

*April 2026*

**Latvia University of  
Life Sciences and  
Technologies  
Consolidated  
Institutional  
Assessment**



**Final report**



*April 2026*

**Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies  
Consolidated Institutional Assessment**

**Final report**

---



# Table of Contents

---

1	Summary of Unit-Level Performance	2
2	Institutional Context	2
3	Overall Institutional Score and Rationale	3
4	Recommendations	4
	Appendix A FTE academic and research staff at units as reported in the self-evaluation reports	5
	Appendix B Unit scores assigned by disciplinary Expert Groups and Institutional Score	6



## 1 Summary of Unit-Level Performance

---

Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies (LBTU) submitted three units for evaluation: Agricultural Sciences, Forestry and Veterinary Sciences, Engineering and Technology, and Social Sciences. The unit-level results show the Social Sciences unit emerging as the strongest performer, while the two larger units demonstrate solid but more moderate performance. This results in an overall institutional profile characterised by good research performance with uneven strength across disciplinary areas.

The Social Sciences unit, although the smallest in terms of FTEs, achieved the strongest overall outcome, receiving a score of 4 (very good) with 4 across most criteria and only a 3 for impact on the discipline. The unit demonstrates strong external funding performance, including participation in Horizon Europe projects, high engagement with national policy processes, and good international visibility. Its performance suggests a focused, strategically coherent research environment, with a comparatively strong position in applied social research and policy-relevant activities.

In contrast, the two larger units, Agricultural Sciences, Forestry and Veterinary Sciences and Engineering and Technology, both received an overall score of 3 (good). Their criterion-level assessments are broadly consistent, with most scores at level 3, indicating solid national performance but more limited international research visibility. Agricultural Sciences received the only score of 2 (adequate) across all LBTU units for impact on the discipline, indicating particularly constrained international scientific influence. Engineering and Technology performed somewhat better on economic and social impact (both scored 4), reflecting strong applied relevance.

The main systemic limitation across units is restricted international research visibility and disciplinary impact, particularly in high-impact publications. This pattern suggests that while LBTU has made significant progress and demonstrates solid national research capacity, further strategic focus and greater scientific depth across the broader disciplinary areas would be necessary to raise the institution's overall international research standing.

Full details of the unit's FTEs and scores are in Appendices A and B.

## 2 Institutional Context

---

The institutional self-assessment report presents Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies (LBTU) as a specialised research university with a strong applied mission, focused on agriculture, forestry, veterinary sciences, engineering, and selected areas of the social sciences, and closely aligned with national and regional development priorities. The institutional strategy emphasises sustainability, bioeconomy, food systems, environmental technologies and rural development, and provides a coherent framework for research activities across the university.

LBTU has systematically responded to the recommendations of the previous evaluation. Key actions include strengthening institutional research governance and support structures, enhancing doctoral training arrangements, expanding international research collaboration, and increasing engagement with industry and societal stakeholders, particularly in areas related to bioeconomy and sustainable development. These measures have contributed to more coherent research management and improved applied research performance, although their impact on international scientific visibility and disciplinary leadership is still emerging.



Research at LBTU is structured through disciplinary faculties and research institutes, supported by central governance mechanisms and institutional research management structures. The institutional context suggests a stable and well-organised research environment, with established internal procedures for project management, external funding support and doctoral training.

The unit-level assessments indicate that LBTU's institutional arrangements enable solid applied research performance, particularly in areas linked to industry needs, regional development and sectoral innovation. This includes organisational structures that support collaboration with industry and public sector partners, applied research projects, knowledge transfer activities, and engagement with sectoral stakeholders.

The institutional context also helps explain some of the shared limitations across units, especially regarding international scientific visibility and disciplinary impact. While the institutional strategy promotes societal relevance and economic engagement, the structural approach and resources for high-impact scholarly research and for building long-term international leadership in specific scientific fields are not well articulated.

The institutional research strategy is articulated primarily through broad thematic priorities such as sustainable development, circular economy, innovation ecosystems and societal impact, which provide a coherent framework for interdisciplinary and policy-oriented research. These priorities are particularly well aligned with applied social science research and stakeholder-driven projects, and help explain the comparatively strong performance of the Social Sciences unit.

At the same time, the institutional strategy remains relatively generic in scientific terms and offers limited discipline-specific guidance for the larger technical and life science fields. While the strategy identifies societal challenges (e.g., sustainable agriculture, food security, environmental sustainability and rural development), **it does not clearly articulate targeted scientific priorities, research areas or methodological niches in engineering, agricultural sciences or veterinary sciences where LBTU aims to achieve international leadership.** As a result, the institutional framework provides less strategic direction for strengthening scientific depth and international disciplinary visibility in these fields. The institutional strategy articulates the societal challenges LBTU seeks to address, but less clearly the specific scientific questions and disciplinary agendas it aims to lead.

There seems to be a slight mismatch between the strategy and the means. While LBTU positions itself strategically as a research university, the institutional research model and strategic instruments are predominantly oriented toward applied, stakeholder-driven and innovation-focused research. This creates a degree of tension between the ambition to achieve strong international scientific performance and the practical emphasis on societal relevance, regional engagement and knowledge transfer. As a result, the current institutional configuration supports solid applied research and impact, but provides more limited structural conditions for the sustained development of high-impact disciplinary research typical of research-intensive universities.

### 3 Overall Institutional Score and Rationale

---

Assigned overall score: **3 (good), strong national player with some international recognition.**

The overall institutional score of 3 reflects a synthesis of the unit-level evidence and the institutional context, indicating that the LBTU demonstrates a solid research performance with clear national relevance and some international engagement.

At the unit level, the Social Sciences unit represents the strongest component of LBTU's research profile, demonstrating strong external funding performance, high societal and policy engagement, and good international visibility relative to its size. The two larger units contribute substantially to applied research and innovation agendas aligned with the university's mission. However, their scientific quality and disciplinary impact remain more moderate, with limited evidence of sustained international leadership or agenda-setting research.

LBTU has articulated a coherent institutional mission and research strategy centred on sustainability, societal challenges and innovation, which effectively supports applied research and external engagement across units. At the same time, the institutional research model and strategic instruments are predominantly oriented toward stakeholder-driven, non-academic, impact-focused activities and provide limited structural conditions for the development of high-impact disciplinary research.

### 4 Recommendations

---

- Strengthen the institutional research strategy to increase scientific impact in Agricultural Sciences, Forestry and Veterinary Sciences and Engineering and Technology. Chairs of Disciplinary Expert Groups recommend that LBTU refine its institutional research strategy by articulating clearer, discipline-specific scientific priorities in agriculture, forestry, veterinary sciences and engineering, beyond broad thematic orientations such as sustainability and bioeconomy. Identifying a limited number of research areas, core scientific questions, and niches where the university aims to achieve international leadership would help concentrate resources, strengthen scientific depth, and improve the institution's influence on the development of these disciplines.
- Balance applied excellence with long-term investment in scientific capacity and visibility. Chairs of Disciplinary Expert Groups recommend complementing LBTU's strong applied and stakeholder-driven research model with greater institutional support for fundamental and exploratory research, including investment in researcher development, attracting foreign researchers and international academic collaboration.



## Appendix A FTE academic and research staff at units as reported in the self-evaluation reports

	FTE academic and research staff at units as reported in the self-evaluation reports																	
	2019			2020			2021			2022			2023			2024		
Unit	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total
Agricultural sciences, forestry, and veterinary sciences	64.98	129.39	194.37	68.45	119.6	188.05	67.68	116.36	184.04	73.63	136.27	209.9	40.03	136.41	176.44	50.36	148.56	198.92
Engineering and Technology	109.9	144.4	254.3	107.19	131.43	238.62	108.12	129.75	237.87	105.46	145.4	250.86	69.75	147.37	217.12	73.64	158.09	231.73
Social Sciences Research Unit	51.1	30.4	81.5	51.3	32.3	83.6	57.2	35.2	92.4	53.9	37.1	91	41.6	38.4	80	44	40.6	84.6



## Appendix B Unit scores assigned by disciplinary Expert Groups and Institutional Score

---

Unit	Unit scores assigned by disciplinary Expert Groups						
	Overall score	Quality of research	Impact on the discipline	Economic impact	Social impact	Research environment & infrastructure	Development potential
Agricultural sciences, forestry, and veterinary sciences	<b>3</b>	3	2	3	3	3	3
Engineering and Technology	<b>3</b>	3	3	3	4	4	3
Social Sciences Research Unit	<b>4</b>	4	3	4	4	4	4

Assigned overall score: **3 (good), strong national player with some international recognition.**