

Survey response for Latvia

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for Latvia to the survey on governance of public research policy across the OECD. It provides additional background information to the OECD database of governance of public research policy as described in Borowiecki, M. and C. Paunov (2018), "How is research policy across the OECD organised? Insights from a new policy database", *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, No. 55, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en>. The data was compiled by the OECD Working Party on Innovation and Technology Policy (TIP). Data quality was validated by delegates to OECD TIP Working Party the in the period between March 2017 and May 2018. Additional references that were used to fill out the questionnaire are indicated.

The data is made freely available online for download at <https://stip.oecd.org/resgov>.

Contact:

Caroline Paunov, Senior Economist, E-mail: Caroline.Paunov@oecd.org;

Martin Borowiecki, Junior Economist, E-mail: Martin.Borowiecki@oecd.org.

Abbreviations and acronyms

CFCA	Central Finance and Contracting Agency
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
HEQAA	Higher Education Quality Assurance Agency
LCS	Latvian Council of Science
LSISC	Latvian Science and Innovation Strategic Council
MoES	Ministry of Education and Science
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
RIS3	Smart Specialization Strategy
SEDA	State Education Development Agency
SEQS	State Education Quality Service
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises

Survey of public research policy

Topic 1: Institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations

Table 1. Questions on institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.1.1. Who mainly decides on the scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations for a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p>c) Which are the main mechanisms in place to decide on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of national importance, e.g. digital transition, sustainability? Please describe who is involved and who decides on the priorities (e.g., government, research and innovation councils, sector-specific platforms including industry and science, etc.).</p> <p><i>(This question does not refer to who sets overall science, technology and industry priorities. This is usually done by parliaments and government. The question refers to decisions taken after budgets to different ministries/agencies have been approved. Scientific priorities refer to scientific disciplines, e.g. biotechnology; sectoral priorities refer to industries, e.g. pharmaceuticals; and thematic priorities refer to broader social themes, e.g. digital transition, sustainability, etc.)</i></p> <p>d) From 2005-16, were any significant changes introduced as to how decisions on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic orientation of major programmes are taken (e.g. establishment of agencies that decide on content of programmes)?</p> <p>References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Responses C4 and H4</p>	<p>a and b) The Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) decides on the scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations for HEIs and PRIs. The implementation of innovation policy is overseen by the MoES in cooperation with the Ministry of Economics.</p> <p>Main state-funded research programmes and respective amount of funding per budget year are as follows: Basic Research Funding Programme (institutional funding) – 27 MEUR; Government Research Programmes – 5,6 MEUR; Fundamental and Applied Research Grants – 4 MEUR. Budget allocation for HEIs is provided within the Programme for Higher Education Institutions – 86 MEUR (including funding from sectoral ministries) and Programme for Development of Research Activity in HEIs – 6,5 MEUR.</p> <p>c) Missing answer.</p> <p>d) <i>Changes over 2005-2016</i> No significant changes as to how decisions are made within these programmes were made from 2015-16. However, in 2016 assessment exercise was launched under the Horizon 2020 Policy Support Facility to review the Latvian research funding system and propose improvements in the institutional and organizational structure of budget allocations. Recommendations are due by the end of 2017.</p>
<p>Q.1.2. Who allocates institutional block funding to a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(Institutional block funds (or to general university funds) support institutions and are usually transferred directly from the government budget.)</i></p>	<p>a and b) The MoES allocates funding to HEIs and PRIs from the funds of state budget within Basic Research Funding Programme, Programme for Higher Education Institutions and Programme for the Development of Research Activity in HEIs.</p> <p>The MoES administers basic institutional funding for HEIs and PRIs. This is block funding for HEIs and PRIs allocated on a yearly basis within the Programme for Higher Education Institutions and Basic Research Funding Programme. The allocation takes into account the input and output indicators of HE and research activity such as academic and research staff, infrastructure, implemented research projects, scientific publications etc. Basic research funding is allocated only to those PRIs and state-established HEIs which are registered in the State Register of Research Institutions. In addition, state HEIs receive performance-based funding within the Programme for the Development of Research Activity in HEIs.</p>

c) Who allocates **project-based funding** of research and/or innovation for HEIs and PRIs?
(*Project-based funding provides support for research and innovation activities on the basis of competitive bids.*)

d) Is there a transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. the European Research Council)?
e) What is the importance of such funding relative to national funding support?

f) From 2005-16, were any changes made to way programmes are developed and funding is allocated to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. merger of agencies, devolution of programme management from ministries to agencies)?

c) Competitive, project-based funding from the funds of state budget is allocated within the Fundamental and Applied Research Grants Programme. This programme is administered by the Study and Science Administration (SSA). Expertise and evaluation of projects implemented within the Fundamental and Applied Research Grants Programme is organized by the Latvian Council of Science (LCS). International funding schemes are administered by the State Education Development Agency (SEDA). LCS organizes expertise of competitive projects. Five expert commissions assess research proposals on the basis of scientific excellence. The LCS also wields influence within the science system through its decisions on academic promotion.

SEDA coordinates the international funding schemes. It works on behalf of MoES. SEDA implements national policy in the field of education, science and innovation, it performs the functions of the "Horizon 2020" National Point of Contact, ensures administration of project implementation within ERDF and ESF programmes, the ERASMUS+ programme in Latvia, management of the EEA and Norwegian financial instrument programmes and projects and other international funding instruments.

d) Latvian HEIs and PRIs can apply for funding from the European Research Council and other international funding schemes.

e) International funding for research in HEIs and PRIs (mainly from EU funds) constitutes 45% of the total research funding. According to the World Bank report "Higher Education Financing in Latvia: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses", 2014, Latvian HEIs are strongly aware of the importance of their income from EU structural funds (allocated within Latvia) and other potential EU-research funding (allocated through EU agencies), and, as such, will be responsive to criteria related to such funds.

f) *Changes over 2005-2016*

Reform of HE funding model

In 2015 a three-pillar HE financing model was introduced which foresees a combination of basic institutional funding allocated on the basis of a yearly agreement (pillar 1) with performance-based component using a formula with performance indicators (pillar 2), and innovation component which entails project-based funding for development within Structural Funds programmes (pillar 3). Regulations regarding the above-described model were adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers in 2015.

Structural reform of research sector and revision of funding principles of PRIs

In 2015, following the international assessment of research institutions structural reform of research sector was introduced. Government provided (on limited competition basis) additional 13 MEUR to support excellent HEIs and PRIs to develop their strategies and integrate weaker institutions. The reform also entailed revision of the principles of allocating basic research funding to HEIs and PRIs, stipulating an increase by 10% of the calculated basic allocation to those institutions which received evaluation "4" or "5" (i.e. are among excellent science organisations) (starting from 1 January 2015) and excluding those whose evaluation was "1" or "2" (starting from 1 January 2016). Moreover, the minimum level

of scientific personnel employed in research institutions was stipulated.

Revision of the legislation on the operation of PRIs

In 2016 changes in the Law on Scientific Activity were introduced stipulating that a PRI can be merged with another PRI or integrated into a HEI.

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Responses C4 and H4.

Q.1.3. Do performance contracts determine funding of a) HEIs?

Institutional block funds can be partly or wholly distributed based on performance. (Performance contracts define goals agreed between ministry/agency and HEIs/PRIs and link it to future block funding of HEIs and PRIs.)

b) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract?

c) Do performance contracts include quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation?

d) What are the main indicators used in performance contracts? Which, if any, performance aside from research and education is set out in performance contracts?

e) Do HEIs participate in the formulation of main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts?

f) Do the same priorities and criteria set in performance contracts apply to all HEIs?

g) Are any other mechanisms in place to allocate funding to HEIs and PRIs?

h) From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs?

(In case performance contracts are in place that bind funding of PRIs, please provide information about them.)

a) Performance agreements are integral part of Latvian HE and research funding system. Performance agreements are set on a yearly basis in consultation with HEIs and PRIs.

Performance agreements are set yearly with HEIs and from 2017 - also with PRIs. Performance contract defines the goals of the HEI and stipulates the amount of institutional block funding (1 pillar), as well as performance-based funding (2 pillar) the HEI receives in the respective year. Performance contracts with PRIs stipulate the goals and quantitative targets of scientific activity and the amount of institutional block funding for the year.

b) The share of HE budget that is allocated strictly based on performance indicators constitutes about 7%.

c and d) Performance contracts include quantitative targets for HE and research, as well as other innovation-related indicators such as cooperation with entrepreneurs and employers, strengthening knowledge transfer and contributing to innovation capacity of businesses.

They set out priorities depending on the specific profile of the institution. About 10 priorities are defined in the agreement for each HEI. These include increasing the number of international students and mobility of academic staff, engagement of new scientists in research projects, cooperation with industry and local government, participation in international research programmes, participation in international ranking U-Multirank, etc.

e and f) The agreements are tailored to the specific profile of institutions. HEIs participate in the formulation of agreements.

g) See response to 1.2

h) Changes over 2005-2016

A new HE funding model has been introduced following the World Bank assessment in 2014 which resulted in recommendations for a new performance-based funding model. The new model was adopted and operationalized in 2015.

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Responses C4 and H4.

World Bank "Higher Education Financing in Latvia: Final Report", 2014

Q.1.4. Who decides on the following key **evaluation** criteria of HEIs and PRIs?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of a) HEIs? Who is responsible for b) evaluating and c) monitoring HEIs' performance?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of d) PRIs? Who is responsible for e) evaluating and f) monitoring PRIs' performance?

h) From 2005-16, was any institution created for evaluating HEIs and PRIs or were any changes made to criteria applied for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs?

a and d) MoES is responsible for setting the key evaluation criteria of HEIs and PRIs, as well as for developing the conceptual framework for monitoring the quality and performance of HEIs and PRIs.

b and c) Responsibility for evaluating and monitoring HEIs' performance is shared by MoES, State Education Quality Service (SEQS) and Higher Education Quality Assurance Agency (HEQAA).

SEQS is responsible for monitoring the conformity of HEIs to the national regulation and standards.

HEQAA conducts quality assurance of HEIs and HE study programmes in accordance with the European Standards of Quality Assurance.

e and f) Evaluation of PRIs is organized by the MoES in cooperation with external consultants.

h) *Changes over 2005-2016*

On 1 July 2015, regulation of the Cabinet of Ministers was passed to transfer the function of accreditation of higher education institutions, colleges, and study fields, as well as licencing of study programmes to the Academic Information Centre on the basis of which an independent Higher Education Quality Assurance Agency was formed.

In the EU funds programming period 2014-2020 support is being provided for the development of independent Higher Education Quality Assurance Agency, its initial operation and quality support measures, including implementation of pilot accreditation of study courses in HEIs, as well as expert training (total financing of EUR 1.5 million, including ESF financing of EUR 1.27 million). On 18 February 2016, the AIC project *Support for Fulfilment of Requirements to the Agency Set by ERAQ* was adopted, and the implementation was initiated on 8 March 2016. The duration of the project implementation will be 3,5 years. The aim of the project is to secure support for fulfilling requirements for European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education – EQAR Agency, increasing the quality of operation and strengthening the internal capacity of the Agency.

In 2016 amendments in the Law on Scientific Activity were passed specifying the key criteria of international assessment of PRIs. International assessment of PRIs should be conducted every 6 years by engaging a team of international experts. Criteria for evaluating PRIs are devised by MoES in cooperation with external consultants.

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Responses C4 and H4.

Q.1.5. Which **recent reforms** to institutions that are in charge of priority setting, budget allocations, and evaluations of HEIs and PRIs were particularly important?

A new HE funding model has been introduced following the World Bank assessment in 2014 which resulted in recommendations for a new performance-based funding model. The new model was adopted and operationalized in 2015.

Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms

Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.1. a) Is there a Research and Innovation Council, i.e. non-temporary public body that takes decisions concerning HEI and PRI policy, and that has explicit mandates by law or in its statutes to either?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – provide policy advice (i.e. produce reports); – and/or oversee policy evaluation; – and/or coordinate policy areas relevant to public research (e.g. across ministries and agencies); – and/or set policy priorities (i.e. strategy development, policy guidelines); – and/or joint policy planning (e.g. joint cross-ministry preparation of budgetary allocations)? <p>b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p>c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p><i>References:</i> <i>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Response B7.</i> <i>Cabinet Regulation No. 553, 16.09.2014. "Regulation on the Latvian Science and Innovation Strategic Council"</i> <i>Law on Scientific Activity</i></p>	<p>a and b) The Latvian Science and Innovation Strategic Council (LSISC) is the main research and innovation council in Latvia. It operates under the auspices of the Cabinet of Ministers. It is a collegial, consultative body which has been formed to ensure coordinated cross-sectoral cooperation in research, technology development and innovation policy.</p> <p>c) Latvian Council of Science</p>
<p>Q.2.2. With reference to Q.2.1, does the Council's mandate explicitly include a) policy coordination; b) preparation of strategic priorities; c) decision-making on budgetary allocations; d) evaluation of policies' implementation (including their enforcement); e) and provision of policy advice?</p> <p><i>References:</i> <i>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Response B7.</i></p>	<p>a to e) LSISC's mandate includes policy coordination within government and between government, agencies, academia, and businesses to ensure successful implementation of the RIS3 Strategy. Its task is also to monitor the implementation of RIS3 and to coordinate inter-agency joint programming.</p> <p>Its mandate includes assessment of the results and effectiveness of investment in R&D according to the National Development Plan 2020, preparing strategic priorities and recommendations for policy implementation, coordinating the development of instruments in R&D and other functions. The mandate of the LSISC is stipulated by the Cabinet of Ministers regulation.</p> <p>LSISC is involved in the implementation of the Latvian Smart Specialization Strategy (RIS3). It coordinates the implementation of RIS3 between government, funding agencies, academia, and businesses. LSISC is responsible for inter-agency programming and monitoring of policy implementation (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response B7).</p>

<p>Q.2.3. With reference to Q.2.1, who formally participates in the Council? a) Head of State, b) ministers, c) government officials (civil servants and other representatives of ministries, agencies and implementing bodies), d) funding agency representatives, e) local and regional government representatives, f) HEI representatives, g) PRI representatives, h) private sector, i) civil society, and/or j) foreign experts</p>	<p>a to j) The composition of LSISC stipulated by the Cabinet of Ministers regulation is as follows: Prime Minister, Director of State Chancellery, Minister of Education and Science, Minister of Economics, Minister of Finance, Minister of Justice, Minister of Health, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Environmental Protection and Regional Development, Minister of Culture, Director of the President's Chancellery, Head of Cross-sectoral Coordination Centre, Head of Latvian Patents' Office, representatives of Latvian Confederation of Employers, Latvian Chamber of Commerce, Latvian Association of Municipalities, private association "the association "Baltic Institute of Research, Technology and Innovation", as well as representatives of Latvian Academy of Sciences, Association of Scientific Institutions, Rector's Council, Latvian University Association, Latvian Council of Science.</p>
<p>Q.2.4. With reference to Q.2.1.b., does the Council have its own a) staff and/or its own b) budget? If so, please indicate the number of staff and the amount of annual budget available.</p> <p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to the mandate of the Council, its functions, the composition of the Council, the budget and/or the Council's secretariat? Was the Council created during the time period?</p>	<p>a and b) The LSISC does not have its own budget or staff. The functions of the Secretariat of LSISC are performed by the Cross-sectoral Coordination Centre.</p> <p>c) LSISC was formed in 2014. Its mandate and functions have not been changed. In 2016 upon the formation of a new government the composition of LSISC was renewed. In May 2017 changes in the composition of LSISC were introduced by which the Minister of Justice and Head of Latvian Patents' Office were added to the members of LSISC</p>

Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.5. a) Is there a national non-sectoral STI strategy or plan?</p> <p>b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or plan?</p>	<p>a and b) The main national non-sectoral STI strategy is the National Development Programme “Guidelines for the Development of Science, Technology and Innovation 2014-2020”.</p> <p>Guidelines for the Development of Science, Technology and Innovation 2014-2020 is a medium-term policy planning document that identifies national goals and priorities for science, technology and innovation for the period by 2020. It promotes achievement of the objectives defined in the national long-term and medium-term policy planning documents. Latvian Smart Specialization Strategy (RIS3) is a strategy for the transformation of the economy towards higher added value, productivity and more efficient use of reReferences. The Latvian RIS3 was developed as part of the National Development Programme “Guidelines for the Development of Science, Technology and Innovation 2014-2020”</p>
<p><i>References:</i> <i>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Response B1. Guidelines for the Development of Science, Technology and 2014-2020, website (Latvian) Available at http://polsis.mk.gov.lv/documents/4608</i></p>	
<p>Q.2.6. Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities?</p> <p>a) Specific themes and/or societal challenges (e.g. Industry 4.0; “green innovation”; health; environment; demographic change and wellbeing; efficient energy; climate action) - Which of the following themes and/or societal challenges are addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Demographic change (i.e. ageing populations, etc.) – Digital economy (e.g. big data, digitalisation, industry 4.0) – Green economy (e.g. natural reReferences, energy, environment, climate change) – Health (e.g. Bioeconomy, life science) – Mobility (e.g. transport, smart integrated transport systems, e-mobility) – Smart cities (e.g. sustainable urban systems urban development) <p>b) Specific scientific disciplines and technologies (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agriculture and agricultural technologies – Energy and energy technologies (e.g. energy storage, environmental technologies) – Health and life sciences (e.g. biotechnology, medical technologies) – ICT (e.g. artificial intelligence, digital platforms, data privacy) – Nanotechnology and advanced manufacturing (e.g. robotics, autonomous systems) 	<p>a) RIS3 was introduced in 2014. It addresses health, the green economy and digital economy, as well as sustainable urban development as societal challenges.</p> <p>b) Regarding specific scientific fields, it addresses the following areas (without order of preference): Bio-economy, biomedicine, medical technologies, bio-pharmacy and biotechnologies; smart materials, technology and engineering system and smart energy; and information and communications technology.</p> <p>It includes as its integral part Latvia’s Smart Specialization Strategy (RIS3) which identifies the following areas as priorities of economic development: Smart Energy, Advanced ICT, Knowledge-intensive bioeconomy, Biomedicine, medical technologies and biotechnology, Smart materials, technology and engineering.</p>

c) Specific regions (e.g. smart specialisation strategies)	c) Missing answer.
d) Supranational or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020)	d) Missing answer.
e) Quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.)	e) Guidelines for the Development of Science, Technology and Innovations 2014-2020 envisage quantitative targets such as level of investment in R&D, human reReferences in R&D (scientific staff in PRIs and private sector, graduates of doctoral programmes), scientific output (publications, patents) etc.
f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies?	f) <i>Changes over 2005-2016</i> In 2015 a monitoring system of the implementation of RIS3 was introduced to monitor the progress of achieving these targets.

References:
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Response B1.
Government of Latvia (2017) Research, Technology Development and Innovation Guidelines 2014-2020, website (Latvian), Available at <http://polsis.mk.gov.lv/documents/4608> (accessed 01 March 2017).

Q.2.7. What reforms to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy?	The formulation of RIS3 strategy in 2014.
--	---

Table 4. Questions on inter-agency programming and role of agencies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.8. Does inter-agency joint programming contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy? (<i>Inter-agency joint programming refers to formal arrangements that result in joint action by implementing agencies, such as e.g. sectoral funding programmes or other joint policy instrument initiatives between funding agencies.</i>)</p> <p><i>References:</i> EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Response B6 and B7.</p>	Inter-agency coordination is done by the LSISC and SEDA.
<p>Q.2.9. a) Is co-ordination within the mandate of agencies?</p> <p>b) From 2005-16, were any changes made to the mandates of agencies tasked with regards to inter-agency programming? Were new agencies created with the task to coordinate programming during the time period?</p> <p><i>References:</i> EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Latvia. Response B6 and B7.</p>	<p>a) Coordination of policy decisions with regard to STI is within the mandate of the MoES; inter-agency coordination is done by the LSISC and SEDA.</p> <p>b) The Mandate of the agency SEDA was broadened. In 2015 SEDA assumed the functions of National Contact Point of Horizon 2020 and ensures participation in joint programmes and joint technology initiatives stipulated in Article 185 and 187 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union as well as EU COST, ERA-NET un ERA-NET+ projects.</p>
Q.2.10. What reforms of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?	See response to question 2.9.c

Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy

Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.1. a) Do the following stakeholders participate as formal members in Research and Innovation Councils? (i.e. <i>Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) – HEIs/PRI and/or their associations 	<p>a) External stakeholders are members of LSISC. It includes representatives of the Latvian Confederation of Employers, the Latvian Chamber of Commerce, business representatives, a member of the association "Baltic Institute of Research, Technology and Innovation", as well as representatives of the Latvian Academy of Sciences, the Association of Scientific Institutions, the Rector's Council, the Latvian University Association, and the Latvian Council of Science.</p>
<p>b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in council/governing boards of HEIs? (i.e. <i>Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) 	<p>b) External stakeholders cannot take part in university councils/governing boards of HEIs with the exception of Convention of Advisors which typically includes representatives of industry and employers' associations.</p> <p>The Law on Higher Education Institutions stipulates the types of governing bodies in HEIs. Convention of Advisors consults the senate and rector on strategic matters for the development of the institution of higher education. The Convention of Advisors has the right to recommend the examination of issues in the senate and the constitutional assembly.</p>
<p><i>References:</i></p> <p>Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinel, M. (2015). <i>University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard</i>. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, p. 27, accessed 19.09.2016.</p> <p><i>Law on Higher Education Institutions</i></p>	
<p>Q.3.2. a) Are there online consultation platforms in place to request inputs regarding HEI and PRI policy? b) Which aspects do these online platforms address (e.g. open data, open science)?</p>	<p>a and b) Online consultations are carried out according to the regulation of the Cabinet of Ministers which stipulates the procedure of involving stakeholders in the development of HEI and PRI policy.</p>
<p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms?</p>	<p>c) No major changes made.</p>
<p>Q.3.3. Which reforms to consultation processes have proven particularly important?</p>	<p>Missing answer.</p>

Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.4. Who decides about allocations of institutional block funding for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If HEIs face national constraints on using block funds, i.e. funds cannot be moved between categories such as teaching, research, infrastructure, operational costs, etc. This option also applies if the ministry pre-allocates budgets for universities to cost items, and HEIs are unable to distribute their funds between these.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)</i></p>	<p>a and b) HEIs and PRIs have the freedom to move public funds internally between different categories.</p> <p>According to the World Bank report “Higher Education Financing in Latvia: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses”, 2014, Latvian HEIs exercise a large degree of autonomy with respect to the internal allocation of financial reReferences and building financial reserves. This implies that they are relatively able to reallocate reReferences between departments and different activities. As such, cross-subsidization is possible in cases where an institution wants or needs to do so, e.g. in order to maintain a study program with relatively low student numbers.</p> <p>According to the University Autonomy in Europe survey in case of Latvia the internal allocation of funds received from the annual block grant is now up to the universities, and there is greater freedom to borrow funds and keep surpluses.</p>
<p><i>References:</i></p> <p><i>Data on institutional autonomy is based on a survey conducted by the European University Association (EUA) between 2010 and 2011 across 26 European countries. The answers were provided by Secretaries General of national rectors' conferences and can be found in the report by the European University Association (Estermann et al., 2015).</i></p> <p><i>World Bank “Higher Education Financing in Latvia: Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses”, 2014. Retrieved from: http://www.izm.gov.lv/lv/publikacijas-un-statistika/petijumi.</i></p> <p><i>Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinel, M. (2015). University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016.</i></p> <p><i>European University Association (2016). University Autonomy in Europe (Webpage). Retrieved from http://www.university-autonomy.eu/, accessed 19.09.2016.</i></p>	
<p>Q.3.5. Who decides about recruitment of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If recruitment needs to be confirmed by an external national/regional authority; if the number of posts is regulated by an external authority; or if candidates require prior accreditation. This option also applies if there are national/regional laws or guidelines regarding the selection procedure or basic qualifications for senior academic staff.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to hire academic staff. This option also applies to cases where laws or guidelines require the institutions to publish open positions or the composition of the selection committees which are not a constraint on the hiring decision itself.)</i></p> <p>Who decides about salaries of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If salary bands are negotiated with other parties, if national civil servant or public sector status/law applies; or if external authority sets salary bands.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)</i></p>	<p>a and b) It falls within the autonomy of HEIs and PRIs to recruit their own staff. National law states certain general principles to be adhered to when hiring senior academic employees.</p> <p>c and d) Minimum monthly salary level at HEIs is set by the Cabinet Regulation for academic (pedagogic) staff and restrictions have been implemented nationally for administrative staff.</p>

Who decides about **reassignments** and **promotions** of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If promotions are only possible in case of an open post at a higher level; if a promotion committee whose composition is regulated by law has to approve the promotion; if there are requirements on minimum years of service in academia; if automatic promotions apply after certain years in office, or if there are promotion quotas.

Institutions themselves: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)

Q.3.6. Who decides about the **creation of academic departments** (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. **technology transfer offices**) at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If there are national guidelines or laws on the competencies, names, or governing bodies of internal structures, such as departments or if prior accreditation is required for the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to determine internal structures, including the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)

Who decides about the creation of legal entities (e.g. **spin-offs**) and **industry partnerships** at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If there are restrictions on legal entities, including opening, closure, and restructuring thereof; if restrictions apply on profit and scope of activity of non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to create non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)

Q.3.7. Who earns what **share of revenues** stemming from IP (patents, trademarks, design rights, etc.) created from publicly funded research at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

- HEI
- Research unit / laboratory within HEI
- Researchers

c) From 2005-16, were any reforms introduced that affected the institutional autonomy of HEIs and PRIs?

Q.3.8. Which **reforms** to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research?

e and f) Dismissals are subject to regular Labour Law. Promotions for academic staff are constrained by the mandatory periodical re-opening of academic positions, the procedure of which is stipulated by the Cabinet Regulation

a to d) HEIs and PRIs are essentially free to determine their internal structure. It falls within the autonomy of HEIs to denote its internal governance and organizational structure. The same applies to PRIs. HEIs and PRIs are able to create both for-profit and not-for-profit entities which are subordinate to the institution.

However, the state can intervene by initiating mergers of state established institutions.

a and b) The institution itself (HEI or PRI) is the owner of revenues from IP created from publicly funded research.

According to the Law on Scientific Activity a state scientific institution has the right to use intellectual property created as a result of research activity financed from the state budget. If the intellectual property has been created as a result of cooperation with other institutions or scientists the right to the intellectual property equals to the extent that is proportional to the institution's contribution.

The Cabinet of Ministers determines the procedures and conditions for the use of this property at a state scientific institution, observing the provisions of the regulatory enactments regulating intellectual property.

c) The reforms introduced in 2015-2016 have not significantly affected institutional autonomy.

The reform of HEI funding model is aimed at strengthening the financial autonomy of HEIs by stimulating the use of third-party funding for research and engagement of students and young scientists in industry relevant research projects.