COUNTRY NOTE

EDUCATION AT A GLANCE 2020


Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators is the authoritative source for information on the state of education around the world. It provides data on the structure, finances and performance of education systems in OECD and partner countries.

Lithuania

Participation and outcomes of vocational education and training

- Vocational education and training (VET) programmes attract a diverse range of students, including those seeking qualifications and technical skills to enter the labour market, adults wishing to increase their employability by developing their skills further, and students who may seek entry into higher education later on.
- About one in three students from lower secondary to short-cycle tertiary level are enrolled in a VET programme on average across OECD countries. However, there are wide variations across countries, ranging from less than 20% of students enrolled in vocational education to more than 45% in a few countries. In Lithuania, 16% of students are enrolled in vocational programmes, lower than the OECD average (32%), with the majority of lower secondary to short-cycle tertiary VET students (46%) found in post-secondary non-tertiary education (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Snapshot of vocational education




Note: Only countries and economies with available data are shown. The years shown in parentheses is the most common year of reference for OECD and partner countries. Refer to the source table for more details.
Source: OECD (2020), indicator A3 and B7. See Education at a Glance Database. http://stats.oecd.org/ for more information and Annex 3 for notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en).

- VET is an important part of upper secondary education in most OECD countries. On average, 27% of all upper secondary students opt for VET programmes in Lithuania, a lower proportion than the OECD average of 42% (Figure 1). Certain fields of study are more common than others at this level. In Lithuania, the most common broad field is engineering, manufacturing and construction with 48% of upper secondary vocational graduates earning a qualification in this field, compared to 33% on average across OECD countries.
- The organisation and delivery of upper secondary VET programmes varies considerably from country to country. In that context, the combination of learning in school and in the work environment through combined school- and work-based programmes offers numerous advantages. However, these programmes do not exist in Lithuania and all students in upper secondary vocational education are enrolled in school based programmes. In school-based programmes, at least 75% of the curriculum is taught within the school environment.
- The average age of enrolment in upper secondary vocational programmes across OECD countries (21 years) tends to be higher than for general programmes (17 years), a pattern also found in Lithuania. The average age of enrolment in upper secondary education is higher for students in vocational programmes (20 years) than for students in general programmes (18 years). The share of upper secondary vocational students tends to increase with age. In Lithuania, the share of upper secondary students enrolled in VET is 24% among 15-19 year-olds (OECD average: 37%), and 54% among 20-24 year-olds (OECD average: 62%).
- Vocational upper secondary students are typically less likely to complete their qualification than those from general programmes. Lithuania follows this pattern as the completion rate for upper secondary education (within the theoretical duration of the programme) is lower among students enrolled in vocational programmes (59%) than among those in general ones (86%).
- To support upper secondary vocational students' transition to post-secondary education and improve their career prospects, many countries have created direct pathways from vocational programmes to higher levels of education. In Lithuania, 97% of upper secondary vocational students are enrolled in programmes that offer the chance of direct access to tertiary education, higher than the OECD average of 70% (Figure 1).
- In 2019, 18% of 25-34 year-olds in Lithuania held an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary vocational qualification as their highest educational level while 20% held a general one. The employment rate of younger adults with a vocational upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education tend to be higher than the employment rate of those with general qualifications at this level (by 9 percentage points on average across OECD countries). Lithuania follows this pattern, as 81% of 25-34 year-olds with an upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary vocational qualification are employed compared with 77% of those with a general qualification (Figure 1).
- Poorer labour-market prospects of VET qualifications combined with higher tertiary attainment may have contributed to the decline in the share of adults with an upper secondary vocational qualification across generations in many countries. In Lithuania, among those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education as their highest attainment, 62% of 55-64 year-olds (older adults), compared with 48% of 25-34 year-olds (younger adults) held a vocational qualification. In comparison, the equivalent OECD averages are 72% for older adults and 59% for younger adults.
- On average across OECD countries, the ratio of students to teaching staff is similar in both upper secondary vocational and general programmes. However, Lithuania is among the five countries where teachers' teaching time in vocational programmes is 10 to 30% higher than in general programmes.

The rising demand for tertiary education

- The expansion of tertiary education is a worldwide trend. Between 2009 and 2019, the share of 25-34 year-olds with a tertiary degree increased in all OECD and partner countries. In Lithuania, the share increased by 11 percentage points during this period, higher than the average increase across OECD countries (9 percentage points). In 2019, 55% of 25-34 year-olds had a tertiary degree in Lithuania compared to 45% on average across OECD countries (Figure 2).
- From the gender perspective, younger women are more likely than younger men to achieve tertiary education in all OECD countries. In Lithuania, 66% of 25-34 year-old women had a tertiary qualification compared to 45% of their male peers, while on average across OECD countries the shares are 51% of younger women and 39% of younger men.
- In Lithuania, the average age of first-time graduates from tertiary education in 2018 was 24 years, lower than the OECD average of 25 years. Structural factors, such as admission procedures, the typical age at which students graduate from upper secondary education, or cultural perceptions of the value of professional or personal experiences outside of education may explain the differences in the average age of graduation from tertiary education across countries.
- If current patterns of graduation continue, it is estimated that 38% of young adults will graduate from tertiary education for the first time in their life before the age of 30 on average across OECD countries (excluding international students). In Lithuania, 50% of young adults will graduate from tertiary education by that age and most of them will graduate from a bachelor's or equivalent level.
- Young people can face barriers to labour market entry as they transition from school to work, but higher educational attainment increases their likelihood of being employed and is associated with higher incomes. On average across OECD countries, the employment rate in 2019 was 61% for 25-34 year-olds without upper secondary education, 78% for those with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education as their highest attainment and 85% for those with tertiary education. In Lithuania, the shares are 55% for below upper secondary, 79% for upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary and 92% for tertiary attainment. Having a tertiary degree also carries a considerable earnings advantage in most OECD and partner countries. In Lithuania, in 2014, 25-64 year-olds with a tertiary degree with income from full-time, full-year employment earned 77% more than full-time, full-year workers with upper secondary education compared to 54% on average across OECD countries (Figure 2).
- International student mobility has been expanding quite consistently in the past twenty years. In 2018, 5.6 million tertiary students worldwide had crossed a border to study, more than twice the number in 2005. In Lithuania, the share of foreign or international students increased from 3% in 2014 to 5% in 2018. Meanwhile 9% of Lithuanian tertiary students are enrolled abroad compared to 2% in total across OECD countries (Figure 2). English-speaking countries are the most attractive student destinations overall in the OECD area, with Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States receiving more than 40% of all internationally mobile students in OECD and partner countries. Among students leaving Lithuania to study, the most popular destination country is the United Kingdom.
- Beyond the economic and employment outcomes, higher educational attainment is related to greater social benefits. For example, those with a tertiary education are more likely to feel they have a say in what their government does. In 2016, on average across OECD countries participating in the International Social Survey Programme, 41% of tertiary-educated adults agreed with this sentiment compared to 28% of those with below upper secondary education. In Lithuania, 16% of tertiary-educated adults feel this way compared with 5% of those with below upper secondary education.

Figure 2. Snapshot of tertiary education



Note: Only countries and economies with available data are shown. The years shown in parentheses is the most common year of reference for OECD and partner countries. Refer to the source table for more details.
Source: OECD (2020), indicator A1, A3, A4 and B6. See Education at a Glance Database http://stats.oecd.org/for more information and Annex 3 for notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en).


Starting strong

- Early childhood education and care (ECEC) has experienced a surge of policy attention in OECD countries in recent decades, with a focus on children under the age of 3 in many countries. In Lithuania, 16% of 1-year-olds were enrolled in a formal ECEC programme (ISCED 0) in 2018, below the OECD average of 34%. Among 2-year-olds, the enrolment rate at ISCED 0 is 67% in Lithuania, 21 percentage points above the OECD average of 46% (Figure 3).
- In many OECD countries, ECEC begins for most children long before they turn 5 and there are universal legal entitlements to a place in ECEC services for at least one or two years before the start of compulsory schooling. While compulsory education begins at age 7 in Lithuania, 86% of 3-5 year-olds in 2018 are enrolled in ECEC programmes and primary education in Lithuania, compared to 88% on average across OECD countries (Figure 3).
- Public provision of early childhood education and care is an important factor in ensuring broad access to affordable ECEC. On average across OECD countries, more than one in two of the children in early childhood educational development services (ISCED 01) are enrolled in private institutions. In Lithuania, 11% of children enrolled in ISCED 01 programmes attend private ECEC institutions. Enrolment in private institutions is usually less common for 3-5 year-olds, who are usually enrolled in pre-primary education (ISCED 02), than for younger children. In Lithuania, 4% of children attending pre-primary education are enrolled in private institutions, compared to one in three children on average across OECD countries.
- The workforce is at the heart of high-quality early-childhood education and care: stimulating environments and high-quality pedagogy are fostered by better-qualified practitioners and high-

quality interactions between children and staff facilitate better learning outcomes. In that context, lower child-staff ratios are found to be consistently supportive of staff-child relationships across different types of ECEC settings (NICHD, 2002). In Lithuania, there are 10 children for every teacher working in early childhood educational development services (ISCED 01) compared to 7 on average across OECD countries. In Lithuania, the ratio of children for every full-time equivalent (FTE) teacher working in pre-primary education (ISCED 02) is 10 compared to 14 on average across OECD countries (Figure 3).

- Sustained public financial support is critical for the growth and quality of ECEC programmes. In 2017, annual total expenditure in pre-primary settings (ISCED 02) averaged USD 6 610 per child in Lithuania, lower than the average across OECD countries (USD 9 079) (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Snapshot of early childhood education and care



Note: Only countries and economies with available data are shown. Annual expenditure per child is shown in equivalent USD converted using PPPs. The years shown in parentheses is the most common year of reference for OECD and partner countries. Refer to the source table for more details.
Source: OECD (2020), indicator B2. See Education at a Glance Database http://stats.oecd.org/ for more information and Annex 3 for notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en).


Investing in education

- Annual expenditure per student on educational institutions from primary to tertiary level provides an indication of the investment countries make in each student. In 2017, Lithuania spent less on primary to tertiary educational institutions per full-time student than the OECD average, investing a total of USD 6 652 per student compared to USD 11 231 on average across OECD countries (Figure 4).
- The way education is provided influences how resources are allocated between levels of education and between public and private institutions. In 2017, Lithuania spent USD 6 094 per student at non-tertiary level (primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary education), USD 3 904 lower than the OECD average of USD 9 999. At tertiary level, Lithuania invested USD 8 428 per

student, USD 7 899 less than the OECD average (Figure 4). Expenditure per student on private educational institutions is higher than on public institutions on average across OECD countries. This is also the case in Lithuania, where total expenditure on public institutions from primary to tertiary level amounts to USD 6 640 per student, compared to USD 6 917 on private ones.

- In most OECD countries, expenditure per upper secondary student varies according to programme orientation. Spending per student on upper secondary vocational programmes tends to be higher than for upper secondary general ones due to the higher cost of equipment, lower student-to-teacher ratios, and work-based requirements of such programmes. On average across OECD countries, expenditure per student in upper secondary vocational programmes was USD 1 470 higher than in general programmes in 2017. Lithuania follows a different pattern: spending per student amounted to USD 5 832 in upper secondary vocational programmes, USD 234 lower than spending per student on general ones at the same level.
- Among OECD countries, Lithuania was among the countries that spent the lowest proportion of its gross domestic product (GDP) on primary to tertiary educational institutions. In 2017, Lithuania spent 3.4% of GDP on primary to tertiary educational institutions, which is 1.5 percentage points lower than the OECD average. Across levels of education, Lithuania devoted a below average share of GDP at non-tertiary levels and a lower share at tertiary level (Figure 4).
- Between 2012 and 2017, expenditure per student from primary to tertiary education increased by an average annual growth rate of 1.3% across OECD countries. In Lithuania, expenditure on educational institutions fell at an average rate of 2.5% a year, while the number of students fell on average by 3% per year. This resulted in an average annual growth rate of 0.5% in expenditure per student over this period.
- Capital costs represent a lower than average share of expenditure on primary to tertiary institutions in Lithuania. At primary, secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary level, capital costs account for 5% of total spending on educational institutions, 2 percentage points below the OECD average. At the tertiary level, capital costs represent 7%, lower than the average across OECD countries of 10%.
- Compensation of teachers and other staff employed in educational institutions represents the largest share of current expenditure from primary to tertiary education. In 2017, Lithuania allocated 78% of its current expenditure to staff compensation, compared to 74% on average across OECD countries. Staff compensation tends to make up a smaller share of current expenditure on tertiary institutions due to the higher costs of facilities and equipment at this level. In Lithuania, staff compensation represents 72% of current expenditure on tertiary institutions compared to 80% at non-tertiary levels. On average across OECD countries, the share is 67% at tertiary level and 77% at non-tertiary level.

Figure 4. Snapshot of the financial resources invested in educational institutions




Note: Only countries and economies with available data are shown. Expenditure in national currencies is converted into equivalent USD by dividing the national currency figure by the purchasing power parity (PPP) index for GDP. The years shown in parentheses is the most common year of reference for OECD and partner countries. Refer to the source table for more details.
Source: OECD (2020), indicator C1 and C2. See Education at a Glance Database http://stats.oecd.org/ for more information and Annex 3 for notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en).

Working conditions of school teachers

- The salaries of school staff, and in particular teachers and school heads, represent the largest single expenditure in formal education. Their salary levels also have a direct impact on the attractiveness of the teaching profession. In most OECD countries and economies, statutory salaries of teachers (and school heads) in public educational institutions increase with the level of education they teach. In most OECD countries and economies, they also increase with experience. On average, statutory salaries of teachers with maximum qualifications at the top of their salary scales are 78-80% higher than those of teachers with the minimum qualifications at the start of their career at pre-primary (ISCED 02), primary and general lower and upper secondary levels. In Lithuania, maximum salaries are 42% to 57% higher than minimum salaries at each level of education.
- Teachers' actual salaries reflect their statutory salaries and additional work-related payments. Average actual salaries depend also on the characteristics of the teaching population such as their age, level of experience and qualification level. In Lithuania, teachers' average actual salaries amount to USD 33 630 at the pre-primary level (ISCED 02) (lower than the OECD average of USD 38 677), USD 33 630 at the primary level (lower than the OECD average of USD 43 942), USD 33 630 at the general lower secondary level (lower than the OECD average of USD 46 225) and USD 33 630 at the general upper secondary level (lower than the OECD average of USD 49 778) (Figure 5).

- Teachers' average actual salaries remain lower than those of tertiary-educated workers in almost all countries, and at almost all levels of education. Teachers' average actual salaries at pre-primary (ISCED 02), primary and general secondary levels of education are 80-94% of the earnings of tertiary-educated workers on average across OECD countries and economies. In Lithuania, the proportion ranges from 140% at pre-primary level (ISCED 02) 140% at primary level to 140% at lower secondary level and 140% at the upper secondary level (Figure 5).
- The average number of teaching hours per year required of a typical teacher in public educational institutions in OECD countries tends to decrease as the level of education increases, from 993 hours at pre-primary level (ISCED 02), to 778 hours at primary level, 712 hours at lower secondary level (general programmes) and 680 hours at upper secondary level (general programmes). In Lithuania, teachers are required to teach 640 hours per year at pre-primary level, 835 hours per year at primary level, 907 hours at lower secondary level (general programmes) and 907 hours at upper secondary level (general programmes).
- During their working time, teachers also perform various non-teaching tasks such as lesson planning and preparation, marking students' work and communicating or co-operating with parents or guardians. At the lower secondary level, teachers in Lithuania spend 60% of their statutory working time on teaching, compared to 44% on average among OECD countries (Figure 5).
- Large proportions of teachers in many OECD countries will reach retirement age in the next decade, while the size of the school-age population is projected to increase in some countries, putting many governments under pressure to recruit and train new teachers. In Lithuania, 5% of primary teachers are considered young teachers (under the age of 30), which is lower than the OECD average of 12%. On average across OECD countries, the proportion of young teachers decreases at other levels of education, to 10% in lower secondary education and 8% in upper secondary education. In Lithuania, the proportion of young teachers decreases to 4% at lower secondary level and to 3% at upper secondary level (Figure 5). Between 2005 and 2018, the proportion of young teachers at upper secondary level decreased by 7 percentage points in Lithuania, whereas it fell by 4 percentage points on average across OECD countries during this period.

Figure 5. Snapshot of teachers' working conditions



Note: Only countries and economies with available data are shown. Teachers' salaries are shown in equivalent USD converted using PPPs. The years shown in parentheses is the most common year of reference for OECD and partner countries. Refer to the source table for more details.
Source: OECD (2020), indicator D3, D4 and D5. See Education at a Glance Database http://stats.oecd.org/ for more information and Annex 3 for notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en).


The impact of COVID-19 on education

- The global 2020 COVID-19 pandemic has sent shockwaves around the world. In a first effort to contain the virus, many countries have imposed a lockdown and schools and/or universities have closed for several months across all OECD and partner countries. In Lithuania, the closures were nationwide from 16 March 2020 and schools started progressively reopening on 25 May 2020. By the end of June, Lithuania had experienced 15 weeks of effective school closures in some form, compared to 14 weeks on average across OECD countries (UNESCO, 2020). However, the actual impact in some countries may have been less severe as some of these periods included scheduled school breaks.
- Excluding the non-compulsory part of the curriculum, students in public institutions in Lithuania attended classes for 613 hours per year on average at primary level and 804 hours at lower secondary level in 2019. Each week of school closure therefore represents about 18 hours of compulsory instruction time at the primary level and 22 hours of compulsory instruction time at lower secondary level during which students have physically not attended school (Figure 6). During this time, many OECD and partner countries have turned to distance learning to ensure the continuity of education.
- School reopening in the context of the pandemic is contingent on the capacity to maintain a safe distance of 1-2 metres between pupils and staff. Countries with smaller class sizes may find it easier to comply with new restrictions on social distancing. In Lithuania, the average class size at primary level is 17 students in public institutions, which is smaller than the OECD average of 21.

In public lower secondary institutions, there are 19 students per class in Lithuania, compared to 23 students per class on average across OECD countries. However, the need to reduce class size may depend on other factors such as physical space, the availability of rooms and staff, and personal decisions by students and staff on whether to return to school (Figure 6).

- While there is uncertainty about the likely overall impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education expenditure, governments will face difficult decisions on the allocation of resources, as government funds are injected into the economy and the health sector. In 2017, public spending on primary to tertiary education as a share of government expenditure in Lithuania was 9%, lower than the OECD average of 11% (Figure 6).
- As unemployment rises, private funding of education may also be at risk. The impact may be most severe in those countries and levels of education that rely most heavily on household expenditure, in particular early childhood education and care and tertiary education. This is less the case in Lithuania. In pre-primary education (ISCED 02), private sources accounted for 13% of total expenditure in Lithuania in 2017, lower than the OECD average of 17%. At tertiary level, 30% of total expenditure comes from private sources, compared to 29% on average across OECD countries.
- The crisis may have a severe impact on the internationalisation of higher education as the delivery of online course material and travel restrictions may raise questions among international students' perception on the value of obtaining their degree from an institution abroad. Lithuania, with a lower share of international students than in total across the OECD, may be less strongly affected than other countries.
- Unemployment may increase, as the economy struggles to cope with the reduced activity that resulted from the lockdown. Those with lower educational attainment are the most vulnerable, as they are the most unlikely to benefit from remote working. In 2019, before the pandemic hit, 19% of young adults with below upper secondary education in Lithuania were unemployed compared to 3% of tertiary-educated 25-34 year-olds (Figure 6). In the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, the unemployment of young adults without an upper secondary education increased by 12.9 percentage points between 2008 and 2009 in Lithuania compared to 3.9 percentage points among those with tertiary education.

Figure 6. Snapshot of indicators relevant to the impact of COVID-19 on education



Note: Only countries and economies with available data are shown. The years shown in parentheses is the most common year of reference for OECD and partner countries. Refer to the source table for more details.
Source: OECD (2020), indicator A3, D1, D2, and C4. See Education at a Glance Database http://stats.oecd.org/ for more information and Annex 3 for notes (https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en).

References

NICHD (2002), "Child Care Structure>Process>Outcome: Direct and indirect effects of caregiving quality on young children's development", *Psychological Science*, Vol. 13, pp. 199-206.

OECD (2020), *Education at a Glance 2020: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD/Eurostat/UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2015), *ISCED 2011 Operational Manual: Guidelines for Classifying National Education Programmes and Related Qualifications*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264228368-en.

Schleicher, A. and F. Reimers (2020), *Schooling disrupted schooling rethought: How the Covid-19 pandemic is changing education*, https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/view/?ref=133_133390-1rtuknc0hi&title=Schooling-disrupted-schooling-rethought-How-the-Covid-19-pandemic-is-changing-education (accessed on 3 June 2020).

UNESCO (2020), *School closures caused by Coronavirus (Covid-19)*, https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse (accessed on 04 August 2020).

More information

For more information on Education at a Glance 2020 and to access the full set of Indicators, visit www.oecd.org/education/education-at-a-glance-19991487.htm

For more information on to the methodology used during the data collection for each indicator, the references to the sources and the specific notes for each country, visit Annex 3 of the publication (https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en).

For general information on methodology, please refer to the OECD Handbook for Internationally Comparative Education Statistics: Concepts, Standards, Definitions and Classifications (https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304444-en).

Updated data can be found on line at http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-data-en and by following the *StatLinks* under the tables and charts in the publication.

Explore, compare and visualise more data and analysis using the Education GPS:

https://gpseducation.oecd.org/

The calculation on the number of weeks of school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic is based on data from UNESCO (UNESCO, 2020). For general information on the methodology considered for the data, please refer to the methodological note.


Questions can be directed to:	**Country note authors:**
Marie-Helene Doumet Directorate for Education and Skills marie-helene.doumet@oecd.org	Etienne Albiser, Eric Charbonnier, Manon Costinot, Corinne Heckmann, Bruce Golding, Yanjun Guo, Simon Normandeau, Daniel Sanchez Serra, Markus Schwabe and Giovanni Maria Semeraro

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and any map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

On 15 May 2020, the OECD Council invited Costa Rica to become a Member. While Costa Rica is included in the OECD averages reported in this note, at the time of its preparation, Costa Rica was in the process of completing its domestic procedures for ratification and the deposit of the instrument of accession to the OECD Convention was pending.

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the terms and conditions to be found at www.oecd.org/termsandconditions/.



From:
Education at a Glance 2020
OECD Indicators

Access the complete publication at:
https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en

Please cite this chapter as:

OECD (2020), "Lithuania", in *Education at a Glance 2020: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/06cf76ed-en

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area. Extracts from publications may be subject to additional disclaimers, which are set out in the complete version of the publication, available at the link provided.

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the Terms and Conditions to be found at http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions.