

ROMANIA  
ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE  
“MIHAI VITEAZUL” NATIONAL  
INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY

No. 193147 of 14.07.2021



**METHODOLOGY**  
**for evaluating the individual performance of the teaching staff**  
**within**  
**“Mihai Viteazul” National Intelligence Academy**

Approved in “Mihai Viteazul” National Intelligence Academy Senate meeting of July 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021.

- Bucharest, 2021-

## LEGAL BACKGROUND

- Law of National Education no. 1 of 2011, with subsequent amendments and additions;
- Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75 of 2005 on the quality assurance in education, with subsequent amendments and additions;
- Law no. 87 of 2006 for the approval of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75 of 2005 on quality assurance in education, with subsequent amendments and additions;
- Decision no. 915 of December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017 on the amendment of the annex to the Government Decision no. 1418 of 2006 for the approval of the *Methodology for external evaluation, standards, reference standards, and list of performance indicators of the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education*;
- Decision nr. 993 of November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020 on the approval of the institutional evaluation *Methodology for the authorization, accreditation and periodic evaluation of the education providing organizations*.

## CHAPTER I GENERAL DISPOSITIONS

Art. 1. This methodology aims to describe the way of organizing and conducting the activity of evaluating the individual performance of the teaching staff within “Mihai Viteazul” National Intelligence Academy, hereinafter referred to as ANIMV.

Art. 2. (1) The subjects of the evaluations are teaching and research staff and tenured military instructors within ANIMV, who conduct educational activities in university and postgraduate study programs.

(2) Teaching and research staff, military instructors, and visiting professors, who conduct teaching activities in continuous training programs, are to be evaluated according to the *Operational procedure for collecting and evaluating feedback within ANIMV*.

Art. 3. The purpose of the evaluation is to correctly measure and appreciate the professional performances of the personnel nominated in article 2, to identify the appropriate ways of consolidating a culture of quality and to establish the most suitable measures to ensure the conditions for increasing the performance of the evaluated personnel.

## CHAPTER II

### EVALUATION COMPONENTS

Art. 4. Evaluation of the teaching staff within ANIMV is conducted according to the Law of National Education no. 1 of 2011, with subsequent amendments and additions, according to which, “the results and performances of the teaching and research activities of the teaching and research staff of the university are periodically evaluated, at intervals of maximum 5 years” (art. 303, paragraph 1).

Art. 5. The evaluation process is conducted at the beginning of the academic year, following the assessment period.

Art. 6. The evaluation will be conducted in compliance with the following rules:

- a) The evaluation is open, honest and formative;
- b) The evaluation standards are the same for all evaluated staff members;
- c) The evaluation is attended by: head of department, colleagues from within the department, elected in the evaluation commission, students, and, through self-evaluation, the evaluated teaching staff;
- d) The reviews are formulated so that they encompass all the professional achievements of the evaluated person, regardless of the level of complexity, the amount of time required, and the effort made;
- e) The evaluated person has the right to appeal the evaluation result and request the re-evaluation of their professional performance;
- f) The final results of the individual evaluation are confidential. This information is available for the head of department, the dean, the commandant (rector) and the evaluated person. Members of the evaluation commission have access to statistical data on the peer evaluation. The chairman of the Commission for Evaluation and Quality Assurance (CEAC) has access to statistical data on faculties. The member of the Quality Assurance Office designated to summarize and process the evaluation questionnaires given to the students, has a non-disclosure obligation on the processed data. Statistical data is analyzed in the departments and faculties councils.

Art. 7. The components of the teaching staff evaluation provided in this methodology are in accordance with the *Methodology for external evaluation, standards, reference standards, and list of performance indicators of the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, and they encompass:

- a) Self-evaluation;
- b) Evaluation by the management;
- c) Peer evaluation;
- d) Evaluation by the students.

## CHAPTER III

### EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Art. 8 - (1) The evaluation process is coordinated by the CEAC.

(2) Heads of departments are responsible for organizing the evaluation of the teaching staff, military instructors, and subordinate military personnel. The heads of departments have the obligation to support the activities of organizing the collection of specific information for the evaluation of teaching staff.

Art. 9 The evaluation of the teaching staff is mandatory and is conducted based on the following documents:

- a) Evaluation sheet for teaching staff/ self-evaluation sheet/ (Annex no.1);
- b) The questionnaire for evaluating the teaching activity given to the students, established by the specific procedure for the feedback evaluation within ANIMV;
- c) Peer evaluation sheet (Annex no. 2).

Art. 10 **Self-evaluation** is conducted annually, by each teacher, based on the completion of a multi-criteria self-evaluation sheet (Annex no. 1).

Art. 11 (1) **Evaluation by the management** is conducted based on the self-evaluation, by the head of the department, who may be assisted by two colleagues appointed by decision of the faculty council.

(2) Scores range from 1 to 10, with 2 decimals. If, after the evaluation, the score is higher or lower by 1,5 points than the one obtained in the self-evaluation, the head of department will request another evaluation from the CEAC / the quality assurance structure within the faculty.

(3) The evaluation conducted by the faculty CEAC is considered final and brought to the attention of the evaluated teaching staff member, who signs for confirmation.

Art. 12 - (1) **Peer evaluation** is coordinated by the Department Council and it requires that each member of the department evaluates at least 3 colleagues from the same structure, using the form in Annex no. 2. For departments where this is not possible, their members will evaluate colleagues from other departments, depending on their need.

(2) In the peer evaluation sheet, the name of the evaluator is optional, each teacher can choose whether or not to specify his/her name on the collegial evaluation sheet. If specified, the identity of the evaluators is considered confidential.

(3) The peer evaluation is based on directly known data and those resulting from the participation in the lectures and seminars held by the evaluated person.

(4) The peer evaluation respects the principle that the evaluators have a teaching or research degree at least equal to that of the person being evaluated.

(5) The coordination and organization of the peer evaluation process is the responsibility of the department council, which may appoint one of its members for this purpose.

Art. 13 - (1) **Evaluation of teaching staff by the students** is conducted in accordance with *Operational procedure for collecting and evaluating feedback within ANIMV*, approved by the ANIMV Senate.

- (2) The evaluation is conducted every semester and consists of applying a questionnaire<sup>1</sup> which can be completed anonymously either in physical or electronic format.
- (3) The evaluation process of teaching staff by the students is coordinated by the head of department.
- (4) The responsibility of collecting and interpreting the questionnaires rests with a specific person designated by CEAC.
- (5) Any actions that could (directly or indirectly) manipulate, condition or influence students in the free expression of opinions, are forbidden.
- (6) The results are analyzed by the CEAC and made available to the head of department.
- (7) Each teacher is informed by the head of department on the evaluation results for each individual subject, in order to improve the specific performance of each evaluation criterion, thus aiming for a continuous increase in the quality level of the teaching act.

#### **CHAPTER IV CONDUCTING THE EVALUATION**

Art. 14. – **Peer evaluation** is to be conducted as follows:

- a) In October, the director/ head of department establishes the schedule for conducting peer evaluations, including the participation of evaluators in lectures and seminars, from November to June, so that each teacher attends classes at least twice in the case of each of the colleagues they will evaluate; at the same time, the director/ head of department conducts training classes for the evaluators;
  - b) The participation schedule of the evaluators in lectures and seminars is brought to the attention of the teaching staff in the department.
  - c) After the completion of the peer evaluation, in the first half of June, the evaluators present the results of the peer evaluation to the director/ head of department.
- (2) Performance criteria will be operationalized through specific performance scales, approved annually by the faculty department council board, with CEAC endorsement.
  - (3) The possible evaluation grades will be: excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory.

Art. 15. – **Evaluation by students/ trainees** is to be conducted as follows:

- (1) For university study programs, the evaluation of teaching staff by students usually takes place in the first half of March and June. All students participate in the evaluation, regardless of the form of education they attend.
- (2) For postgraduate, initial and continuing training programs, the evaluation of teaching staff by students takes place after the completion of each program.
- (3) For the situations provided for under paragraphs (1) and (2), the director/ head of department makes the following data available to the Quality Assurance Office, at least 5 working days before the evaluation of the teaching staff by students/ trainees: date, time,

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Operational procedure for collecting and evaluating feedback within ANIMV.*

place, number of participants and list of teachers who participated in each individual study program.

(4) Based on the data received from the structures, a representative of the Quality Assurance Office ensures the required number of questionnaires, supervises their completion by the students/ trainees, collects them after completion, and hands them over to the specific person designated by the CEAC for data processing, through a program specialized in data interpretation. The designated person must not be among the evaluated teaching staff members. During lock down, feedback is provided online.

(5) Results of processing the questionnaires constitute preliminary data for analysis at the department, faculty and university level.

(6) The evaluation result is accessible to the director/ head of department, the dean, the rector and the evaluated person.

(7) The evaluation results are discussed individually, processed statistically, by departments, faculties, and at the level of ANIMV, in order to formulate policies for improving quality.

Art. 16. **Self-evaluation** is to be conducted as follows:

(1) In the first half of June, the teaching staff makes the self-evaluation sheet available to the director/ head of department.

(2) For the self-evaluation sheet, the self-analysis of individual performance applies for the current academic year.

Art. 17. **Evaluation by management** is to be conducted in the first half of July.

Art. 18. The conclusions and proposals resulting from the evaluation are presented to the chairman of CEAC, so that they are included in the *Annual Internal Evaluation Report on the Quality of Education in ANIMV*, which is presented to the University Senate, as well as to the Quality Assurance Office in the Education, in order to capitalize on the information necessary to develop the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education institutional self-evaluation documentation.

## **CHAPTER V APPEALS AND RESULTS SUMMARIZATION**

Art.19 – (1) The teaching staff who have objections to the results of the evaluation may file an appeal within 3 working days from the date of communication of the individual score.

(2) The appeal is transmitted to the Dean of the faculty and is solved by a committee appointed by a decision of the Faculty Council.

(3) The individuals involved in the evaluation process, the Dean of the Faculty or the head of department to which the person who appealed the evaluation belongs, cannot be a part of the Appeals Committee.

(4) The Appeals Committee may decide to reject the appeal or to nullify the evaluation conducted by the evaluated person.

(5) The Appeals Committee shall settle the appeal within 5 working days from the date of its registration. The solution of the Appeals Committee shall be communicated in written form to the appellant.

Art. 20 (1) After solving the appeals, the results of the evaluation are processed and summarized, as follows:

- a) Summary sheet on the results of the evaluation by the management, drawn up by the head of department (Annex no. 3);
- b) Summary sheet on the results of the evaluation by the students, drawn up by a person designated to CEAC and transmitted to the head of department (Annex no. 4);
- c) Sheet on the results of the evaluation process drawn up by the head of department and sent to the Dean (Annex no. 5);
- d) Synthetic evaluation sheet at department level (by teaching degrees), drawn up by the head of department and transmitted to CEAC-Faculty (Annex no. 6);
- e) Synthetic evaluation sheet at Faculty level, drawn up by CEAC-Faculty and integrated in the Annual Self-evaluation Report made at Faculty level, and transmitted to CEAC (Annex no. 7);

Art.21 Depending on the results of the evaluation, the Faculty Council will identify managerial/internal control measures aimed at the improvement of the specific quality standards' implementation.

## **CHAPTER VI FINAL PROVISIONS**

Art. 22 This Methodology enters into force on the date of its approval by the ANIMV Senate.

Art. 23 Any amendment, determined by the appearance of new normative acts at national level, recommendations of the Ministry of Education, or internal considerations, shall be approved by the Academy Senate.

Art. 24 The annexes are an integral part of this Methodology.

Art. 25 At the date of entry into force of this Methodology, *the Methodology for assuring and evaluating the quality of teaching staff within „Mihai Viteazul” National Intelligence Academy*, the 2015 edition, is repealed.

**ROMANIA**  
**ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**  
**“MIHAI VITEAZUL” NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY**

**Faculty** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department** \_\_\_\_\_

Name and surname of the teacher	
Teaching degree	

**Evaluation form – teaching staff**

**MULTI-CRITERIA EVALUATION SHEET**  
 THE EVALUATED TEACHING/RESEARCH STAFF

ASSESSMENT CRITERION	HEAD OF DEPARTMENT	PEER EVALUATION	EVALUATION BY STUDENTS
SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE			
DIDACTIC CAPACITY			



RESEARCH POTENTIAL			
PROFESSIONAL DEONTOLOGY			

**ROMANIA**  
**ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**  
**“MIHAI VITEAZUL” NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY**

**Faculty** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department** \_\_\_\_\_

Name and surname of the teacher	
Teaching degree	

## SELF-EVALUATION SHEET

(TEMPLATE)

Teaching position .....

Period of evaluation .....

### I. TEACHING CAPACITY AND LEVEL OF PROFESSIONAL TRAINING (KNOWLEGDE)

1. Documentation activity conducted: ...
2. Sources of documentation used in the field of the job: ...
3. Teaching methods used: ...
4. Teaching methods used in seminars: ...
5. Study supports for lectures/seminars: ...
6. National and international recognition: ...
7. Conclusions resulting from evaluation by students, according to Annex no. 3 a and b...

### II. RESEARCH ACTIVITY

1. Books, monographs, public treaties in recognized publishing houses: ...
2. Studies published in specialized journals, with reviewers and editorial collectives: ...
3. Conferences/synthesis papers presented at scientific manifestations: ...
4. Papers published in the volumes of national and/or international conferences, with reviewers and program committee: ...
5. Approved patents, applied products: ...
6. Scientific awards, awarded on papers: ...
7. Grants won through competition: ...

- 8. Scientific research contracts: ...
- 9. Scientific research reports etc.: ...

**III. ACADEMIC ETHICS:**

Conclusion of the head of department:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of the head department: \_\_\_\_\_

I am aware of the evaluation made by the head of department	
Date:	
Signature of the evaluated teacher	

Comments made by CEAC faculty/ANIMV (if applicable):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of the CEAC faculty/ANIMV  
chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

I am aware of the evaluation made by the CEAC faculty/ANIMV	
Date:	
Signature of the evaluated teacher	

**ROMANIA  
ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE  
"MIHAI VITEAZUL" NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY**

**Faculty** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Department** \_\_\_\_\_

Name and surname of the evaluated teacher (teaching/management staff)	
Teaching degree	Military Training Instructor/Teaching assistant/Lecturer/Visiting professor/Professor
Teaching staff	

**Peer evaluation sheet**

Indicate the level of performance using the following scale:

No.	Criteria	Performance level/Score
1.	PRESENTATION DESIGN	
2.	CLASSROOM ATMOSPHERE	
INDIVIDUAL TOTAL SCORE (average performance level)		

Comments on the evaluated teacher:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Name and surname of the evaluator (optional):

**ROMANIA**  
**ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**  
**“MIHAI VITEAZUL” NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY**

Faculty \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary sheet on the results of the evaluation by the  
management**

No.	Name and surname of the evaluated teacher	Teaching degree	Evaluation result (rating)	Comments

Head of Department:

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**ROMANIA**  
**ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**  
**“MIHAI VITEAZUL” NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY**

Faculty \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

**Summary sheet on the results of the evaluation by the students**

No.	Name and surname of the evaluated teacher	Teaching degree	Total average score	Rating	Comments

Person designated by CEAC ANIMV

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**ROMANIA**  
**ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**  
**“MIHAI VITEAZUL” NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY**

Faculty \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

**Sheet on the results of the evaluation process**

No.	Name and surname of the evaluated teacher	Teaching degree	Evaluation result			
			Evaluation by management	Peer evaluation	Evaluation by students	Final result

Head of Department:

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**ROMANIA**  
**ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**  
**“MIHAI VITEAZUL” NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY**

Faculty \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

**Synthetic sheet of the evaluation process at department level**  
**(synthetic/non-nominal situation)**

No.	Teaching degree	Number of teachers/	Forms of evaluation/Rating			
			Rating	Evaluation by management	Peer evaluation	Evaluation by students
1.	Professor					
2.	Visiting professor					
3.	Lecturer					
4.	Teaching assistant					
5.	Military Training Instructor					



Head of Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**Annex no. 7**

**ROMANIA  
ROMANIAN INTELLIGENCE SERVICE  
“MIHAI VITEAZUL” NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ACADEMY**

**Synthetic sheet of the evaluation process at faculty level  
(synthetic/non-nominal situation)**

No.	Teaching degree	Number of teachers	Forms of evaluation/Rating			
			Rating	Evaluation by management	Peer evaluation	Evaluation by students
1.	Professor					
2.	Visiting professor					
3.	Lecturer					
4.	Teaching assistant					

Dean: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_