

**THE ROMANIAN QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

RQAAHE

**QUALITY EVALUATION ACTIVITIES GUIDE
FOR UNIVERSITY STUDY PROGRAMMES
AND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
INSTITUTIONS**

**PART II
INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION EXTERNAL
EVALUATION**

DECEMBER 2006

The external evaluation of academic quality is carried out in the following situations:

- a) **for the *temporary functioning authorisation* of a *study programme* (programme authorisation) or of a *higher education service provider* (institutional authorisation)**
- b) **for the *accreditation* of a *study programme* (programme accreditation) or of a *higher education institution* (institutional accreditation)**
- c) **for the *periodical certification, every five years*, of the academic quality of education and research services from an *accredited university*.**

PART II
INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION EXTERNAL EVALUATION

SUMMARY

The institutional accreditation external evaluation is carried out:

- for the education providers, at the higher education level, which want to obtain the temporary functioning authorisation;
- for the education providers, at the higher education level, which obtained the temporary functioning authorisation (are institutionally authorised) and apply for institutional accreditation.

The institutional accreditation external evaluation comprises:

THE PRELIMINARY PHASE at each stage: *verifying the compliance with the compulsory normative requirements on the temporary functioning authorisation and accreditation of academic degree study programmes*, mentioned at paragraph 4.2 from the Methodology, for a number of programmes established as follows:

- for Stage I – a part of (or all) the study programmes if there are at least three study programmes that obtained the temporary functioning authorisation from RQAAHE and the Ministry of Education and Research;
- for Stage II – according to the number of academic degree fields where the education provider offers at least three accredited study programmes.

EVALUATION STAGES

II.1. STAGE I: EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR THE TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION OF A HIGHER EDUCATION SERVICE (EDUCATION) PROVIDER (INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORISATION)

II.2. STAGE II: EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF A HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION (INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION)

Both accreditation phases aim at:

- verifying the managerial activity and institutional structures;
- verifying the financial activity
- verifying the internal quality assurance procedures.
- verifying the quality status at institutional level, resulted from the analysis and correlation of all the available information, according to the Methodology.

Monitoring the evaluation: a *mission manager*, member of the RQAAHE Commission, usually from the *Accreditation department*.

The mission manager proposes, as a *coordinator* of the expert evaluators team carrying out the visit, a representative of the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial or financial activities or, as the case may be, a representative of one of the permanent speciality experts Commissions evaluating a field, one or several study programmes. The proposal is discussed and approved in the Agency's Council.

The team (commission) of EXPERT EVALUATORS:

- expert evaluators from the FIELDS corresponding to the visited study programmes, usually comprising a member of the permanent speciality experts Commission (they draw up the VISIT RECORD, for the temporary authorisation/accreditation, signed by all the team members); the *Visit Record* is discussed and approved within the PERMANENT SPECIALITY EXPERTS Commissions, on fields (they draw up REPORTS ON THE STUDY PROGRAMMES QUALITY EVALUATION, FOR THE TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION/ACCREDITATION, for

each evaluated programme); the *Reports on the study programmes quality evaluation, for the temporary authorisation/accreditation* shall be submitted to the ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT;

- expert evaluators in the field of managerial and financial activities and institutional structures (draw up the VISIT RECORD and the REPORT OF THE INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION COMMISSION FOR MANAGERIAL AND FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES, which are submitted to the ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT);

- the ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT discusses and approves the *Reports of study programmes quality evaluation, for the temporary authorisation/accreditation* and the *Report of the institutional evaluation commission for managerial and financial activities* (draws up the ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT REPORT);

- the ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT REPORT is presented and discussed in the RQAAHE COUNCIL (after approval, it is achieved by the AGENCY's EXTERNAL INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION/ACCREDITATION).

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

2. Specific objectives of the accreditation external evaluation

3. Methodological stages of the institutional accreditation external evaluation

3.1. Conditions for starting off the procedure of the temporary institutional authorisation

3.2. Conditions for starting off the institutional accreditation procedure

4. Temporary authorisation external evaluation of a higher education service provider (institutional authorisation)

4.1. Normative requirements on the temporary authorisation of academic degree study programmes

4.2. Standards, reference standards and performance indicators for the institutional temporary authorisation

5. Accreditation external evaluation of a higher education institution (institutional accreditation)

5.1. Normative requirements on the accreditation of academic degree study programmes

5.2. Standards, reference standards and performance indicators for the institutional accreditation

6. The main issues of the process of external institutional evaluation for accreditation

6.1. The main issues of the external institutional evaluation for accreditation

6.2. The main objectives of the external institutional evaluation

7. Evaluation data for the activities and structures involved in evaluation

7.1. Access to information of the evaluators teams

7.2. Students' participation

8. Finality and utility of the external evaluation and of the reports published by the Agency

8.1. Institutional evaluation results

8.2. Comparing the quality evaluation results to reference sources

9. External evaluation team (commission)

9.1. Structure of the institutional external evaluation team (commission)

9.2. Management of the institutional external evaluation team (commission)

10. Development of the institutional evaluation process for institutional authorisation/accreditation

10.1. Preparation and development of external evaluation

10.2. Additional details concerning the development of the activities specified within the external institutional evaluation calendar.

11. Study programmes' evaluation

11.1. Aim of the study programme evaluation as part of the institutional accreditation

11.2. Evaluation method

12. Content and structure of the Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation

13. The way of finalising and distributing the Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation

14. Procedure of solving the complaints

APPENDICES

1. Introduction

In higher education, evaluation and accreditation are carried out at the level of institutional structures for each programme included in the academic degree cycle, leading to a distinct university qualification, in compliance with the provisions of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on education quality assurance, approved by Law no. 87/2006, art. 29(3). Master of science and doctoral programmes are submitted to external evaluation, in order to obtain accreditation.

The accreditation external evaluation begins at the request of the education provider that intends to offer one or several programmes.

According to the provisions of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on education quality assurance, approved by Law no. 87/2006, art. 35 (1), it is only that higher education institutions with temporary authorisation or accreditation that may carry out higher education activities and use the title of “university” or other similar.

Accreditation supposes two successive stages:

- a) **the temporary functioning authorisation**, which gives the right to develop the educational process and to organise, as the case may be, the admission to studies.

For higher education providers, the temporary functioning authorisation is issued on the basis of the approval of RQAAHE and Ministry of Education and Research, by Government Decision, according to the provisions of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on education quality assurance, approved by Law no. 87/2006, art. 30, letter f.

The education provider having obtained the temporary functioning authorisation has the right to manage teaching, non-teaching and research staff, according to its own development strategy, and to participate in national and international programmes, according to the provisions of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on education quality assurance, approved by Law no. 87/2006, art. 32 (1).

- b) **the accreditation** which, together with the rights provided for at letter a) and the right to issue diplomas, certificates and other documents of studies recognised by the Ministry of Education and Research and to organise, if the case, graduation exams, academic degree, master of science, doctor’s degree.

For higher education providers, the accreditation is carried out by the law, promoted by the Government, at the initiative of the Ministry of Education and Research, on the basis of RQAAHE’s approval, according to the provisions of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on education quality assurance, approved by Law no. 87/2006, art. 31, letter g.

The draft Law on the accreditation of a higher education institution may be initiated by the Ministry of Education and Research only if the institution has **at least three accredited study programmes**, according to the provisions of Part I, paragraph 1.6, *of the External evaluation Methodology, the standards, reference standards and list of the RQAAHE’s performance indicators*, approved by Government Decision no. 1418/11.10.2006.

The accredited education provider is part of the national education system, with all the rights and obligations conferred by the law, as it results from the provisions of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on education quality assurance, approved by Law no. 87/2006, art. 32 (2).

- The *Guide of external institutional evaluation for the accreditation of a higher education service provider* (hereinafter called the *Guide*) is a work instrument of higher education service providers preparing the educational offer, by initiated or developed institutional study programmes, and of external evaluators of academic quality.
- The *Guide* is based upon the *External evaluation methodology, the standards, reference standards and list of performance indicators*, adopted by Government Decision no. 1418/2006 and is meant to offer indicators and practices specific to the quality assurance at the level of every study programme and of the institutional structures' organisation in order to allow the provider's temporary authorisation or, if the case, accreditation.
- The mission of the Romanian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (hereinafter called the *Agency*) is to achieve high quality standards in the development of study programmes and in obtaining higher education qualifications, and to support the continuous improvement of higher education quality, in the wide public's interest. This guide presents the stages and procedures of carrying out the process of external institutional evaluation for authorisation or, if the case, accreditation.
- The Agency promotes public confidence in the rules and standards of issuing diplomas in the Romanian higher education, in the consistency of their application in all concrete situations within the evaluated higher education institutions. For this purpose, the Agency carries out the external evaluation by the multi-criteria examination of the academic performances of higher education institutions, by the programmes they provide, as well as of the institutional structures' organisation and functioning.
- In order to ensure the seriousness, impartiality and respect of confidence, the Agency's activity is based on general principles and also on the adoption of a set of operation principles and rules that are presented in **APPENDIX 1.1**.
- The external institutional evaluation process supposes a **consistent strategic and informational partnership** between the Agency (RQAAHE) and the National Council for Higher Education Financing (NCHEF), the Rectors' National Council (RNC), as well as the systematic consultation of the National Agency for Qualifications in Higher Education and Partnership with the Economic and Social Environment (ACPART).

The external institutional evaluation is a process focusing on the study programmes' quality as well as on the responsibility of higher education providers for what they do in this purpose. It is carried out through the peer review on the basis of the internal evaluation documents elaborated by each higher education provider. The evaluation process combines the assessment of the institutional capacity to adequately organise the study programmes' development with the investigations on the way to ensure quality at every *initiated* study programme or the way to ensure quality at the level of each study programme *in progress*.

2. Specific objectives of the accreditation external evaluation

The specific objectives of the accreditation external evaluation are different from quality evaluation objectives within higher education institutions by certain particular elements. These elements are related to the finality of the way the evaluation results are materialised in order to apply the legal provisions on obtaining, maintaining or passing to the higher level of the legal status allowing the higher education provider to materialise the educational offer by means of its study programmes.

These specific objectives are presented further on, taking into consideration these particularities.

- to ensure the university communities, beneficiaries and the public in general, that the education providing institution applying for the authorisation, or accreditation, can organise and develop study programmes and demonstrates that it complies with the minimum quality standards of a higher education institution;
- to direct the education providing organisation towards the continuous increase of academic quality, asserted by results in education and research;
- to support higher education institutions in order to develop a quality management and culture and to demonstrate their state, by relevant proof and documents;
- to determine the education providing organisation to self-evaluate and to cooperate in its external evaluation in order to ensure and increase quality;
- to determine the education providing organisation to cooperate with other higher education institutions in order to achieve, monitor and compare academic quality;
- to identify and publish any attempt of a programme's functioning that does not comply with the minimum standards of academic quality, according to the *established performance indicators*.

After the evaluation, the Agency offers objective public information on the basis of its own evaluation reports, about at least the following distinct and independent aspects:

- taking as a benchmark *the quality criteria, the standards and performance indicators*, as well as the *specific academic standards* of a field or of a university study programme, the Agency assesses to what degree the estimated learning process results (established by the study programme provider) may be actually achieved in the respective institution from the effectiveness point of view of the *proposed* or, as the case may be, *in progress* educational curriculum, and proportional to the results obtained by the students during the learning process;
- *the observation of the learning opportunities' quality* is focused on the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process, on the academic support and, by adequate learning resources, on the progress achieved by the students of various programmes.
- *the institutional capacity*, respectively the assessment of the way the education provider proves to possess a coherent organisation and an adequate management and administration system necessary for a stable functioning on short and medium term, as well as the human resources it can count on in order to achieve its stated mission and objectives.

Thus, the institutional accreditation external evaluation is carried out for both accreditation stages provided for by the law, for *programmes* and also at *institutional level*.

The external evaluation for study programmes, but also at institutional level, is mainly focused on the following aspects:

- *the learning experience offered to the students* by running through a higher education programme that ensures the access to a distinct academic qualification (an assessment concerning the way the study programme's content allows the students fulfilling all their professional obligations to obtain the knowledge, the competences and abilities which are defining for the academic qualification proposed by the university);
- the *peer review carried out by persons with the same training and competence level*, used as a means of the internal quality assurance;
- *the flexibility in organising the external evaluation mission*, so as the activity of the Agency's expert-evaluators not to create disturbances in the good operation of the teaching process;
- the *mutual respect*, so that the evaluation process should be carried out in a friendly environment; normally, the Agency's expert evaluators do not expect to find fields of quality assurance that the university should not have identified in the self-evaluation report as being fields of concern for quality improvement;
- the *maintenance and continuous improvement of academic standards* and improvement of the learning infrastructure;
- the *use of self-evaluation as a key document*, which must have a reflexive and evaluative character (it starts from the statements comprised in the self-evaluation report and analyses these statements' truthfulness);
- the *responsibility* of the assessed *institution to provide the Agency's expert-evaluators with all relevant information* (any document mentioned in the self-assessment must be at the evaluators' disposal);
- *direct access of the expert evaluators to the data and documents* supporting all the affirmations and statements from the self-evaluation report, provided to the Agency's expert evaluators, as well as to the interested.

3. Methodological stages on the external evaluation for institutional accreditation

The institutional accreditation methodology implies the following successive work stages provided for in the Romanian Government Decision no. 1418/11.10.2007.

On the basis of the application to start the external evaluation procedure for the temporary authorisation / accreditation, submitted to the accreditation department of RQAAHE by the education provider, the RQAAHE Council decides the starting of the external evaluation procedure if the following conditions are cumulatively fulfilled:

- together with the application, the education provider also submitted the *Internal evaluation report (self-evaluation)*, drawn up in compliance with the provisions of Art. 10 of the Government's Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on the education quality assurance, approved by Law no. 87/2006, for the educational structure the temporary authorisation respectively the accreditation is requested for, using as benchmarks the standards typical to the accreditation stage;

- the education provider proves with relevant documents to have paid the fee provided for by the regulations in force for the temporary authorisation, respectively accreditation procedure, according to the Government Decision no. 1731/06.12.2006.

The ***Internal evaluation report (self-evaluation)***, is drawn up taking into consideration the structure presented at APPENDIX 3.1.

3.1. Conditions for starting the procedure of institutional temporary authorisation

The temporary functioning authorisation of a higher education institution can be awarded, by Government Decision, at least 6 months before the beginning of a new academic year, if the education providing organisation has initiated at least three study programmes that were proposed and approved to function by RQAAHE and the Ministry of Education and Research.

In this respect, the provider must apply for and obtain:

- RQAAHE's favourable reports on the temporary authorisation of at least three academic degree study programmes; the Government Decision approving the temporary authorisation, initiated by the Ministry of Education and Research, also approved by RQAAHE, on the basis of the AGENCY'S REPORT ON STUDY PROGRAMME AUTHORISATION, submitted by RQAAHE to the Ministry of Education and Research, ***for each programme***, with the temporary authorisation proposal;
- the favourable report concerning the temporary institutional authorisation; the AGENCY'S INSTITUTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR TEMPORARY INSTITUTIONAL AUTHORISATION is submitted by RQAAHE to the Ministry of Education and Research, with the *temporary authorisation proposal*, in order to initiate the Government Decision, also approved by RQAAHE;.

The academic degree study programmes with temporary functioning authorisation are annually monitored by RQAAHE.

If, at monitoring the academic degree study programmes with temporary functioning authorisation, it is ascertained that, after the first two years of operation, the authorisation standards were not respected and the necessary measures were not taken for accreditation, RQAAHE Council may propose to the Ministry of Education and Research the withdrawal of the temporary functioning authorisation of the respective higher education structure.

3.2. Conditions for starting off the institutional accreditation procedure

In order to obtain accreditation, a higher education provider must request to the RQAAHE and obtain, by Government Decision:

- ***at least three accredited academic degree study programmes***; for the accreditation of an academic degree study programme, it is respected the condition that between the graduation date of the first series of graduates and the date of submitting the application for accreditation should be a 2-year period, taking into account that overrunning this deadline brings about the proposal of withdrawing the temporary functioning authorisation (Art. 31 (c)); the AGENCY'S REPORT ON PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION is submitted by RQAAHE to the Ministry of Education and Research, ***for each programme***, with the *accreditation proposal*, in order to initiate the Government Decision, also approved by RQAAHE.
- the favourable report on the institutional accreditation; the AGENCY'S EXTERNAL INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION, with the *institutional*

accreditation proposal, is submitted by RQAAHE to the Ministry of Education and Research, which can initiate the draft Law on the accreditation of the higher education institution.

The temporary authorisation/accreditation proposals are based on the fulfilment of all the performance indicators established for the evaluated structure. If they are fulfilled, the Agency cannot propose the temporary authorisation or accreditation.

4. External evaluation for the temporary authorisation of a higher education service provider (institutional authorisation)

The temporary authorisation of a higher education service provider represents the first stage of institutional accreditation, giving the right to carry out the educational process and to organise, as the case may be, the admission to studies.

The evaluation activities' phasing is carried out taking into account the necessity of coordinating the activities of a complete external evaluators group, more numerous than for programme evaluation and for the adequate use of evaluation resources.

The Self-evaluation report shall comprise:

- the elements necessary to the authorisation of at least three academic degree study programmes, from the same field or belonging to different fields;
- the elements necessary to the institutional evaluation.

4.1. Normative requirements on the temporary authorisation of academic degree study programmes

By analysing the documents provided by the education provider applying for the temporary authorisation/accreditation and by the visits carried out at its headquarters, RQAAHE verifies within the PRELIMINARY PHASE, the fulfilment of the ***Compulsory normative requirements, of the standards and performance indicators*** stipulated in the External evaluation methodology, approved by the Romanian Government Decision no. 1418/11.10.2006.

The programmes' evaluation procedures are presented in Part I of the Guide, the **EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR STUDY PROGRAMMES ACCREDITATION**.

4.2. Standards, reference standards and performance indicators for the temporary institutional authorisation

The numbering and indicators in the table are those from the "External evaluation methodology" elaborated by RQAAHE and approved by G.D. no. 1418/11.10.2006.

A. Institutional capacity
A.1. Institutional, administrative and managerial structures

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.A.1.1. Mission, objectives and academic integrity</p> <p>The institution formulates its own mission and establishes the objectives pursued in compliance with a set of benchmarks. The institution can prove that it respects and protects the personnel's and students' academic freedom and that it functions in conditions of university autonomy, of public responsibility and liability for the education offered and resources used for this purpose.</p>	<p><i>I.P.A.1.1.1. Mission and objectives</i> Min: The institution is established and functions in compliance with the legal requirements. The institution has a University Charter whose provisions comply with the national legislation and principles of the European Higher Education Area and are known by the academic community members. The stated mission and objectives particularise it within the national higher education system by clarity, distinction and specificity.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.1.1.2. Academic integrity</i> Min: The institution has an ethical and academic integrity code in order to protect the values of academic freedom, university autonomy and ethical integrity. It also has clear practices and mechanisms for applying the code.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.1.1.3. Public liability and responsibility</i> Min: The institution possesses internal audit practices with regard to the main university activity fields in order to ensure that the assumed liabilities are rigorously met, in conditions of public transparency.</p>	<p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities, for all the study programmes that are evaluated for the temporary institutional authorisation.</i> <i>(For the programmes: It is applied at the chair (or department) level which best corresponds to the field of the evaluated study programme.)</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. By institution we understand the higher education provider.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. There shall be presented the procedures and rules that are to be applied after obtaining the temporary authorisation.</i></p>

<p>S.A.1.2. Management and administration</p> <p>The institution has a coherent, integrated and transparent system of university management, based on an effective and efficient administration, adapted to the stated mission and objectives.</p>	<p><i>I.P.A.1.2.1. Management system</i></p> <p>Min: The institution has a management system and Internal functioning rules which comply with the legal requirements in force. The mechanism of choosing the students' representatives in councils, senates and other structures is clearly described in the University charter and internal rules. This is democratic and transparent, non-discriminating and does not limit the students' right to represent and to be represented.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.1.2.2. Strategic management</i></p> <p>Min: The institution has a strategic plan with at least four-year horizon and annual operational plans which are known by the academic community members and are applied according to practices and mechanisms of rigorous observation.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.1.2.3. Effective administration</i></p> <p>Min: The university's administration complies with the legal regulations in force, it is effective with regard to the organisation, number and qualification of personnel and rigorously functions by the services rendered to the academic community.</p>	<p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. It shall be verified by RQAAHE within a year since obtaining the temporary authorisation.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. It shall be verified by RQAAHE within a year since obtaining the temporary authorisation.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. It shall be verified by RQAAHE within a year since obtaining the temporary authorisation.</i></p>
---	---	--

A.2 - Material basis

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.A.2.1. Patrimony, equipment, allocated financial resources</p> <p>The university owns a patrimony which efficiently contributes to the fulfilment of the mission and established objectives.</p>	<p><i>I.P.A.2.1.1. Spaces for education, research and other activities</i></p> <p>Min: By respecting the differences between the types of education (full-time, evening, part-time education and distance education) and, respectively, the research activities' objectives, the university ensures educational and research spaces corresponding to its specific features, by lecture rooms, didactic laboratories and research centres, in compliance with the technical, safety and hygienic-sanitary standards in force. Their quality is assessed according to the area, volume, technical status, total number of students, of teaching and research staff, differentiated on fields, study programmes and institutionally by reference to the above mentioned standards.</p> <p><i>The indicator also refers to the students' hostels and other spaces offered to the students for social, cultural and sports activities.</i></p> <p><i>I.P.A.2.1.2. Equipment</i></p> <p>Min: The teaching / seminar rooms are endowed with technical equipment for learning, teaching and communication which facilitates the teaching staff's activity and every student's receptivity; research laboratories are endowed with equipment and means of operation according to the minimum exigencies.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.2.1.3. Financial resources</i></p>	<p><i>The institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities.</i></p> <p><i>The institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. For the temporary authorisation, the indicator's fulfilment is optional.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the</i></p>

	<p>Min: The institution proves to possess sufficient financing sources and financial resources, on short term (annual) and long term (for minimum three/four successive years), which it allocates in order to adequately fulfil the established mission and objectives. The institution possesses an annual realistic budget and a three/four-year budget, as well as short and medium-term policies, concerning financial sustainability.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.2.1.4. The granting system of scholarships and other types of material support for students</i></p> <p>Min: The institution has its own Rules of granting scholarships and other types of material support for students, which it consistently applies. Scholarships are granted from state budget allocations and from own resources.</p>	<p><i>institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities.</i></p>
--	---	---

B. Educational effectiveness

B.1. Study programmes' content

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.B.1.1. Students' admission The institution formulates its own student recruitment and admission policy and applies it transparently and rigorously, in compliance with the principle of all the candidates' equality,</p>	<p><i>I.P.B.1.1.1. Principles of the policy of admission to the study programmes offered by the institution</i></p> <p>Min: The institution applies a transparent student recruitment and admission policy, publicly</p>	

<p>without any discrimination.</p>	<p>announced at least 6 months before being applied. The university marketing promotes real and correct information, indicating verification and confirmation possibilities. The admission is exclusively based upon the candidate's academic abilities and applies no discriminating criteria.</p> <p><i>I.P.B.1.1.2. Admission practices</i> Min: The admission in a university study cycle is carried out only on the basis of the previous studies diploma, taking into account the hierarchical order of graduation averages.</p>	
<p>S.B.1.2. Structure and presentation of study programmes Study programmes are formulated in detail, according to the expected learning results and which correspond to an academic qualification.</p>	<p><i>I.P.B.1.2.1. Study programmes' structure</i> Min: Each study programme / speciality within the university is based upon the correspondence between learning and research results. A study programme is presented as a package of documents including: the programme's general and specific objectives; the educational curriculum with the disciplines' shares expressed in ECTS study credits, as well as the successively arranged disciplines in the educational period; the thematic syllabuses or the disciplines' records included in the educational curriculum, respectively learning results expressed as cognitive, technical or professional and emotional-value abilities which are achieved by a discipline; the examination and evaluation method for each discipline, taking into account the planned results; the organisation</p>	

method and contents of the graduation exam, as a summative exam certifying the assimilation of cognitive and professional abilities corresponding to the academic qualification.

I.P.B.1.2.2. Study programmes differentiation

Min: Study programmes are integrated as structure, regardless of the type of education (full-time, evening classes, part-time and distance learning), but they differentiate according to the means used within the type of education. For part-time and distance education, the indicator differentiates accordingly.

I.P.B.1.2.3. Study programmes relevance

Min: Cognitive and professional relevance of study programmes is defined according to the rhythm of knowledge and technology development in the field and to the labour market and qualifications requirements. The institution possesses mechanisms for the annual collective analysis of the knowledge activity transmitted and assimilated by the students and for analysing the changes occurred in the qualifications' profiles and in their impact upon the study programme organisation.

B.2. Learning results

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.B.2.1. Valorisation of the acquired academic qualification</p> <p>The acquired knowledge,</p>	<p><i>I.P.B.2.1.1. Valorisation by the capacity to enter the labour market</i></p> <p>Min: At least 50% of the</p>	<p><i>Shall not be applied for the temporary authorisation</i></p>

competence and abilities are enough in order to allow the graduates to enter the labour market, to develop their own business, to continue academic studies in the next cycle and to permanently study.

graduates are employed within two years since the graduation date at the academic qualification level.

I.P.B.2.1.2. Qualification valorisation by the continuation of university studies

Min: At least 20%* of the last two series of graduates of academic degree studies are admitted to master of science studies, regardless of the field*

* The percent shall increase, according to the domains, together with the coming into force of the provisions of Law no. 288/2004 on university studies organisation, including from the point of view of the financial support of the 2nd cycle – master of science.

I.P.B.2.1.3. Students' level of satisfaction concerning professional and personal development ensured by the university.

Min: More than 50% of the students positively assess the learning/development environment offered by the university and their own learning route.

I.P.B.2.1.4. Student focused learning methods

Min: The teaching staff's main responsibility is to project the learning methods and environment focused on student, less focused on the traditional responsibility to transmit only information. The relation between student and teacher is based on partnership, where each party takes the

Shall not be applied for the temporary authorisation

	<p>responsibility of achieving the learning results. Learning results are explained and discussed with the students from the perspective of their relevance for the students' development. The teaching staff uses new technology resources (e.g. e-mail, personal website for subjects, bibliography, electronic format resources and dialogue with students) and auxiliary materials, such as blackboard, flipchart and video-projector.</p> <p><i>I.P.B.2.1.5. Students' career guidance</i> Min: Professors have permanence hours at the students' disposal and personalise their guidance at the students' request. There are supervising professors or tutors or other ways of association between a teacher and a group of students.</p>	
--	---	--

B.3. Scientific research activity

STANDARD	INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.B.3.1. Research programmes The institution has a long-term strategy and medium and short-term programmes referring to the research objectives, projects and expected results, as well as to the fulfilment resources. There is a research ethos and culture, and also concerns for the valorisation of research results.</p>	<p><i>I.P.B.3.1.1. Research planning</i> Min: The long-term strategy and medium and short-term programmes on research are adopted by the faculties' Senate and Councils, together with the specification of the practices of obtaining and granting the achievement resources and of the valorisation methods. Research interests are predominantly institutional.</p> <p><i>I.P.B.3.1.2. Research achievement</i> Min: Research owns enough financial, logistic and human</p>	

	<p>resources in order to achieve its objectives.</p> <p><i>I.P.B.3.1.3. Research valorisation</i></p> <p>Min: Research is valorised by: didactic publications, scientific publications, technological transfer by consultancy centres, scientific parks or other valorisation structures, achievement of new products etc. Every professor and researcher has at least one publication or a didactic or scientific achievement annually. Through mass-media, the institution participates in the dissemination of the research results.*</p> <p>* In fields such as: Medical sciences, Agricultural sciences, Technical sciences, Architecture, Town planning etc., where the research results are valued by projects on the basis of which new products are developed, infrastructure development or environment protection works are carried out, these results shall also be considered.</p>	
--	--	--

C. Quality management

C.1. Quality assurance strategies and procedures

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.1.1. Quality assurance structures and policies</p> <p>The structures, policies and strategies create the institutional framework for the effective quality development and monitoring, for the acknowledgement of a quality culture and for the continuous improvement of quality</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.1.1.1. Quality assurance system organisation</i></p> <p>Min: Within the institution, there is a central commission and study programme commissions which function in an integrated manner.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.1.1.2. Quality assurance policies and strategies</i></p>	<p><i>For the study programmes submitted to evaluation</i></p>

standards.	Min: The university has a policy programme focused on quality and means of achievement.
------------	---

C.2. Procedures on the periodical initiation, monitoring and revision of the programmes and activities carried out

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.2.1. Periodical approval, monitoring and evaluation of study programmes and diplomas corresponding to the qualifications.</p> <p>Within the university there are rules on the periodical initiation, approval, monitoring and evaluation of every study programme and of the issued diplomas. These rules are rigorously and consistently applied.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.2.1.1. Existence and enforcement of the rules on the periodical initiation, approval, monitoring and evaluation of study programmes</i></p> <p>Min: The rules exist and are enforced.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.2.1.2. Correspondence between diplomas and qualifications</i></p> <p>Min: Study programmes and diplomas are elaborated and issued according to the academic qualification requirements.</p>	

C.3. Objective and transparent procedures of learning results evaluation

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.3.1. Students' evaluation</p> <p>The students' examination and marking are carried out on the basis of criteria, rules and techniques which are rigorously and consistently applied.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.3.1.1. The university has rules concerning the students' examination and marking which are rigorously and consistently applied</i></p> <p>Min: There are such rules as well as specific procedures of consistent knowledge and application by tenured university teachers and students. Together with the course's tenured university teacher, at least one more speciality professor participates in the examination.</p>	<p><i>At the study programme's level</i></p>

	<p><i>I.P.C.3.1.2. Integrating the examination in the teaching and learning projection, on courses and study programmes</i></p> <p>Min: Each course is thus projected so as to combine teaching, learning and examination. The students' examination and evaluation procedures are focused on the learning results and announced to the students in advance and in detail.</p>
--	---

C.4. Periodical evaluation procedures of teaching staff quality

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.4.1. Teaching and research staff quality</p> <p>Universities must have enough teaching staff, as a number and functioning basis, as to be adequate to the students' total number, according to the field and, with regard to the qualifications, they must comply with the specific features of study programmes and established quality objectives.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.4.1.1. Relation between the teaching staff and students</i></p> <p>Min: According to the study programme's specific features, the university establishes the relation considered optimum for the objectives and level of academic quality between the tenured teaching staff with the basic teaching load within the university and the total number of registered students. In the quality evaluation, a professor is considered to have the basic teaching load in a single university.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.4.1.2. Peer review</i></p> <p>Min.: The peer review is periodically organised, based on general criteria and collegial preferences.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.4.1.3. Teaching staff evaluation carried out by the students</i></p> <p>Min.: The students may evaluate the teaching staff by means of a form approved by the Senate,</p>	

	<p>which is optionally applied after each semester training cycle. Its results are confidential, being accessible only to the dean, rector and evaluated person.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.4.1.4. Evaluation carried out by the university management</i></p> <p>Min: The teaching staff perform their own self-evaluation and are annually evaluated by the head of department.</p>
--	---

C.5. Learning resources accessibility

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.5.1. Learning resources and students' services</p> <p>The resources and services offered to the students are sufficient, adequate and relevant in order to facilitate the learning process and to ensure a quality students' life.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.5.1.1. Learning resources availability</i></p> <p>Min: The university ensures learning resources (manuals, handbooks, bibliographical references, readers, anthologies etc.) for each study programme in libraries, resource centres etc., in classic and electronic format and free of charge. The university's library must possess, beside the electronic access, a sufficient number of national and foreign volumes and subscription to the main national and foreign speciality magazines for every discipline defining a study programme. Each library has a programme and resources of obtaining books and magazines.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.5.1.2. Teaching as a learning source</i></p> <p>Min: Each professor owns updated teaching strategies for every course, in compliance with the study programme, students'</p>	

	<p>characteristics, type of education and pre-defined quality criteria.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.5.1.3. Stimulation and recovery programmes</i> Min: The university has stimulation programmes for students with high learning results and also recovery programmes for those who have learning difficulties.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.5.1.4. Students' services</i> Min: The university has a minimum number of social, cultural and sports services for students such as: accommodation spaces for at least 10% of students, a sports base, various consultancy services, with an efficient management.</p>	<p><i>Shall not be applied for the programme temporary authorisation</i></p> <p><i>Shall be observed by the institutional accreditation Commission</i></p>
--	---	--

C.6. Systematically updated data base, with regard to the internal quality assurance

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.6.1. Information systems Universities gather, process and analyse data and information concerning the students' education and life quality status in the academic area.</p>	<p><i>IP.C.6.1.1. Data bases and information</i> Min: The institution has an information system which facilitates the gathering, processing and analysis of relevant data and information for the quality institutional evaluation and assurance.</p>	<p><i>Shall be observed by the institutional accreditation Commission</i></p>

C.7. Transparency of public interest information concerning study programmes and, if the case, the granted certificates, diplomas and qualifications

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.7.1. Public information Data and information public transparency, in printed and electronic format, concerning all the qualifications and study programmes, this information's actuality, correctness and validity must be permanently demonstrated.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.7.1.1. Public information offer</i> Min: The university and all its faculties must offer quantitative and/or qualitative, actual and correct information and data, about the qualifications, study programmes, diplomas, academic and research staff, the facilities offered to the students and about any aspects of interest for the public, in general, and for the students, in particular.</p>	

C.8. Functionality of education quality assurance structures, according to the law

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.8.1. The institutional structure of education quality assurance complies with the legal provisions and permanently carries out its activity The quality evaluation and assurance commission was created, has a structure and carries out the activities stipulated by the regulations in force.</p>	<p><i>IP.C.8.1.1. The commission coordinates the enforcement of the quality evaluation and assurance activities</i> Min: The education quality evaluation procedures and activities were elaborated by the university Senate. The commission elaborates the internal evaluation annual report and makes it public by posting up or publication, including in electronic format, and formulates proposals of education quality improvement.</p>	<p><i>At the level of the study programme submitted to evaluation</i></p>

The necessary evaluation data for the activities and structures involved in the institutional authorisation evaluation are presented in Chapter 7, being the same as those for institutional accreditation.

5. External evaluation for the accreditation of a higher education institution (institutional accreditation)

The accreditation of a higher education institution represents the second stage of the process by means which, together with the right to carry out the educational process and to organise, if the case, the admission to studies, the institution is authorised to issue diplomas, certificates and other documents of study recognised by the Ministry of Education and Research and to organise, as the case may be, graduation exam, academic degree, master of science, doctorate.

The evaluation activities' phasing is carried out taking into account the necessity of coordinating the activities of a complete external evaluators group, more numerous than for programme evaluation and for the adequate use of evaluation resources.

The Self-evaluation report shall comprise:

- the elements necessary to the accreditation of at least three academic degree study programmes, from the same field or belonging to different fields;
- the elements necessary to the institutional evaluation.

5.1. Normative requirements on the accreditation of academic degree study programmes

By analysing the documents provided by the education provider applying for accreditation and by the visits carried out at its headquarters, RQAAHE verifies within the PRELIMINARY PHASE, the fulfilment of the ***Compulsory normative requirements***, stipulated in the External evaluation methodology, the standards, reference standards and list of performance indicators of RQAAHE approved by the Romanian Government Decision no. 1418/11.10.2006.

The accreditation procedures specific to the programmes' evaluation are presented in Part I within the Guide, the **EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR STUDY PROGRAMMES ACCREDITATION**.

5.2. Standards, reference standards and performance indicators for the institutional accreditation

The numbering and indicators in the table are those from the "External evaluation methodology" elaborated by RQAAHE and approved by G.D. no. 1418/11.10.2006.

A. Institutional capacity
A.1. Institutional, administrative and managerial structures

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.A.1.1. Mission, objectives and academic integrity</p> <p>The institution formulates its own mission and establishes the objectives pursued in compliance with a set of benchmarks. The institution can prove that it respects and protects the personnel's and students' academic freedom and that it functions in conditions of university autonomy, of public responsibility and liability for the education offered and resources used for this purpose.</p>	<p><i>I.P.A.1.1.1. Mission and objectives</i> Min: The institution is established and functions in compliance with the legal requirements. The institution has a University Charter whose provisions comply with the national legislation and principles of the European Higher Education Area and are known by the academic community members. The stated mission and objectives particularise it within the national higher education system by clarity, distinction and specificity.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.1.1.2. Academic integrity</i> Min: The institution has an ethical and academic integrity code in order to protect the values of academic freedom, university autonomy and ethical integrity. It also has clear practices and mechanisms for applying the code.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.1.1.3. Public liability and responsibility</i> Min: The institution possesses internal audit practices with regard to the main university activity fields in order to ensure that the assumed liabilities are rigorously met, in conditions of public transparency.</p>	<p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities, for all the study programmes that are evaluated for the temporary institutional authorisation.</i></p> <p><i>(For programmes: It is applied at the chair (or department) level which best corresponds to the field of the evaluated study programme.)</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. By institution we understand the higher education provider.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. There shall be presented the procedures and rules that are to be applied after obtaining the temporary authorisation.</i></p>

<p>S.A.1.2. Management and administration</p> <p>The institution has a coherent, integrated and transparent system of university management, based on an effective and efficient administration, adapted to the stated mission and objectives.</p>	<p><i>I.P.A.1.2.1. Management system</i></p> <p>Min: The institution has a management system and internal functioning rules which comply with the legal requirements in force. The mechanism of choosing the students' representatives in councils, senates and other structures is clearly described in the University Charter and internal rules. This is democratic and transparent, non-discriminating and does not limit the students' right to represent and to be represented.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.1.2.2. Strategic management</i></p> <p>Min: The institution has a strategic plan with at least four-year horizon and annual operational plans which are known by the academic community members and are applied according to practices and mechanisms of rigorous observation.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.1.2.3. Effective administration</i></p> <p>Min: The university's administration complies with the legal regulations in force, it is effective with regard to the organisation, number and qualification of personnel and rigorously functions by the services rendered to the academic community.</p>	<p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. It shall be verified by RQAAHE within a year since obtaining the temporary authorisation.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. It shall be verified by RQAAHE within a year since obtaining the temporary authorisation.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. It shall be verified by RQAAHE within a year since obtaining the temporary authorisation.</i></p>
---	---	--

A.2 - Material basis

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.A.2.1. Patrimony, equipment, allocated financial resources</p> <p>The university owns a patrimony which efficiently contributes to the fulfilment of the mission and established objectives.</p>	<p><i>I.P.A.2.1.1. Spaces for education, research and other activities</i></p> <p>Min: By respecting the differences between the types of education (full-time, evening, part-time education and distance education) and, respectively, the research activities' objectives, the university ensures educational and research spaces corresponding to its specific features, by lecture rooms, didactic laboratories and research centres, in compliance with the technical, safety and hygienic-sanitary standards in force. Their quality is assessed according to the area, volume, technical status, total number of students, of teaching and research staff, differentiated on fields, study programmes and institutionally by reference to the above mentioned standards.</p> <p><i>The indicator also refers to the students' hostels and other spaces offered to the students for social, cultural and sports activities.</i></p> <p><i>I.P.A.2.1.2. Equipment</i></p> <p>Min: The teaching / seminar rooms are endowed with technical equipment for learning, teaching and communication which facilitates the teaching staff's activity and every student's receptivity; research laboratories are endowed with equipment and means of operation according to the minimum exigencies.</p>	<p><i>The institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities.</i></p> <p><i>The institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities. For the temporary authorisation, the indicator's fulfilment is optional.</i></p>

	<p><i>I.P.A.2.1.3. Financial resources</i> Min: The institution proves to possess sufficient financing sources and financial resources, on short term (annual) and long term (for minimum three/four successive years), which it allocates in order to adequately fulfil the established mission and objectives. The institution possesses an annual realistic budget and a three/four-year budget, as well as short and medium-term policies, concerning financial sustainability.</p> <p><i>I.P.A.2.1.4. The granting system of scholarships and other types of material support for students</i> Min: The institution has its own Rules of granting scholarships and other types of material support for students, which it consistently applies. Scholarships are granted from state budget allocations and from own resources.</p>	<p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities.</i></p> <p><i>It is observed by the institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities.</i></p>
--	---	---

B. Educational effectiveness

B.1. Study programmes' content

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.B.1.1. Students' admission The institution formulates its own student recruitment and admission policy and applies it transparently and rigorously, in compliance with the principle</p>	<p><i>I.P.B.1.1.1. Principles of the policy of admission to the study programmes offered by the institution</i> Min: The institution applies a transparent student recruitment</p>	

<p>of all the candidates' equality, without any discrimination.</p>	<p>and admission policy, publicly announced at least 6 months before being applied. The university marketing promotes real and correct information, indicating verification and confirmation possibilities. The admission is exclusively based upon the candidate's academic abilities and applies no discriminating criteria.</p> <p><i>I.P.B.1.1.2. Admission practices</i> Min: The admission in a university study cycle is carried out only on the basis of the previous studies diploma, taking into account the hierarchical order of graduation averages.</p>	
<p>S.B.1.2. Structure and presentation of study programmes Study programmes are formulated in detail, according to the expected learning results and which correspond to an academic qualification.</p>	<p><i>I.P.B.1.2.1. Study programmes' structure</i> Min: Each study programme / speciality within the university is based upon the correspondence between learning and research results. A study programme is presented as a package of documents including: the programme's general and specific objectives; the educational curriculum with the disciplines' shares expressed in ECTS study credits, as well as the successively arranged disciplines in the educational period; the thematic syllabuses or the disciplines' records included in the educational curriculum, respectively learning results expressed as cognitive, technical or professional and emotional-value abilities which are achieved by a discipline; the examination and evaluation method for each discipline, taking into account the</p>	

planned results; the organisation method and contents of the graduation exam, as a summative exam certifying the assimilation of cognitive and professional abilities corresponding to the academic qualification.

I.P.B.1.2.2. Study programmes differentiation

Min: Study programmes are integrated as structure, regardless of the type of education (full-time, evening classes, part-time and distance learning), but they differentiate according to the means used within the type of education. For part-time and distance education, the indicator differentiates accordingly.

I.P.B.1.2.3. Study programmes relevance

Min: Cognitive and professional relevance of study programmes is defined according to the rhythm of knowledge and technology development in the field and to the labour market and qualifications requirements. The institution possesses mechanisms for the annual collective analysis of the knowledge activity transmitted and assimilated by the students and for analysing the changes occurred in the qualifications' profiles and in their impact upon the study programme organisation.

B.2. Learning results

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.B.2.1. Valorisation of the acquired academic qualification</p> <p>The acquired knowledge,</p>	<p><i>I.P.B.2.1.1. Valorisation by the capacity to enter the labour market</i></p> <p>Min: At least 50% of the</p>	<p><i>Shall not be applied for the temporary authorisation</i></p>

competence and abilities are enough in order to allow the graduates to enter the labour market, to develop their own business, to continue academic studies in the next cycle and to permanently study.

graduates are employed within two years since the graduation date at the academic qualification level.

I.P.B.2.1.2. Qualification valorisation by the continuation of university studies

Min: At least 20%* of the last two series of graduates of academic degree studies are admitted to master of science studies, regardless of the field*

* The percent shall increase, according to the domains, together with the coming into force of the provisions of Law no. 288/2004 on university studies organisation, including from the point of view of the financial support of the 2nd cycle – master of science.

I.P.B.2.1.3. Students' level of satisfaction concerning professional and personal development ensured by the university.

Min: More than 50% of the students positively assess the learning/development environment offered by the university and their own learning route.

I.P.B.2.1.4. Student focused learning methods

Min: The teaching staff's main responsibility is to project the learning methods and environment focused on student, less focused on the traditional responsibility to transmit only information. The relation between student and teacher is based on partnership, where each party takes the

Shall not be applied for the temporary authorisation

	<p>responsibility of achieving the learning results. Learning results are explained and discussed with the students from the perspective of their relevance for the students' development. The teaching staff uses new technology resources (e.g. e-mail, personal website for subjects, bibliography, electronic format resources and dialogue with students) and auxiliary materials, such as blackboard, flipchart and video-projector.</p> <p><i>I.P.B.2.1.5. Students' career guidance</i> Min: Professors have permanence hours at the students' disposal and personalise their guidance at the students' request. There are supervising professors or tutors or other ways of association between a teacher and a group of students.</p>
--	---

B.3. Scientific research activity

STANDARD	INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.B.3.1. Research programmes The institution has a long-term strategy and medium and short-term programmes referring to the research objectives, projects and expected results, as well as to the fulfilment resources. There is a research ethos and culture, and also concerns for the valorisation of research results.</p>	<p><i>I.P.B.3.1.1. Research planning</i> Min: The long-term strategy and medium and short-term programmes on research are adopted by the faculties' Senate and Councils, together with the specification of the practices of obtaining and granting the achievement resources and of the valorisation methods. Research interests are predominantly institutional.</p> <p><i>I.P.B.3.1.2. Research achievement</i> Min: Research owns enough financial, logistic and human resources in order to achieve its</p>	

	<p>objectives.</p> <p><i>I.P.B.3.1.3. Research valorisation</i></p> <p>Min: Research is valorised by: didactic publications, scientific publications, technological transfer by consultancy centres, scientific parks or other valorisation structures, achievement of new products etc. Every professor and researcher has at least one publication or a didactic or scientific achievement annually. Through mass-media, the institution participates in the dissemination of the research results.*</p> <p>* In fields such as: Medical sciences, Agricultural sciences, Technical sciences, Architecture, Town planning etc., where the research results are valued by projects on the basis of which new products are developed, infrastructure development or environment protection works are carried out, these results shall also be considered.</p>	
--	--	--

C. Quality management

C.1. Quality assurance strategies and procedures

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.1.1. Quality assurance structures and policies</p> <p>The structures, policies and strategies create the institutional framework for the effective quality development and monitoring, for the acknowledgement of a quality culture and for the continuous improvement of quality standards.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.1.1.1. Quality assurance system organisation</i></p> <p>Min: Within the institution, there is a central commission and study programme commissions which function in an integrated manner.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.1.1.2. Quality assurance policies and strategies</i></p> <p>Min: The university has a policy</p>	<p><i>For the study programmes submitted to evaluation</i></p>

	programme focused on quality and means of achievement.	
--	--	--

C.2. Procedures on the periodical initiation, monitoring and revision of the programmes and activities carried out

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.2.1. Periodical approval, monitoring and evaluation of study programmes and diplomas corresponding to the qualifications.</p> <p>Within the university there are rules on the periodical initiation, approval, monitoring and evaluation of every study programme and of the issued diplomas. These rules are rigorously and consistently applied.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.2.1.1. Existence and enforcement of the rules on the periodical initiation, approval, monitoring and evaluation of study programmes</i></p> <p>Min: The rules exist and are enforced.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.2.1.2. Correspondence between diplomas and qualifications</i></p> <p>Min: Study programmes and diplomas are elaborated and issued according to the academic qualification requirements.</p>	

C.3. Objective and transparent procedures of learning results evaluation

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.3.1. Students' evaluation</p> <p>The students' examination and marking are carried out on the basis of criteria, rules and techniques which are rigorously and consistently applied.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.3.1.1. The university has rules concerning the students' examination and marking which are rigorously and consistently applied</i></p> <p>Min: There are such rules as well as specific procedures of consistent knowledge and application by tenured university teachers and students. Together with the course's tenured university teacher, at least one more speciality professor participates in the examination.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.3.1.2. Integrating the examination in the teaching and</i></p>	<p><i>At the study programme's level</i></p>

	<p><i>learning projection, on courses and study programmes</i></p> <p>Min: Each course is thus projected so as to combine teaching, learning and examination. The students' examination and evaluation procedures are focused on the learning results and announced to the students in advance and in detail.</p>
--	--

C.4. Periodical evaluation procedures of teaching staff quality

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.4.1. Teaching and research staff quality</p> <p>Universities must have enough teaching staff, as a number and functioning basis, as to be adequate to the students' total number, according to the field and, with regard to the qualifications, they must comply with the specific features of study programmes and established quality objectives.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.4.1.1. Relation between the teaching staff and students</i></p> <p>Min: According to the study programme's specific features, the university establishes the relation considered optimum for the objectives and level of academic quality between the tenured teaching staff with the basic teaching load within the university and the total number of registered students. In the quality evaluation, a professor is considered to have the basic teaching load in a single university.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.4.1.2. Peer review</i></p> <p>Min.: The peer review is periodically organised, based on general criteria and collegial preferences.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.4.1.3. Teaching staff evaluation carried out by the students</i></p> <p>Min.: The students may evaluate the teaching staff by means of a form approved by the Senate, which is optionally applied after each semester training cycle. Its</p>	

	<p>results are confidential, being accessible only to the dean, rector and evaluated person.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.4.1.4. Evaluation carried out by the university management</i></p> <p>Min: The teaching staff perform their own self-evaluation and are annually evaluated by the head of department.</p>	
--	---	--

C.5. Learning resources accessibility

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.5.1. Learning resources and students' services</p> <p>The resources and services offered to the students are sufficient, adequate and relevant in order to facilitate the learning process and to ensure a quality students' life.</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.5.1.1. Learning resources availability</i></p> <p>Min: The university ensures learning resources (manuals, handbooks, bibliographical references, readers, anthologies etc.) for each study programme in libraries, resource centres etc., in classic and electronic format and free of charge. The university's library must possess, beside the electronic access, a sufficient number of national and foreign volumes and subscription to the main national and foreign speciality magazines for every discipline defining a study programme. Each library has a programme and resources of obtaining books and magazines.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.5.1.2. Teaching as a learning source</i></p> <p>Min: Each professor owns updated teaching strategies for every course, in compliance with the study programme, students' characteristics, type of education and pre-defined quality criteria.</p>	

	<p><i>I.P.C.5.1.3. Stimulation and recovery programmes</i> Min: The university has stimulation programmes for students with high learning results and also recovery programmes for those who have learning difficulties.</p> <p><i>I.P.C.5.1.4. Students' services</i> Min: The university has a minimum number of social, cultural and sports services for students such as: accommodation spaces for at least 10% of students, a sports base, various consultancy services, with an efficient management.</p>	<p><i>Shall not be applied for the programme temporary authorisation</i></p> <p><i>Shall be observed by the institutional accreditation Commission</i></p>
--	---	--

C.6. Systematically updated data base, with regard to the internal quality assurance

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.6.1. Information systems Universities gather, process and analyse data and information concerning the students' education and life quality status in the academic area.</p>	<p><i>IP.C.6.1.1. Data bases and information</i> Min: The institution has an information system which facilitates the gathering, processing and analysis of relevant data and information for the quality institutional evaluation and assurance.</p>	<p><i>Shall be observed by the institutional accreditation Commission</i></p>

C.7. Transparency of public interest information concerning study programmes and, if the case, the granted certificates, diplomas and qualifications

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.7.1. Public information Data and information public transparency, in printed and electronic format, concerning all the qualifications and study</p>	<p><i>I.P.C.7.1.1. Public information offer</i> Min: The university and all its faculties must offer quantitative and/or qualitative, actual and</p>	

programmes, this information's actuality, correctness and validity must be permanently demonstrated.	correct information and data, about the qualifications, study programmes, diplomas, academic and research staff, the facilities offered to the students and about any aspects of interest for the public, in general, and for the students, in particular.
--	--

C.8. Functionality of education quality assurance structures, according to the law

STANDARD	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	OBSERVATIONS
<p>S.C.8.1. The institutional structure of education quality assurance complies with the legal provisions and permanently carries out its activity</p> <p>The quality evaluation and assurance commission was created, has a structure and carries out the activities stipulated by the regulations in force.</p>	<p><i>IP.C.8.1.1. The commission coordinates the enforcement of the quality evaluation and assurance activities</i></p> <p>Min: The education quality evaluation procedures and activities were elaborated by the university Senate. The commission elaborates the internal evaluation annual report and makes it public by posting up or publication, including in electronic format, and formulates proposals of education quality improvement.</p>	<p><i>At the level of the study programme submitted to evaluation</i></p>

6. The main aspects of the external institutional evaluation process for accreditation

6.1. *The main aspects of the external institutional evaluation for accreditation*

The external institutional evaluation for accreditation focuses on three main aspects, as it follows:

- ***The efficiency of the internal mechanisms and structures of quality assurance*** at the institutions' level (institutional capacity), from the point of view of the Good Practices Code in order to ensure the academic quality and graduation standards in higher education (this Code is to be elaborated by the Agency after the pilot stage in 2006-2007) and the degree in which the study programmes' content and quality and the standards of issuing diplomas are periodically revised by each university. At the same time, it is analysed if the recommendations carried out on the occasion of previous (internal and external) evaluations are implemented and also their effect. The aim of this examination is to provide public information on the quality of activities within every higher education institution, as a programme provider for the higher qualification internally and internationally recognised.
- ***The accuracy, the complete and credible character of information*** that the institutions publish with regard to the quality of their study programmes and diplomas they issue at graduation. On this occasion, information are provided concerning the level of confidence that can be granted to the informative materials published by the institutions on the activity quality. The information's useful character is emphasised for the students and other interested parties.
- ***The mechanisms and procedures of internal quality assurance, which are analysed by the documentary examination of the study programmes' quality assurance, respectively, by the thematic evaluation of certain activities*** (for example, the way the university ensures the quality of professional and career guidance services; which is the mechanism of internal quality assurance at the level of departments and faculties etc.). The external evaluation aims at demonstrating the validity and credibility of the information provided by the universities on the basis of the internal quality assurance process. As a general trend, within the external institutional evaluation for ***accreditation***, the study programmes' evaluation must usually cover all the institution's temporarily authorised or accredited programmes, in order to verify the maintenance of the minimal conditions requested for authorisation/accreditation; nevertheless, if certain programmes have been recently evaluated for accreditation and the Agency's report was favourable, they shall not be submitted to a new evaluation within this stage.

6.2. *The main objectives of the external institutional evaluation for accreditation*

In order to answer the requirements it is carried out for, the external institutional evaluation has several main objectives:

- Examining the mechanisms and internal procedures of assurance and continuous improvement of the quality and results of their application, especially at the study programmes' level.

- The way of using the external references included in the *Quality Assurance Methodology*, including in the *Good Practices Code*.
- The available public information on the content and quality of study programmes and the standards of issuing diplomas at their graduation.
- The internal system of information management and its contribution to the internal monitoring of quality and fulfilment of standards.
- Elaborating, using and publishing the information on programmes.
- The academic standards proposed by the institution and those achieved by the students in obtaining academic qualifications at the graduation of study programmes.
- Students' experience in the learning process.
- Ensuring the teaching staff quality, including the evaluation criteria and the way in which the teaching-learning efficiency is monitored, improved and rewarded by the university's management.
- The way the institution raises the quality level of all educational, research and managerial activities compared to the levels of performance indicators realised at the temporary authorisation stage.

This list of objectives is not limitative, other objectives can be added, in mutual agreement with the institution, in order to achieve the external evaluation purpose.

7. Evaluation data for the activities and structures involved in evaluation

7.1. Access to information of the evaluator teams

In order to support the evaluation teams (commissions) in formulating their assessments, they possess a variety of information sources, namely:

- The set of information which is annually reported to the Ministry of Education and Research and, respectively, to the NCFHE – National Council for Financing Higher Education and NURC – National University Research Council. The agency is aware of the fact that institutions shall need help in fulfilling the requirements and shall provide adequate recommendations to the expert evaluators teams who shall visit the institutions within the experimental (pilot) phases.
- The self-evaluation reports elaborated by the institutions, including the self-evaluation documents specific to study programmes and the relevant documentation.
- The information presented as evaluation reports of the activity / programme by the representatives of the institution's students.
- The information within the institution and from other sources about the curricular areas selected for evaluation, including the record of the students' results at these disciplines in the respective university, compared to other higher education institutions.
- Reports on the institution drawn up by the Agency or by other relevant organisations within the last five years.
- Information obtained during or after the evaluation visits.

The team of expert evaluators permanently interacts with the *contact person* assigned by the institution.

7.2. Students' participation

Students represent a central element of the external institutional evaluation's objectives. The evaluation teams examine a series of relevant aspects for the students:

- the quality of information provided to them, the way the learning process is facilitated and supported, the academic standards that are expected to be achieved and those practically recorded at obtaining the university qualification;
- within each evaluation process, the students are invited to participate in its main stages. Their representative structures – mainly the students' organisation or its equivalent – has the possibility to participate in the preliminary meeting between the Agency and institution and may provide a written report, prior to the evaluation visit. The members of the representative structure, but also other students, are invited to take part in certain meetings during the evaluation visits and have the possibility to ensure that the external evaluation team took notice of the most important aspects and of their preoccupations as students.

8. Finality and utility of external evaluation and of the reports published by the Agency

The institutional evaluation results are published by the Agency as the AGENCY'S REPORT ON INSTITUTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION/ACCREDITATION.

The report contains assessments on the confidence that can be granted to the institution's current and predictable management from the point of view of the study programmes' quality, to the confidence that can be granted to the education provider or institution on the basis of the clear, honest, complete and correct character of the information published about the quality of its programmes and of certification standards; this assessment is mainly useful to the current and future students of the institution.

The AGENCY'S REPORT ON INSTITUTIONAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION/ACCREDITATION also formulates comments on other aspects, including on the characteristics, capacities and limits of the internal methods of quality assurance by the institutions, on the quality of study programmes and standards of granting diplomas and study certificates, according to the conclusions of the study programmes' evaluation. At the same time, the report comprises references on the compliance with the *National framework of qualifications in the Romanian higher education*, with the main provisions in the *External evaluation methodology, the standards, reference standards and list of performance indicators of RQAAHE*, published by the Agency.

The report emphasises good practice aspects and **finishes with the proposal concerning the award/non-award of the temporary authorisation** or, as the case may be, **accreditation**.

If the Agency ascertains that quality standards are not fulfilled, it shall inform the Ministry of Education and Research and shall act in accordance with the provisions of the Government's Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on education quality assurance, approved by Law no. 87/2006, art. 34.

9. External evaluation team (commission)

9.1. *Structure of the external institutional evaluation team (commission)*

For each evaluation mission, the *Accreditation department* proposes for approval to the Agency's Council a *mission director* among the members of RQAAHE Council. The *Coordinator* of the expert evaluators *team* carrying out the visit is proposed by the *mission director* and may be a representative of the *institutional evaluation Commission for managerial and financial activities* or, as the case may be, a representative of one of the *Commissions of permanent speciality experts* evaluating a field or one or several study programmes. The proposal is discussed and approved in the Agency's Council, after the approval within the Executive Board.

The team size is determined by the Agency in accordance with the dimension and complexity of the evaluated institution's activity. The *team coordinator* is mainly focused on institutional aspects and plays an important role in assuring that, by the team members' activity, relevant data are collected, necessary for a complete evaluation. The other evaluators answer to the requirements at institutional level, as well as to those at the study programmes' level.

The external evaluation team regularly consists of **minimum three persons, out of whom one is the team's coordinator. In well justified cases, additional expert evaluators can be added to the team, according to the number of study programmes or other aspects considered necessary.** Additional, technical or speciality experts, *inside the country or abroad*, are called to offer other opinions on aspects typical to the activity at the level of compulsory normative requirements, discipline or study programme etc.

The evaluators are selected by the Agency, from its own register of evaluators and are prepared by the Agency so they should better know the purposes, objectives and procedures of the external evaluation process as well as with its own roles and tasks within the evaluation mission.

The evaluators, persons with relevant experience for their positions within the evaluation team, are prepared by the Agency according to the dynamics of the methodology, standards, criteria and performance indicators.

Applying the external mechanisms of quality evaluation must be as transparent and efficient as possible and, at the same time, it should not consume more resources than necessary. For this purpose, the team (commission) of expert evaluators uses the existing information and documentary support of the study programmes provider. Thus, the internal documents are submitted for examination to the evaluators assigned by the Agency as self-evaluation documents. Evaluators shall also use other information and documents available in electronic format, for example, on an intranet site of the higher education institution.

The mission director:

- pursues that the time allocated for an evaluation should be the minimum necessary in order to help expert evaluators make their own assessments on the evaluated study programmes as well as on the institution;
- assures the transparency of the evaluation process by applying the standards and reference standards published by the Agency;
- permanently interacts with a representative of the institution, hereinafter called the *contact person*. The contact person contributes to the efficient communication between the Agency's evaluators and the higher education institution and is appointed by the Rector's Decision.

The external evaluation team (commission) is monitored by the Agency’s Council on the whole period of preparation, development and report of the external evaluation mission, by the *mission director*.

APPENDIX 9.1 comprises elements on the selection and training of expert evaluators.

The reports of evaluating the study programmes’ quality are drawn up by the commission of permanent speciality experts. The *report of the institutional evaluation commission for managerial and financial activities* is drawn up by the commission, with the expert evaluators’ participation, members of the team, who deal with financial, patrimony and managerial issues.

9.2. *Coordinating the external institutional evaluation team (commission)*

The *mission director* formulates recommendations to the institutions during the visit preparation and works with the evaluation team to the initial documentation analysis, using as a benchmark the information from the Agency’s database. The *mission director* is an important interlocutor in the dialogue with the evaluated institution’s representative. He is also responsible for the mission’s achievement, collaborating with the *coordinator of the evaluators team* to the elaboration and, if the case, revision of the final report on the basis of possible suggestions of the evaluated institution. He signs, together with the *mission’s coordinator*, the final form of the *Evaluation reports of the study programmes’ quality* and of the *Report of the evaluators commission of financial and managerial activities* presented to the RQAAHE’s ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT.

10. Carrying out the external institutional evaluation process for authorisation/institutional accreditation

10.1. *Preparing and carrying out the external evaluation for temporary authorisation/institutional accreditation*

The external institutional evaluation process takes place according to the following calendar:

Calendar of the organisation and carrying out of the external institutional evaluation process for authorisation/accreditation

No.crt.	Activities	Period
1	The RQAAHE’s Quality Assurance Department takes notice of the Application for temporary authorisation/institutional accreditation submitted to the Agency by the education provider/university and of the fulfilment of the other requirements referring to the process initiation, including the institution’s legal representation and financial character.	RQAAHE assigns the director of external evaluation mission for temporary authorisation / accreditation , 6 months prior to the evaluation visit, according to the application for institutional evaluation or other legal document on the basis of which the external evaluation is initiated, submitted by the institution to the Agency’s headquarters.

2.	The preliminary visit of the evaluation mission director. The mission director visits the institution in order to meet the institution's representatives and students concerning the future evaluation visit. The mission director discusses and establishes together with the institution the calendar of the external evaluation process, the Evaluation Methodology and corresponding guides. The institution is represented by the <i>contact person</i> .	The preliminary visit of the evaluation mission director takes place 5 months at most before the evaluation visit.
3.	At the proposal of the Quality Assurance Department, the Agency's Council approves the list of study programmes that are to be evaluated, as well as the structure of the expert evaluators team: the team's coordinator, expert evaluators. The data referring to the programmes are communicated to the university in order to prepare the necessary complementary documentation.	Shall be finalised four months before the evaluation visit.
4.	The Agency receives the self-evaluation Report (documentation) at institutional level, the documentation for the study programmes selected by the Agency's Council for external evaluation, as well as the appendices in written and electronic format.	The Agency expects to receive the self-evaluation Report as well as the complete documentation at least two months prior to the evaluation visit. If the documents are not received in due time or if it is ascertained that they are incomplete, the Agency reserves the right to re-schedule the visit to a future date which should not disturb the calendar of the other evaluations established by the Agency.
5.	The meeting of the evaluation team coordinator with the contact person and a students' representative in order to identify the objectives of carrying out evaluations during the visit, the possible thematic evaluation fields and the calendar, timetable and place of each stage within the evaluation visit. There will also be established the additional information that must be prepared by the institution until the external evaluation visit.	Shall be carried out at RQAAHE's headquarters, one month at most before the evaluation visit. During the visit, the experts commission may request to evaluate a limited number of other objectives, as well as certain timetable changes.
6.	The evaluation team visits the institution. The mission director joins the team in the final day of the visit. The team of evaluators meets the teaching staff and students in order to discuss issues concerning evaluation at institutional and thematic levels and at the study programmes selected by the Agency. The evaluation of the study programmes and/or fields is usually carried out by two experts.	The external institutional evaluation visit is carried out throughout three week days (usually, from Wednesday to Friday).
7.	If need be, the institution is notified with regard to a possible request for a specialised independent expertise for a study programme or field where ambiguities or doubt have appeared on the internal mechanism of quality assurance. The institution can provide, during the last day of the evaluation visit, additional information that may contribute to the situation's clearing up.	At the beginning of the second day of visit.
8.	The mission director sends the visited institution a letter comprising the preliminary results of the institutional	In two weeks at most after the evaluation visit.

	evaluation. The letter is elaborated with the agreement of all evaluation team members and countersigned by the <i>mission coordinator</i> .	
9.	If necessary, the mission director establishes within a week, together with the institution, the date/dates when the additional expert evaluators shall be present for the additional visit of evaluating the programme, field or thematic evaluation. This visit takes place within two weeks at most after the institutional evaluation visit.	Additional expert evaluators submit to the RQAAHE's Quality assurance department reports containing the new visit's conclusions, within a week since the new visit's conclusion.
10.	The institution is responsible for the letter containing the preliminary results of the institutional evaluation.	Within one month at most since the external institutional evaluation visit.
11.	<p>THE ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT discusses and approves the <i>Reports of the study programmes quality evaluation</i> and the <i>Report of the evaluators' commission of financial and managerial activities</i>. The Department draws up the ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT'S REPORT;</p> <p>ACCREDITATION DEPARTMENT'S REPORT is presented and discussed in the RQAAHE COUNCIL, which draws up the AGENCY'S EXTERNAL INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR TEMPORARY AUTHORISATION / ACCREDITATION, in the <i>mission director's</i> presence. The Council decides the publication of the <i>Agency's external institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation</i> on RQAAHE's site. It is advisable to publish in appendix the answer letter of the evaluated institution.</p>	Within two months at most since the institutional evaluation visit.

10.2. Additional details concerning the development of the activities specified in the external institutional evaluation calendar.

The evaluation process starts **six months** before the documentation visit, when the Agency's Accreditation Department assigns the *mission director* and provides the application for external evaluation for temporary authorisation/institutional accreditation submitted by the higher education institution.

- **The preliminary meeting** between the **mission director** and the education provider takes place approximately **five months** prior to the evaluation visit. The issues discussed shall be the interaction between the evaluation team members, the evaluated institution and Agency, the content of the documentation prepared by the university for external evaluation (to ensure that self-evaluation documents cover all the aspects of the external evaluation process). The basis necessary to the study programmes that shall be evaluated within the mission is also established. The preliminary meeting offers at the same time the possibility of various discussions between the mission director and representatives of the students' organisations with concern to the students' contribution within the external institutional evaluation process.

During this preliminary meeting, the Agency discusses with the institution all the aspects which, at request, are to be evaluated more profoundly than within the usual procedure of evaluating study programmes.

On the basis of the preliminary discussions with the higher education institution, as well as of the information existing in the Agency, the mission director proposes for approval to the Agency's Council the calendar of the institutional evaluation mission and the list of all the institution's study programmes that shall be evaluated within the mission.

The mission director asks the education provider to answer in writing if it develops other programmes, at its headquarters or in other centres, besides the study programmes with temporary authorisation or accreditation. All the information are transmitted in writing to the Agency's Council.

If such situations are ascertained, the Agency's Council notifies the education provider that it shall not carry out the external institutional evaluation unless all study programmes should become legal. The Agency shall immediately inform M.Ed.R. in writing with regard to the ascertained situation.

Within the same reunion, the Agency's Council establishes, at the Accreditation Department's proposal, the *mission coordinator* and the expert evaluators. Approximately **four months** before the visit, the institution is informed on the study programmes that shall be evaluated.

- **Necessary initial documentation.** The institution is requested to place at the Agency's disposal the initial evaluation documentation not later than **two months** before the visit. The *Internal self-evaluation report* has normally **about 60 pages, and is presented in written and electronic format.** Additional appendices and documents are presented only in electronic format.

APPENDIX 10.1. presents elements on the elaboration of the institution's self-evaluation documents and recommendations on the structure of the *Internal evaluation report (self-evaluation)*. **APPENDIX 10.2** presents additional aspects referring to the operation and management of the information received by the Agency, including from students.

At its receipt, the documentation is taken over by the *mission director* in order to ensure its distribution in electronic format to the external evaluation team members.

- **External evaluation visit**

The external evaluation mission is usually carried out throughout **three week days**, from *Wednesday to Friday*. The detailed programme for each work reunion with the management, the teaching staff and students is established by the team in mutual agreement with the evaluated institution. A visit usually has the following objectives:

- to consult the additional documentation provided by the institution, including the reports of external examiners involved in the internal self-evaluations.
- to examine the way the institution approaches quality assurance.
- to examine the relation between institutional procedures and their application at the study programmes or discipline level, emphasising the efficiency of the study programmes' internal evaluations.
- to examine the way the institution complies with the requirements of ensuring the knowledge, competences and aptitudes specified in the National Framework of Qualifications in Higher Education.
- to examine the study programmes' evaluation processes, including pre-established discussions, as well as the evaluation of illustrative examples for assessing the students' activities. To examine the accuracy, reliability and complete character of the information

published on the institution's site for students and interested public, focused on the study programmes specifications (mission, content, academic qualification at the programme's graduation).

- to evaluate the declared quality of the programmes and current results of the students, not only on the basis of academic results, but also of the way students are assisted during the educational process and of the way to optimise the use of learning opportunities.
- at the conclusion of the evaluation visit, meetings shall take place with the institution's management, respectively, when necessary, with the personnel within the study programmes and/or selected disciplines, with the aim of clearing up the current issues and those resulted from the evaluation.

On the last day of visit, the team works independently, without the participation of the institution's contact person. Under the coordinator's leadership, the team analyses the conclusions/final results of the external evaluation, at institutional and study programmes' level:

- it makes assessments on the confidence that can be granted to the institution for the management of its study programmes and academic standards quality announced by it at issuing diplomas.
- it makes assessments on the confidence of taking into consideration, from the point of view of the accuracy, integrity and complete and correct character, the information that the institution publishes on the quality of its programmes and graduation standards.
- identifies a series of aspects, such as good practice in quality management or in the teaching-learning process and educational facilitation etc.
- elaborates preliminary recommendations of the continuous improvement of the activity and disseminated information's quality.

The Agency's **mission director** participates together with the team members in the activity of the last day of external evaluation visit.

Moreover, the last day of visit, the team confirms possible programmes or fields for which it requests the speciality opinion of other independent experts. According to the possibilities, they are brought to the evaluated institution's notice the second day of visit. When the additional speciality opinion is requested, the external evaluation team's results, evaluations and recommendations formulated the last day of visit are provisional.

At the conclusion of the external evaluation visit, **no verbal information is made to the visited institution**. Within **two weeks** from the visit, the institution's management receives a letter from the Agency, which contains the main conclusions of the external evaluation and possible recommendations that shall be comprised in the preliminary report. If the speciality opinion of additional experts shall be taken into consideration, the Agency sends to the institution a letter by means of which it informs that it has sent the documentation to them, but the institution is informed on the main results of the external evaluation only after the additional experts send their own observations to the Agency.

11. Study programmes' evaluation

11.1. Aim of the study programmes' evaluation as part of the institutional accreditation

Study programmes' evaluation as part of the institutional accreditation aims at:

- verifying the measure in which the quality assurance mechanism at institutional level adequately operates at the level of each examined study programme.
- evaluating real (effective) results obtained by the students during the study programme compared to the results declared by the institution and efficiency of the support provided to the students throughout the educational process.
- directly comparing the institution's statement with regard to the accuracy, complete and correct character of the provided information about the content and quality of its programmes and about graduation standards to the students' and graduates' experience.
- the number of study programmes that are to be examined within every institutional evaluation is determined by the Agency, according to the date in which study programmes received the temporary functioning authorisation or accreditation.

The evaluation of study programmes/fields answers to several general requirements during the institutional evaluation visit. It supposes the activity of two experts, out of whom at least one has current or recent experience on the evaluated study programme or curricular area. Normally, approximately 25% of the visit time is allocated to the application of the specific procedures of evaluating the selected study programmes/fields.

11.2. Evaluation method

The evaluation method is carried out as it follows, according to the following elements.

The self-evaluation documents of the study programmes (or of the fields) must be placed at the external institutional evaluation's disposal at least two months before the visit. The self-evaluation report shall also comprise the way of fulfilling the *Compulsory normative requirements for temporary authorisation/accreditation of study programmes*, which stood at the basis of granting the respective statute, accompanied by relevant specifications on the educational curriculum. The internal report must contain all the elements specified in the *Visit Record a) and b)* for each evaluated study programme and, as the case may be, the homologous documents of the previous most recent evaluation. **APPENDIX 11.1** comprises elements concerning the elaboration of the study programmes' self-evaluation documents as part of the institutional evaluation.

- Relevant additional documents (internal records on the students' results, processed data of opinion surveys among the students and/or teaching staff, report extracts of the chair or faculty council meetings etc.) may be requested one month at most before the visit, usually at the meeting of the institution's contact person with the mission director. In all cases, the documentation must limit itself to the team's essential information, according to the requirements formulated by him.
- The discussions of the evaluation team members with the institution's teaching staff and students (at the study programme level) are carried out on specific themes identified by the team, but also enable the teaching staff and students to bring in the team's attention a series of other aspects of interest for ensuring or improving quality. The participation in the discussions within the internal evaluations of a number of persons from outside (graduates, partners in training programmes etc.) may also be requested.
- The discussions with the teaching staff and students about the content and modality of transmitting knowledge from the disciplines' analytical syllabuses are carried out in order to verify the accuracy and reliability, the complete character of the information provided by the institution to the current and potential students, employers and other persons interested in the programmes' quality and their graduation standards.

- Verifying the relation between the offered study programmes and the knowledge, competences and aptitudes expected at each study programme's graduation is made by discussions on the quality of the teaching-learning process and on the performances achieved by the students.

After evaluating every study programme/field and filling in the *Visit record*, results a conclusion drawn by the team on the way the quality assurance institution's commitments practically operate, at programme/discipline level, on the way to ensure a reasonable level of quality and graduation standards. Normally, the team's evaluations are expected to confirm the institution's assessments. If the self-evaluation document of a study programme/field indicates deficiencies, the external evaluation team shall try to ensure that the institution understands and adopts the proper measures for rapidly removing those deficiencies, within **two weeks** at most from the visit.

In certain circumstances, the team may find itself in the impossibility to draw a conclusion with concern to the visit. These circumstances involve:

- The identification of a potentially different performance which the team cannot confirm without the opinion of other programme or field specialists.
- The identification of major deficiency/deficiencies in the study process development that the team cannot confirm without the opinion of other specialists.
- The identification of significant discrepancies between the information disseminated by the institution and the team's conclusions.

In these circumstances, after consulting the *mission director*, the evaluation team notifies the institution the penultimate day of visit (if the evaluation procedure of the study programme / field is almost complete until that moment) that it is not able to draw a conclusion without benefiting from an opinion of additional experts. After the notification, during the last day of the evaluation visit, the institution may provide the team with additional information. In case if, the last day, the team confirms the intention to request the opinion of other independent experts, the Agency shall appoint a team of at least 2 experts. These experts shall carry out in the following two weeks a separate programme evaluation. In such situation, the Agency's evaluation team shall not adopt any final conclusion on a programme/curricular area without referring to the point of view of these additional experts.

The reference to additional experts has the aim of carrying out a more profound study of the study programme/field, for refining particular aspects signalled by the Agency's team. Their activity consists of verifying the institution's statement with concern to the quality, based on the primary internal evaluation record and on the students' activity. The activity involves several meetings with the students and members of the teaching staff and may also involve external evaluators used by the institution in carrying out its own internal evaluation. Where speciality conclusions identified possible deficiencies in facilitating the teaching-learning process, the evaluation also includes the verification of the interaction between teaching staff and students (separate reunions of independent experts with the students and members of the involved teaching staff). The experts' results are not reported to the evaluated institution but to the Agency, so that the latter should take them into consideration within the final evaluation. The draft final report is elaborated after the experts develop their own activity and shall not be placed at the institution's disposal, until the moment the team draws the final conclusions.

12. Content and structure of the Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation

The observations of the external institutional evaluation for temporary authorisation/accreditation are comprised in the *Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation*, which shall be published. The conclusions of this report represent the final evaluation on the ***credibility that can be granted to the institution's management and with regard to the study programmes quality assurance***. The conclusions are based on a series of evaluation observations, such as the extent to which quality was ensured, taking into account the real situation observed during the evaluation visit, the context/conditions and mission of the institution, but also the way it was managed and reflected in the institution's primary records.

The *Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation* mentions one of the two conclusions, referring to the credibility of assuring the quality of study programmes and the managerial and financial aspects within the evaluated institution, respectively the **"temporary authorisation/accreditation proposal"** or the **"non-authorisation/non-accreditation proposal"**.

The temporary authorisation/accreditation proposal is supported by the fulfilment of the quality criteria, for the provided study programmes as well as for the institutional management. When the Agency assesses, on the basis of the institution's records and observations during the visit, that the institution adequately ensures the quality requirements and standards and, for this purpose, it creates conditions for the future quality assurance, the ***temporary authorisation / institutional accreditation*** shall be recommended to the M.Ed.R.

The **"non-authorisation/non-accreditation"** proposal is determined by the fact that there are obvious evidence or it is ascertained that the institutional capacity of quality management of the programmes and/or certification standards is inadequate compared to the performance indicators in a solid and efficient manner. Such conclusion can be based on deficiencies of the institutional structures' and procedures' management or within the implementation process at programme and discipline level. Moreover, the Agency may decide upon the granting of the „non-authorisation/non-accreditation" rating if there are justified reasons of doubt in considering that the information provided by the institution and publicly available are complete, correct and trustful.

Granting the „non-accreditation" rating is based on substantial evidence related to serious and fundamental deficiencies of the institutional capacity to ensure and maintain the quality of the programmes and certification/granting standards of diplomas, at institutional and study programmes level.

The non-fulfilment of the compulsory normative requirements for study programmes and at institutional level is a serious reason for the Agency to propose the „non-authorisation/non-authorisation".

APPENDIX 12.1 comprises **recommendations on the Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation**.

13. The way of finalising and distributing the *Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation*

The letter containing the preliminary results of the institutional evaluation, with the main elements of the **draft report**, is prepared and submitted to the institution, usually in two weeks after the visit. The institution is requested to notify the Agency within one month since the evaluation visit (in two weeks from the receipt of the letter referring to the preliminary report's content) the corrections considered necessary as they are related to the errors resulted from the data taken over from the self-evaluation documents or to the misunderstanding of information/actions. The draft report is revised according to the institution's complaints, if these complaints are completely documented. The *mission director* draws up the draft report.

The *Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation* is published by the Agency and has the aim of providing information for the wide public as well as for the professionals (university staff and management staff, researchers, stakeholders etc.). Therefore, the report comprises a summary especially meant for the wide public and mainly for the students. It is provided separately from the rest of the report. On the other hand, the institution is requested to provide a short statement of accepting the report's conclusions in order to be published by the Agency as appendix to the report. The statement offers the institution the possibility to present the evolution registered after the visit of the evaluation commission, in particular, the actions carried out or proposed and related to the recommendations comprised in the report.

Normally, the *Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation* is published by RQAAHE within two months since the institutional evaluation visit. This period can be extended if, according to the opinion of the additional speciality experts, new investigations are necessary for the correct assessment of quality assurance for one or several study programmes or fields.

14. Procedure of solving the complaints

The Agency makes efforts to have, with each evaluated university, a close and constructive relation, based on the systematic and continuous communication between the institutions. At the same time, after the evaluation visit, the *mission director* sends to the evaluated university a letter comprising the preliminary results of the institutional evaluation, to be able to transmit in writing possible comments and suggestions of correcting certain data that have been misunderstood or inadequately taken over.

As the data used in the report's arguments are public and provided by the institution in writing or during the evaluation visit, the university may only dispute the way of carrying out the external evaluation process for faulty drafting. After publishing the *Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation* on the RQAAHE website, the institution may dispute in writing the decision proposed by the Agency, within two weeks at most from the date of publication, by a letter registered at the Agency within the delay mentioned.

Within 30 days at most from the complaint's receipt, the Agency's Council reanalyses the report, invites the university's rector and the contact person for a discussion of solution, then it

submits its proposal to the Council's approval. The Council's president officially notifies the education provider with regard to the result of the report's re-examination.

The Agency publishes on the website a note on the way the claim was solved.

APPENDICES TO THE EXTERNAL INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION GUIDE FOR INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION

APPENDIX 1.1. The principles and functioning standards promoted by the Romanian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

APPENDIX 9.1 Selecting and training the expert-evaluators

APPENDIX 10.1. Elements on the elaboration of the institution's self-evaluation documents and recommendations on the structure of the *Internal evaluation report (self-evaluation)*.

APPENDIX 10.2. Aspects related to the operation and management of the information received by the Agency and students

APPENDIX 12.1. The structure of the *Agency's External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation*

The principles and functioning standards promoted by the Romanian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

The Agency aims at fulfilling and promoting the general principles mentioned further on, at strategic and operational levels of its activity:

- ***Inclusiveness*** – taking into consideration the interests and expectations of all the persons and groups publicly interested in higher education and facilitating their participation in all the Agency’s aspects.
- ***Openness*** – the transparency of the Agency’s activity and methods, building institutional confidence between the Agency and universities, providing information to the wide public with concern to the Agency’s activity.
- ***Sequentiality*** – the necessity of regular, systematic and punctual action in all the evaluation and reporting activities, with the aim of supporting the decisional process at the Agency level and at the level of higher education system.
- ***Comparability*** – using the gained experience within the Agency and other organisations as means of information within future activities.
- ***Relevance*** – ensuring that the information provided by the Agency is useful and understood by the beneficiaries.

These principles are applied in order to develop standard external evaluation services, according to the Methodology presented on the Agency’s website.

The Agency is the object of an internal systematic monitoring and of an evaluation of its strategy, procedures and processes, with the aim of ensuring permanent credibility and continuous improvement of its performance. It is for this purpose that the advisory Commission of the RQAAHE’s Council operates.

Selecting and training the expert-evaluators

Introduction

1. Expert-evaluators and additional experts are selected by the Agency according to the published selection criteria and generally from its own record of expert-evaluators. Additional experts, specialists in certain study programmes or fields, may be selected among the designations of the universities and professional organisations.
2. All the persons involved in the external evaluation, including the mission directors, benefit from training programmes coordinated by the Agency's Council in order to ensure that they are aware of the purposes, objectives and procedures of the external evaluation process and have the competence of assuming their own role within this process.
3. The qualities required to the persons involved in the external evaluation are mentioned above in a different section. Each selection procedure aims at ensuring the balance within the group of evaluators from the point of view of the sector, branch, geographic, on sexes and ethnic characteristics.
4. If a second opinion from independent experts is needed, they shall be thus selected in order to ensure the necessary competence to examine the content of a study programme or of a curricular area and evaluate the level of the academic graduation standards of a programme.
5. The Agency carries out the training of the personnel involved in external evaluation in collaboration with adequate providers of training programmes. The training purpose is to ensure that:
 - The purposes and objectives of the external evaluation process are understood.
 - The involved procedures are known.
 - Their role is properly understood and their tasks fulfilled, but there shall be team work in answering the Agency's expectations and respecting the process rules.
 - Is completely valorised the opportunity to explore and practice the assimilation and data analysis techniques, to draw up visit programmes, to build and test hypotheses, to formulate conclusions and statements on the degree of confidence, to prepare reports.

Qualities required for expert evaluators

- Relevant experience in the academic management and in quality assurance at institutional level in higher education.
- Personal and professional credibility from the institutions' management and/or stakeholders coordinating the activity of the higher education sector.
- Ability to assimilate a great quantity of heterogeneous information, to analyse data and facts and to elaborate reasonable conclusions on complex actions and to carry out research and investigations within documentary and verbal records with the aim of issuing conclusions/assessments.
- Clear oral and written communication skills.
- If they represent a certain academic field, they should possess current or recent teaching experience, or experience in supporting the learning process at the level of the academic degree, master of science and doctoral study cycles, namely by using the results of the scientific research.

Qualities required for additional experts for external evaluation, inside the country or abroad

- Personal credibility in the field, in higher education or equivalent professional credibility.
- Current experience in the teaching process or in supporting the learning process at the level of the academic degree or master of science programmes within the respective field of university studies.
- Experience to work with study programme specifications elaborated for the respective field; a good understanding of the admission requirements within the study programme and ability to interpret the statistics upon the students' performances; knowing the comparable programmes from other universities and the graduation and certification standards within other institutions.
- Ability to assimilate an important quantity of heterogeneous information, to analyse and elaborate a reasonable conclusion on complex actions.
- Ability to identify, plan and follow the directions of an evaluation with the aim of answering the tasks specified by an audit commission, by using various sources, including documentary and oral records, in order to draw a credible conclusion.

Elements on the elaboration of the institution's self-evaluation documents and recommendations on the structure of the *Internal evaluation report (self-evaluation)*.

Aim of the institution's self-evaluation documents

1. The institution's self-evaluation documents are the initial reference elements for the commission of expert-evaluators. Their importance results from the preoccupation to bring to the notice of the interested public, on the one hand, the institutional methods of assuring the quality of study programmes and graduation standards and, on the other hand, the attention paid by the institution to the quality, consistency and entirety of the information published with relation to the training offer expressed in reference standards.

2. Self-evaluation documents enable the institution to:

- create the conditions by means of which, on the basis of the analysis and internal evaluation results, the institution's strengths should be confirmed and publicly certified by the external evaluation process, and assess the efficiency of the policies and procedures of quality assurance and continuous improvement management;
- to present its own evaluation of the way the institution exercises its responsibilities in two vital fields within the institutional evaluation: *providing quality programmes*, publicly reasoned by adequate reference standards and, respectively, the *adequate exercise of public liability in granting diplomas and certificates at graduating study programmes*;
- to present its own efficiency evaluation of the internal quality assurance structures and mechanisms; the way to ensure the accuracy, the complete and credible character of the information published by the institution, its practices and procedures about the mission and main objectives of institutional evaluation;
- to allow the external evaluation team understand the way the institution ensures the quality and standards of graduating study programmes, to enable the team to draw a conclusion on the confidence that can be granted to the institution's management at present, and, in the near future, on the quality and fulfilment of standards or reference standards.

Style and dimension of the institution's self-evaluation documents

3. The institution's self-evaluation documents must:

- Be honest and relevant.
- Be concise and reasoned by attached documents, available to the evaluation commission.
- Offer a large perspective at institutional level.
- Present an adequate balance between *description* and *self-evaluation*.

4. The self-evaluation documents must provide enough data in order to enable the external evaluation team to understand the main characteristics of the way the institution approaches the quality assurance process compared to the national standards/its own reference standards publicly

announced on the institution's website. The documents must focus on the efficiency and concision of the way of presentation. If the institution expresses confidence in its own efficiency, the institution's self-evaluation documents must be thus elaborated as to minimise the need of additional data and clearing up for the team of expert-evaluators. As the perception and confidence given by the team depend (at least in the initial phase) on the institution's self-evaluation documents, it is important for them to be clear and easily verifiable by means of the attached documentation prepared by the institution.

5. The *internal self-evaluation report* has normally **about 60 pages and is submitted in written and electronic format**. The appendices and additional documents are only submitted in electronic format.

To enable the homogeneous presentation of the RQAAHE Reports and analyses, all the documents presented in electronic format shall be written in font: Times New Roman, font size: 12, line spacing: 1.5 lines. The documents shall be drawn up in WORD and pdf.

Structure of the Internal evaluation report (institutional self-evaluation)

6. The Internal evaluation report (institutional self-evaluation) is structured as it follows:

- Introduction (presentation of the institution and the dynamics of its performances in the period from the last external evaluation);
- The quality assurance process of study programmes and standards, respectively, reference standards, as part of the institutional strategic management;
- Presentation of the measures of assuring the accuracy, the complete and confidence character of the information disseminated by the institution.

7. In elaborating its own self-evaluation documents, the institution is required:

- (i) to create the conditions to enable the external evaluation commission identify the dimension, type of institution, mission, study cycle/cycles for which it provides study programmes, the organisational and managerial structure of the educational and scientific research activity;
- (ii) to submit and analyse on a document-basis the progress registered in the field of providing study programmes from the last external evaluation;
- (iii) to submit and analyse its own observations carried out on the occasion of the internal evaluations on subjects or curricular areas, as well as on the way of taking into account and solving the ascertained defaults, in order to promote the improvement of the institutional practice;
- (iv) to describe in brief the main characteristics of its own institutional framework and its own activities of quality assurance and maintenance of the academic standards of issuing

diplomas and graduation certificates, of continuous improvement of study programmes' quality and of the support for the learning-training process;

- (v) to describe the internal professional rules of the professors and students and to emphasise all the important changes operated at institutional level as answer to their application;
- (vi) to mention the use of external reference sources, including the National Framework of Qualifications in Higher Education and, if possible, the reference standards of the fields specific to each study programme („*Subject benchmark statements*”);
- (vii) to describe and comment for the next **four** years its own strategy for consolidating good results and removing the identified defaults;
- (viii) to identify the disciplines or fields at the level of the whole institution that exemplify good practice and illustrate the formulated statements.

8. When the institution is trained during the external evaluation in a process of changing its own system or procedures, the Agency shall accept the lack of availability of the records that illustrate the new structures' efficiency. In these conditions, the institution must refer to the way it manages and monitors the changing process. The Agency expects for these changes to be operated by the institution during the authorisation/accreditation process.

Submitting the documents to the Agency

9. The institution is required to submit to the Agency the self-evaluation as well as the other documents and records, attached in a copy in printed and electronic format, according to the Calendar of the organisation and carrying out of the external institutional process for authorisation/accreditation, respectively at least two months before the external evaluation visit.

Confidentiality

10. The content of the institution's self-evaluation documents remains confidential at the level of Agency and external evaluation team. Nevertheless, in case if the advice of independent experts is necessary on fields or subject areas, the self-evaluation documents shall be placed at their disposal, in conditions of confidentiality commitment of the data they operate with.

Aspects related to the operation and management of the information received by the Agency and students

Introduction

1. Students represent the main objective of each institutional evaluation. Therefore, they are invited to take part in the main stages of this process. The students' representative organisation within the institution – normally the students' organisation or its equivalent – has the possibility to participate in most of the stages of an external evaluation process, starting with the preliminary visit of the director of institutional evaluation mission that takes place five months before the evaluation visit. Moreover, the members of the representative structure and other students, are also invited to take part in the stages of the institutional evaluation visit. These meetings offer the students the opportunity to ensure that the external evaluation team is aware of the most important aspects for them.

2. In order to start the external evaluation process, the university must present the institutional self-evaluation documents, as well as the statement by means of which it ensures the Agency that the information provided to the students and other categories of interested public are clear, complete and trustful. The Agency encourages the university to consult the students with regard to the content of the self-evaluation documents and to invite students, through their representative organisation, to elaborate their own written report.

3. The students' written report offers additional possibilities by means of which the students, through their representative organisation, notify the external institutional evaluation team on the most important aspects for them. This report represents the result of a voluntary action within the external evaluation process and no institution shall be penalised if its students do not wish to submit a written report to the commission of evaluators.

Format, dimension and content

4. There is no pre-established rule regarding the format and dimension of the students' written report or a pre-established list of the elements it should contain. Students are free to provide any type of information they consider adequate and useful for the objectives of the external institutional evaluation process and to elaborate it as they wish.

5. Nevertheless, the report includes a presentation of the students' organisation, of its representativeness among the university's students, if the report has in view only the students from an educational cycle or expresses points of view of all categories of students, information with concern to the way the opinions were gathered and the way of elaboration, the relation between the students' organisation, the university management and institution's administration, whether and how they took notice of the content of the university's official self-evaluation documents etc.

6. The report does not represent an alternative to the institutional self-evaluation documents and do not have to be a comment of the institutional self-evaluation documents. Students can choose to consider the issues used by the institution in elaborating its self-evaluation documents and/or take into consideration the interest fields particularly pursued within the external institutional evaluation and communicated by the mission director at the preliminary visit five months prior to the visit.

These include:

- The accuracy, complete and trustful character of the information published by the institution about the quality of its programmes and graduation standards (there can be included the accuracy of publicity materials and referrals to the programmes' specifications).
- The information received by the students on the expected academic performances, their experience resulted from the study programmes and the method of evaluating their performances (aspects may be included, such as: the useful character of the professional supervision guides for study programmes, the evaluation and feed-back received by the students for their academic performances).
- Students' experience in the learning process (here can be included the quality of the academic and non-academic support and access to the learning facilities).
- Students' participation in the quality management and graduation standards within the institution (this could include the representation possibility within the commissions at university and programme level, but also other modalities to provide the feed-back to the institution's teaching staff and management).

7. The report drawn up by the students must not comment upon the competence of certain members of the teaching staff or management nor contain claims/personal complaints.

Style

8. The written report must:

- Be balanced and relevant.
- Be concise.
- Present an adequate balance between description and evaluation.

Elaboration/drawing up details

9. The students' report must be transmitted to the Agency at least two months prior to the institutional evaluation visit.

Confidentiality

10. The Agency particularly supports the dialogue between the students' organisation and institution, and recommends that students should transmit the written report to the institution and that the institution should provide the students' organisation with its self-evaluation documents. This openness enables the external evaluation team to freely discuss both documents, with the university staff and students during the evaluation process and to verify the accuracy of their contents. If the students' organisation wishes so, it may request, even at submitting the document, that the written report should not be placed at the institution's disposal and that its confidentiality should be maintained by the Agency, by the team and any other independent expert requested to assist the team within its activity. The Agency shall respect this wish, but students should take into consideration the fact that the confidential use of their report brings about a weak impact at university level, as the institution's personnel does not know the students' opinion.

The informative structure of the Agency's *External institutional evaluation report for temporary authorisation/accreditation*

Summary

The executive summary has a common structure for all the external evaluation reports submitted to the attention of the Agency's Council and comprises in its final part the evaluation results and conclusions. It **addresses the wide public**, especially to the potential students and is available separately from the rest of the report. This summary comprises:

- Introductory statement on the evaluation's general objectives
- Summary of the evaluation commission's conclusions
- Credibility of the information disseminated by the institution
- Assessing the academic infrastructure
- Good practice characteristics
- Statement on the confidence granted to the institution, materialised through the authorisation/non-authorisation or accreditation/non-accreditation proposal, as the case may be
- Recommendations on the institution's activity

The external institutional evaluation report

The external institutional evaluation report is prepared **for the use of the audited university and for the Agency's database**. After being approved by the Agency's Council, this report is published on the Agency's website together with the letter of the evaluated university.

The main report consists of three parts:

- (1) a descriptive introduction with standard content (the institution's dimension, type, mission and particularities, organisational structure, list of programmes on university study cycles, the type of information disseminated by the institution for students and candidates, the progress registered since the last academic evaluation);
- (2) a description of the evaluation process with the conclusions of each analysis stage of quality assurance at institutional and study programme level, of fulfilling the graduation standards; this part also contains observations on the results of the discussions carried out with the teaching staff representatives, with the students, graduates and possibly the graduates' employers;

(3) assessments with regard to the credibility, accuracy and complete character of the published information.

External evaluation results

The external evaluation results throughout the institution refer to the institution's managerial capacity to ensure and continuously improve the quality of study programmes; the capacity to efficiently support learning in order to achieve graduation standards. These results can be thus structured:

- The efficiency of the institutional procedures of programme quality assurance.
- The efficiency of the institutional procedures of ensuring graduation standards.
- The efficiency of the institutional procedures of supporting the educational process.
- The internal evaluation results of the study programmes' quality.
- The students' use of the academic infrastructure.
- The utility of the self-evaluation documents in illustrating the institution's capacity to reflect its own possibilities and limits and the way to manage them in order to enforce quality and graduation standards.
- The credibility of the information disseminated by the institution with regard to the study programmes.
- Good practice aspects
- Statement related to the confidence granted to the institution
- Recommendations for the activity of the education provider/institution