub-item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

Amendments to the sub-item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

23.3. Details required under the Description of the procedure for registering objects in the Register of studies, training programmes and qualifications as approved by the order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania that are required in order to register the programme in the Register of studies, training programmes and qualifications;

23.4. A copy of the agreement for the delivery of a joint study programme signed by all partnering higher education institutions in Lithuanian or English in the event of a joint study programme.

Amendments to the sub-item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

24. When a study programme is proposed by a branch, a programme description shall meet the requirements covered in items 12–20 of the Methodology. Annexes to the programme description shall meet the requirements covered in sub-items 23.1 and 23.2 of the Methodology. Documents supporting the evaluation and accreditation of the programme against the requirements applicable in that particular country may be submitted as an extra annex to the programme description.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

25. The higher education institution shall produce the programme description to the Centre both as a hard copy and electronic copy. The electronic copy of the programme description shall be produced by the institution to the Centre by e-mail at kokybe@skvc.lt, or in a computer medium. The electronic copy of the programme description shall be produced in a .doc, .docx or .pdf format. Information required in order to register the programme in the Register of studies, training programmes and qualifications shall be produced exclusively in .doc or .docx formats. Each annex to the programme description in the electronic format shall be produced in a separate document.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

III. EXAMINATION OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS OR BRANCHS

26. On receipt of an application to accredit the programme the Centre shall determine whether:

26.1. All documents required under item 19 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure had been submitted and whether they are in the appropriate form;

26.2. The programme meets the requirements of item 17 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure;

26.3. There is any one of the conditions laid down in item 18 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure;

26.4. All partners intending to deliver the programme are authorised to deliver studies of the same cycle and type and award the corresponding qualification degree, if the programme proposed is a joint programme.

Amendments to the item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

27. Should the Centre determine that not all of the documents required under item 19 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure had been submitted and (or) the documents submitted are not in the appropriate form, and (or) the programme does not meet the requirements laid down in sub-items 17.1–17.3 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure, the term of 20 working days to make the accreditation decision shall be suspended until shortcomings are rectified. The Centre shall notify the higher education institution of any shortcomings identified and suspension of the process in accordance with the procedure of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure.

28. The higher education institution shall have no more than 15 working days from the day of receipt of the decision of the shortcomings identified and suspension of the process to rectify these shortcomings. Should the higher education institution fail to rectify shortcomings within the said term, the Centre shall terminate the examination process and notify the higher education institution of this decision.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

29. Should the existence of at least one of the conditions specified in item 18 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure be ascertained during the examination of the application to accredit the programme, the Centre shall suspend the term of 20 working days to make the accreditation decision and notify the higher education institution of this decision. The decision shall detail the obligation of the higher education institution to notify the Centre no later than within 15 days from the day of dispatch of the said decision whether the higher education institution wishes to

conduct an external evaluation at the Centre. The application to conduct an external evaluation at the Centre may be submitted together with the application to accredit the programme.

30. On receipt of the application by the branch asking to conduct an external evaluation, the Centre shall conduct this procedure as provided for in items 34–54 of the Methodology and make the decision on the external evaluation of the programme.

31. Having made the decision to conduct the external evaluation of the programme the Centre shall notify the branch and the Ministry of Education and Science of the decision made.

I. PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION DECISION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITEM 17 OF THE DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION PROCEDURE

32. Should the Centre determine at the time of the examination of the application to accredit the programme by the higher education institution when the programme is subject to accreditation as provided for in item 17 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure that all documents required under item 19 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure had been submitted and are in the appropriate form, the programme meets the requirements of sub-items 17.1–17.3 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure and none of the conditions set out in item 18 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure is present, the Centre shall make the decision to accredit the programme for the term set out in item 9 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure.

33. Should there be doubts as to the compliance of the programme with legal requirements that is subject to accreditation in accordance with item 17 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure, the Centre may initiate an external evaluation of the programme, or hire an expert (experts) to produce expert opinion. Should this be the case, the Centre shall within 20 working days from the day of receipt of the documents required under item 19 of the Description notify the higher education institution of the suspension of the accreditation process until an external evaluation is conducted or an expert opinion is received. Once the Centre makes the decision to conduct an external valuation of the programme, the higher education institution shall be informed of the course of the external evaluation in accordance with and within the terms as provided for in applicable legislation.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

II. PROGRESS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF A PROGRAMME AND DECISION ON PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION

34. In cases established in item 18 of the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure a programme shall be evaluated externally against the criteria set out in section III of Chapter 3 of the Methodology.

35. Experts for an external evaluation shall be selected as provided for in the Expert selection procedure as approved by the order of the Director of the Centre.

36. The Centre shall notify the higher education institution of the composition of an evaluation team by e-mail. Within 5 working days from the day of dispatch of the notice of the expected composition of the evaluation team the higher education institution may provide its arguments as to why one or another member of the evaluation team should be replaced.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

37. The Centre shall hold a meeting of experts during which it will support the team in identifying the goals and tasks of the evaluation, explain this Methodology and familiarise the team with legislation governing external evaluations.

38. Having reviewed information provided in the programme description the experts shall produce an initial report; identify areas to be evaluated and questions that will require special attention during site visits. The Centre shall prepare an agenda of the visit and coordinate this agenda with the evaluation team and the higher education institution.

39. The site visit to the higher education institution shall last 1 to 2 days.

40. The site visit shall involve meetings with the management of the higher education institution or divisions thereof, developers of the programme description, expected lecturers of the programme, and social partners. The visit shall be regarded as valid when at least 2/3 of the evaluation team participate. During the site visit the experts shall inspect the facilities and learning resources intended to be used to deliver the programme.

Amendments to the item:

No V-58, 22/08/2013, Official Gazette, 2013, No 91-4565 (27/08/2013), ID 113207CISAK0000V-58

41. The higher education institution shall, when possible, provide the opportunity for all members of the community to meet with the experts should they wish to do so.

42. During the site visit the higher education institution shall provide the premises and equipment needed by the experts to do their work.

43. The evaluation team shall prepare a draft report and produce this draft report to the Centre no later than within 1 month from the end of the site visit.

44. Upon production of the draft report to the Centre the experts shall propose one of the following

44.1. To give a positive evaluation of the programme;

44.2. To recommend changes to the programme;

44.3. To give a negative evaluation of the programme.

45. The programme shall be given a positive evaluation when the experts have no comments, or the comments presented are insignificant. The programme shall also be given a positive evaluation if the higher education institution made changes to the programme in light of the expert recommendations within the term set in item 48 of the Methodology.

46. Recommendations to make changes to the programme shall be made should there be shortcomings in the programme that need to be rectified without changing the programme in essence.

47. The programme shall be given a negative evaluation in the event of important and extensively justified reasons by the experts that the programme does not meet the requirements, the purpose of the programme is unclear, the facilities and learning resources are insufficient to deliver the programme, and the higher education institution fails to produce a justified prospective plan of improvements to the facilities and learning resources, etc. The programme shall also be given a negative evaluation if the higher education institution fails to make changes to the programme within the term given in item 48 of the Methodology.

Amendments to the item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

48. The Centre shall e-mail the draft report without expert proposals, except in the case covered in sub-item 44.2 of the Methodology, to the higher education institution which then shall have 10 working days from the day of dispatch of the draft report to present its comments with regards to what the higher education institution believes to be factual mistakes in the draft report. Should the draft report contain a proposal to make changes to the programme as provided for in sub-item 44.2 of the Methodology, the higher education institution shall have 10 working days from the day of

dispatch of the draft report to make the changes suggested by the experts and e-mail change supporting documents to the Centre.

Amendments to the item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

49. The Centre shall forward to the evaluation team any comments by the higher education institution with regards to what the higher education institution believes to be factual mistakes in the draft report and (or) documents supporting the rectification of shortcomings in the programme.

50. Having evaluated comments by the higher education institution with regards to what the higher education institution believes to be factual mistakes in the programme and (or) documents supporting the rectification of shortcomings in the programme as identified by the experts, the experts shall then have 14 days to prepare and deliver to the Centre the final report on programme evaluation. Each evaluation area shall be given points as provided in Annex 2 to the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure.

51. Conclusions of the evaluation shall be considered in the Higher Education Evaluation Commission in accordance with the procedure set out in the Regulations of the Higher Education Evaluation Commission in effect approved by the Director of the Centre. The team leader or some other member of the evaluation team that evaluated the programme, as well as the developer (developers) of the programme description and other representatives of the institution may be invited to the meeting of the higher Education Evaluation Commission.

52. Having considered the conclusions of the evaluation report and listened to the arguments presented by the attendees of the meeting, the Higher Education Evaluation Commission shall adopt one of the proposals specified in the Regulations of the Higher Education Evaluation Commission.

53. Should there be doubts as to the completeness, validity or objectivity of the evaluation report, the Centre may initiate an additional external evaluation of the programme.

54. Having due regard to the expert conclusions and the proposal by the Higher Education Evaluation Commission the Centre shall make the decision to evaluate the programme as provided for in the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure. Together with the decision the Centre shall e-mail or post the evaluation report or copy thereof to the higher education institution.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

55. Based on the entered decision with regards to the evaluation of the programme or the evaluation report by the Agency the Centre shall make the accreditation decision as provided for in the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure. The accreditation decision made shall be published by the Centre as required under applicable legislation.

Amendments to the item:

No V-71, 24/08/2016, published on TAR on 25/08/2016, ID 2016-22629

56. In the event that an external evaluation was done by the Agency, then the Centre shall make the decision to accredit the programme as provided for in the Description of the evaluation and accreditation procedure.

III. EXTERNAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

57. The external evaluation of the programme shall be based on the analysis of 6 areas: programme aims and intended learning outcomes, curriculum design, teaching staff, facilities and learning resources, study process and its evaluation, and programme management.

58. During the external evaluation of the programme each area shall be analysed against certain predetermined assessment criteria, i.e. features that determine the quality of a programme.

59. The area of programme aim(s) and intended learning outcomes shall be assessed against the following criteria:

59.1. The need for the programme on the higher education institution, regional, national or international levels is clearly justified with data of national human resources monitoring or linked to graduate career opportunities;

59.2. The aim(s) of the programme and intended learning outcomes are defined and clear, they fit to the mission, goals and (or) strategy of the higher education institution;

59.3. The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are based on the academic and (or) professional requirements, needs of the state, society and labour market;

59.4. The aims and intended learning outcomes of the programme are consistent with the type and cycle of studies, and the level of qualifications;

59.5. The name of the programme, intended learning outcomes, curriculum and the qualification awarded fit one another.

Amendments to the item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

60. The area of curriculum design shall be assessed against the following criteria:

60.1. The curriculum design meets legal requirements;

60.2. Course (module) syllabuses are consistent with the type and cycle of studies;

60.3. Course (module) syllabuses and methods are appropriate to reach the intended learning outcomes;

60.4. Volume of the programme is appropriate to reach the learning outcomes;

60.5. The curriculum is consistent with the latest advances in science, art or technology.

61. The area of teaching staff shall be assessed against the following criteria:

61.1. The staff expected to teach the programme meets legal requirements;

61.2. The qualification of staff expected to teach the programme is adequate to reach the intended learning outcomes;

61.3. The number of staff expected to teach the programme is adequate to reach the intended learning outcomes;

61.4. Research (applied research, artistic activities) conducted by the staff expected to teach the programme is directly related to the programme being analysed.

62. The area of facilities and learning resources shall be assessed against the following criteria:

62.1. The premises allocated to the programme are adequate and sufficient;

62.2. The equipment (laboratory, computer, tools) allocated to the programme is adequate and sufficient;

62.3. The facilities for practical training allocated by the higher education institution are adequate;

62.4. The learning resources (textbooks, books, periodicals, data bases) are adequate, sufficient and available.

63. The area of study process (expected) and its evaluation shall be assessed against the following criteria:

63.1. The admission requirements are justified;

63.2. The methods to be applied are adequate to reach the learning outcomes;

63.3. The student achievement assessment system is clear and adequate to assess learning outcomes.

63.4. Measures anticipated to prevent dishonest studies, discrimination and measures of appeal are clear and transparent.

Supplement with a sub-item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

64. The area of programme management shall be assessed against the following criteria:

64.1. The processes of planning, organisation, supervision and improvement of studies are clearly described and internal quality assurance measures are indicated;

64.2. Stakeholders had been involved/will be involved in the programme development, assessment and improvement processes;

Amendments to the sub-item:

No V-67, 12/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

64.3. The intended measures of internal quality assurance are adequate.

IV. FINAL PROVISIONS

65. Should the higher education institution disagree with the decision made by the Centre with regards to programme evaluation, the institution shall have 30 days from the day of dispatch of the decision to produce an argument-based appeal regarding the evaluation.

66. Any appeal by the higher education institution shall be examined by the Study Programme Appeal Commission (hereinafter – the Appeal Commission) functioning in accordance with the Regulations of the Study Programme Appeal Commission approved by the Director of the Centre. A decision by the Appeal Commission shall be made no later than 60 days from the day of logging the appeal.

Amendments to the item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

66.¹ Both the decision of the Centre and of the Appeal Commission may be further appealed in accordance with the Law on Administrative Proceedings of the Republic of Lithuania within one month from the day of receipt of the decision.

Supplemented with an item:

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

67. For the purposes of accreditation decision the Centre may hire experts.

68. Orders by the Director of the Centre accrediting study programmes shall be published in the Register of Legislation (TAR). Information about programme accreditation shall also be published on the Centre's website.

Amendments to the item:

No V-67, 18/12/2014, published on TAR on 18/12/2014, ID 2014-19919

69. Higher education institutions shall be required by law to make the evaluation results of their study programmes publicly available.

70. *Annulled:*

No V-68, 22/07/2016, published on TAR on 25/07/2016, ID 2016-21002

Amendments to the annex:

No V-23, 22/04/2013, Official Gazette, 2013, No 49-2469 (11/05/2013), ID 113207CISAK0000V-23

To the Methodology for drafting the descriptions of proposed study programmes and for conducting external evaluation and accreditation thereof

MODEL TABLES

Table 1. Links between the aim(s) of the study programme, learning outcomes of the study cycle, intended learning outcomes and courses (modules).

Aim of the programme		
Description of learning outcomes of the study cycle*	Intended learning outcomes of the programme	Courses (modules)
Knowledge and its application		
Ability to conduct research		
Special competences		
Social competences		
Personal competences		

*A description of the appropriate level of qualification from the Lithuanian Qualifications Framework may be produced instead of the description of learning outcomes of the study cycle. This section should provide a description of learning outcomes appropriate for the cycle and type of studies (professional bachelor, bachelor or master) based on the Descriptor of study cycles with demonstrated links to the intended learning outcomes of the programme.

Table 2. List of intended lecturers

Name, surname	Qualification and (or) academic degree, present or expected academic appointment	Course (module) to be taught*	Field of research (artistic) activities	Professional (practical work) experience in years
1	2	3	4	5
Lecturers of study field courses				
Lecturers of general courses of university (college) studies				

*In the case of a master degree study programme applied courses shall be marked by letter “T”.

**Experience of practical work (for example, in production, sales, services, public administration, etc.) acquired by the lecturer over the past seven years relevant to the course (courses) to be taught. Professional experience shall be indicated only for those lecturers who are expected to teach applied courses of a master degree study programme. In the case of a college study programme practical work experience in the area of the course to be taught shall be indicated for all lecturers.

Table 3. Links between the intended learning outcomes of the programme and learning outcomes of the course (module) and teaching/learning and student achievement assessment methods.

Intended learning outcomes of the programme	Learning outcomes of the course (module)	Teaching/learning methods	Student achievement assessment methods

Amendments to the annex:

No V-23, 22/04/2013, Official Gazette, 2013, No 49-2469 (11/05/2013), ID 113207CISAK0000V-23