"Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy, Bucharest

EVALUATION REPORT

May 2013

Team:
Prof. Winfried Müller, Chair
Prof. Carmen Fenoll
Nicolai Slotte
Dr Karen Willis, Team Coordinator

Table of contents

1.   Introduction

This report is the result of the evaluation of *"Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy*. The evaluation took place in 2012-13 in the framework of the project "Performance in Research, Performance in Teaching – Quality, Diversity, and Innovation in Romanian Universities", which aims at strengthening core elements of Romanian universities, such as their autonomy and administrative competences, by improving their quality assurance and management proficiency.

The evaluations are taking place within the context of major reforms in the Romanian higher education system, and specifically in accordance with the provisions of the 2011 Law on Education and the various related normative acts.

While the institutional evaluations are taking place in the context of an overall reform, each university is assessed by an independent IEP team, using the IEP methodology described below.

1.1.   The Institutional Evaluation Programme

The Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) is an independent membership service of the European University Association (EUA) that offers evaluations to support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture. The IEP is a full member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and is listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR).

The distinctive features of the Institutional Evaluation Programme are:
- A strong emphasis on the self-evaluation phase
- A European perspective
- A peer-review approach
- A support to improvement

The focus of the IEP is the institution as a whole and not the individual study programmes or units. It focuses upon:
- Decision-making processes and institutional structures and effectiveness of strategic management
- Relevance of internal quality processes and the degree to which their outcomes are used in decision-making and strategic management as well as perceived gaps in these internal mechanisms.

The evaluation is guided by four key questions, which are based on a 'fitness for (and of) purpose' approach:

- What is the institution trying to do?
- How is the institution trying to do it?
- How does the institution know it works?
- How does the institution change in order to improve?

1.2. The "Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy and the national context

"Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy (ANI) of Bucharest is one of the seven military-related universities in Romania. This organisation derives from the academic origins provided in 1991-1992 by the faculty of psychology and sociology at "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" Police Academy in Bucharest, from which the Higher Institute for Intelligence was founded in 1992 as a higher education institution under the auspices of the Romanian Intelligence Service. This was reorganised in 1995 as the National Institute of Intelligence, with two faculties: psycho-sociology and communication studies. In 2000, the National Intelligence Academy was then established with the aim of providing a professional basis for specialist intelligence activity. This institution has one faculty, the faculty of intelligence, but since 2010 has also encompassed the National Institute for Intelligence Studies, which aims to carry out scientific research in the field of intelligence and security.

Today, ANI offers undergraduate, Masters and doctoral programmes, as well as continuing professional development courses, and incorporates a doctoral school. These all have the primary vocational purpose of preparing or further developing students as specialists in the field of military science and intelligence for the Romanian Intelligence Service or one of the other national public services related to defence or security. According to the National Education Law of 2011, ANI was classified as one of the 30 teaching and scientific research/artistic/creative universities. Since its foundation ANI has been in a continuous process of transition and, according to the rector, continues to evolve and adapt to the frequently changing constraints arising from the national requirements on both intelligence and education. Especially during the last three years, strong efforts have been made to fulfil its clear mission effectively. The institutional autonomy of ANI, however, is limited by its dual external accountability to both the Romanian Intelligence Service, of which it is a military unit, and the Ministry of Education, for its recognition as a university.

1.3. The self-evaluation process

The self-evaluation process at ANI was led by a group of ten individuals, comprising the pro-rector (chair), the dean of faculty, the manager of the doctoral school, three heads of department (political and international relation studies; social sciences; and intelligence), the

head of the National Institute for Intelligence, a staff representative of the Evaluation and Quality Assurance Committee, the head of the management and educational activities department, and a students' representative. The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) describes the evidence collection and analysis processes coordinated by the self-evaluation group, who consulted with other constituencies throughout the academy in drafting the document.

The evaluation team appreciates the work undertaken in producing the extensive SER, which includes a thoughtful SWOT analysis identifying some important key themes. However, the evaluation team found that overall, despite its length, the SER gives only a very general description of the institution, which lacks specific details and numbers on the budget, students or staff.

The self-evaluation report, together with the appendices, was sent to the evaluation team in November 2012. The two visits of the evaluation team to the National Intelligence Academy took place from 12 to 14 December 2012 and from 3 to 5 April 2013, respectively. In between visits, the evaluation team was provided with some of the additional documentation it had requested. Some further documentation was provided in the course of the second visit. However, it was explained to the evaluation team at the end of their visit that more complete versions existed of several management documents, which had not been shared for reasons of confidentiality. It should therefore be noted that some of the team's recommendations may not fully reflect the reality presented by these unavailable documents.

During the two visits, meetings were arranged with the leadership of ANI (rector/commander, pro-rector, deputy commander, dean, head and members of senate, heads of departments), members of the academic and non-academic staff, students, and external partners (intelligence and other security services). All meetings were conducted through an interpreter.

1.4   The evaluation team

The evaluation team (hereinafter named the team) consisted of:
- Prof. Winfried Müller, former Rector, University of Klagenfurt, Austria, team chair;
- Prof. Carmen Fenoll, former Vice-Rector, Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha, Spain;
- Nicolai Slotte, student, University of Lund, Sweden;
- Dr Karen Willis, Dean of Academic Quality and Enhancement, University of Chester, UK, team coordinator.

The team thanks the Rector Prof. Ştefan Gheorghe Teodoru and Pro-Rector Prof. Gheorghe Toma both for their warm hospitality and for the open discussions. Prof. Toma, as the liaison contact for ANI, efficiently prepared and organised all meetings during the visit. Thanks are also extended to all staff, students and representatives from external partners that the team

met during their visits. The team also thanks Ms Delia-Cristina Gheorghiu and Ms Mihaela Ignătescu for their excellent translation work and for assisting the team with respect to many organisational details.

2.   Governance and institutional decision making

The National Intelligence Academy is a very distinctive type of higher education institution, having university status and being a military institution under the directive of the Romanian Intelligence Service. ANI aims to provide specialist higher education, which trains both intelligence operatives and analysts to work effectively for a range of public services and also develops their professional capabilities as graduates. ANI is a small institution, in a national context where there are six other higher education military institutions. Given its unique purpose and legal requirements, the leadership of ANI was strictly against any merger with another military institution. The team would therefore suggest that cooperation with other military institutions should be strengthened in order to extend the scope and depth of academic activities, and to enhance institutional autonomy for military universities.

It is clear from the *Strategic Plan 2011-2015*, that ANI values its status as a university consistent with its mission to extend beyond the provision of functional operational training, in order to develop in its students the expertise, which will enable them to operate at a high level in the Romanian Intelligence Service and other beneficiary security services. Such expertise includes the capacity to manage information and undertake research, which are capabilities reflecting the wider aims of university education.

Leadership at ANI is strong and highly motivated. The team observed the tensions, also highlighted by the senior leadership, arising from the dual nature of the institution's mission and the directing authorities to which it is subject. These were evident in many aspects of the organisation, including the structures and governance. ANI has a hybrid internal structure with two strands, one academic and one military. The leadership and the majority (about 90%) of the teaching staff hold both academic titles and military ranks. The rector is also a general and the commander of the academy. He or she is first elected by the university community, according to the law, and then is appointed as commander by the Ministry of National Defence. Uniforms are not worn by the academic staff in their daily work but students are required to do so.

As in many military education institutions, ANI has a clearly hierarchical and centralised decision-making procedure. Where final approval for decisions must be obtained from either the Romanian Intelligence Service, or the Ministry of Education, or both, it appeared to the team that this might constrain some administrative mechanisms and limit the internal opportunities to react to existing challenges.

However, the leadership of ANI claimed that the system now operates well. Alongside its dominant primary mission, ANI also reported benefits to being part of the university system, including quality assurance of provision, potential for research grants, and on the other hand to being a military institution with the development of graduates with job guarantee.

ANI is very small institution, currently (2012-2013) with 144 undergraduate students, and a total number of students on all programmes (including Masters, PhD and other continuing professional development courses) of fewer than 500. Undergraduate recruitment has dropped in recent years, reflecting the demands of the commissioning beneficiary services. The stakeholders, or beneficiaries, which are mainly the Romanian National Intelligence Service, or intelligence and security branches of other ministries and services, determine the number and gender distribution of new students. Since it is these beneficiary organisations that employ the students, the relationships between them and ANI are very close. The number of students that the institution accepts each year is decided by the stakeholders in accordance with their respective future demands. The team was told that this planning approach therefore enables a transparent budget process and effective matching of supply and demand between both parties. The students are guaranteed employment after graduation and provided with all the necessary resources to achieve this shared goal. Admission procedures are very selective and highly competitive. The team was advised that in recent years there have been 20 applications for each undergraduate study place.

ANI reported current staffing of 57 academic teachers, supplemented by a number of visiting professors who contribute further specialisms to the teaching activities, together with small teams of military trainers, researchers and administrators. Around 50 positions remain vacant, a reflection of the reduced student intake at present.

Because of its size, the Academy has a single faculty, with a dean and Faculty Council. However, the overall institutional structure is complex. The three-level structure, comprising the Rectorate and Senate; the dean and Faculty Council; and heads of department and departments, derives from the 2011 law and the different definitions given there for these layers. The Senate is comprised of 11 members. The law requires a separation of function between its chair or president and the rector, and the Senate is concerned only with academic, not military matters. Senate members include three student representatives, one from each undergraduate level. The team was informed by students that the student representatives are elected by the student body (sometimes having been nominated by faculty), with the results validated by the faculty and later also approved by Senate. The leadership of ANI views it as essential to retain the authority potentially to veto an elected representative for security reasons, although it is the view of the team that, as all students have previously been screened for professional suitability, any subsequent inappropriate behaviour would be a disciplinary matter in any case. A student representative is able to be re-elected if all requirements are fulfilled.

It was explained to the team that the activities of Senate and the Faculty Council do not overlap, since Senate deals with wider matters, including those relating to the Institute of Intelligence Studies and to the doctoral school, which fall outside the remit of the faculty. The team understands that it is the responsibility of the dean to coordinate the academic departments and academic staff, whereas Senate is responsible for decisions affecting the

organisation of the institution's activities overall, and is responsible for the oversight of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

However, it appeared to the team that the agendas of the Faculty Council and Senate overlapped considerably and presented multiple decision-making procedures, particularly with regard to undergraduate studies. The team could see no clear reason why, in the interests of simplifying the structure of a small institution such as ANI, the Senate, which appears to be a very effective small group, might not also encompass the tasks of the Faculty Council. The team therefore recommends that, within the context of the law, the leadership of ANI considers this aspect of its current structure and practices, in order to support its capacity to react responsively to the challenges currently faced.

The *Strategic Plan 2011-2015* includes statements of interesting goals, but the team found it to be somewhat vague and lacking in concrete success indicators or statistical detail. It was also not evident to the team how these strategic goals translate into detailed operational activities and targets in the corresponding operational plan. The team therefore recommends that inclusion of benchmarks, of intermediate indicators and the definition of monitoring instruments to assist in measuring progress towards strategic achievements.

ANI receives its state budget indirectly from the Ministry of Education via the budget of the Romanian Intelligence Service. The budget process is cost-based, and includes department level estimations, which then are progressed through the organisation's structure for approval. The team was informed that budget details, trends and plans were classified and could not be made available for security reasons. Therefore, the team was provided with no evidence from which to comment on budget distribution, for example on research, teaching and staffing, or on whether this was increasing or decreasing. There do not appear to be any major financial problems in running the institution, and the team was informed that decisions on how to manage and spend the money, based on the budget allocated and in accordance with strategic planning, rested with the leadership of ANI.

The team formed the view that staffing and budget plans might better reflect the realities of current staffing requirements, rather than carry forward vacancies from year to year. Furthermore, the team formed the impression, supported by the SER, that research money is scarce. At the moment ANI has little possibility of attracting extra funding beside fees for postgraduate teaching and money for research activities. However, it is the view of the team that ANI has the potential to increase its income through consultancies and other projects with civilian society, and also possibly by cutting internal costs arising from its current complex structure.

3. Teaching and learning

In aiming to produce elite intelligence professionals, ANI operates a highly selective admissions procedure; in addition to academic criteria, it involves medical, psychological and security checks. This results in a dropout rate of less than 1%. The team was told that, following admission, students are expected to achieve consistently high academic grades; a student who does not attain a minimum performance of 70% may be asked to leave in order to not lower the institution's standards.

Students do not have to pay tuition fees and receive accommodation, meals, teaching materials, uniforms and some pocket money. In return for this, a military-style discipline is required and students have to commit themselves for a certain period to their sponsoring organisation. As result, graduates are guaranteed a job with the Romanian National Intelligence Service or one of the other sponsoring Romanian security bodies. A student is expected to stay in their future specialist occupation for up to 10 years after graduation.

Curricula are developed in close collaboration with, and approved by, the Romanian Intelligence Service. The content and learning outcomes of study programmes are also regularly reviewed and attuned to the needs of this and other beneficiary organisations, as future employers. Perhaps because of this particular stakeholder-led approach, the team was unable to find a clear sense of the wider higher education aim of educating critical members of society, and this may be a problematic point at this institution. However, the students who met the team appeared completely satisfied and highly committed to the ethos and values of serving their country.

There are three undergraduate degree programmes (Security and Intelligence Studies; Psychology and Intelligence Studies; and Communications, Public Relations and Intelligence Studies) and two types of Masters programme, professional (two programmes) and research (five programmes); the Masters programmes for intelligence officers are for either operatives or analysts. The subject focus of the undergraduate education lies in psychology and the social sciences, and the team formed the impression that neither IT nor foreign languages featured strongly in the curriculum. The meeting with students was conducted through a translator and, although the team was informed that all students learn English as part of their studies, it was not clear whether this is for academic credit. The team recommends that IT knowledge is strengthened in all programmes and that a foreign language policy should be developed for students and staff, with some courses or sessions offered in English. This might be supported, for example, by visiting professors giving lectures in English to increase students' working familiarity with the language.

The facilities appear very attractive and well-resourced. The team was informed that Internet access and the local IT infrastructure were being upgraded and saw evidence of recent

investment. The team commends this and recommends ANI to continue its efforts to develop e-learning.

There is an excellent teacher to student ratio, with no more than 15 students in one class. Each professor also acts as a tutor for groups of up to four students throughout each student's whole educational cycle. This promotes stability and communication between the faculty staff and students, in both personal and academic aspects of the students' experience. This system is much valued by both staff and students, as enabling a quick response to problems; the students who spoke to the team reported that they are listened to when they have a concern. Issues relating to academic performance are also addressed in the tutor-student relationship. A student is offered a minimum of two hours per week contact time with their tutor and can also contact the tutor whenever they might have a concern.

Students are highly motivated and fully respect the strictly regulated conditions within which they study. However, in comparison to undergraduates in most institutions, the team found that there was a tendency to overprotect these students, who could be encouraged to develop more independence and creativity in some activities.

The institution clearly has high expectations of their students and strives to ensure that all students achieve results to the standard expected. With this in mind, the team formed the opinion that more attention could be paid to informing students more clearly of the learning outcomes to be achieved. The students accept the high expectations of them to succeed in their studies but explicit learning outcomes need to be presented at the beginning of the course to enable students to achieve these expectations through their assessments.

The team noted that the SER places emphasis on a student-centred approach to learning, in which the students are "viewed as active partners in the educational process". It is claimed that teaching methods are continuously re-evaluated, with a view to varying approaches towards interactive, investigative and collaborative working. However, the team was not presented with any evidence of a formal learning and teaching strategy document or of whether there is any institutional level leadership of learning and teaching.

As well as lectures, much of the teaching is focused on case studies, problem-solving and seminars based on realistic situations. The team formed the impression that there was a considerable proportion of practical activity for a higher education institution curriculum. However, a strong emphasis on operational application of knowledge and skills is to be expected in vocational programmes. Although stakeholders are very happy with the level of integration of knowledge and skills, which the students bring both to their internships and to their subsequent employment, the team nonetheless questions whether there is sufficient academic focus on their programmes of study. This may be a consequence of the potential conflict within the institution's dual structures and purpose. In this sense, ANI's strength as an institution which educates its students effectively to fulfil specific roles with a closed set of employers may also represent a weakness, in that the narrowness and homogeneity of the

purpose of the curricula inevitably militate against the wider expansiveness of learning, questioning and critical thinking generally expected within a university, and particularly desirable in preparing graduates for intelligence work.

The team was interested to learn of the constraints imposed by the nature of this institution on the use of the Internet by students. Historically, Internet use had proved problematic because of the risks of disclosure both of classified information and of the identity of the students as future intelligence officers. The rector and other staff advised that this had been resolved by the use of two networks: an intranet for classified intelligence matters, and an external network for communication. The team was given to understand that the issue of compromising students' identity could in practice still be a constraint on their attendance at external public events or conferences, although ANI was committed in principle to the openness to knowledge associated with a university.

The team was made aware of some difficulties in recruiting sufficient academic staff, partly due to the strict criteria imposed by the Ministry of Education and partly due to the specialist nature of the disciplines and expertise required at ANI. Some use is made of hourly paid academic staff in niche subjects. Those staff leading on applied practice activities are classed as "military trainers". Many staff teach on both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes. The team was also told of some crossover of teaching staff with other universities, such as the University of Bologna, but the scale or frequency of such arrangements are not clear.

4.   Research

At postgraduate level, ANI runs both doctoral and continuing professional development training and development programmes. There are currently five PhD supervisors and 41 PhD students, a relatively high number for the size of the institution. The team was advised that not all of these students are currently active, thus enabling ANI to fulfil the legal requirement that each professor may supervise only up to eight PhD students at any given time. Additionally, the team learned of the use of non-tenured associate professors to supervise PhD theses. However, the team was informed that it was not easy to find appropriate PhD supervisors from outside ANI, and that this restriction led to concerns for growth. The team was informed that there were three applicants per PhD student place in 2012-2013.

Postgraduate studies are not funded by the Ministry of Education but by payment of fees and all students are in employment, meeting the minimum attendance requirement through attendance at weekends. Some are in military service and some are civilian, but all have a background of working in the intelligence or security fields. Students reported that they were undertaking the PhD for their own personal development and to develop their own areas of work, rather than as a requirement for their careers. The majority of PhD students are engaged in professional doctorates. Research topics undertaken by PhD students are chosen together with the supervisor and all relate to intelligence or security. The literature required is very specialised and mostly sourced through the ANI library. Students were very satisfied with the regular contact and availability of supervisors. Theses are defended publicly, and assessors include external specialists. Studies and final papers are published and are not usually classified documents.

ANI and the beneficiaries are proud of the work of their PhD students and consider this a means to improve the quality of their staff. The team understood that, for most teaching staff, research is generally undertaken in the periods of student examinations and holidays, with teaching as the institution's first priority. Some researchers in the National Institute for Intelligence also teach. The team recommends that ANI should assist young academic staff especially, for example by offering training in research methodologies, research grants and lower teaching loads, as far as possible within legal restrictions.

The team was informed that in 2012, 50 articles were published in specialist journals alongside 15 instances of participation in international sessions, mainly generated through the international security conference organised by ANI each year with 25 participating countries.

Enhancing research activity is an important goal of ANI, but also an area of concern due to poor funding. It appeared that the limited opportunities for international links and publishing, arising from security and confidentiality concerns, constrain opportunities for the growth and development of research at the institution. Research output has been low but is becoming

more visible internationally due to EU projects. The team recommends that ANI should continue to strengthen international research collaborations, to encourage interdisciplinary research and to increase the visibility of its research by being more active in relevant international security groups. This can be promoted by opening ANI further to the international scientific community, through mobility programmes, an extended languages policy, wider conference attendance and incentives to publish in international journals.

Furthermore, the team is of the opinion that the research potential of ANI would be enhanced by strengthening links with other universities, local authorities and enterprises and by using the institution's expertise to develop applied security research projects, internships and consultancies.

5.   Service to society

ANI serves society through the formation of well-educated and trained employees for the Romanian Intelligence Service and other Romanian security bodies. The team was impressed by the commitment, which ANI brings to this central purpose in training and educating present and future generations as practitioners in intelligence, as a service to the security of Romanian society. In this, ANI believes their model of combining intelligence training with a university education to be, although not perfect, both unique and effective as a means of equipping future officers to better understand the world in which they will carry out their activities. The feedback received by the team from the beneficiary organisations who sponsor and employ the students fully confirmed this view. Stakeholders and employers exercise direct influence on the education delivered and accordingly are highly satisfied with the outcomes. Representatives of the stakeholders are invited on occasion to meetings of the Senate and other boards.

In addition to the aim of preparing specialised intelligence officers, ANI also aims to promote a culture of security within civil society, particularly through those undertaking professional Masters programmes, and to promote knowledge-based research in the field of intelligence.

The team commends the lifelong learning activities of ANI and encourages the institution to continue to offer its important services to society through education and research in the fields of intelligence and security. The team also recommends that ANI should extend and strengthen its relationship with civilian society and strive to create more awareness of security aspects in other contexts and industries. There was potential to generate business with civilian partners by preparing and presenting examples of good consultancies and research through non-classified case studies.

The team also commends ANI's promotion of its study and educational programmes in the security field through visits to secondary schools and by use of media and recommends continuation of this approach to marketing its teaching programmes and research.

6.   Quality culture

ANI has established an Evaluation and Quality Assurance Committee, which oversees an annual report and the evaluation of quality. Stakeholders also have a strong influence on the quality of education, which, as a core value of the institution, forms the foundation of its reputation.

The quality culture focuses on all aspects of the education and both military and civil teaching staff are evaluated every academic year. They are awarded grades derived from a "360-degree" model of self-evaluation, student evaluation, peer evaluation and manager evaluation. Beneficiary organisations also evaluate at a strategic level through the performance of the students in internships and (after graduation) in employment. These combined conclusions influence institutional planning at operational and strategic levels. However, for reasons of confidentiality, the team was not given access to any evidence of the use made of the excellent range of collected data to define goals, numerical targets or self-improvement measures in strategic and operational planning, or of any financial or budgetary implications. In view of this, the team recommends that quality arrangements be further strengthened, for example by benchmarking with other institutions and strategic planning with clear goals, indicators, responsibilities and monitoring instruments.

Staff training is provided and partially obligatory (for example, for new staff without teaching experience). Evaluation results have an important impact on staff promotion and financial rewards, and are subject to discussion within departments, the Faculty Council and Senate. Although certain internal quality arrangements could be further strengthened and improved, the team recognises a strong ethos of quality culture within the whole institution, supported by its beneficiary organisations.

The team formed the impression that ownership by the students of quality processes could be stronger. Student engagement is predominantly passive but they could be encouraged, for example, to participate in the formation and development of questionnaires. The team recommends that ANI consider the European Standards and Guidelines on student engagement and involvement.

7. Internationalisation

From their initial meeting with the rector, and reinforced through several subsequent meetings, it was made clear that to the team that internationalisation poses some considerable challenges for ANI. The view expressed by senior staff of the institution was that, due to the sensitive nature of classified intelligence work, there were restrictions on the possibility of student exchanges with other countries. To have students from other countries studying in the institution would be regarded as a threat to national security. All students at ANI are Romanian, and the institution would not consider admitting students of any other nationality within their admissions criteria. Additionally, the rigorous study requirements and timelines of the ANI programmes would make it difficult for their students to miss any of this study time through visits elsewhere. The protection of the identities of the students is also considered a matter of national and personal security, which, if compromised, would affect their future careers. Although ANI acknowledged that the breadth to be gained from internationalisation is a fundamental characteristic of most university education and would be desirable, it appeared to the team that the institution regarded the challenges presented by this dimension of higher education as not yet soluble.

However, the IEP team was interested to note that the representatives of stakeholder organisations did not all appear to hold the same view on this as ANI. They were generally enthusiastic and supportive of the idea of students undertaking exchanges, and believed that an international perspective would be relevant and valuable given that students were preparing to enter a profession in which they would have contact with parties outside Romania. They advocated the advantages of mobility for students in order to familiarise themselves with foreign cultures and to learn foreign languages. However, the beneficiary representatives also acknowledged the constraints on doing so, and that this was a matter on which ANI should be able to determine its own position.

The team concludes that this provides an illustration of the tension that exists between the requirements for universities and those for national intelligence. Romania is member of NATO and the EU, and Romanian higher education institutions have committed themselves to the Bologna ideals. The team found it surprising that, at this stage, ANI has no detailed policy document on internationalisation and that there is little formalised exchange activity at university level. The team was informed that academics should and do partake in international conferences relating to their research fields; the institution highly values this aspect and therefore also organises an annual conference on aspects of security. As only those papers which are not classified are presented at such conferences, it is complicated to establish a full picture of ANI's research productivity in an international arena.

The team commends the annual conference, but believes that there is much more to be done. In order to produce internationally recognised research it is also necessary to have

international cooperation and to publish in international journals. The SER mentions some links with other security institutions, but no concrete details of partner organisations or any aspect of mobility are stated. A greater focus on international collaborative activity, including developing a few trust-based major strategic partnerships and research collaborations, would both satisfy the stakeholders and provide valuable knowledge about other intelligence institutions and cultures.

The team recommends that ANI should give consideration to establishing short-term student internships abroad and signing agreements with appropriate institutions to promote mobility of students and staff. The team recognises ANI's expressed concerns over the risks of compromising the identities of future intelligence officers, and recommends that the institution should discuss these with the Intelligence Service, whose representative was in favour of such development. The issue of recognition and acceptance of courses and credits earned at other Romanian universities and abroad also requires resolution.

The team would encourage ANI to define a clear language policy, with compulsory learning of foreign languages, beyond the existing provision. The team was unable to form a reliable impression of the command of English by the staff and students, as all communications were translated from English to Romanian and vice-versa, which is very rare in a contemporary European HE institution.

Overall, the team recommends that ANI should establish a strategy for internationalisation and defines clear goals to progress these activities, within the given constraints of a military intelligence institution.

8.   Summary of key recommendations

Governance and institutional decision making

- Define performance indicators based on benchmarks from comparable institutions against all goals and objectives in the Strategic Plan 2011-2015.
- Monitor progress with the Strategic Plan regularly and elaborate corresponding operational plans.
- Reconsider the processes of student representation, in order to give students the right and sole responsibility for appointing their own representatives.
- Reconsider the optimal structure and decision-making procedures for ANI (Can they be simplified?).
- Strengthen cooperation with other military institutions in order to extend the scope and depths of academic activities.
- Try to increase own income (consultancies, projects with civilian society) and research money, but also try to cut internal costs.

Teaching and learning

- Continue strategies for implementing all aspects of the Bologna agreement, for example regarding student-centred learning and internationalisation.
- Promote activities organised by students to encourage creativity and independence.
- Continue efforts with e-learning.
- Strengthen IT knowledge in all programmes.
- Further develop a foreign language policy for students and staff and offer courses delivered in English.
- Support mobility of teachers and learners.

Research

- ANI should strengthen research collaborations.
- ANI should encourage interdisciplinary research.
- ANI should increase visibility of its research by being more active in respective international security research groups.
- ANI especially should assist young academic staff by offering training in research methodologies, research grants, lower teaching loads.
- Beside the existing excellent contacts with the Intelligence Service, strengthen links with other universities, local authorities and enterprises (applied security research projects, internships, consultancies, etc.).
- Further open ANI to the international scientific community (mobility programmes, language policy, collaborative research, conference attendance, etc.).
- Promote publications in recognised international journals.

Service to society

- The team encourages ANI to continue its way of offering important services to society through education and research in the security area.
- The team commends the lifelong learning activities of ANI and encourages the continuation of existing activities.
- ANI should strengthen and improve its relationship with the "civilian world".
- The team commends the promotion of ANI's study programmes and education in the security area to schools and media and recommends continuation of this form of marketing its teaching programmes and research.
- ANI should present examples of good consultancies and research in order to attract potential business with civilian partners.

Quality culture

- QA should not be a bureaucratic burden but an instrument of self-improvement that permeates the routines of ANI.
- Students should be involved in the QA procedures according to the ESG.
- The collected data should be used more explicitly for further development of the institution.
- Certain internal quality arrangements should be further strengthened and improved (e.g., benchmarking with other institutions, strategic planning with clear goals, indicators, responsibilities and monitoring instruments).
- Inform students more explicitly of the intended learning outcomes of each course.

Internationalisation

- Define clear goals for internationalisation activities and continue efforts for internationalisation of study programmes, research and all other aspects of international relevance, within the given constraints of a military intelligence institution.
- Elaborate a strategy for internationalisation (strategic partnerships, research collaborations).
- Establish short-term student internships abroad.
- Sign agreements with appropriate institutions abroad to promote mobility of students and staff and establish research collaborations.
- Recognition and acceptance of courses and credits earned at other Romanian universities and abroad has to be resolved.
- Define a clear policy for the use of foreign languages including the provision of courses in English.

9. Conclusion

ANI is a well-established elite institution with strong leadership, highly motivated staff, committed students and very favourable support from its stakeholders, which together equip it with the capacity to meet and respond to the security challenges in Romanian society.

The institution upholds a good quality of education but there is scope to evolve in a number of aspects, to uphold the European Standards and Guidelines.

It appears to the team that the security and confidentiality dilemma of ANI hinders internationalisation, development of cross-cultural experience, intercultural competencies, language skills and specialist IT knowledge. As these skills are very important for modern intelligence professionals, ANI is advised to confront and manage these issues, in order to find a way of joining the international community of military academies and universities without losing its specialist mission.

The team has confidence that ANI will continue to contribute to Romanian society through education and research in the intelligence and security areas, and that it will master the challenges and find its way to becoming an internationally recognised institution, both in the field of educating future intelligence service staff and in security and intelligence-related research.