



Research
Council of
Lithuania

**GUIDELINES FOR 2023 COMPARATIVE EXPERT
ASSESSMENT (CEA) OF R&D ACTIVITIES CARRIED
OUT BY UNIVERSITIES AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTES**

Vilnius, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	3
1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE CEA	4
1.1. PURPOSE AND THE USAGE OF THE CEA RESULTS	4
1.2. PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS	4
1.3. THE UNIT OF ASSESSMENT	4
1.4. GROUPS OF UoA	5
2. EVALUATION CRITERIA	5
3. TIMELINE OF CEA	5
4. CEA PROCEDURE	7
4.1. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION OF THE UoA	8
4.2. VISIT TO LITHUANIA	9
4.2.1. 1 st PANEL MEETING	9
4.2.2. INSTITUTIONAL VISITS	10
4.2.3. 2 nd PANEL MEETING	10
4.3. PANEL REPORT	10
4.4. APPEALS	11
4.4.1. SUBMISSION AND HANDLING OF APPEALS	11
4.4.2. REASSESSMENT OF THE UNIT OF ASSESSMENT	12
5. TASKS OF AN EXPERT AND A PANEL CHAIR	12
6. RESPONSIBILITIES OF AN EXPERT	13
7. ANNEXES	15

ABBREVIATIONS

CEA – Comparative Expert Assessment

Institutions – Lithuanian universities and research institutes

MoESS – Ministry of Education, Science and Sports

R&D – Research and development

RCL – Research Council of Lithuania

FTE(SD) – full-time equivalent of researchers with a scientific degree

U(s)oA – Unit(s) of Assessment

DEFINITIONS

FTE(SD) - the sum of the FTE of teaching staff members with a science degree divided by 3, and the FTE of research workers and other researchers with a scientific degree

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE CEA

1.1. PURPOSE AND THE USAGE OF THE CEA RESULTS

The overall objective of the Comparative Expert Assessment (CEA) of R&D activities carried out by universities and research institutes is to provide a picture of Lithuanian research performance, its socio-economic impact and the capacity of its research institutions.

The CEA allows benchmarking of the research performance of the institutions or their parts (otherwise - the units of assessment (UoA) in the international and national context and to receive feedback about the improvement and development of research performance at departmental, institutional and national level.

Expert Panels evaluate the performance of the UoA based on provided data and a site visit to the UoA. The results of the CEA form a basis for allocating governmental institutional R&D funding. The CEA is organised every five years. The first round of the CEA took place in 2018. The results of the CEA organised in 2018 have been used for allocating 60% of the governmental funding for R&D to universities and research institutes and the results of the CEA in 2023 will be used for allocating 70% of the funding for the upcoming five years.

For the purpose of the CEA, the UoA shall be assessed according to three criteria: R&D quality, economic and social impact and development potential.

The assessment results of the research quality criterion will be used in the evaluation for granting the right for the institutions to organise doctoral studies in certain research fields. It is foreseen that using the results of the CEA will grant the right for universities to carry out bachelor's and master's degree study programmes in the future.

1.2. PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

There are eleven state and five private universities together with eleven state and five private research institutes in Lithuania.

All state institutions, four private universities and two private research institutes are participating in the CEA. The list of participating institutions is provided in Annex 1.

1.3. THE UNIT OF ASSESSMENT

Participating Institutions had to develop the UoA for CEA purposes. The evaluation will be provided for every UoA. The UoA is typically a division of an institution corresponding to the faculty or a whole research institute. The rules for the UoA have been set by the Ministry of Education, Science and Sports and are as follows:

'Departments of the institution that form the unit of assessment are interrelated by common R&D activities [...] The unit of assessment shall operate in not more than two research areas. The smallest size of the unit of assessment shall be 5 full-time equivalent of researchers with a scientific degree (hereinafter – FTE(SD)). The unit of assessment may have maximum 75 FTE(SD). Departments of the Institution that are larger than 75 FTE(SD) shall be split into several units of assessment. If the Institution wishes to form the unit of assessment that has 75–160 FTE(SD) or operates in three research areas, the Institution shall provide arguments for the feasibility of the formation of such unit of assessment [...]. It is recommended that departments of the Institution that constitute a part of other departments of the Institution and are smaller than 75 FTE(SD) should not be split into smaller units of assessment.'

Following the rules, institutions have formed eighty-five UoA for the 2023 CEA. A straightforward comparison with the UoA of previous CEA is limited, because there were 117 UoA during the 2018 CEA.

The cause is mainly due to the change of rules for setting up a UoA. During the 2018 CEA, forming a UoA was allowed in only one respective research area, i.e., if the UoA operated in two research areas (e.g. Natural Sciences and Technology), it had to be split into two UoA for evaluation purposes.

1.4. GROUPS OF UoA

Eighty-five UoA were split into the thirteen groups resulting from four to nine UoA per Panel. The RCL have grouped the UoA taking into account the research fields (the classification of the areas and research fields in Lithuania is provided in Annex 2), in which the quality of the R&D activities needs to be assessed and with the aim that overlap of the research fields between the groups would be as little as possible.

The UoA groups have been set up so that one Expert Panel can visit a UoA group in Lithuania in one week; the same Expert Panel can also assess several UoA groups over several weeks.

The list of the UoA groups is provided in Annex 3.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The CEA is based on three criteria:

- The quality of R&D activities (weight 0.65);
- The economic and social impact of R&D activities (weight 0.2);
- The development potential of R&D activities (weight 0.15).

The Expert Panel (otherwise - Panel) will score each evaluation criterion on a scale from 0 to 5 (half point scores may be given). The scope of the evaluation criteria differs: the quality of R&D activities will be evaluated on the level of the UoA's research field or group of research fields within a research area, whereas the other two criteria will be evaluated on the level of a UoA. The criterion 'Economic and social impact of R&D activities' is used to assess how different activities of UoA contribute to the economy, society or culture, i.e. to the areas outside the academic sphere. Each score should be justified with a written explanation.

Annex 4 provides the definition of the scales alongside the list of the information which will be submitted to inform each of the criteria by participating Lithuanian Research and Higher Education Institutions (Institutions) and the Research Council of Lithuania (RCL). Provided the information is the same for all the research fields and disciplines, it is therefore expected that Experts will adapt and take into account the specific features of the respective research field during the assessment.

3. TIMELINE OF CEA

The overall and general timeline for the CEA is presented in the Table 1 below.

4. CEA PROCEDURE

The procedure for assessment can be schematized in the following way (Chart 1):

Chart 1. The procedure for the assessment



The visit to Lithuania will consist of joint Panel meetings and visits to UoA. A Panel Coordinator (representative of RCL) will assist the Panel members during the whole assessment process.

In order to ensure uniform and consistent application of the assessment criteria during the work of the Panels, the Council may initiate joint meetings of the Panels and/or their Chairs, either physically, remotely or in a mixed format.

N.B. If, due to unforeseen circumstances, one of the members of an Expert Panel is unable to visit Lithuania, the Expert Panel meetings may be organised in a mixed way (physical and remote).

If, due to a state of emergency imposed in the Republic of Lithuania or other circumstances beyond the control of the Council, visits by Experts to Lithuania and/or visits to the UoA are prohibited or not

recommended, meetings may be organised exclusively by electronic means of communication. The meeting and decision-making (voting) may only be conducted by electronic means that ensure the identification of the Expert members.

4.1. INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION OF THE UoA

The Panel Coordinator will provide the Panel members online access to the documentary inputs listed below plus the relevant assessment templates and instructions as to how to submit their individual completed assessments at least twenty working days before the deadline of the submission. Experts will only be required to score a share of UoA covered by the Panel (see next section). However, all Panel members will have access to the documentary inputs (Table 2) for every UoA allocated to the Panel should they wish to look at the information and data for UoA other than those allocated to them.

Table 2. Documentary input

Item	Description
Information about Lithuanian HE and research system	RCL will prepare an overview of the Lithuanian research and higher education system including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developments in the system over the past ten years; • institutional structure of the system; • R&D funding system; • principles of organisation of R&D activities.
Report from UoA: Data and information submitted by UoA	The UoA is required to submit data and information based on approved data submission procedure rules by MoESS. The information in the reports covers the period 2018-2022. The number of listed items in the report depends on the size of the UoA.
Top research outputs	The UoA were required to submit their most important research outputs with the links or copies to it. The number of outputs depends on the size of the UoA: the number of outputs equals the UoA's FTE(SD)/2, with the FTE(SD)s rounded off to the nearest whole number; if UoA is smaller than five FTE(SD)s, then five outputs should be provided. It is recommended that the contribution of the same author would not exceed two outputs. Research outputs could be in any language (in case the output it is not in English, a translation for bibliographic information will be provided).
2018-2021 Results of institutional assessment (annual) performed by RCL	Institutions' annual R&D performance assessment (performed by RCL) for each year from the period 2018 - 2022): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the data on research results dissemination units (research outputs); • the data on participation in projects of international R&D programmes; • the data on orders of economic entities carried out by the Institutions. <p>N.B. Information is not available on the UoA level</p>

For scoring purposes, at least three Panel members will be assigned to each UoA. The number of reviewers of one UoA depends on the number of research fields to be evaluated in that particular UoA. The Panel members will be provided with a scoring template to record their scores and to provide a written explanation of each score (Annex 5). For each UoA assigned to them the Panel members will:

- Become familiarised with the overview of Lithuanian research and higher education system;
- Read the reports (containing data and information) of the UoA;
- Review the submitted top research outputs;
- Review the results of annual institutional assessment;
- Score each UoA using the assessment criteria (Annex 4) and fill the scoring template provided (Annex 5);
- Provide a written explanation of each score indicated in the scoring template. (These written commentaries together with the scoring will form the backbone of the Panel report.)

Panel members will return their completed scoring templates to the Panel Coordinator at least 5 working days before the visit to Lithuania. The Panel Coordinator will collate the scores and will send the summary to Panel members before a 1st Panel meeting.

4.2. VISIT TO LITHUANIA

The main objectives of the visit of the Expert Panel to Lithuania are:

- To discuss the results of the individual Expert assessment of the UoA in the Expert Panel;
- Ensure that the criteria for the Expert assessment are understood in a uniform and consistent manner by all members of the Panel;
- Get to know the staff, PhD students and the research infrastructure of the UoA;
- To agree collectively on all scores of the assessment of the UoA in the UoA group.

The visit of the Expert Panel consists of joint meetings (first and second) and visits to the UoA. The Panel Chair shall chair joint meetings.

During the visit to Lithuania, the Experts may provide written observations on the R&D activities of the UoA and/or recommendations for the continuation and/or improvement of the activities of the UoA in a free format in an online tool. The information recorded may be used by the Panel members to prepare a written explanatory text of the assessment of the UoA.

4.2.1. 1st PANEL MEETING

During the 1st joint Panel meeting, the Panel shall be presented with contextual information relevant to the Expert assessment, the agenda for the visit, and the appointment of the Deputy Chair of the Panel (in case the Chair could not perform his duties during joint meetings).

At this meeting, the Panel will review and moderate the scores based on the results of the individual assessment and make any necessary adjustments. The Panel Coordinator will provide the collated scores and the Panel members will discuss the scores and arguments and come to an agreement on 'draft scores' per UoA.

During the 1st meeting, the Chair shall also assign a UoA for each Expert, the Expert after the visit to Lithuania will prepare a justification (written explanation) and make recommendations for the continuation and/or improvement of the performance of the said UoA by completing the Expert Assessment Form for the UoA (see Annex 6).

4.2.2. INSTITUTIONAL VISITS

The Panel members will visit all UoA assigned to the Panel in Lithuania.

During the visits the Panel members will be able to see the research environment in Lithuania directly and meet with researchers, PhD students and research managers /senior staff. This will provide additional input to the research assessment as Panel members have the opportunity to ask questions and fill gaps in their knowledge.

The findings of the visits will provide input to the 2nd Panel meeting where the 'draft scores' will be reviewed and finalised to become 'final scores'.

The Panel members will be split into groups of at least three Experts for the visits. As a whole, the Panel will visit between four and nine UoA (a travel schedule will be provided during the 1st joint Panel meeting).

The visits will entail:

- Interview with senior institution/university staff, faculty or/and UoA staff and leaders (administration);
- Interview with researchers of the UoA;
- Interview with PhD students;
- A tour of the facilities.

The duration of the visit is approximately three hours, depending on the size of the UoA; the visit time might be adjusted accordingly. During the visit to the UoA, the interviews shall be chaired by the head of the visiting Expert group appointed by the Chair of the Expert Panel.

Visits to the UoA shall be organised by the RCL. The Panel Coordinator or another person designated by the RCL will organise the logistics of the institutional visits and provide a short template for reporting the findings of the visits.

4.2.3. 2nd PANEL MEETING

The Panel members will attend a 2nd Panel meeting to review the UoA scores in light of the visits and make any final adjustments. They will come to an agreement on the 'final scores' and amend the scoring templates accordingly. Additionally, the recommendations to be made for the continuation and/or improvement of the UoA shall be discussed during this meeting.

The Panel meetings will be chaired by the Panel Chair. The Panel meeting will be supported by the Panel Coordinator.

The Panel must seek a consensus in the decision making process. If a consensus cannot be reached, decisions are taken by a majority vote, and differing opinions (specifying the Experts and his/her arguments) are added as an annex to the assessment conclusions. Where agreement on a score cannot be reached the Chair's decision will be final.

4.3. PANEL REPORT

The Panel Chair will be responsible for compiling **the Panel Report**. He/she shall coordinate the work of the members of the Panel and their workload in the preparation of the Panel Report. If necessary, the Panel may organise a remote meeting of the Panel to discuss and/or revise the reasoning, scores and recommendations for the assessment of the UoA.

A template for the Panel Report will be provided in advance by the RCL.

The Panel Report will consist of introductory information, a **report for each UoA** plus an overview of the disciplines covered by each Panel.

Reports for each UoA will include:

- Scores for each of the criteria with explanatory text for each;

- Recommendations for the continuation and/or improvement of the UoA (institution). Recommendations should be formulated for a five year period taking into account the context of the global trends in their respective research fields and peculiarities to the Lithuanian research system within the next five years. This may include recommendations on each of the CEA criteria.

While preparing a report for the UoA, the Expert shall prepare a written explanation of the given score and recommendations for the future based on the individual Expert evaluation forms completed by him/her and by the other Experts, the observations made by the other Experts on the R&D activities of the UoA, the information gathered during the visits to the UoA, and the UoA assessment scores agreed by the Expert Panel at its 2nd joint meeting, in the form provided in Annex 6. The justification for the assessment of the UoA shall be reasoned and based on the information provided for the assessment, the information gathered during the visit and the information provided by the RCL at the request of the Panel. The completed forms shall be submitted by the Experts to the Panel Chair and the Panel Coordinator.

The preparation of Panel Report will have several stages and preliminary timeline is as follows: 1) preparation of the draft Report by the Panel (approx. two weeks after the 2nd Panel meeting); 2) feedback received (if any) (from RCL and/or Institutions) (approx. two weeks); 3) revision and finalisation of the Report (approx. one week); 4) formal acceptance of the finalised Report by RCL.

If the UoA provides any comments regarding factual errors, the Expert Panel shall prepare a response to the UoA on its decision, which will be submitted to the Institution together with the results of the UoA assessment.

N.B. The coordination of drafting the Panel Report should normally not exceed thirty working days after the visit of the Expert Panel to Lithuania. The members of the Panel must send written approval of the Panel Report to the Chair and the Panel Coordinator.

4.4. APPEALS

4.4.1. SUBMISSION AND HANDLING OF APPEALS

The Institutions shall have the right to submit a reasoned appeal to the RCL on possible factual errors in the justification of the UoA assessment and/or breach of the assessment procedures that may have affected the justification of the assessment of the UoA, at the latest within five working days from the date of sending the results of the UoA assessment to the Institution.

The RCL shall set up a Board of Appeal for the CEA purposes. The Board of Appeal shall be composed of seven members. Candidates for the members of the Board of Appeal shall be nominated by the Lithuanian Research Academy, the Conference of Rectors of Lithuanian Universities and the Conference of Directors of the Lithuanian National Research Institutes and the Ministry of Education, Science and Sports.

If the Board of Appeal accepts the appeal, it will act as follows:

- **For factual errors in the justification of the UoA assessment.** The Board of Appeal shall confirm that there are factual errors in the justification of the UoA assessment, the Board of Appeal shall refer the appeal to the Expert Panel to assess whether these have affected the UoA assessment and, if necessary, to adjust the results of the UoA assessment. The Expert Panel shall report its conclusions on its decisions in writing to the Board of Appeal.
- **For breaches of the assessment procedures during the Expert assessment of the UoA that may have affected the justification of the UoA assessment.** The Board of Appeal shall examine whether there has been a breach of the assessment procedure by collecting and verifying data, if necessary, by interviewing and/or requesting explanations from the person(s) who may have committed the breach. The Board of Appeal shall decide whether the breach of the assessment procedure has affected the justification of the assessment of the UoA. If it is confirmed that there were breaches of the assessment procedure during the Expert assessment of the UoA which affected the assessment of the said UoA, the Board of Appeal may decide to repeat the UoA assessment procedure.

4.4.2. REASSESSMENT OF THE UNIT OF ASSESSMENT

If the Board of Appeal finds that procedural irregularities during the Expert assessment have affected the assessment of the UoA, a reassessment of the UoA shall be carried out. Depending on the nature of the breach of the assessment procedure, the Expert Panel (or a reconstituted Panel) and the Coordinator must ensure that such breach is avoided during the reassessment of the UoA.

In the case of a reassessment of the UoA, the Expert Panel shall carry out the assessment remotely by electronic means of communication.

5. TASKS OF AN EXPERT AND A PANEL CHAIR

Task	Detailed description
Familiarise with the provided contextual information about Lithuanian research and higher education system and the legal documents relevant to the CEA.	Before the visit to Lithuania
Read provided information and outputs of the assigned UoA and score each UoA using the assessment criteria (Annex 5) and scoring template provided.	<p>Information to every Expert of the Panel will be provided at least twenty working days before the visit to Lithuania.</p> <p>At least five working days before the visit to Lithuania, the Expert sends to RCL the preliminary scores for the assigned UoA in the provided template together with a short written explanation of each score indicated in the scoring template;</p> <p>The scoring template will also provide the opportunity to make the preliminary list of clarifying questions for the UoA that the Expert would like to clarify during the visit to the UoA.</p>
Request for additional information.	If additional information about the UoA for evaluation purposes is needed, the Expert should indicate the request to the RCL asap. If possible, the RCL will collect the required information.
Come to Lithuania for a one-week visit.	The Expert should participate in at least 2 joint Panel meetings and visit the assigned UoA in Lithuania.
Visit the UoA in Lithuania.	<p>To take the role of the visit Chair (if assigned).</p> <p>To take notes during the visit and share the written observations with the Panel.</p>
Contribute to the preparation of the Final Report by filling the form (report) for the UoA template (Annex 6).	<p>The Final Report should be prepared within thirty working days after the visit to Lithuania.</p> <p>The Panel Chair will distribute the workload between the Panel members.</p>

	The Expert shall prepare the report for the UoA using the template provided in and based on the individual Expert evaluation forms completed by him/her and by the other Experts, the observations made by the other Experts on the R&D activities of the UoA, the information gathered during the visits to the UoA, and the UoA assessment scores agreed by the Expert Panel at its 2 nd joint meeting in Lithuania.
To participate in the appeal procedure (if needed).	The UoA has a right to appeal within five working days after receiving its assessment results.
To participate in re-assessment	

Panel Chair has the same duties as an Expert and has additional tasks:

Task	Detailed description
To coordinate and distribute the workload for the Panel members.	Before, during and after the visit to Lithuania.
To chair Panel meetings.	The Panel must seek for a consensus in the decision making process. If a consensus cannot be reached, decisions are taken by a majority vote, and differing opinions (specifying the Experts and his/her arguments) are added as an annex to the assessment conclusions. Where agreement on a score cannot be reached the Chair's decision will be final.
To be responsible of the preparation of the Final Report.	The Final Report should be prepared within thirty working days after the visit to Lithuania. The Panel Chair shall coordinate the work of the members of the Panel and their workload in the preparation of the Panel Report.

6. RESPONSIBILITIES OF AN EXPERT

Responsibilities of an Expert include:

- To prevent any conflict of interest during the assessment process. Therefore, we kindly ask you to fill and sign a declaration of any potential conflict of interest (see Annex 7) and bring this to the attention of the RCL about any situation(s) which, according to the Expert, gives rise to a conflict of interest or could potentially give rise to a conflict of interest, or state that there are no circumstances giving rise to a conflict of interest;

- To adhere to the principle of confidentiality. All material related to an Expert assessment can be used only for the purposes of the assessment and its improvement; the opinions or written comments of the Panel members expressed whilst making the expert assessment decisions and any part or the entire results of the assessment cannot be disclosed to third parties until the assessment process is finished.

7. ANNEXES

Annex 1. Participating institutions and number of the UoA (in brackets) for 2018 – 2022 CEA

State Universities	Non-state Universities	State Research Institutes	Non-state Research Institutes
1. Kaunas University of Technology (9)	1. European Humanities University (2)	1. Center for Physical Sciences and Technology (3)	1. PPMI Group (1)
2. Klaipėda University (5)	2. ISM University of Management and Economics (1)	2. Nature Research Centre (2)	2. Applied Research Institute for Prospective Technologies (1)
3. The General Jonas Žemaitis Military Academy of Lithuania (1)	3. Kazimieras Simonavicius University (1)	3. Centre for Innovative Medicine (1)	
4. Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theatre (1)	4. LCC International University (1)	4. Lithuanian Research Centre for Agriculture and Forestry (3)	
5. Lithuanian University of Health Sciences (6)		5. Lithuanian Energy Institute (1)	
6. Lithuanian Sports University (2)		6. Lithuanian Institute of History (1)	
7. Mykolas Romeris University (3)		7. Institute of the Lithuanian Language (1)	
8. Vilnius Academy of Arts (1)		8. Lithuanian culture research institute (1)	
9. Vytautas Magnus University (9)		9. Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore (1)	
10. Vilnius TECH (6)		10. Lithuanian Centre for Social Sciences (1)	
11. Vilnius University (18)		11. National Cancer Institute (1)	

Annex 2. Research Areas and Fields classification

1.	Natural Sciences N 000	
1.1.	N 001	Mathematics
1.2.	N 002	Physics
1.3.	N 003	Chemistry
1.4.	N 004	Biochemistry
1.5.	N 005	Geology
1.6.	N 006	Physical Geography
1.7.	N 007	Paleontology
1.8.	N 008	Astronomy
1.9.	N 009	Informatics
1.10.	N 010	Biology
1.11.	N 011	Biophysics
1.12.	N 012	Ecology and environmental sciences
1.13.	N 013	Botany
1.14.	N 014	Zoology
2.	Technology T 000	
2.1.	T 001	Electrical and electronic engineering
2.2.	T 002	Civil engineering
2.3.	T 003	Transport engineering
2.4.	T 004	Environmental engineering
2.5.	T 005	Chemical engineering
2.6.	T 006	Energetics and Power engineering

2.7.	T 007	Informatics engineering
2.8.	T 008	Materials engineering
2.9.	T 009	Mechanical engineering
2.10.	T 010	Measurement engineering
3.	Medical and Health Sciences M 000	
3.1.	M 001	Medicine
3.2.	M 002	Odontology
3.3.	M 003	Pharmacy
3.4.	M 004	Public health
3.5.	M 005	Nursing
4.	Agricultural Sciences A 000	
4.1.	A 001	Agronomy
4.2.	A 002	Veterinary Sciences
4.3.	A 003	Animal Sciences
4.4.	A 004	Forestry
5.	Social Sciences S 000	
5.1.	S 001	Law
5.2.	S 002	Political science
5.3.	S 003	Management
5.4.	S 004	Economics
5.5.	S 005	Sociology
5.6.	S 006	Psychology
5.7.	S 007	Education

5.8.	S 008	Communication and Information
6.	Humanities H 000	
6.1.	H 001	Philosophy
6.2.	H 002	Theology
6.3.	H 003	History and Theory of Arts
6.4.	H 004	Philology
6.5.	H 005	History and Archaeology
6.6.	H 006	Ethnology

Annex 3. *The List of the Units of Assessment groups*

Item No	Group of UoA's name	Abbreviation of UoA	Abbreviation the Institution's title	FTE (SD) of UoA	Research area	Research field in which the R&D quality will be assessed	FTE (SD) in the research field
1.	VV_GR_NT_1	FTMC_DarChem	FTMC	77,03	N	N 003 Chemistry	77,03
		KTU_ChemIn	KTU	108,64	N	N 003 Chemistry	38,45
					T	T 005 Chemical engineering T 004 Environmental engineering	57,39 12,80
		VU Chemija	VU	37,61	N	N 003 Chemistry	37,61
		VU_05T	VU	45,67	T	T 005 Chemical engineering	45,67
		VU_04P	VU	124,88	N	N 004 Biochemistry	124,88
2.	VV_GR_NT_2	KU_JTGM	KU	29,79	N	N 009 Informatics	3,06
					T	T 007 Informatics engineering T 005 Chemical engineering T 003 Transport engineering	8,92 5,51 4,84
						N	N 001 Mathematics N 009 Informatics
		KTU_IT-math	KTU	53,82	T	T 007 Informatics engineering	28,25
					T	T 001 Electrical and electronic engineering	56,48 21,83

						T 010 Measurement engineering	
		VU_MIF	VU	96,77	N	N 001 Mathematics	45,77
						N 009 Informatics	40,44
					T	T 007 Informatics engineering	10,56
		VILNIUS TECH_EI	VG TU	60,74	N	N 009 Informatics	3,27
					T	T 001 Electrical and electronic engineering	22,46
						T 007 Informatics engineering	21,60
3.	VV_GR_NT_3	FTMC_FTF	FTMC	143,90	N	N 002 Physics	115,92
					T	T 008 Materials engineering	26,58
		KTU_Medž-fizik	KTU	42,42	N	N 002 Physics	16,79
					T	T 008 Materials engineering	25,63
		VU_eeimi	VU	44,62	T	T 008 Materials engineering	33,67
						T 001 Electrical and electronic engineering	10,95
		VU_02P+08P	VU	146,24	N	N 002 Physics	128,03
						N 008 Astronomy	18,21
		PTTTI	PTTTI	8,50	N	–	–
					T	–	–
4.	VV_GR_T	KTU_Statyba	KTU	26,21	T	T 002 Civil engineering	26,21
		KTU_Mech-transp-energ	KTU	46,40	T	T 009 Mechanical engineering	34,77
						T 006 Energetics and power engineering	6,04
						T 003 Transport engineering	5,58

		VILNIUS TECH_CE	VG TU	70,65	T	T 002 Civil engineering T 008 Materials engineering	39,87 30,78
		VILNIUS TECH_AMTE	VG TU	44,46	T	T 009 Mechanical engineering T 003 Transport engineering	30,14 14,33
		VILNIUS TECH_EE	VG TU	24,88	T	T 004 Environmental engineering	11,14
		LEI_energ	LEI	123,24	T	T 006 Energetics and power engineering T 004 Environmental engineering	101,87 13,62
5.	VV_GR_AT	LAMMC_SDI	LAMMC	32,61	A	A 001 Agronomy	32,25
		LAMMC_Ži	LAMMC	83,12	A	A 001 Agronomy	83,12
		LAMMC_MI	LAMMC	25,45	A	A 004 Forestry	25,45
		LSMU_Agricult	LSMU	52,65	A	A 002 Veterinary Sciences A 003 Animal science	35,10 17,56
		VDU_TAS	VDU	72,97	A	A 001 Agronomy A 004 Forestry	23,14 12,61
					T	T 004 Environmental engineering T 009 Mechanical engineering T 003 Transport engineering	22,16 5,31 2,23
6.	VV_GR_N	GTC-Aplinka	GTC	83,95	N	N 012 Ecology and environmental sciences N 005 Geology N 006 Geography	50,70 18,25 15,00
		GTC-Bio	GTC	62,13	N	N 014 Zoology N 010 Biology	24,33 23,15

						N 013 Botany	14,65
		KU_GAMT	KU	37,64	N	N 012 Ecology and environmental sciences	22,68
						N 010 Biology	7,99
						N 006 Physical Geography	6,96
		VDU_IGM	VDU	71,84	N	N 012 Ecology and environmental sciences	20,79
						N 010 Biology	19,10
						N 004 Biochemistry	12,76
						N 011 Biophysics	8,01
						N 009 Informatics	6,31
		VU GEO	VU	15,08	N	N 005 Geology	8,43
						N 006 Physical Geography	6,66
		VU_BIO	VU	94,29	N	N 010 Biology	69,32
						N 011 Biophysics	12,22
						N 012 Ecology and environmental sciences	8,17
						N 014 Zoology	4,58
7.	VV_GR_MN	IMC_Gamtos_Medicinos	IMC	41,52	N	N 010 Biology	35,91
					M	M 001 Medicine	5,61
		GMSM_LSU	LSU	42,38	N	N 010 Biology	35,70
					M	–	–
		LSMU_BioMed	LSMU	152,70	N	N 010 Biology	48,69
						N 011 Biophysics	15,00

					M	M 001 Medicine	89,01
		LSMU_Odont	LSMU	14,42	M	M 002 Odontology	14,42
		LSMU_Pharm	LSMU	21,30	M	M 003 Pharmacy	21,30
		LSMU_PubHealth	LSMU	23,80	M	M 004 Public health	23,80
		LSMU_Nurs	LSMU	11,92	M	M 005 Nursing	11,92
		NVI	NVI	18,92	N	N 010 Biology	9,96
						N 011 Biophysics	2,79
					M	M 001 Medicine	6,18
		VU_medicina	VU	115,97	M	M 001 Medicine	94,64
						M 004 Public health	11,45
						M 002 Odontology	4,52
8.	VV_GR_H_1	KU_IST	KU	26,51	H	H 005 History and archaeology	26,51
		LII	LII	69,25	H	H 005 History and archaeology	62,25
						H 006 Ethnology	7,00
		LKI_VV	LKI	50,55	H	H 004 Philology	50,55
		LLTI_VV	LLTI	59,50	H	H 004 Philology	35,50
						H 006 Ethnology	23,00
		VDU_HUM	VDU	37,42	H	H 004 Philology	19,90
H 005 History and archaeology	11,15						
H 006 Ethnology	3,87						
					H 001 Philosophy	2,51	
VU_04H	VU	81,46	H	H 004 Philology	81,46		
VU_05H	VU	30,52	H	H 005 History and archaeology	30,52		

9.	VV_GR_H_2	EHU-HU	EHU	8,08	H	H 001 Philosophy	2,08
		KTU_Human	KTU	16,96	H	H 003 History and Theory of Arts	9,99
		LKTI	LKTI	53,75	H	H 003 History and Theory of Arts	25,50
						H 001 Philosophy	15,75
						H 005 History and archaeology	12,50
		LMTA	LMTA	16,46	H	H 003 History and Theory of Arts	15,18
					S	–	–
		VDA_VAA H	VDA	16,59	H	H 003 History and Theory of Arts	16,59
		VDU_MEN	VDU	7,02	H	H 003 History and Theory of Arts	7,02
		VDU_TEOL	VDU	6,23	H	H 002 Theology	6,23
VILNIUS TECH_HTA	VG TU	8,43	H	H 003 History and Theory of Arts	8,43		
VU_FET	VU	24,80	H	H 001 Philosophy	15,54		
				H 006 Ethnology	9,26		
10.	VV_GR_S_1	EHU-SS	EHU	7,25	S	S 001 Law	2,00
		MRU_TM-VSA	MRU	43,54	S	S 001 Law	43,54
		PPMI	PPMI	5,29	S	–	–
		VDU_POL_KOM	VDU	20,92	S	S 002 Political science	14,93
						S 008 Communication and information	5,99
		VDU_TEIS	VDU	10,15	S	S 001 Law	10,15
		VU_01S	VU	23,55	S	S 001 Law	23,55
		VU_02S	VU	16,07	S	S 002 Political science	16,07
VU_08S	VU	19,24	S	S 008 Communication and information	19,24		

11.	VV_GR_S_2	ISM_ISM	ISM	23,01	S	S 003 Management S 004 Economics	16,68 6,33
		KSU	KSU	10,34	S	S 003 Management S 001 Law	6,07 2,21
		KTU_Ekon-vadyb	KTU	44,80	S	S 003 Management S 004 Economics	28,56 16,24
		LEI_EE	LEI	15,17	S	S 004 Economics	15,17
		MRU_VVVF	MRU	45,41	S	S 003 Management S 004 Economics	24,38 15,77
		VDU_EV	VDU	32,65	S	S 003 Management S 004 Economics	19,67 12,99
		VILNIUS TECH_MEC	VG TU	52,73	S	S 003 Management S 008 Communication and information S 004 Economics	21,10 18,98 12,66
		VU_EV	VU	68,17	S	S 004 Economics S 003 Management	41,29 26,88
12.	VV_GR_S_3	KTU_Socio	KTU	23,28	S	S 007 Education S 002 Political science S 005 Sociology	6,45 5,49 5,37
		KU_SvSOC	KU	36,26	S	S 007 Education S 005 Sociology S 006 Psychology	13,12 11,00 4,02

					M	M 004 Public health	2,87
		LSMC_LSMC	LSMC	79,99	S	S 004 Economics S 005 Sociology S 001 Law	31,90 30,06 18,03
		SM_LSU	LSU	20,53	S	S 007 Education	13,45
		VDU_EDUK	VDU	47,77	S	S 007 Education	47,77
		VDU_SOC_PSI	VDU	28,62	S	S 005 Sociology S 006 Psychology	14,53 14,09
		VU_Edu	VU	34,04	S	S 007 Education	34,04
		VU_SP	VU	49,66	S	S 006 Psychology S 005 Sociology	29,25 20,41
13.	VV_GR_SH	KU_SOCHUM	KU	25,82	S	S 003 Management S 004 Economics S 002 Political science	6,45 3,09 2,80
					H	H 004 Philology H 006 Ethnology	5,70 2,22
		LCC-M	LCC	10,22	S	–	–
					H	–	–
		LKA (NTMA ir S)	LKA	13,85	S	S 002 Political science S 003 Management	5,98 2,88
					N	–	–
					T	–	–
		MRU_ŽVSF	MRU	51,11	S	S 007 Education	18,22

						S 006 Psychology	16,28
				H		H 004 Philology	6,43

Annex 4. Scales for the evaluation criteria and the data to inform the scoring of the criteria

Table 3. Scores and definitions of the criterion: the quality of R&D activities

SCORE	DEFINITION	DESCRIPTION	INFORMATION TO CONSIDER FOR SCORING THE CRITERION
5	Excellent	The unit of assessment is among top international players (in a research field or group of research fields of a research area). R&D activities are of the highest international standard.	The following information will be provided for the R&D quality assessment purposes: 1. by the UoA's research field and/or group/groups of research fields within research area: 1.1. the data on doctoral studies of the unit of assessment for each past 5-year period (as of 31 December): 1.1.1. the list of theses defended; 1.1.2. the numbers of PhD students in the 1-4 years' full-time department and in the 1-6 years' part-time studies department, with foreign students separated out; 1.2. the list of teaching staff with a scientific degree of the unit of assessment as at 31 December of the last year of the assessment period and the list of research workers and other researchers with a scientific degree, with links to their scientific profiles; 1.3. the following information on the unit of assessment for the past five years: 1.3.1. the list of best research outputs; 1.3.2. the list of best reports delivered at conferences abroad; 1.3.3. the list of main national and international awards for R&D activities; 1.3.4. the details of the participation in the competition-based R&D projects. 2. The information available to the RCL, for the period under assessment, on research results dissemination units (research outputs) of the assessment of the Institution and the participation in the international R&D programmes in
4	Very good	The unit of assessment is strong at the international level (in a research field or group of research fields of a research area). R&D carried out is of high level and internationally recognised.	
3	Good	The unit of assessment is strong with limited international recognition (in a research field or group of research fields of a research area). R&D carried out is of high level and nationally recognised.	
2	Satisfactory	The unit of assessment is assessed satisfactorily at the national level (in a research field or group of research fields of a research area). R&D carried out is satisfactory.	

1	Poor	<p>The unit of assessment is assessed as poor at the national level (in a research field or group of research fields of a research area.</p> <p>R&D activities carried out are of low level.</p>	research areas obtained after summarising the annual results of R&D activities of universities and research institutes.
0	No R&D	The unit of assessment does not carry out R&D.	

Table 4. Scores and definitions of the criterion: the economic and social impact of R&D activities

SCORE	DEFINITION	DESCRIPTION	INFORMATION TO CONSIDER FOR SCORING THE CRITERION
5	Excellent	<p>The unit of assessment carries out scientific research of exceptional importance and is an extremely important partner in R&D outside academia.</p> <p>The unit of assessment has a positive influence on the development of society and is a highly valued partner in R&D matters not only within the academic community but also outside it. Employees of the Institution are regarded as experts in public and private sectors.</p>	<p>The following information will be provided for the economic and social impact of R&D activities assessment purposes:</p> <p>1. for the past five years:</p> <p>1.1. the list of research outputs, R&D orders of economic entities (Lithuanian and foreign), and I projects (national and international) that had the greatest economic and social impact;</p> <p>1.2. the lists of the main cases of participation of researchers of the unit of assessment in working groups, panels or committees formed by administrative authorities, state and municipal enterprises and organisations;</p> <p>1.3. the lists of the main consultations provided by the unit of assessment to the public or economic entities;</p> <p>1.4. the lists of the main scientific conferences and events organised by the unit of assessment;</p> <p>1.5. the lists of the main cases of participation of the researchers of the unit of assessment in editorial boards of scientific journals;</p> <p>1.6. the lists of the main memberships of the researchers of the unit of assessment in international working groups, associations etc.;</p>
4	Very good	<p>The unit of assessment carries out very important scientific research and is a very important partner in R&D beyond the academic community.</p> <p>The research carried out is important for society. The unit of assessment is closely related not only with academic community but also with business, decision-makers and society.</p>	

3	Good	<p>The unit of assessment carries out important research and is an important partner in R&D outside the academic community.</p> <p>The research carried out is important for society. Relationship with business, decision-makers and society is appropriate to a recognised institution carrying out academic activities.</p>	<p>1.7. the lists of the main results of scientific popularisation activities; 1.8. the data on cooperation agreements between research and economic entities. 2. The information for the period under assessment available to the Council on orders of economic entities carried out by the Institution, obtained having summarised the results of annual assessment of R&D activities of universities and research institutes.</p>
2	Satisfactory	<p>Unit of Assessment carries out important scientific research, but little interacts with private sector, decision-makers, society.</p> <p>The research carried out is important for society, but interaction of the unit of assessment with business, decision-makers and society is weak.</p>	
1	Poor	<p>The research carried out by the unit of assessment is not important, there is no interaction with business decision-makers and society.</p> <p>The research carried out is not important for society. The unit of assessment does not interact with business, decision-makers and society.</p>	
0	No R&D	<p>The unit of assessment does not carry out R&D.</p>	

Table 5. Scores and definitions of the criterion: the development potential of R&D activities

SCORE	DEFINTION	DESCRIPTION	INFORMATION TO CONSIDER FOR SCORING THE CRITERION
5	Excellent	<p>The unit of assessment has great potential to maintain excellent ratings.</p> <p>Having regard to current performance, the human resources, strategy, organisation of activities and</p>	<p>The following information will be provided for the development potential of R&D activities assessment purposes:</p> <p>1. the description of the current R&D infrastructure and the lines of its planned development in terms of its use, available access to other R&D</p>

		infrastructure of the unit of assessment will ensure conditions for excellent ratings in the next 5 years.	<p>infrastructure, participation in national and international research infrastructures, participation in other international R&D organisations;</p> <p>2. human resources structure and dynamics:</p> <p>2.1. numbers of research workers (teaching staff and research workers, other researchers), PhD students, other employees (hereinafter collectively - the employees) for the last year of the period under assessment;</p> <p>2.2. the distribution of the employees by age and gender (as at 31 December of the last year of the period under assessment);</p> <p>2.3. human resources management principles;</p> <p>3. the strategic operating plan of the unit of assessment or the Institution;</p> <p>4. the description and justification of the R&D subjects to be developed;</p> <p>5. the information on the policy of training new generation of researchers;</p> <p>6. the information on the UoA's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT).</p>
4	Very good	<p>The unit of assessment has potential to achieve very good ratings.</p> <p>Having regard to current performance the human resources, strategy, organisation of activities and infrastructure of the unit of assessment will ensure conditions for very good ratings in the next 5 years .</p>	
3	Good	<p>The unit of assessment has potential to achieve good ratings.</p> <p>Having regard to current performance, the human resources, strategy, and organisation of activities and infrastructure of the unit of assessment will ensure, conditions for good ratings in the next 5 years.</p>	
2	Satisfactory	<p>The unit of assessment has potential to operate only satisfactorily.</p> <p>Having regard to current performance, the human resources, strategy, and organisation of activities and infrastructure of the unit of assessment will ensure to achieve only satisfactory ratings in the next 5 years.</p>	
1	Poor	<p>The unit of assessment has no potential to operate at least satisfactorily.</p> <p>Having regard to current performance, the human resources, strategy, organisation of activities and infrastructure of the unit of assessment will lead to poor ratings in the next 5 years.</p>	
0	No R&D	<p>The unit of assessment does not carry out R&D.</p>	

(Individual Expert Assessment Form for the Unit of Assessment)

INDIVIDUAL EXPERT ASSESSMENT OF THE UNIT OF ASSESSMENT

Type of the institution _____

Name of the institution _____

Official abbreviation of the name of the institution _____

Name of the Institution's unit of assessment (hereinafter – UoA) _____

Abbreviation of the UoA name _____

The scope of the UoA (FTE(SD)) _____

Research Area(s) _____

Research Field(s) _____

Group(s) of the research fields within the research area(s) _____

Quality of the R&D activities of the UoA within the research field(s) (group(s) of research fields within the research area(s)):

Research field (group of fields of research within the research area)

Scope (FTE(SD)) _____

Score (points) _____

Reasoned justification of the score:

Economic and social impact of R&D activities of the UoA:

Score (points) _____

Reasoned justification of the score:

The development potential of R&D activities of the UoA:

Score (points) _____

Reasoned justification of the score:



(Expert Assessment form for the Unit of Assessment)

EXPERT ASSESSMENT OF THE UNIT OF ASSESSMENT

Type of the institution _____

Name of the institution _____

Official abbreviation of the name of the institution _____

Name of the Institution's unit of assessment (hereinafter – UoA) _____

Abbreviation of the UoA name _____

The scope of the UoA (FTE(SD)) _____

Research area(s) _____

Research field(s) _____

Group(s) of the research fields within the research area(s) _____

Quality of the R&D activities of the UoA within the field(s) of science (group(s) of fields of science within the area(s) of science):

Research field (group of research fields within the research area) _____

Scope (FTE(SD)) _____

Score (points) _____

Reasoned justification of the score (starting from 300 words):

Economic and social impact of R&D activities of the UoA:

Score (points) _____

Reasoned justification of the score (starting from 300 words):

The development potential of R&D activities of the UoA:

Score (points) _____

Reasoned justification of the score (starting from 300 words):

Recommendations for continuity and/or improvement of the activities of the UoA (starting from 300 words):

--

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS OF AN EXPERT OF THE RESEARCH COUNCIL OF LITHUANIA

[dd] [month] 2023

(place)

I, _____,
(First Name, Surname)

being a candidate of the Research Council of Lithuania (hereinafter – the Council) for the membership in the Expert Panel for Comparative Expert Assessment of Research and Development Activities Carried out by Universities and Research Institutes (hereinafter – the Expert Assessment), which shall assess the group(s) of the units of assessment (*name(s) of the group(s) of the units of assessment assigned*) hereby note that:

(tick the correct answers)

I have not had any employment relationship with Lithuanian higher education and research institutions during the reporting period of the Expert Assessment (years 2018–2022) and up to the date of signing this declaration with the Council;

I have not had any joint scientific publications with researchers from Lithuanian higher education and research institutions during the reporting period of the Expert Assessment (years 2018–2022) and up to the date of signing this declaration with the Council;

I disclose and confirm that on the date of signing this declaration, there are no circumstances or situations which, to my knowledge, give rise to a conflict of interest or could potentially give rise to a conflict of interest between me and Lithuanian higher education and research institutions and their researchers, except for the following circumstances:

(describe the situation(s) which gives rise to a conflict of interest or could potentially give rise to a conflict of interest, or state that there are no circumstances giving rise to a conflict of interest)

I shall avoid actions that may create conflicts of interest between me and Lithuanian research and higher education institutions and its researchers until the Expert Panel work is finished. I am informed that if new circumstances relating to a potential conflict of interest arise or become apparent, I must inform the Council in writing without delay.

I am informed that if the Council has reasonable information that I may be involved in a conflict of interest situation and have not informed and/or recused myself from decision-making in relation to the assessment of the subject concerned, the Council may suspend my participation in the assessment process and carry out an investigation into a possible breach of the declaration of interests.

I certify that the information I have provided is correct.

(Signature)

(Full name of the candidate for membership of the Expert Panel)
