



THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT OF THE SALZBURG SEMINAR VISITING ADVISORS' REPORT

**KLAIPEDA UNIVERSITY
KLAIPEDA, LITHUANIA**

October 16-20, 2000

Team Members:

Dr. Leonardo de la Garza, Chancellor of the Tarrant County College District in Fort Worth, Texas, USA, (team leader)

Dr. Dumitru Ciocoi-Pop, Rector of "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu, Romania

Dr. Jochen Fried, Director, Universities Project, Salzburg Seminar

Dr. Barbara Hill, Senior Fellow, Center for Leadership Development and International Initiatives, American Council on Education, USA

Purpose and Scope of the Visit

The Rector of Klaipeda University invited a team of Visiting Advisors from the Salzburg Seminar to provide consultative services to the University on a number of issues selected by the university leadership for their pertinence to the future development of the institution. The visit was arranged and sponsored by the Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project, a multi-year series of symposia convening senior representatives of higher education from Central and East Europe and Russia, with their counterparts from North America and West Europe. The Visiting Advisors Program (VAP) is an extension of the Universities Project. The Visiting Advisors, who are selected by the Salzburg Seminar, are seasoned, credentialed and well-experienced members of the higher education profession, who volunteer their services to travel to a host institution to share their knowledge and expertise with the university leadership.

Two acknowledgements are in order, which made the visit to the University possible. First, we should recognize the invaluable resources to the higher education community, especially in Europe, and the brilliant and service-oriented philosophy of the Salzburg Seminar and its leadership. Efforts such as the one described in this report toward the improvement of the higher education profession would not be possible were it not for the assistance of the Seminar and the resources it brings to such efforts.

Secondly, we should acknowledge the leadership of Klaipeda University, and very particularly its Rector, Professor Stasys Vaitekunas, for having the

courage and insight to request an objective review and report of the University's constructs, programs, advancement, limitations, and potential. The request from the University leadership for a visit by a team of advisors demonstrates a strong willingness and considerable courage to stand for objective scrutiny by an independent team of outsiders, involving the entire university community, as a precursor to effective and positive change. We commend the Rector and the university community for this enlightened action.

The Rector provided the opportunity for the Visiting Advisors to meet with a wide variety of individuals, including the Vice-Rectors, most of the deans, department chairs, professors, and students. In advance of the visit, the University sent printed materials as well as some analytical documents outlining the issues that it chose to be addressed at the meetings. Since the audience for this report is the University community, we will primarily focus on our observations and recommendations, and be very sparing in presenting facts and descriptions that are known to the members of Klaipeda University.

It is important to stress at the outset of this report that Klaipeda University is still a very young member of the family of European higher education institutions. Founded in 1991, it had to cope with a multitude of challenges, some of them typical for a newly established university, others reflecting the difficult path of Lithuania toward increased economic success as well as social and political stability. Klaipeda University also had the very rare opportunity of creating a university unhampered by long-standing traditions and entrenched structures. The Visiting Advisors are very much aware of the special nature of Klaipeda University, which is still in the process of taking roots. In our view, all those involved in nurturing this young institution can be proud of what has been achieved within a relatively short period of time. The deliberations which are to follow in this report are meant to support the University in achieving its self-declared goals and objectives.

There is much about Klaipeda University to be admired, not the least of which is its potential for continued growth and service to the western and coastal area of the country. Certainly, it has shown a strong tendency toward growth. Examples include growing from three faculties in 1991 to seven faculties and one institute today; and serving a student body of 2,400 in 1991 to one approaching 7,000 students today. The growth in academic programs has followed the growth in faculty and student body, as well. The three main functions of the University, as articulated by the Rector include: international education; a national presence, providing specialties for the Lithuania economy; and, a national presence and span of service for the western region of Lithuania.

Vision

The vision of the future of the University by the Rector and his team builds upon and has symmetry with the aforementioned main functions of the University: first and foremost, of course, was the need to establish the University, and that is fairly well accomplished. Second, the University will

seek to upgrade study and research to improve its communications infrastructure. (It should be noted here that seven years ago, after long and difficult negotiations, the university took over some historic military barracks, which now constitute the main campus. Notably, as well, the math and science buildings were refurbished with direct assistance from business, industry and the community.) These difficult yet successful efforts bode well for continued similar successes in the future. Third, the University intends to construct new laboratories, while at the same time expanding the use of laboratories at other institutions. Fourth, there is a need to continue to give needed attention to the campus facilities infrastructure; finally, there are elaborate plans for additional buildings and student dormitories. For this latter plan, there is hope to attract private funding to help accomplish this. For example, there is an on-going discussion with private enterprise to possibly build a supermarket on the property in exchange for assistance with building the university infrastructure. It is clear that the University leadership has given careful thought to the future needs of the institution.

Challenges, Limitations and Problems

Two general areas which present challenges and limitations to the Klaipeda University community, include academic structure and service to students. The third, and clearly the primary challenge facing the university, is of a financial nature. These challenges and impediments toward excellence and continued growth are addressed and detailed in the following sections of this report.

Academic Structure

Although founded only ten years ago, KU is nonetheless not a *creatio ex nihilo*. Like other universities in Central and Eastern Europe, which came into existence only after the momentous political changes of 1989, KU has “inherited” academic resources that existed locally before, and converged these into a new and free-standing academic institution. The present structure of KU reflects the short history of the institution and is the result of two major initiatives. The first was the merging of the various academic units that were situated in Klaipeda prior to the creation of KU (branch faculties of other Lithuanian universities, research institutes, independent academic entities). There followed the careful addition of new units, such as the Faculty of Health Science, created in response to societal needs and favorable opportunities. Given the young age of the institution, it is entirely understandable that in some ways KU still resembles more a conglomerate of individual segments as it strives to find a more defined institutional profile.

The Visiting Advisors applaud the efforts that the KU leadership has undertaken thus far to integrate the previously independent academic resources in Klaipeda under one roof, while trying to form an overarching institutional structure. It seems clear that in the early years of KU's existence, a certain degree of unrestrained development was both unavoidable and justifiable. Too much control and rigorous planning might have suffocated new initiatives and stifled the steady growth of the University. However, it seems to team members that KU must now forge a new chapter of its development and

enter a period of consolidation and reorganization of its programs. This next step of KU's maturation is prompted by the need for more comprehensive academic structures, which would enable KU to strengthen its position within the Lithuanian higher education landscape. But it is also the precarious financial situation of KU, which makes it mandatory to carefully consider the scope of the developmental path for the institution for the next decade and beyond.

As a result of the meetings held with KU colleagues, the Visiting Advisors have identified the following challenge related to the academic structure of the University: What needs to be done in order to reinforce the *cohesion and consistency* of the teaching and research potential at KU? We define cohesion as consisting of two distinct qualities: on the one hand a clearly recognizable academic profile, and on the other hand an enhanced interconnectedness among the individual institutional units (faculties/departments, institutes and scientific centers.) There is no easy answer to this question, which we consider to be of key importance for the future of KU. When searching for an answer, it might be helpful for the University leadership to observe one general assumption and two more specific parameters. The widely shared assumption is that for the vast majority of higher education institutions, it is no longer feasible to embrace the concept of "one size fits all." Over the past few decades, universities experienced a dramatic increase in knowledge production on the one hand, and broad streams of new demands from stakeholders (students, government, employers, the local community) on the other hand. This has led to a situation, which has been described as a "demand-response imbalance": "demands on universities outrun their capacity to respond [and] knowledge outruns resources." (Burton R. Clark (1998), *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities. Organizational Pathways of Transformation*, Oxford: Pergamon, pp.129-130). As a consequence, higher education institutions have to make certain choices. Since they cannot cover the entire universe of knowledge (as universities in the past often tended to believe) and since they need to set priorities with regard to external demands, they have no alternative but to define and create their own individual profile in accordance with their own special mission. In short, universities must develop their own individual identity and focus "that help them solve the problem of severe imbalance and to define anew their societal usefulness." (Burton R. Clarke, p.147)

Needless to say, the situation is even more complicated for higher education institutions in societies under transition such as Lithuania. But for KU as a young university, exceptional opportunities may be at hand. KU is an institution that is still relatively lean and formable, and above all, not burdened with traditions and age-old practices that could prevent determination of a common strategy to introduce a more clearly defined institutional profile.

Two parameters deserve special attention by the KU leadership when searching for this strategy:

- Market demands, above all the student market: when deciding whether or not to introduce a new study program (or to close an existing one),

the first and foremost criterion for KU should be the clearly demonstrable evidence of demand (or the lack thereof) on the part of the university's clients.

- Societal relevance, particularly with regard to the West Lithuanian region: KU should constantly strive to augment its role as an engine of change and innovation within the local and regional community, thus underlining its key role in promoting human resource development, which is of paramount importance for the economic and social prosperity in and around Klaipeda.

With reference to these more general considerations, the Visiting Advisors would like to draw the attention of the KU leadership to some more specific observations and suggestions:

1. KU commands a wealth of expertise in the area of maritime studies ranging from marine techniques to submarine archeology. Although the materials that we received prior to the visit were not sufficiently detailed to acquire a more comprehensive picture, and the visit was too short to explore these resources in depth, it is obvious that this area is one of KU's major strengths. However, we were surprised to discover that this expertise is dispersed across the University with no apparent focus or institutional structure that would allow the various approaches to maritime studies to converge and link together beyond disciplinary boundaries. Currently, teaching and research related to maritime topics seems to be segregated into a wide range of institutional units and sub-units (faculty, institutes, scientific centers) with little or no overlap. For example, we chanced upon the expertise in the field of marine and submarine archeology as well as marine economy in the Faculty of Social Sciences which didn't seem to be linked to neighboring disciplines.

The Visiting Advisors felt that KU has the academic capacity to create a new and multidisciplinary focus in the area of maritime studies (in teaching, research and service) that at present is prevented from flourishing by fragmentation and confinement into disciplinary boxes and departmentalized academic structures. Maritime studies (as, for example, environmental studies) is not a traditional subject area in the disciplinary sense. Instead, it is a typical 'problem-driven' field of knowledge combining elements of all faculties of KU, from the natural sciences to the humanities. The departmental arrangements with their hierarchical structure discourage lateral collaboration in a transdisciplinary setting, which is the key to this area of applied teaching and research. It is well known that new scientific discoveries, but also new applications of existing knowledge, form on the edges of fields and disciplines—at the borders to their neighbors, as it were—and not at the core, where textbook knowledge is at home. Unless the university creates an institutional structure and environment, which is conducive to cross-fertilization of knowledge resources, this potential for innovation and academic integration will remain untapped.

The Visiting Advisors would like, therefore, to encourage the KU leadership to initiate a discussion within the University concerning ways in which to re-organize the academic structures in order to unleash its scientific potential in

this important area which is so highly relevant for the Klaipeda region. This discussion should be informed by a thorough investigation of maritime studies programs at other universities in the Baltic Sea region and beyond.

2. The academic structure of KU is composed of seven faculties, two institutes and twenty-one scientific centers. Whereas the first two categories are very familiar (with the “institutes” serving specialized instructional purposes), the rationale and the function of the centers were much less obvious. Some of them seemed to be research offshoots of individual departments, while others might be considered as proto-departmental units (like the Centers for American Studies or for Regional Planning) that also include a teaching function. The general impression of the Visiting Advisors is that these centers tend to be sub-units of specialization, perhaps even over-specialization, which potentially intensify the forces of dispersion and separation within the academic structure of the KU.

If this impression is correct, it follows that an appropriate suggestion would be that the KU leadership review the original rationale of the scientific centers and consider a new policy with regard to these units. In our view, the centers could serve a vital function within the overall composition of KU's academic resources if they were to become the interfaces of collaboration and scholarly exchange between the various faculties. Their main purpose and *raison d'être* would be to stimulate interdisciplinary work, to generate “binding energy” and to explore new territories of academic activity that may hold the promise of becoming a regular and firmly institutionalized component of the university (i.e. a department) in the future. The centers thus would develop into agents and promoters of enhanced cohesion with regard to the academic structure of KU as a whole. They would also become a crucial tool in terms of the strategic planning of the KU's future development.

To implement this new role of the centers, they must be temporary instruments of permanent renewal. They should be established for an initial period of two to three years, based on a project proposal, which describes the planned activities of the center, its interdisciplinary/interfacultative approach and the possible benefits for KU. The continuation of support for each center for one or more periods should be subject to an evaluation of its achievements that should also include external reviewers. After two funding cycles, the relevant decision-making body of KU would have to decide whether to turn the center into a fixed part of the academic structure or whether to discontinue it. Given this new role and purpose of the scientific centers, which might be renamed “interdisciplinary centers,” it is obvious that they could not be established as adjunct entities of individual departments or even faculties. It would be the University Senate or a special committee authorized by the Senate, which should be in charge of all matters related to the centers. This would allow for a measure of objective and unattached assessment to take place, which is a critical element in the process of program review. Again, the Visiting Advisors would strongly encourage the KU leadership to include external members in this committee, both academic and non-academic.

3. As was mentioned above, the Visiting Advisors appreciate the fact that during the early years of KU's existence, the University seemed to have adopted an accumulative approach toward expanding its academic portfolio. It provided a common roof for higher education units that existed locally before and supplemented these by new components to form a more comprehensive and attractive higher education institution. The Visiting Advisors assume that this process is still ongoing and that the KU leadership envisions further academic growth. However, when reviewing the composition of the seven faculties, we concluded that there might also be the need for consolidation and re-organization of the present scope of academic resources.

From an outsider's view, it is not readily apparent why KU has three different departments for art pedagogy—one for theatre, one for music and one for art in general—spread out over three different faculties (humanities, arts and pedagogy). It is also not self-evident that a department of recreation is part of the faculty of natural sciences. And while it is not unheard of that a philosophy department is a component part of a faculty of social sciences, we learned from students of this faculty that their philosophy courses are largely unconnected to other parts of their curriculum.

This may just be episodic evidence for some inconsistencies in the composition of the faculties, and the Visiting Advisors are convinced that for each of these cases there is a rationale behind the assignment of a department to one faculty or the other. But our observations seem to indicate that there is room for re-thinking some of the original arrangements regarding academic structure before moving on to expand the range of study programs. For a university the size of KU, a total of seven faculties and more than fifty departments seems very large, exacerbating the problems of managing a young and very dynamic institution. It would, therefore, seem reasonable for the KU leadership to take stock of the current structure of the faculties and initiate a discussion about a possible reshaping (including a merging) of some of these units.

4. Universities throughout Europe find themselves more and more involved in discussions about teaching styles and more effective and efficient methods of disseminating knowledge. In many countries, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe, formal lectures and one-way communication in classrooms is still the predominant mode of instruction at universities. In this report's section about students and their concerns, some of the shortcomings of these methods are discussed.

The Visiting Advisors encourage KU to become a spearhead of reform in this regard. Teaching at the university level is an art that requires skills and techniques that cannot be taken for granted. It would be a mistake to think that a good scholar is automatically a good university teacher. But old habits die hard, and young colleagues are all too often left alone when it comes to designing courses and trying to create an effective learning environment. Therefore, we suggest that KU create a special Center for Instructional Development to provide opportunities for professional development in teaching to faculty members and teaching assistants, to enable them to

promote active student learning. The Center would also to be a depository for equipment that would be available for instructional use. Furthermore, this unit could be entrusted with the responsibility for developing methods and instruments for evaluating faculty teaching. The establishment of such a Center, staffed by existing faculty members, would underscore KU's commitment to innovative ideas and boost its reputation by positioning it in the forefront of reform both within Lithuania and beyond.

Students and Their Concerns

The KU leadership asked the Visiting Advisors team to address a number of issues related to students and their concerns. The Advisors were pleased to have the opportunity to meet with students both in scheduled meetings as well as during informal conversations while touring the University. The majority of the students with whom the Advisors met were students elected to union positions in the various faculties and in the University as a whole.

We found the students to be intelligent, articulate, polite, reasonable, analytical, and well informed in their observations and comments.

The students' concerns belonged in four specific categories: the academic program, pedagogy, living conditions, and governance. It is important to recognize that these are the students' perceptions; other members of the academic community might have other perceptions or explanations of the same or similar phenomena.

Academic concerns:

1. The students felt that there are not enough good professors, assistants, and lecturers. This seemed to be a comment on the relative quality of the instructional staff rather than merely a comment about its size.
2. Professors visiting from other institutions lecture on weekends, which impacts on some students who as a result must attend lectures seven days a week.
3. Students were concerned that some good professors leave the University for other positions.

Pedagogical concerns:

1. The students expressed a desire for a variety of teaching methods. Use of computer-assisted instruction and some self-paced learning was particularly mentioned.
2. The students are concerned that the lecture method may not include the latest findings and research. The students want their studies to be relevant and up to date.
3. The students feel hampered by lack of books in some faculties and the lack of new books as well. One student leader indicated that only 200 books have been added to the library in the past year. Others stated that sometimes books are only available at Vilnius or Kaunas. Finally, in making a point about the importance of books, compared to the efficacy of some professors'

“canned lectures,” one student leader asserted that he could read two or three books in a relatively short time and gain in knowledge what lectures provide in a full semester—if the books are available.

Concerns about living conditions (some concerns are specific to Klaipeda University, while some are typical of all students in Lithuania.):

1. Students feel that the imposition of fees leaves them with very few resources for living expenses.
2. The demand for student housing is greater than the number of places available, even though the dormitories need repairs.
3. Although the students understand the budgetary reasons for the curtailing of electricity, heat and the imposition of a week-long holiday in the middle of the term as a cost-saving measure, they are concerned that such measures are hampering their studies. Happily, they reported that professors were empathetic to the students' plight, and modified their expectations for accelerated learning by accommodating for the loss of a week's work.

Concerns about governance:

1. Students felt that they were not consulted or at least not adequately consulted about the stipend change.
2. Students would like a larger voice in local matters and hope that the Senate structure with ten student representatives specified in the higher education law will be implemented.
3. Students appreciate the regular meetings they have with the deans of the different faculties and with the central administration.

In spite of these various concerns, the students express a very strong loyalty to Klaipeda University. While there is major concern about student stipends, this loyalty seems to diminish other concerns.

Why do the students come to Klaipeda University? Some are local residents and attend so that their parents can assist them with housing and other costs. Those who live with their families express a longing for “a real student life” separate from their families. A great number of the students are not local, and they attend because of the specialties offered, with the arts being cited particularly. They maintain this loyalty to what the institution offers, even though they think that the degree from Vilnius University is more prestigious because of that university's much longer existence and the historic perception of excellence that has been accorded to that university.

The students listed many good features about Klaipeda University:

1. It is a young university without the encumbrances of what one student referred to as “old-fashioned” traditions. They perceive the university as new, flexible, and changing.
2. The administration has an open relation with students.
3. Some students are particularly fond of the city of Klaipeda, the second largest city in Lithuania.

4. Some value the location because employers come to the university and it is easy to get a job in a thriving economic center. They value the connections that some professors have with the world of work beyond the university and that these professors share information about potential jobs.
5. Students value the special curricula that are particularly close to the practice, such as marine technology.
6. The students are pleased with the increasing number of exchanges, such as Socrates, that are possible, even though there are limits on participation. A few years ago, they thought there were too few such opportunities.
7. They are hopeful that impediments to the possibilities of summer jobs in the United States and Europe will be solved.

Even though the students have criticism—which is to be expected at any university—once those comments are analyzed, their dominant view is one of pride in their institution. Given that students are the most important component of the university, their enthusiasm for Klaipeda University is testimony for a good future for the institution.

Financing

Among the areas identified for discussion by the University leadership were general organizational issues related to university administration and finance. Prior to arrival in Klaipeda, the Advisors received brief documentation regarding university financing. The materials refer basically to the “unfulfilled promises of the Lithuanian government.” The Advisors learned, for instance, that in 1998 the government assigned to KU (apart from the capital investments allotted for construction) 22840 thousand Litas, but only 22251,3 thousand Litas was actually received by the University. This resulted in an underpayment of 588,7 thousand Litas. In 1999 the sum of 22186 thousand Litas was apportioned, but only 20477 thousand Litas was received by KU, creating a shortage of 1709 thousand Litas. Additionally, the government allocated 5058 thousand Litas for the construction of a students’ campus in 1999, but it provided only 2895,3 thousand Litas. This resulted in a considerable delay in the construction of the Faculty of Humanities that came to a halt at the beginning of 2000, and is now scheduled for the year 2001.

The insufficiency of government funding compelled KU to incur debts for various services such as electricity, central heating, communications, and running water supply. As of January 1, 2000 these debts amounted to 2348,5 thousand Litas. The University was therefore forced to identify other ways of securing financial support to cover its debts, at least in part. Thus, KU resorted to admitting an additional number of tuition-paying students which helped earn 4063,6 thousand Litas in 1998 and 5079 thousand Litas in 1999. The money thus obtained went into the partial payment of the services performed by the teaching staff and into the construction of the new campus. The government assigned KU 19125 thousand Litas for the academic year 2000. This sum represents 87.6% of the funding planned for the previous financial year. This state of affairs will lead to the reduction of the administrative staff and an increase in the number of students paying tuition.

The University is optimistic that its funding problems will improve as a result of the introduction of the new Law of Higher Education and the newly elected government, both of which came into being in the fall of 2000.

Having reported above the factual situation related to the financial challenges faced by KU, it should be expected, and proper, for an external reviewer to offer observations and recommendations which are intended to be analytical and helpful. These follow.

1) The KU seems to direct its whole discontent as regards finances towards the government that, most assuredly, failed to keep its promises. Beyond any doubt, the critical view of the government's performance is fully justified. However, from reading the KU materials and from the meetings the Advisors Team attended with the Klaipeda deans and faculty, one could conclude that the general concern is focused on the government performance alone. Little was said about alternative ways and means of making the best use of the money received, through creative approaches including some that may be considered untraditional which might result in improved financial management.

2) The non-government funds obtained by KU appear to have come mostly from the tuition-paying students, which, indeed, is one of the major sources of additional funds that many universities in Eastern Europe have introduced. However, directing this money to various departments perhaps should not be easily dismissed by stating that "the money went to the teaching staff and to the construction of the new student campus." The allocation of funds could take into account some important factors. With this in mind, there follow some suggested strategies.

- Money could be selectively directed to the "performance niches" (the University's fields of excellence.)
- Under this scenario, the departments which provided more money (such as from tuition) should benefit more, this being in itself an incentive. An example of a division of university funds might be the following:
 - A fund (anything between 20-30% kept by the University central administration in view of supporting those facilities which do not belong to any specific Faculty, but to the University as such).
 - 70-80% should go to the Faculties (Schools) in keeping with two criteria:
 - number of student equivalents (the budget money)
 - number of tuition-paying students (non-government money)
- It is also very important that even within the Faculty (School) the money (whether representing state funding or tuition payment) be assigned to various departments in accordance with a set of well-formulated and adequately publicized criteria known to every member of the academic community. Thus, apart from financial distribution, the academic community will acquire an increased self-awareness and

self-evaluation. There does exist, however, a potential delimiting factor: this operation can be accomplished only by having a wholly computerized financial network.

Increased tuition revenue represents only one of the many ways in which a university can provide the extra money necessary for it to function efficiently. Below are other means that have been found to produce good and, occasionally, fast results. Of course, it is recognized that necessary adjustment to the local needs and specific conditions may have to be made.

3) Restructuring the size of the teaching units, meaning that larger groups of students, coupled with the increase of the student-faculty (teaching staff) ratio—something between twelve and sixteen students per teacher—would enable KU to approach international standards. Moreover, one ought not to lose sight of the reality that the average number of classroom attendance hours does not exceed twenty hours per week in many European universities; it is eighteen and even lower at some others. These three elements: teaching units adjustments, student-faculty (teaching staff) ratio improvement and lower average number of classroom attendance hours, if properly balanced, may yield superior use of the existing finances which in its turn may lead to superior academic standards.

4) Another financial innovation could be the purchasing of real estate (small factories, small agricultural units.) This should not be easily dismissed as unrealistic. But, as in the case with all revenue-producing actions, these too must be preceded by competent exploration of the market and realistic study of inner potentials and market access.

5) Research work and consultancy can be great assets to a university willing to be strongly interconnected with the community, which may be defined as local, regional and even national. Despite economic hardships, many local enterprises, state-owned or private, may find it considerably more convenient to co-operate with university consultants or research teams, for reasons that need not be detailed here.

6) Creation of a university publishing house provided with updated facilities (which of course require an initial investment,) can be of inestimable use to a university in the following ways:

- publishing at lower costs the works authored by the university faculty and research teams;
- providing multiple copies, for internal use, of the books that the university libraries are short of, a problem highlighted by KU students we met. Thus traditional lectures, with students jotting down carefully everything that the lecturer says, could be altered considerably. This could enable students to study by themselves in libraries while the lectures could be turned into highly interactive classes.
- the publishing house could also get involved in non-academic publishing or printing a wide range of materials for various customers, and contribute substantially to increasing university revenue.

7) The creation of “small centers” focused on short-term studies or specialization may also become an activity that can definitely contribute to the financial advancement of the university, such as foreign language learning or short-term specialization in some fields.

8) There are a number of jobs in the university administration, which can be easily fulfilled by students doing part-time work. Financially, this would be an advantage for both university administration and students.

9) Depending on the field of specialization, students can be encouraged to create small associations focused on research, or engage in some work associated with their field of competence, such as tourism, health sciences, maritime studies etc.

10) Community interconnectedness is essential to all these activities; the university's involvement in win-win partnership should represent a strong priority, next to its academic goals.

11) Associations and foundations cooperating with the university (e.g. alumni association, citizens' associations affiliated with extra-university advisory boards,) and co-operation with various foundations (domestic and foreign) should also be considered important means of improving the university's financial resources. Finally, gifts and donations should not be overlooked, even at a stage when the state economy is still far from being fully recovered.

Needless to say, these “ways and means” are all theoretically fully perceived by KU, which has every chance of becoming a model university on a regional and even national level. This university has a campus, which, if properly provided with the adequate facilities, will be admired by many universities, not only in Lithuania. KU must certainly live up to the significance of the powerful symbol of army barracks turned into university buildings.

The Visiting Advisors think that it is of crucial importance for KU to change its perspective. It is not enough that university leaders are familiar with ways in which to improve the University's financial status; it is very important that they should act accordingly, knowing very well that no university that has set its sights high, can depend entirely on government money. Financial support from the central government, arguably, is never enough, regardless of the country/university we may single out when giving examples.

KU can learn valuable lessons from the bilateral agreements of co-operation it has signed with foreign institutions of higher education in countries with a prestigious higher education heritage. KU should also not overlook the value and importance of occasional visits and sharing expertise with universities in countries with a similar “recent past” which have identified ways of dealing with financial challenges. Indeed, such interaction should be encouraged.

To conclude, the University should not depend exclusively (or should depend less and less) on government money. It should focus on self-financing,

submitting this aspect of its activity and all its functions to a “niche-identification process” constantly monitored and improved by internal and external evaluation, interaction and pro-active University strategy.

Conclusion

The Visiting Advisor's Team submits, for consideration by the University and its leadership, the foregoing report of findings and recommendations. The report represents the team's best efforts to study, analyze, inform and make suggestions regarding the current state of affairs, efforts and programs at Klaipeda University. We also acknowledge that the accuracy of our findings is largely determined by the quality and quantity of the materials made available to the consultants, coupled with the relative fullness and level of participation of members of the University community in scheduled and sometimes unscheduled discussion sessions during the visit.

Among the key measures of success for any young, growing and thriving institution, one would have to include those attributes that define the Klaipeda University and its leadership. These include a capacity for excellence in planning, hard work, perseverance, loyalty, enthusiasm and external community support. As a result, the university has been able to not only survive, but grow and prosper under what at best may be described as adverse conditions, certainly with regard to financial matters. Thus, there is every reason to believe that the university will continue to be well served by the traits and attributes of its leadership and its community, and that its future and vision of service should be assured.

The University Rector and his management team? who have full access to all of the informational resources, internal as well as external to the university? will weigh the merit and appropriateness of the Visiting Team's findings that may include new opportunities as well as challenges. The suggestions for improvement are made in good faith and with the hope that some will be implemented.

The Visiting Advisors take this opportunity, once again, to thank the executive leadership team of Klaipeda University for the demonstrated leadership in requesting the Advisors' visit. We wish to also thank the members of the staff for their attentiveness, assistance and gracious hospitality during our stay. For each member of the team, it was a uniquely memorable and valuable learning and personal development experience and opportunity to serve the profession. For all of this, we are most grateful.

Visiting Advisors Team

Dumitru Ciocoi-Pop Romania

Dr. Ciocoi-Pop has been the Rector of “Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu since 1992, and was recently elected to serve a third term. The former Vice Rector and Chair of the Department of British and American Studies, Dr. Ciocoi-Pop also holds the position of President at the Transylvanian School, the International Foundation for Supporting University Education in Sibiu, and the Sibiu Division of OMNIA-International Foundation for Charity, Reconciliation and Peace. He earned a Ph.D. in philology of English and American literature at “Babes-Bolyai” University of Cluj-Napoca.

Jochen Fried Germany

Dr. Jochen Fried is Director of the Universities Project of the Salzburg Seminar. He is the former head of programs at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna. He was lecturer in German language and literature at the University of Ljubljana and at Cambridge University under the auspices of The German Academic Exchange Service. Dr. Fried's main area of professional interest is higher education and research policy. He serves as an expert for the Austrian Federal Ministry for Science and Transport, and is a member of the editorial board of the UNESCO-CEPES quarterly review “Higher Education in Europe.” Dr. Fried is a graduate of the University of Düsseldorf where he received his Ph.D.

Leonardo de la Garza USA

Dr. Leonardo de la Garza is Chancellor of the Tarrant County College District, Fort Worth, Texas. Previously, he was President of the Santa Fe Community College, Santa Fe, New Mexico and the El Paso County Community College District, El Paso, Texas. In addition to his duties as Chancellor of the Tarrant County College District, Dr. de la Garza is adjunct professor of the University of North Texas Higher Education Program and the University of Texas at Austin's Community College Leadership Program. Dr. de la Garza was educated at Bee County College, Beeville, Texas, Saint Edward's University, Austin, and at the University of Texas at Austin, where he earned a Ph.D. in educational administration. He has conducted post-doctoral research in higher education management at Harvard University.

Barbara Hill, USA

Dr. Barbara Hill is a Senior Fellow in the Center for Leadership Development and International Initiatives of the American Council of Education (ACE.) She previously served as President of Sweet Briar College, Virginia, Provost of Denison University, Ohio, and Associate Dean of the Faculty at Barnard College of Columbia University. Dr. Hill has served the Association of American Colleges and Universities as editor of the quarterly *Liberal Education*, has been on the Boards of Directors of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. Dr. Hill holds M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in English literature from the University of Washington in Seattle.

THE UNIVERSITIES PROJECT OF THE SALZBURG SEMINAR

Universities throughout the world are undergoing systemic changes in their governance, academic design, structure, and mission. The Salzburg Seminar's Universities Project focuses on higher education reform in Central and East Europe, Russia, and the Newly Independent States as universities in these regions redefine their relationships with governments and try to become more integrated into the global intellectual community.

The Universities Project is a multi-year series of conferences and symposia convening senior representatives of higher education from the designated regions with their counterparts from North America and West Europe. Discussion in the Project's programs focuses on the following themes:

- University Administration and Finance
- Academic Structure and Governance within the University
- Meeting Students' Needs, and the Role of Students in Institutional Affairs
- Technology in Higher Education
- The University and Civil Society

OBJECTIVES

Universities and other institutions of higher learning are seeking to reshape themselves in ways that will prepare them more fully for the twenty-first century. Even as these institutions are considering extensive systemic changes in their academic design, structure, and mission, all desire autonomy in governance and in their intellectual life. Accordingly, the Universities Project aims to promote the higher education reform process by inviting senior administrators to participate in conferences and symposia concerning issues of university management, administration, finance, and governance.

THE VISITING ADVISORS PROGRAM (VAP)

The Salzburg Seminar launched this enhanced aspect of the Universities Project in the autumn of 1998. Under this program, teams of university presidents and higher education experts visit universities in Central and East Europe and Russia at the host institutions' request to assist in the process of institutional self-assessment and change. By the end of 2000, twenty-three VAP visits will have taken place to universities in East and Central Europe and Russia. A full schedule of visits is planned for 2001. The addition of the Visiting Advisors Program brings to the Universities Project an applied aspect and serves to enhance institutional and personal relationships begun in Salzburg.

The Salzburg Seminar acknowledges with gratitude the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, which are funding the Universities Project and the Visiting Advisors Program respectively.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information regarding the Salzburg Seminar's Visiting Advisors program, the Universities Project, and Salzburg Seminar programs, please contact one of the Seminar's offices below.

Salzburg Seminar
Schloss Leopoldskron
Box 129
A-5010 Salzburg, Austria

Telephone: +43 662 83983
Fax: +43 662 839837

Salzburg Seminar
The Marble Works
P.O. Box 886
Middlebury, VT 05753 USA

Telephone: +1 802 388 0007
Fax: +1 802 388 1030

Salzburg Seminar website: www.salzburgseminar.org