Introduction

• 16 units of assessments
• International panel from 5 countries
  – Hungary, Croatia, Finland, Belgium, Great Britain/Singapore
• The Panel worked by consensus
  – after detailed discussions
• Research assessment ≠
  education or health care assessment
Observations

• Vigorous biomedical research
• The elite is of international good standing
• Some promising organisational changes
  – Merging former units in new institute(s)
• A snapshot – cause of uncertainty
• Good PhD students
General problems

- Participation in large multicenter studies
  - Often, members of collaborations only
  - Contributing (patient) data
  - This is not original scientific activity

- Framework for doctoral (PhD) studies
  - Studies last too long
  - Stipends not enough for subsistence
  - Dissertations in Lithuanian
General problems – cont.

• Career path is broken at the postdoctoral stage

• Journals in Lithuanian
  – Primary scientific reports – should be in English
  – Professional articles – knowledge dissemination should be in Lithuanian!!!
Distributed assessment scores

Medicine

- Q
- ESI
- PI
- RM
- DP
- OS

Scores distributed as follows:

- 0,0% to 10,0%
- 10,0% to 20,0%
- 20,0% to 30,0%
- 30,0% to 40,0%
- 40,0% to 50,0%
- 50,0% to 60,0%
Research quality

- 7/16 units scored 4 – very good (internationally)
- 7/16 units scored 3 – strong national leader
- 2/16 units scored 2 – nationally good

Recommendations:
- Score 4: resist fragmentation, maintain focus
- Score 3: focus on a few topics, decrease fragmentation
- Score ≤2: organise, focus on a few very good topics
Economic and social impact of research

Scores are much lower than research quality, easily explained by biomedicine’s social role, which usually is not considered a productive activity.
Infrastructure for research

• In general, reasonable or good infrastructure
• Excellent use of the structural funds
• Some units still in transition from old to new
• It will take time to have an effect...
Research management

• Score $\geq 4$ is somewhat less frequent than score 4 for quality or potential

• In general, management skills need improving – may be the root cause of fragmentation.

Recommendation:

• Invest in formal training for potential leaders

• Management coaching should be considered
Development potential

• 8/16 scored ≥4, a very good finding
• Transitional stage was considered
  – where consistent information was available
• Good management is needed to develop to potential

• Caution: large units may not have uniformly good potential
Distribution of assessment scores

Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>ESI</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>OS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excellence in many subject areas

Examples:

• Gastroenterology
• Cardiology
• Neurosciences
• ... and some others

- Odontology in Kaunas – no research infrastructure
General Policy recommendations

- Clear research mission for the larger units
- Reconsider doctoral studies
  - Special attention to clinical research fields!
- Reconsider research career path
  - an emphasis on the postdoctoral phase,
  - stipend, research money,
- Take special care of the young elite postdocs (1 to 5%, with international excellence)
Clinical research – special aspects

• Clinical PhD
  – A liability, needs attention and policy change.
  – Not a Lithuanian speciality
  – The policy makers usually do not allow for length of medical studies and specialization together.
  – A unique solution for the PhD in clinical sciences.

• Clinical university departments should do (clinical) research

• Teaching hospitals may not do appreciable research
Summary

If science policy, local management and the researchers will do what is necessary, the Panel foresees a bright future for Lithuanian biomedical science