



THE OMBUDSMAN FOR ACADEMIC ETHICS AND PROCEDURES OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

DECISION REGARDING ASSESSMENT AND PUBLIC COMPETITION AT KAUNAS TECHNICAL COLLEGE

24 March 2015 No. SP-7

Vilnius

The **Ombudsman for Academic Ethics and Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania** (hereinafter – Ombudsman), <...> examined the complaint of V. L. (we have impersonalized the data) (hereinafter – applicant) received in the Office of Ombudsman for Academic Ethics and Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania (hereinafter – Office of Ombudsman) on 20 October 2014 and the material submitted by Kaunas Technical College (hereinafter – College), and **determined that:**

The applicant asks:

“1. To evaluate whether the KTK (Kaunas Technical College, specified by us) Director has used correct selection criteria to appoint the members of the commission of assessment and competitions for academic employees <...>.

2. To evaluate what criteria and procedure the Commission (College’s commission of assessment and competitions for academic employees, specified by us) has used to fill in the generalized opinion of the students in the assessment card of the lecturers during their tenure: “good”, “average”, “bad”.

3. To evaluate the performance indexes of all the lecturers (18 employed by KTK, 6 from outside), who took part in the senior lecturer’s assessment through tenure and with regard to public competition held on 17 June 2014. Do all the lecturers satisfy the requirements of the clauses 56, 57, 63 of the “Rules on Organization of Lecturers’ Assessment and Competitions for Posts” <...> 56, 57, 63.

4. To evaluate whether the members of the Commission (College’s commission of assessment and competitions for academic employees, our remark) were in compliance with the clauses 19, 20 of the Rules on the ethical principles when they were evaluating my performance results during the tenure.

5. To determine whether the Commission (College’s commission of assessment and competitions for academic employees, our remark) has evaluated correctly my performance results of five years (from 01/06/2009 until 16/05/2014).

6. To determine whether M. M. (we have impersonalized the data) has won the competition for the post of senior lecturer correctly, according to the approved Rules.”

<...>

With regard to the clauses 11-13 of the Rules on Organization of Lecturers’ Assessment and Competitions for Posts (approved by the Order No. VI-178 of the College’s Director of 12 December 2013) (hereinafter – Rules), it should be stated that <...> the Commission was formed in violation of

the sub-clause 12.1 of the Rules, which states that “at least two thirds of the members <...> have to be researchers working as senior lecturers”.

<...>

<...> When the Commission decided to certify senior lecturer E. S. (we have impersonalized the data) for the tenure, it violated the part of the clause 15 of the Rules of the edition of 04/12/2005 that states that “the assessment shall be carried out by the commission following <...> the minimal qualification requirements.”

<...>

<...> When the Commission decided to certify senior lecturer M. Z. (we have impersonalized the data) for the tenure, it violated the part of the clause 15 of the Rules of the edition of 04/12/2005 that states that “the assessment shall be carried out by the commission following <...> the minimal qualification requirements.”

<...>

<...> When the Commission decided to certify senior lecturer V. N. (we have impersonalized the data) for the tenure, it violated the part of the clause 15 of the Rules of the edition of 04/12/2005 that states that “the assessment shall be carried out by the commission following <...> the minimal qualification requirements.”

<...>

<...> When the Commission decided to certify senior lecturer P. S. (we have impersonalized the data) for the tenure, it violated the part of the clause 15 of the Rules of the edition of 04/12/2005 that states that “the assessment shall be carried out by the commission following <...> the minimal qualification requirements.”

<...>

<...> When the Commission decided to certify senior lecturer R. S. (we have impersonalized the data) for the tenure, it violated the part of the clause 15 of the Rules of the edition of 04/12/2005 that states that “the assessment shall be carried out by the commission following <...> the minimal qualification requirements.”

<...>

The Ombudsman decided:

1. To inform Kaunas Technical College and the Ministry of Education and Science about the Ombudsman’s decision.
2. To recommend to Kaunas Technical College to revoke the decisions to certify senior lecturers for the nature, who did not meet the minimal qualification requirements set in the Rules.
3. To recommend to Kaunas Technical College to revoke the decisions regarding the competition’s winners, who did not satisfy the minimal qualification requirements set for senior lecturers in the Rules, and therefore could not be assessed.
