



**DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRE FOR QUALITY ASSESSMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

**ORDER  
ON THE APPROVAL OF THE METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION OF NEW  
RESIDENCY STUDY PROGRAMMES, METHODOLOGY FOR EXTERNAL  
EVALUATION OF RESIDENCY STUDIES, PLAN OF EXTERNAL EVALUATION  
OF RESIDENCY STUDIES**

1 December 2020, No V-99  
Vilnius

Pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Order No V-1269 of the Minister for Education, Science and Sport of the Republic of Lithuania of 24 August 2020 on the Approval of the Description of Procedure for External Evaluation and Accreditation of Residency Studies, Evaluation Areas and Indicators:

1. I hereby approve the Methodology for Evaluation of New Residency Study Programmes (attached);
2. I hereby approve the Methodology for External Evaluation of Residency Studies (attached);
3. I hereby approve the Plan of External Evaluation of Residency Studies (attached);

Director

Almantas Šerpatauskas

## **THE METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION OF NEW RESIDENCY STUDY PROGRAMMES**

### **CHAPTER I GENERAL PROVISIONS**

1. The Methodology for Evaluation of New Residency Study Programmes (hereinafter referred to as 'the Methodology') sets out the requirements for the description of the new residency study programme, which a higher education institution (hereinafter referred to as 'the higher education institution') established in the Republic of Lithuania and authorised to conduct studies and study-related activities, intending to conduct residency study programmes in the Republic of Lithuania and abroad, submits to the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as 'the Centre'), requirements for documents submitted by the higher education institution and the procedure for examining thereof at the Centre, the evaluation process of the new residency study programme and the procedure for examining complaints and appeals against the decision taken by the Centre concerning the evaluation of the new residency study programme (hereinafter referred to as 'the residency study programme').

2. The Methodology has been developed in accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania, the Description of the Procedure for External Evaluation and Accreditation of Residency Studies (hereinafter referred to as 'the Description') and the Evaluation Areas and Indicators for External Evaluation of Residency Studies (hereinafter 'the List of Evaluation Areas and Indicators') approved by Order No V-1269 of the Minister for Education, Science and Sport of the Republic of Lithuania of 24 August 2020 on the Approval of the Description of Procedure for External Evaluation and Accreditation of Residency Studies, Evaluation Areas and Indicators, as well as the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.

3. The definitions used in the Methodology correspond to those defined in the Law on Higher Education and Research, the Law on Medical Practice of the Republic of Lithuania, the Law on Dental Practice of the Republic of Lithuania, the Description of the Procedures for Implementation and Supervision of Residency Study Programme Requirements approved by Resolution No 248 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania of 14 March 2018.

4. The decision on the evaluation of the residency study programme (if the higher education institution does not conduct accredited residency studies in that field and accreditation) shall be taken by the Centre in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Description:

4.1. after a simplified evaluation of the residency study programme;

4.2. after an external evaluation of the residency study programme;

5. The higher education institution, which provides the residency study programme in the field where the residency studies are not evaluated and accredited, shall apply to the Centre for a simplified evaluation of the residency study programme in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Description.

6. The higher education institution shall apply to the Centre for external evaluation of the residency study programme under one of the following conditions:

6.1. the residency studies of the conducted field are accredited for a term of three years;

6.2. the residency study programme is assigned to the field of residency studies that the higher education institution does not conduct.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCUMENTS TO BE SUBMITTED**

7. A higher education institution seeking to have the residency study programme evaluated, and the field (if the higher education institution does not conduct accredited residency studies in that field) has been accredited, shall submit the following to the Centre:

7.1. a request to evaluate the residency study programme (if the higher education institution does not conduct accredited residency studies in that field, the request shall state that accreditation of the residency studies in the field is also requested). A separate request for the evaluation of a residency study programme shall not be submitted if the description of the new residency study programme (hereinafter referred to as ‘the description of the residency study programme’) is submitted together with the application to obtain an authorisation to conduct studies and study-related activities;

7.1. a description of the residency study programme drafted in accordance with the requirements set out in Paragraph 8 of the Methodology;

7.2. the report of the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Lithuania on the need for specialists to be trained and the services provided by them (if a residency study programme constituting the group of study fields within the health is submitted);

7.3. the report of the State Food and Veterinary Service on the need for specialists to be trained (if a residency study programme constituting the group of study fields within the veterinary is submitted);

7.4. The Description of the Procedure for Registering Objects of the Register of Studies, Training Programmes and Qualifications approved by the Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania, contains the data required for registration of the residency study programme in the Register of Studies, Training Programmes and Qualifications (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Register’).

8. The description of the residency study programme shall consist of:

8.1. a description of the residency study programme, the components of which must correspond to the evaluation areas set out in the list of Evaluated areas and indicators. The description of the residency study programme shall contain an analysis of these evaluation areas in accordance with the indicators set out in the List of Evaluation Areas and Indicators, as well as the data and information, analysed in Annex 1 of the Methodology. Where a joint residency study programme is submitted for evaluation, the description of the residency study programme must clearly indicate the peculiarities of the joint study programme. It shall also specify which resources (human and learning) are used in each of the higher education institutions conducting the joint residency study programme;

8.2. The annexes to the description of the residency study programme, which shall include:

8.2.1. descriptions of cycles. The descriptions shall be presented in accordance with the form established by the higher education institution, including the following necessary information: the title of the cycle, the volume of the cycle in credits and hours (indicating the volume of contact and self-study work in hours), the objective, the links among the study results of the residency study programme, the results of the study cycle, the study methods and the methods of evaluation of the achievements of a resident, reporting forms, evaluation criteria, the content of the cycle, compulsory literature;

8.2.2. curriculum vitae of the teaching staff of the new residency study programme. The curriculum vitae of the lecturer shall contain the following information: name and surname of the lecturer, an available degree in pedagogy and/or science, pedagogical work experience, the field of scientific interests, the most significant scientific and methodological work of the lecturer related to the field of the residency study programme, prepared in the last five years, practical work experience in the field of teaching cycle, improvement of qualification in the didactic and field-related field over the past three years, level of proficiency in foreign languages.

9. Where a higher education institution intends to launch a study programme in a branch established in a foreign country, it must submit to the Centre a request for approval of the execution

of a residency study programme in a branch established in a foreign country and a description of the residency study programme. The components of the description of the residency study programme must correspond to the evaluation areas set out in the list of Evaluated areas and indicators. The description of the residency study programme shall contain an analysis of these evaluation areas in accordance with the indicators set out in the List of Evaluation Areas and Indicators, as well as the data and information, analysed in Annex 1 of the Methodology. The annexes to the description of the residency study programme shall correspond to the requirements set out in Paragraph 8.2 of the Methodology.

10. In the event that the external evaluation of the residency study programme of the higher education institution has been carried out by an agency for quality assessment in higher education listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as 'the Agency'), the following documents shall be to the Centre together with the request for registration of the residency programme (and the accreditation of the field if the higher education institution does not conduct accredited residency studies in that field):

10.1. the reports on the external evaluation of the residency study programme not older than one year, with evaluation scores according to the evaluation areas set out in the List of Evaluation Areas and Indicators and the grading scale of the evaluation areas of the residency studies set out in the Annex to the Description. If the evaluation report of the residency study programme are drafted in a language other than the official language, the translation of the external evaluation report into the official language shall also be submitted to the Centre in accordance with the procedure laid down by legal acts;

10.2. The data contained in the Description of the Procedure for Registering Objects of the Register of Studies, Training Programmes and Qualifications approved by the Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania, required for registration of the residency study programme in the Register.

11. The higher education institution shall submit to the Centre the documents signed with a qualified electronic signature at kokybe@skvc.lt or via the information system 'E. pristatymas'. The description of the residency study programme in electronic form shall be presented in 'doc', 'docx' or 'pdf' format. Information about the study programme required for the registration of the residency study programme in the Register shall be provided only in 'doc' or 'docx' format. Each annex to the description of the residency study programme in the electronic version shall be presented as a separate document.

### **CHAPTER III**

#### **PROCESS OF EVALUATION OF NEW RESIDENCY STUDY PROGRAMME**

12. After examining the documents submitted by the higher education institution, the Centre shall determine whether:

12.1. all the documents specified in Paragraph 7 of the Methodology have been submitted and whether they have been formalised in accordance with the procedure laid down in Chapter II of the Methodology;

12.2. the residency study programme complies with the requirements set out in the Description of the requirements and supervision procedures for the implementation of medical residency studies and dental residency study programmes and the procedure for supervision approved by Resolution No 144 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania of 13 February 2019 on the approval of the Description of Requirements for the Implementation of Medical Residency Studies and Dental Residency Study Programmes and the Procedure for Supervision (if a residency study programme constituting the group of study fields within the health is submitted) or the Description of the requirements and supervision procedures for the implementation of study programmes of veterinary medicine approved by Resolution No 149 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania of 1 March 2017 on the implementation of the Law on Higher Education of the Republic of Lithuania (if a residency study programme constituting the group of study fields within the veterinary is

submitted) for the duration of residency study programmes, the scope of theoretical and practical studies and the supervisor of residents.

13. In the event that the Centre finds, within ten working days from the submission of the request from the higher education institution to evaluate the residency study programme, that the documents submitted by the higher education institution do not meet the requirements set out in Paragraph 12.1 of the Methodology and/or the residency study programme does not comply with the requirements set out in Paragraph 12.2 of the Methodology, the evaluation process shall be suspended until the shortcomings identified have been remedied. The Centre shall inform the higher education institution of the shortcomings identified and of the suspension of the process.

14. The higher education institution may remedy the shortcomings found within a maximum of ten working days from the date of receipt of the decision on the shortcomings found and the suspension of the process. If the higher education institution fails to remedy the shortcomings found by the Centre within this term, the Centre shall terminate the request examination procedure and inform the higher education institution thereof.

15. In the event that the Center determines that the documents submitted by the higher education institution comply with the requirements set out in Paragraph 12.1. of the Methodology and the residency study programme complies with the requirements set out in Paragraph 12.2. of the Methodology, the Center shall, within ten working days from submission of the request of the higher education institution to evaluate the residency study programme or informing the higher education institution about the correction of shortcomings identified by the Center, in case of simplified evaluation of the residency study programme, take a decision to evaluate the residency study programme positively, and in case of external evaluation of the residency study programme, shall initiate the external evaluation procedure.

16. The external evaluation of the residency study programme shall be performed in accordance with the evaluation areas and indicators specified in the List of Evaluation Areas and Indicators as well as the analysed data and information specified in Annex 1 to the Methodology.

17. Experts for the external evaluation of the residency study programme shall be selected in accordance with the procedure established in the Procedure of Selection of Experts approved by the order of the Director of the Centre.

18. The Centre shall inform the higher education institution about the composition of the expert team by e-mail. The higher education institution may, within five working days of receiving notification of the intended composition of the expert team, request, on a reasoned basis, the replacement of the member(s) of the intended expert team.

19. The Centre shall consider the comments received regarding the composition of the expert team in the Permanent Commission formed by the order of the Director of the Centre to examine the requests of higher education institutions to replace experts and shall inform the higher education institution about the decision taken. In the event that the higher education institution has not submitted a reasoned request regarding the change of the composition of the expert team within the term specified in Paragraph 18 of the Methodology, the higher education institution shall be deemed to have approved the composition of the expert team.

20. The principles and procedures for the organisation of experts' work are laid down in the Procedure of the Organisation of Experts' Work, approved by the Order of the Director of the Centre.

21. After examining the information provided in the Description of the residency study programme, as well as other publicly available information, the experts shall prepare initial findings and shall prepare for issues that require particular attention during the visit.

22. The duration of the visit of the expert team to the higher education institution shall be 1–2 days.

23. The visit to the higher education institution shall follow the visit agenda drawn up by the Centre and coordinated with the expert team and the higher education institution.

24. The higher education institution shall enable any member of the community who wishes to meet the expert team to do so by making public the visit information. Except in cases agreed in advance with the Evaluation Coordinator, one member of the higher education institution community

may attend only one meeting with the expert team per visit.

25. During the visit, meetings are held with the administration of the higher education institution or its unit(s), the authors of the description of the residency study programme, the teaching staff intending to teach in the residency study programme, employers or other social partners interested in the specialists planned to be prepared based on the programme, as well as experts shall review the material base foreseen for the implementation of the residency study programme.

26. The expert team shall prepare a draft of the evaluation report of the residency study programme (hereinafter referred to as the 'draft report') with the evaluation of each evaluation area indicated in the List of Evaluation Areas and Indicators according to the grading scale of the residency study in the fields under evaluation presented in the Annex to the Description (except for the case specified in Sub-Paragraph 27.2 of the Methodology) and shall submit it to the Centre at least within one month from the end of the visit to the higher education institution.

27. During submission of the draft report of the evaluation of the residency study programme to the Centre, the expert team shall submit one of the following proposals:

27.1. to evaluate the residency study program positively, if not more than one of the evaluation areas and indicators of the evaluation area is evaluated by the expert team not less than "satisfactory" – 2 points according to the grading scale specified in Annex to the Description;

27.2. offers the higher education institution to adjust the residency study programme if the expert team identifies shortcomings in the programme that must be remedied and they are easily remedied without substantially changing the programme;

27.3. to evaluate the residency study program negatively it at least one of the evaluation areas and indicators of the evaluation area is evaluated by the expert team "unsatisfactory" – 1 point – or at least two evaluation areas are evaluated as "satisfactory" – 2 points according to the grading scale specified in Annex of the Description.

28. The Center shall send the draft report of the external evaluation with the evaluation of each evaluation area according to the grading scale set out in the Annex to the Description (except for the case provided for in Sub-Paragraph 27.2 of the Methodology) to the higher education institution by e-mail or via the information system 'E.pristatymas', which shall have the right to provide comments concerning factual errors in the draft report of the external evaluation or on the evaluations based thereon. Where the proposal set out in Sub-Paragraph 27.2 of the Methodology was submitted in the draft report of external evaluation, the higher education institution shall have the right to correct the shortcomings indicated by the experts and submit the adjusted description of the residency study programme to the Center by e-mail or via the information system 'E.pristatymas' with annexes and/or other documents substantiating the corrections made and comments on the factual errors in the draft report of the external evaluation or the evaluations based thereon.

29. Having examined the comments of the higher education institution on the factual errors in the draft report of the external evaluation or the evaluations based thereon and/or the adjusted description of the residency study programme with annexes and/or documents substantiating other adjustments, the expert team shall prepare the final report of the external evaluation and submit it to the Centre at least within ten working days.

30. The report of the external evaluation shall be examined in the Studies' Evaluation Committee formed by the Centre, operating in accordance with the procedure established by the Regulations of the Studies' Evaluation Committee approved by the order of the Director of the Centre.

31. Guided by the report of the external evaluation and taking into account the proposal of the Studies' Evaluation Committee, the Centre shall take a decision on the evaluation of the residency study programme in accordance with the procedure established in Paragraph 31 of the Description. Together with the decision, the Centre shall provide the higher education institution with a copy or a transcript of the evaluation report.

32. The Center shall submit the data of the positively evaluated residency study programme to the Register within three working days from the day of taking a decision to evaluate the residency study programme positively.

33. Where the residency studies in the field conducted by a higher education institution are accredited for a period of seven years in accordance with Sub-Paragraph 16.1 of the Description, the submitted new residency study programme shall be evaluated by the higher education institution itself in accordance with the procedure established by it. The higher education institution shall submit a request for registration of the residency study programme and the documents specified in Sub-Paragraphs 7.2 or 7.3, 7.4 of the Methodology to the Centre by e-mail to kokybe@skvc.lt or via the information system 'E.pristatymas'. The Centre shall forward the data of the residency study programme to the Register.

34. Where the residency study programme is attributed to a field in which the higher education institution does not conduct residency studies, the Centre, having received the state code assigned to the residency study programme from the Register and, in accordance with the decision of the Centre on the evaluation of the residency study programme or the report of the external evaluation of the Agency, shall prepare an order on the accreditation of residency studies in the field within five working days.

35. A separate decision on the accreditation of residency studies in the field shall not be taken when the higher education institution already conducts accredited studies in that field.

36. The Centre shall publish the decision on the accreditation of the residency studies in the field in the Register of Legal Acts.

#### **CHAPTER IV FOLLOW-UP**

37. Following the commencement of the residency study programme, for which an external evaluation has been performed in accordance with Paragraph 26 of the Description, the follow-up activities shall be started.

38. The higher education institution shall prepare a Progress Report on the implementation of the expert recommendations (hereinafter referred to as 'the Progress Report'), which shall provide for the measures to improve the residency studies and shall present the information on the implementation of the measures and submit it to the Centre at least 1.5 years after the registration of the residency study programme (or accreditation of the study field if the higher education institution does not conduct accredited studies in that field). An example of the Progress Report is given in Annex 2 to the Methodology.

39. Having received the Progress Report, the Centre shall analyse it and provide feedback to the higher education institution and shall publish the report on its website together with the report of the evaluation of the residency study programme.

#### **CHAPTER V HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS**

40. During the evaluation of the external residency programme, the higher education institution may lodge a complaint with the Centre regarding the activities and/or inactivity and implementation of procedures by participants in the evaluation process prior to the evaluation decision is taken. The complaint shall be examined by the commission set up by an order of the Director of the Centre. The decision of the Centre shall be taken at least within twenty working days from the date of receipt of the complaint.

41. The higher education institution may lodge a reasoned appeal with the Centre within twenty working days from the date of receipt of the decision if it disagrees with the decision taken by the Centre regarding the evaluation of the residency programme.

42. The appeal of the higher education institution shall be heard by the Appeal Commission of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as the 'Appeal Commission') acting in accordance with the regulations of the Appeals Committee, approved by an order of the Director of the Centre. The decision of the Appeal Commission shall be taken at least

within forty-five working days from the date of receipt of the appeal.

43. Both the decision of the Centre and the decision of the Appeal Commission may be appealed against in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Law on Administrative Proceedings of the Republic of Lithuania within one month from the date of receipt of the decision.



### EVALUATION AREAS, AIMS, INDICATORS, DATA AND INFORMATION ANALYSED

Seq. No.	Evaluation areas and aims	Indicators	Data and information analysed
1.	<b>Aims, learning outcomes and curriculum of residency studies</b>  <b>Aim</b> Studies are based on the needs of the state and society and enable residents to achieve the aims and learning outcomes.	1.1. Evaluation of the compliance of residency programmes conducted in a higher education institution with the needs of the state and society.	1.1.1. The relevance of the learning outcomes of the residency study programme is analysed, its compliance with the needs of the society and the labour market is substantiated. 1.1.2. The possibilities for the development of the residency study programmes implemented in the higher education institution per field are substantiated (applicable only if the higher education institution also implements more programmes in the study field in which the programme is to be implemented).
		1.2. Evaluation of the study plan of the residency study programme and curriculum with the legal requirements and the intended aims and learning outcomes.	1.2.1. The compliance of the curriculum design of the residency study programme, cycle curriculum and scope with the academic and/or professional requirements to achieve the intended aim(s) and learning outcomes are substantiated. 1.2.2. The study plan of the residency study programme is presented, setting out the mandatory and optional cycles during the course of the studies, specifying the scope of the cycles in credits, contact and self-working hours and the lecturer(s) who will teach the cycle. 1.2.3. The inter-coherence of the title of the residency study programme, the expected learning outcomes, the curriculum and the qualifications to be awarded is substantiated.

		1.3. Evaluation of the explicitness of competences required for learning, professional activity in the health protection system and the empowerment of residents for self-employment.	1.3.1. The competences on which the learning outcomes of the residency study programme are based are described and the stage of the residency study in which they are to be achieved is indicated.
		1.4. Evaluation of the compatibility of the aims of the residency study programmes, learning outcomes, teaching(learning) and evaluation methods.	1.4.1. The coherence of the aims of the residency study programme, expected learning outcomes with the learning outcomes of the programme cycles, the methods of teaching (learning) and evaluation.
2.	<b>The progress of residency studies and evaluation of achievements</b>  <b>Aim</b> Residency studies prepare residents for independent activities	2.1. Evaluation of the suitability of selection for residency studies.	2.1.1. The requirements and procedure for admission to the programme and the methods of making public this information are indicated.
		2.2. Evaluation of the implementation of the policy of ensuring academic integrity, tolerance and non-discrimination.	2.2.1. The principles to ensure academic integrity, tolerance and non-discrimination and measures envisaged are described.
		2.3. Evaluation of the appropriateness, adequacy and effectiveness of academic, financial, social, psychological and other support provided to residents.	2.3.1. Information on academic, financial, social, psychological, personal and other support provided to residents at the higher education institution is presented.
		2.4. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the application of procedures for the submission and examination of appeals and complaints regarding the study process.	2.4.1. The application of the procedures for the submission and examination of appeals and complaints regarding the study process is described .
		2.5. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the evaluation system for achievements of residents.	2.5.1. The procedure of the evaluation of achievements of residents is described, the methods and criteria for the evaluation of achievements applied in the studies used for the evaluation of the learning outcomes of resident studies are indicated.
		2.6. Evaluation of conditions ensuring access to study for socially vulnerable groups and students with special needs.	2.6.1. The application of the study process to socially vulnerable groups and residents with special needs is described (consultations on access to studies, individualised study process, forms and means of integration of residents into the life of the academic community, etc.).

3.	<p><b>Staff of residency studies</b></p> <p><b>Aim</b> The staff of the residency studies is appropriate and sufficient to ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes</p>	<p>3.1. Evaluation of the links between research conducted by teaching staff teaching in residency study programmes with the residency studies.</p> <p>3.2. Evaluation of the suitability of the practical (clinical) experience of the staff working in the residency study programmes to achieve the expected competencies of the residents.</p> <p>3.3. Evaluation of the support of the staff (academic and non-academic/administrative) used for conducting residency studies and effective learning of residents and the conditions for them to continuously improve their professional competencies (scientific, didactic, professional).</p>	<p>3.1.1. Evidence of the links between research conducted by the teaching staff of the residency study programmes with the residency study programme is provided.</p> <p>3.2.1. Evidence of practical (clinical) experience of the teaching staff of the residency study programme related to the cycles to be taught in the residency study programme is provided.</p> <p>3.3.1. The conditions and systematic nature of the development of the teaching staff (academic and non-academic/administrative) used for the implementation of residency studies and ensuring the effective learning process of the residents in the science, didactic or professional activities are described (formal arrangements, funding, areas of development, methods).</p>
4.	<p><b>Learning facilities and resources for residency studies</b></p> <p><b>Aim</b> The implementation of residency studies is ensured by sufficient and appropriate resources enabling to achieve the learning outcomes</p>	<p>4.1. Evaluation of the accessibility, suitability and sufficiency of information and methodological resources to ensure an effective learning process.</p> <p>4.2. Evaluation of the accessibility, suitability and adequacy of the infrastructure (premises, equipment, etc.) for residency studies and clinical practice.</p> <p>4.3. Evaluation of the adaptation of the residency study infrastructure for persons with special needs.</p>	<p>4.1.1. The number, relevance, recency and suitability for the study field of the teaching materials at the higher education institution's library and reading rooms are given.</p> <p>4.1.2. Information on available access to electronic publications suitable for achieving learning outcomes is provided.</p> <p>4.2.1. Data on the premises to be used for the residency study programme and the number of workplaces therein are provided.</p> <p>4.2.2. Data on the base for internships to be used for the implementation of studies are provided.</p> <p>4.2.3. The sufficiency and suitability of the means and equipment to be used for the residency study programme to achieve the expected learning outcomes are substantiated.</p> <p>4.3.1. The adaptation of the premises, means and equipment to be used for studies to persons with special needs is described.</p>

		4.4. Ongoing evaluation of the renewal of the residency study infrastructure, taking into account the innovations and needs of medical, veterinary and dental science and internship.	4.4.1. Information on the renewal of the resources (premises, equipment, methodological resources, etc.) required for the residency study programme and a plan for the improvement thereof (if necessary) is provided and its financial validity is presented.
5.	<b>Quality management and public information of the residency studies</b>  <b>Aim</b> The organisational structure of residency study management ensures an efficient process of planning, organising, evaluating and improving residency studies	5.1. Evaluation of the organisational structure and distribution of responsibilities in the residency study management.  5.2. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the involvement of stakeholders in internal quality assurance.	5.1.1. The structure of study management and decision-making as well as the periodicity of internal evaluation are described. 5.1.2. The role of the head of the residency study programme and conditions allowing his/her efficient performance are described. 5.1.3. Information on the methods and measures applied to ensure the quality of residency studies is provided.  5.2.1. Data on the involvement of stakeholders in the preparation of the residency study programme, in the evaluation and development processes of the programme, the contribution of stakeholders and their feedback are provided.

**PROGRESS REPORT ON  
THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION**

Evaluated area	Expert recommendations provided during the last evaluation	Scope and time limits for the implementation of recommendations	Actions planned by the higher education institution within the evaluated area and time limits for the actions	Notes
1. Aims, learning outcomes and curriculum of residency studies				
2. The progress of residency studies and evaluation of achievements				
3. Staff of residency studies				
4. Learning facilities and resources for residency studies				
5. Quality management and public information of the residency studies				

*Signature of the head of subdivision of the higher education institution*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Position, name, surname

\_\_\_\_\_  
signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
date

## **METHODOLOGY FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF RESIDENCY STUDIES**

### **CHAPTER I GENERAL PROVISIONS**

1. The Methodology of External Evaluation of Study Fields (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Methodology’) sets out the general requirements for the preparation of the residency study self-evaluation report (hereinafter referred to as ‘the self-evaluation report’) for higher education institutions (hereinafter referred to as ‘the higher education institutions’), the process of external evaluation of residency studies (hereinafter referred to as ‘the evaluation’) performed by the Study Quality Assessment Centre in Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Centre’), adoption of accreditation decisions, follow-up activities and the procedure for submitting complaints and appeals against the decisions of the Centre regarding the evaluation of residency studies in the field.

2. The Methodology has been developed in accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania, the Description of the Procedure for External Evaluation and Accreditation of Residency Studies (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Description’) and the Evaluation Areas and Indicators for External Evaluation of Residency Studies (hereinafter ‘the List of Evaluation Areas and Indicators’) approved by Order No V-1269 of the Minister for Education, Science and Sport of the Republic of Lithuania of 24 August 2020 and the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.

3. The definitions used in the Methodology correspond to those defined in the Law on Higher Education and Research, the Law on Medical Practice of the Republic of Lithuania, the Law on Dental Practice of the Republic of Lithuania, the Description of the Procedures for Implementation and Supervision of Residency Study Programme Requirements approved by Resolution No 248 of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania of 14 March 2018.

4. The Centre shall conduct the evaluation in accordance with the External Evaluation Plan of Residency Studies approved by the Centre, which also sets deadlines for the submission of self-evaluation reports. At least six months shall be given for the preparation of the self-evaluation report.

### **CHAPTER II PREPARATION OF A SELF-EVALUATION REPORT**

5. A higher education institution that wants the Centre to carry out the evaluation of the residency studies in the field shall submit to the Centre a request for the evaluation and accreditation of the residency studies in the field and self-evaluation report within the time limits specified in the external evaluation plan of residency studies. These documents shall be submitted to the Centre signed by a qualified electronic signature at [kokybe@skvc.lt](mailto:kokybe@skvc.lt) either through the system ‘E. pristatymas’.

6. If the higher education institution ceases the residency studies of that field (does not admit or does not intend to admit new students), it shall inform the Centre in writing thereof at least six months prior to the submission of the self-evaluation report.

7. The higher education institution shall be responsible for the proper and timely self-evaluation, preparation of the self-evaluation report and its submission to the Centre within the time limits set out in the external evaluation plan for residency studies in the field.

8. The higher education institution shall carry out a self-evaluation in accordance with its own procedure, involving residents, social partners and other stakeholders. The self-evaluation report shall comply with the requirements set out in this Methodology.

9. The self-evaluation shall include the performance of self-assessment for each of the evaluation areas, goals and indicators defined in the List.

10. The self-evaluation report shall provide data for the last five years of study. If the residency studies of the field under evaluation are of shorter duration, data for the entire period of the residency studies in the field shall be provided.

11. The self-evaluation report shall provide a summary analysis of all study programmes of the residency studies in the field. If studies of the same residency studies in the field are conducted in a branch of the higher education institution established in foreign state, the self-evaluation report shall provide information on the residency studies in the field in that branch.

12. Where there is a joint study programme between the residency studies in the field evaluated, the self-evaluation report shall clearly identify the specific features of the joint study programme. It shall also indicate the resources (human and learning resources) available at each of the high education institutions delivering the joint study programme.

13. The self-evaluation report shall have the following parts: general part (introduction, analysis of the residency studies in the field under evaluation) and annexes. The body text of the general part of the self-evaluation should be presented in doc, docx or pdf format. If foreign experts are invited to perform the external evaluation, the self-evaluation report shall be presented in Lithuanian and the English translation of the self-evaluation report shall also be submitted.

14. The introduction of the self-evaluation report shall include a brief description of the profile of the higher education institution delivering the residency studies in the field under evaluation (type and basis of activities, divisions, including branches located in a foreign state, their management and their relationships, the scope of residency studies in the field under evaluation) and the experience in delivering the residency study field under evaluation.

15. The analysis of the residency studies in the field in the self-evaluation report shall identify and analyse all the evaluation areas and indicators set out in the List of Evaluated Areas and Indicators, presenting quantitative and qualitative data and their analysis according to the information provided in Annex 1 of the Methodology. At the end of the analysis of each evaluation area, the recommendations of the previous evaluation (if have been provided for a specific evaluation area) shall be presented and how they have been taken into account. The strengths and areas for improvement in each evaluation area shall be summarised.

16. The self-evaluation report shall provide the information needed for the evaluation in a purposeful manner.

17. The self-evaluation report shall be accompanied by the following annex: study plans of the residency study programmes in the field prepared according to the format established by the higher education institution. The study plan of each programme shall disclose the curriculum design, the scope of the student's mandatory and optional cycles (if any) shall be arranged and their scope in credits shall be indicated. The form of examination of each cycle, the number of contact hours and independent work, as well as the teaching staff teaching the subject, shall also be indicated.

### **CHAPTER III**

#### **PROCESS OF EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF RESIDENCY STUDIES**

18. The evaluation shall be organised by the Centre with the assistance of external experts.

19. The organisation of the evaluation at the Center shall start only upon receipt of a request from a higher education institution to evaluate and accredit residency studies in the field and a self-evaluation report.

20. The Centre shall have the right to refuse to carry out the evaluation of the residency studies in the field if the higher education institution has not submitted to the Centre a request for such evaluation and credit the residency studies in the field and the self-evaluation report within the deadlines set in the external evaluation plan of residency studies.

21. As a general rule, a single team of experts shall be formed to evaluate studies of the same residency studies in the field delivered by higher education institutions. In cases where there is a

greater number of higher education institutions delivering the field studies and/or study programmes delivered within them, the Centre may call on more expert teams.

22. Experts for the external evaluation shall be selected in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Procedure of Selection of Experts, approved by the Director of the Centre.

23. The principles and procedures for the organisation of experts' work are laid down in the Procedure of the Organisation of Experts' Work, approved by the Order of the Director of the Centre.

24. The Centre shall inform the higher education institution of the expected composition of the expert team via e-mail or through the system 'E.pristatymas'. The higher education institution may, within five working days of receiving notification of the intended composition of the expert team, request, on a reasoned basis, the replacement of the member(s) of the intended expert team. The Centre shall consider the comments received regarding the composition of the expert team in the Permanent Commission formed by the order of the Director of the Centre to examine the requests of higher education institutions to replace experts and shall inform the higher education institution about the decision taken. In the event that the higher education institution has not submitted a request regarding the change of the composition of the expert team within the term specified in this Paragraph herein, the higher education institution shall be deemed to have approved the composition of the expert team.

25. The Centre shall evaluate whether the self-evaluation report provided by the higher education institution has been prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in the Methodology and shall inform the higher education institution by e-mail of any shortcomings (if any) within 10 working days of the receipt of the self-evaluation report.

26. Within ten working days of the receipt of the information about the shortcomings, the higher education institution shall submit a revised self-evaluation report to the Centre.

27. The self-evaluation report shall be submitted by the Centre to the expert team set up by the Centre at least two months before the visit to the higher education institution. Where, for reasons beyond the control of the Centre, part of the expert team changes and it is objectively impossible for the new members of the expert team to submit the self-evaluation report within the time limits provided for in this paragraph, the self-evaluation report shall be provided as soon as possible after the new experts are included.

28. The higher education institution may, at least 1 month prior to the visit of the expert team, provide information on major changes in the study field that took place after the submission of the self-evaluation report to the Centre.

29. After examining the information provided in the self-evaluation report, as well as other publicly available information, findings or summary of the previous external evaluation of the residency studies in the field, and student survey results, the experts shall prepare for the evaluation, identifying areas and issues that require particular attention during the visit.

30. The duration of the visit of the expert team to the higher education institution shall be 1-5 days depending on the scope of the objects to be evaluated.

31. The visit shall follow the visit schedule drawn up by the Centre and coordinated with the experts and the higher education institution. Information on the upcoming visit shall also be sent to the resident self-government institution of the higher education institution.

32. During the visit, the higher education institution shall provide suitable premises and equipment for the meetings and the work of the expert team.

33. As far as possible, the higher education institution shall enable any member of the community who wishes to meet the expert team to do so by making public the visit information. Except in cases agreed in advance with the Evaluation Coordinator, one member of the higher education institution community may attend only one meeting with the expert team per visit.

34. Persons studying and/or working at that higher education institution do not participate in meetings with graduates and employers.

35. Representatives of the resident self-government institution of the higher education institution may also participate in meetings with residents.

36. During the visit, meetings are held with the administration of the higher education



institution or its unit(s), the authors of the self-evaluation report of the residency studies, the teaching staff of the field studies, the residents, the graduates and their employers. During the visit, the experts review the learning resources for the delivery of the residency studies in the field, get acquainted with the material of the final examinations of the residents and other assessment documents.

37. If the evaluation is performed by an international expert team, the meetings usually take place in English. If necessary, the higher education institution shall provide qualified translator services. The interpreter shall participate in student meetings only with the agreement of the Evaluation Coordinator.

38. The expert team shall prepare a draft report of the residency studies in the field (hereinafter referred to as the 'draft report') with the evaluation of each evaluation area indicated in the List of Evaluation Areas and Indicators according to the grading scale presented in the Annex to the Description and shall submit it to the Centre at least within one month from the end of the visit to the higher education institution. Each evaluation area of the residence studies in the field shall be evaluated according to the grading scale presented in Annex to the Description.

39. The Centre shall forward the draft report to the higher education institution by e-mail, which shall have the right to submit comments on the factual errors in the draft report and the evaluations based thereon to the Centre at least within ten working days from the date of sending the draft report. If foreign experts have been used for the external evaluation, a translation of the comments on the factual errors and the assessments based thereon into the English language shall also be provided.

40. Within ten working days of the receipt of the comments, the experts who have analysed the comments of the higher education institution on the factual errors in the draft report or the evaluations based thereon shall prepare and submit the draft report to the Centre.

41. The report of the external evaluation shall be examined in the Studies' Evaluation Committee formed by the Centre, operating in accordance with the procedure established by the Regulations of the Studies' Evaluation Committee approved by the order of the Director of the Centre.

42. Guided by the evaluation report and taking into account the proposal of the Studies' Evaluation Committee, the Centre shall take a decision on the accreditation of the residency studies in the field in accordance with the procedure established in Chapter III of the Description. Together with the decision, the Centre shall provide the higher education institution with a copy of the evaluation report and a transcript of the evaluation report translated into Lithuanian.

43. The Centre and the higher education institution are required to make public the evaluation report and the decision on accreditation within the time limits specified in the Paragraph 40 of the Description.

44. The Centre shall publish the decision on the accreditation of the residency study field in the Register of Legal Acts.

## **CHAPTER IV FOLLOW-UP AND MONITORING**

45. Follow-up on the evaluation of residency studies in the field shall be the responsibility of the higher education institution.

46. Follow-up is an integral part of the evaluation, intended for the development of the residency studies in the field, taking into account the evaluation report and the recommendations contained therein.

47. Follow-up shall be carried out in the following stages:

47.1. provision of improvement means. The higher education institution, having received a decision on the accreditation of the residency studies in the field, shall provide for the means of development of the residency studies in the field and the elimination of the shortcomings identified during the evaluation means according to the recommendations provided in the evaluation report. The higher education institution shall announce these to its academic community;

47.2. implementation of planned means. The higher education institution shall implement the planned means of development of the residency studies in the field by preparing a Progress Report on the implementation of external evaluation recommendations (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Progress Report’) and submitting it to the Centre. An example of the Progress Report is given in Annex 2 to the Methodology.

47.3. monitoring of the implementation of the means envisaged. The Centre shall, when the residency studies in the field are accredited for a period of seven years, monitor the implementation of the development results and the evaluation recommendations of the residency studies in the field. The monitoring is performed through the analysis of the Progress Report and the provision of feedback to the higher education institution.

48. Progress Reports shall be prepared and submitted to the Centre by taking into account the accreditation period for the residency studies in the field:

48.1. at least 3.5 years after the accreditation of the residency studies in the field if the field studies are accredited for a period of seven years;

48.2. at least 2 years after the accreditation of the residency studies in the field if the field studies are accredited for a period of three years;

49. If the residency studies in the field have been accredited for a period of seven years, having received the Progress report, the Centre shall analyse it and provide feedback to the higher education institution and shall publish the Progress Report on its website together with the evaluation report.

50. If the residency studies in the field are accredited for a period of three years, the Centre shall, having received the Progress Report, submit it to the Ministry of Education, Science and Sports of the Republic of Lithuania. The Progress Report shall be considered by a commission formed by the Minister of Education, Science and Sports in accordance with the procedure established in Paragraph 18 of the Description.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS**

51. During the external evaluation, the higher education institution may lodge a complaint with the Centre regarding the activities and/or inactivity and implementation of procedures by participants in the evaluation process prior to the evaluation decision is taken. The complaint shall be examined by the commission set up by an order of the Director of the Centre. The decision of the Centre shall be taken at least within twenty working days from the date of receipt of the complaint.

52. The higher education institution may lodge a reasoned appeal with the Centre within twenty working days from the date sending the decision if it disagrees with the decision taken by the Centre regarding the evaluation.

53. The appeal of the higher education institution shall be heard by the Appeal Commission of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Appeal Commission’) acting in accordance with the regulations of the Appeal Commission, approved by an order of the Director of the Centre within forty-five days of the receipt of the appeal. The Centre shall inform the higher education institution in writing of the decision of the Appeal Commission.

54. Both the decision of the Centre and the decision of the Appeal Commission may be appealed against in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Law on Administrative Proceedings of the Republic of Lithuania within one month from the date of receipt of the decision.

---

### EVALUATION AREAS, AIMS, INDICATORS, DATA AND INFORMATION ANALYSED

Evaluation areas	Indicators	Data and information analysed
<p>1. Aims, learning outcomes and curriculum of residency studies</p> <p><b>Aim</b> Studies are based on the needs of the state and society and enable residents to achieve the aims and learning outcomes.</p>	<p>1.1. Evaluation of the compliance of residency programmes conducted in a higher education institution with the needs of the state and society.</p>	<p>1.1.1. The relevance of the learning outcomes of the residency study programme in the field is analysed, compliance of ongoing programmes with the needs of the society and the labour market is substantiated.</p> <p>1.1.2. Professional activity areas of the specialists trained under the residency studies in the field analysed are indicated.</p> <p>1.1.3. The possibilities for the development of the residency study programmes implemented in the higher education institution per field are substantiated (applicable only if the higher education institution also implements more programmes in the study field in which the programme is to be implemented).</p>
	<p>1.2. Evaluation of the study plan of the residency study programme and curriculum with the legal requirements and the intended aims and learning outcomes.</p>	<p>1.2.1. The compliance of the curriculum design of the residency study programme, cycle curriculum and scope with the academic and/or professional requirements to achieve aim(s) and learning outcomes are substantiated.</p> <p>1.2.2. The study plan of the programme is presented, setting out the mandatory and optional cycles during the course of the studies, specifying the scope of the cycles in credits, contact and self-working hours and the lecturer(s) who will teach the cycle.</p>
	<p>1.3. Evaluation of the explicitness of competences required for learning, professional activity in the health protection system and the empowerment of residents for self-employment.</p>	<p>1.3.1. The competences on which the learning outcomes of the residency study programme are based are described and the stage of the residency study in which they are to be achieved is indicated.</p>
	<p>1.4. Evaluation of the compatibility of the aims of the residency study programmes, learning outcomes, teaching(learning) and evaluation methods.</p>	<p>1.4.1. The coherence of the aims of the residency study programmes, expected learning outcomes with the learning outcomes of the programme cycles, the methods of teaching (learning) and evaluation.</p>

<p>2. The progress of residency studies and evaluation of achievements</p> <p><b>Aim</b> Residency studies prepare residents for independent activities</p>	<p>2.1. Evaluation of the suitability of selection for residency studies.</p>	<p>2.1.1. The requirements for admission to the study programmes of residency studies in the field and the methods of making this information public are indicated.</p> <p>2.1.2. The following data on the admission to the study programmes of residency studies in the field are provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) number of applicants: first priority and remaining priorities;</li> <li>b) number of signed agreements (to state funded and non state funded places);</li> </ul> <p>2.1.3. Relative values of the results of admission to the programmes are presented and the analysis on how the tendencies to enrol in individual study programmes are reflected in the context of the residency studies in the field is provided;</p> <p>2.1.4. The lowest, highest, and average admission scores of the admitted students over the last three years are presented and analysed.</p>
	<p>2.2. Evaluation of the participation of residents in the study process and research activities (shall not apply to the new residency study programmes).</p>	<p>2.2.1. Information on the possibilities and ways for residents to participate in the study process and research activities is provided.</p> <p>2.2.2. The number of residents of the higher education institution participating in research activities as a share of all residents in the residency studies in the field over the last three years is provided and commented on.</p>
	<p>2.3. Evaluation of conditions for ensuring the academic mobility of residents (shall not apply to the new residency study programmes).</p>	<p>2.3.1. Information on opportunities for the participation of residents in, and publicity of, mobility programmes is provided.</p> <p>2.3.2. The number of residents from higher education institution coming for full-time field studies from abroad as a share of all residents in the residency studies in the field over the last three years is provided and commented on.</p> <p>2.3.3. The number of residents of the higher education institution, who have left for part-time field studies, as a share of all residents in the residency studies in the field over the last three years is provided and commented on.</p>

<p>2.4. Evaluation of the implementation of the policy of ensuring academic integrity, tolerance and non-discrimination.</p>	<p>2.4.1. The principles to ensure academic integrity, tolerance and non-discrimination and measures are described.</p> <p>2.4.2. Generalised information on the examined cases of violation of the principles of academic integrity, tolerance and non-discrimination and the decisions made during the last three study years (if any) is presented.</p>
<p>2.5. Evaluation of the feedback provided to the residents during the studies, promoting the self-assessment of the achieved results and further planning of the study progress (shall not apply to the study programs to be implemented).</p>	<p>2.5.1. A description of how the results achieved by residents are monitored is given and the monitoring results are used (who is responsible for monitoring the results, the periodicity of the monitoring, the use of the monitoring results to improve the quality of studies, etc.).</p> <p>2.5.2. Information on how residents are provided with feedback on their study achievements and further planning of study progress is provided.</p>
<p>2.6. Evaluation of the appropriateness, adequacy and effectiveness of academic, financial, social, psychological and other support provided to residents.</p>	<p>2.6.1. Information and figures on the need, forms and effectiveness of academic, financial, social, psychological, personal and other resident support are provided.</p>
<p>2.7. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the application of procedures for the submission and examination of appeals and complaints regarding the study process.</p>	<p>2.7.1. The application of the procedures for the submission and examination of appeals and complaints regarding the study process is described (procedure of submission and examination of appeals and complaints, number of appeals and complaints submitted by the residents of the evaluated residency studies in the field, and decisions made over the last three years) and the evaluation of effectiveness of these procedures.</p>
<p>2.8. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the evaluation system for achievements of residents.</p>	<p>2.8.1. The procedure of the evaluation of achievements of residents is described, the methods and criteria for the evaluation of achievements applied in the studies used for the evaluation of the learning outcomes of resident studies are indicated.</p>
<p>2.9. Evaluation of conditions ensuring access to study for socially vulnerable groups and students with special needs.</p>	<p>2.9.1. The application of the study process to socially vulnerable groups and residents with special needs is described (consultations on access to studies, individualised study process, forms and means of integration into the life of the academic community, etc.).</p>

<p>3. Staff of residency studies</p> <p><b>Aim</b> The staff of the residency studies is appropriate and sufficient to ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes</p>	3.1. Evaluation of the links between research conducted by teaching staff teaching in residency study programmes with the residency studies.	3.1.1. Summarized information on the links between research conducted by the teaching staff of the residency studies in the field with the residency study programme is provided.
	3.2. Evaluation of the suitability of the practical (clinical) experience of the staff working in the residency study programmes to achieve the expected competencies of the residents.	3.2.1. Summarized information on the link between the practical (clinical) experience of the teaching staff of the residency studies in the field with the cycles taught in the residency studies is provided.
	3.3. Evaluation of the support of the staff (academic and non-academic/administrative) used for conducting residency studies and effective learning of residents and the conditions for them to continuously improve their professional competencies (scientific, didactic, professional).	3.3.1. The conditions and systematic nature of the development of the teaching staff (academic and non-academic/administrative) used for the implementation of residency studies and ensuring the effective learning process of the residents in the science, didactic or professional activities are described (formal arrangements, funding, areas of development, methods).
<p>4. Learning facilities and resources for residency studies</p> <p><b>Aim</b> The implementation of residency studies is ensured by sufficient and appropriate resources enabling to achieve the learning outcomes</p>	4.1. Evaluation of the accessibility, suitability and sufficiency of information and methodological resources to ensure an effective learning process.	4.1.1. The number, relevance, novelty, accessibility, and compliance of the methodological resources in the library and reading rooms of the higher education institution with the needs of the residency study in the field under evaluation are presented. 4.1.2. Information on available access to electronic publications used in the residency studies is provided.
	4.2. Evaluation of the accessibility, suitability and adequacy of the infrastructure (premises, equipment, etc.) for residency studies and clinical practice.	4.2.1. Data on the premises used for the residency studies and the number of workplaces therein are provided. 4.2.2. Data on the arrangements for work placements for residency studies are provided. 4.2.3. The adequacy and suitability of the means and equipment used for residency studies to achieve the learning outcomes are evaluated.
	4.3. Evaluation of the adaptation of the residency study infrastructure for persons with special needs.	4.3.1. The adaptation of the premises, means and equipment used for residency studies to persons with special needs is described.
	4.4. Ongoing evaluation of the renewal of the	4.4.1. The process of planning and upgrading the resources (premises,

	residency study infrastructure, taking into account the innovations and needs of medical, veterinary and dental science and internship.	equipment, methodological resources, etc.) needed to carry out residency studies is described in the light of changing student and teaching staffs' needs, innovations in medical, veterinary, dental science and practice.
<p>5. Quality management and public information of the residency studies</p> <p><b>Aim</b> The organisational structure of residency study management ensures an efficient process of planning, organising, evaluating and improving residency studies</p>	5.1. Evaluation of the organisational structure and distribution of responsibilities in the residency study management.	<p>5.1.1. The structure of study management and decision-making, distribution of responsibilities as well as the periodicity of internal evaluation are described.</p> <p>5.1.2. The role of the head of the residency study programme and conditions allowing his/her efficient performance are described.</p> <p>5.1.3. Information on the methods and measures applied to ensure the quality of residency studies is provided.</p>
	5.2. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the involvement of stakeholders in internal quality assurance.	5.2.1. Data on the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation and development processes of the residency studies, the contribution of stakeholders for study improvement and their feedback are provided.
	5.3. Evaluation of the feedback of residents on the quality of residency studies and the use for the improvement of studies.	5.3.1. The opinion of the residents on the quality of the studies, collected by the Centre through the use of the National Student Survey app (hereinafter referred to as 'the NSA'), is analysed. If the information collected through the NSA is not sufficient for the Centre or the higher education institution does not use the NSA, then the opinion of the residents of the higher education institution on the quality of their studies is collected and summarised by the higher education institution. Indication of how the information collected is used to improve studies is given.
	5.4. Evaluation of the collection, use and publicity of information on residency studies, their evaluation and improvement processes and results.	<p>5.4.1. Indication of what data is collected and publicised about the implementation of residency studies (information about study programmes (admission requirements, study results, qualifications to be acquired), their evaluation results, opinion of social stakeholders on the quality of studies, employment, etc.) is provided.</p> <p>5.4.2. Examples of how the information collected on the execution and evaluation of studies are used to improve residency studies are provided.</p>

**PROGRESS REPORT ON  
THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL  
EVALUATION**

Evaluated area	Expert recommendations provided during the last evaluation	Scope and time limits for the implementation of recommendations	Actions planned by the higher education institution within the evaluated area and time limits for the actions	Notes
1. Aims, learning outcomes and curriculum of residency studies				
2. The progress of residency studies and evaluation of achievements				
3. Staff of residency studies				
4. Learning facilities and resources for residency studies				
5. Quality management and public information of the residency studies				

*Signature of the head of subdivision of the higher education institution*

---

Position, name, surname

---

signature

---

date



APPROVED  
ORDER No V-99  
of the Director of the Centre for Quality  
Assessment in Higher Education of 1  
December 2020

**PLAN OF EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF RESIDENCY STUDIES**

<b>Year and semester of evaluation</b>	<b>Term for submission of self-evaluation</b>	<b>Study field</b>	<b>Higher education institution</b>
<b>2023 I</b>	October 2022	Veterinary science	Lithuanian University of Health Sciences