

UNIVERSITY OF MEDICINE AND PHARMACY IN TIRGU MURES (UMFTGM)

FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION REPORT

June 2017

Team:

Prof. Dr. Juan Viñas, Chair

Prof. Ir. Hans Beunderman

Ian McCready

Dr. Oliver Vettori, Team

Coordinator

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Governance and institutional decision-making.....	6
3. Quality culture	8
4. Teaching and learning	10
5. Research	12
6. Service to society.....	14
7. Internationalisation	16
8. Conclusions.....	18

1. Introduction

This report is the result of a follow-up evaluation of the University of Medicine and Pharmacy in Tîrgu Mureş (UMPTGM). The European University Association's (EUA) Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) originally evaluated the University of Medicine and Pharmacy in Tîrgu Mureş in 2013 and submitted its report to the university in April 2013. In 2016, the university subsequently requested that IEP carry out a follow-up evaluation.

1.1 Institutional Evaluation Programme and follow-up evaluation process

IEP is an independent membership service of the EUA that offers evaluations to support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture. 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).

In line with the IEP philosophy as a whole, the follow-up process is a supportive one. There is no prescribed procedure, and it is for the institution itself to set the agenda in the light of its experiences since the original evaluation. The institution is expected to submit its own self-evaluation report, which will describe the progress made, possibly indicating barriers to change.

The rationale is that the follow-up evaluation can assist the institution in evaluating the changes that have been made since the original evaluation: What was the impact of the original evaluation? What use has the institution made of the original evaluation report? How far has it been able to address the issues raised in the report? The follow-up evaluation is also an opportunity for the institution to take stock of its strategies for managing change in the context of internal and external constraints and opportunities.

As for the original evaluation, all aspects of the follow-up process are also 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 University of Medicine and Pharmacy in Tîrgu Mureş's profile

The University of Medicine and Pharmacy Tîrgu Mureş (UMFTGM in this report) is situated in the city of Tîrgu Mureş, the capital of Mureş County in the northern-central part of Romania. The university plays a very important role for the city, being one of its most important employers and a key attraction for people from other parts of Romania. It also plays a key role within the regional health care system.

UMFTGM is a public university consisting of three faculties: Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy. UMFTGM's vision focuses on consolidating its position as a national leader in medical and pharmaceutical education and research, concentrating on the development of modern teaching methods, basic and interdisciplinary research, as well as their transfer to clinical practice. The institution offers a variety of undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate programmes and is among the four largest universities for medicine in Romania. It is the only university for medicine in the country that offers programmes in three languages: Romanian, Hungarian and English. Doctoral studies are organised through a doctoral school, or the Institution Organiser of PhD Studies (IOSUD).

In the academic year 2016/17, the number of academic staff amounts to 450, showing a slight decrease from the previous year, which is largely due to a legally induced reduction in the number of teaching assistants. Student numbers have been steadily increasing over recent years, reaching 5 643 in the academic year 2016/17.

The university is largely publically funded, with tuition fees and European funding being the two other main sources. Since the last evaluation, the infrastructure of the university has been extended by three additional buildings: a research centre (CCAMF), a new building for the Faculty of Pharmacy and a swimming pool which serves not only as a sports facility but also as a training base for students.

1.3 The evaluation process

The self-evaluation process was undertaken by a self-evaluation group under the supervision of the Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance and International Relations. The self-evaluation group consisted of academic staff members from all three faculties as well as student representatives. The IEP evaluation team found the self-evaluation report (SER) to be written in a confident and concise style. It was informative and included key information on all areas relevant to the evaluation, although it was more descriptive than analytical. In addition, even though the report had apparently been made available to all university members, some of the Senate representatives interviewed were allegedly not aware of the SER.

Overall, all the interview partners were very open and forthcoming and the IEP evaluation team found a general climate of generous cooperation and openness, as well as a willingness to find areas for improvement.

The self-evaluation report of UMFTGM, together with the appendices, was sent to the evaluation team in February 2017. The visit of the evaluation team to the university took place from 27 to 30 March 2017.

The evaluation team (hereinafter named the team) consisted of:

- Prof. Dr. Juan Viñas, former Rector, University of Lleida, Spain, team chair

- Prof.Ir. Hans Beunderman, former Vice Rector and Dean, Delft University of Technology, Netherlands
- Ian McCready, Student Representative, Laurea University of Applied Sciences, Finland
- Dr. Oliver Vettori, Dean for Accreditation and Quality Management, WU (Vienna University of Economics and Business), Austria team coordinator

The team greatly appreciated the collegiate atmosphere and all the support it received during its visit. It wishes to thank everyone involved in the preparation of the SER and the visit, but most notably Rector Prof. Leonard Azamfirei and Prof. Angela Borda and their teams for all their efforts and dedication.

2. Governance and institutional decision-making

UMFTGM's vision focuses on the goal to consolidate its position as a national leader in medical and pharmaceutical education and research, concentrating on the development of modern teaching methods, basic and interdisciplinary research, as well as their transfer to clinical practice. In many ways the Strategic Plan 2016-2020 seems to be a continuous follow-up of the Strategic Plan 2012-2016, which was at the heart of the previous IEP evaluation. However, the resemblance does not stop with the content: like its predecessor, the current plan shows an abundance of ideas and activities and will require considerable effort to be implemented within four years.

Yet even though the current Strategic Plan is ambitious, it is supported by all the actors that the team met during their visit, many of whom have also been involved in the formulation of the plan. The constructive climate and strong dialogue-orientation allows for adjustments in the implementation process and it would appear that the members of the university community do not shy away from the efforts and time they need to invest.

Continuity is also shown at the level of the senior leadership: at least half of the key members of the current Administrative Board have already served in the previous term, and managerial and political experience is definitely helpful when trying to carry forward a change and improvement process.

However, not all goals in the Strategic Plan seem to be fully operationalised, especially in terms of indicators of success or a concrete sense of what needs to be achieved by 2020. The team acknowledges that this allows for some flexibility, but there is also a danger of losing oneself among too many objectives and of moving forward without a clear target. Current monitoring happens annually in the form of reports at the faculty and university level, but in some cases this might be too late or slow. From the perspective of the team, **implementing a process of systematic intermediate monitoring (in addition to the regular annual reports and *ad hoc* discussions at the faculty and university level) and linking it to budgetary reports will help to identify problems in time and also to keep track of the vast catalogue of measures and sub-targets.**

"Institutional advancement" is the most comprehensive part of the current institutional plan and the team was impressed by the number of measures that are included here, many of which will not only raise technical and financial challenges, but also social and cultural challenges ones. One area that seems particularly challenging is the current and future relationship between UMFTGM and the University Petru Maior (UPM). The idea of a collaboration between the two institutions to create a "metropolitan university" had already been mentioned during the previous IEP evaluation and, since then, several joint activities have been started. Many of those interviewed during the follow-up evaluation saw a more structured cooperation with UPM (research, knowledge transfer, shared facilities, etc.) as potentially beneficial, but there were also concerns and not everyone was certain of the benefits of moving too far too fast. As is suggested in section 6 of this report (Service to

Society) strategic partnerships with other institutions and organisations outside UMFTGM, and potentially even outside the city, should be further explored in general, but carefully and with an eye on the fears and concerns of the actors involved. Overall it is important to keep in mind to balance the investments in infrastructure and technological advancement with investing in the human part of the university.

In this regard it is important to be aware that continuous improvement in many areas simultaneously requires the efforts of many people, and that efficiency can only be increased to a certain degree. The team found the faculty and staff of UMFTGM fully dedicated to their university, and the family metaphor was stressed several times. Yet modernising curricula, advancing the university and increasing research output will require time and energy from a range of actors, many of whom will be involved in several endeavours at the same time. **The team therefore recommends to keep a close eye on the workload and time management of its academic staff and to find solutions that allow for secured time for research, pedagogical training, service to society or personal development.**

This goes hand in hand with a strategy-driven human resource management. The visit confirmed one of the key challenges mentioned in the SER, namely the need to attract enough qualified staff for a university career, in particular in those fields where careers outside of the university are better paid. **With academic careers being demanding and not necessarily financially rewarding, the university is advised to make staff recruitment, staff development and staff well-being a strategic priority and to find ways to strengthen the considerable intrinsic motivation of the people carrying the institutional advancement. Attracting new high-potential staff would also be helped by offering additional incentives.**

In order to keep staff members motivated and underline their important function within the university, it is also suggested that UMFTGM **finds a way to give recognition to the non-academic health care professionals who participate in the teaching process.**

Last but not least, concerning financial matters, the team found the university in a comfortable and stable position. Even the considerable investments in the university infrastructure in recent years do not seem to have put a serious dent in UMFTGM's resources. Staff salaries are still slightly above average and none of those interviewed were at all worried about the financial outlook. Yet considering that student fees make up a big part of the university's budget and the institution is predominantly publically funded, the team suggests that it would be a good idea to identify and monitor the major financial and institutional risks as is currently being done by so many other European universities. **Introducing risk-based budgeting might thereby allow for contingency planning for the mid-term future.**

3. Quality culture

From the perspective of the team, the university has been working hard on the further implementation of its quality management system (QMS) and seems to be aware of the danger of becoming overly bureaucratic and for the need to engage staff and students. Responsibilities for building and maintaining the system lie with the Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance and International Relations who is aided by the Committee for Quality Assurance and Evaluation and the Department of Quality Assurance. The team found the core team to be very dedicated and reflective with regard to the strengths and weaknesses of the current system.

A Quality Assurance Manual functions as the main internal guidelines and all staff members are not only encouraged, but – via their job profiles – required to contribute to the quality assurance processes. Processes seem to be the main “building block” of the system, with around 150 operational processes having been identified and documented, according to the SER. Most of the recommendations from the initial IEP evaluation seem to have been followed up, but closing the loop of the QA processes, also with regard to communication, still seems to be a challenge. The team therefore recommends that the university further continues following up on evaluation findings and also **finds ways to demonstrate more clearly what changes have been made as a result of stakeholder feedback (in particular student feedback) and internal quality assurance processes in order to help the staff share a common understanding of the purpose and logic behind the system.**

This also requires that the feedback gathered is adequate and representative. The current course evaluations are mainly processed electronically, and response rates could be improved. In addition, students do not seem to fully trust the anonymity guarantee within an electronic evaluation system and have apparently already approached the university management to change the situation. Overall, the evaluation team found a great willingness to act upon identified weaknesses, but this requires that the feedback and evaluation instruments uncover issues to act upon. UMFTGM is thus encouraged **to further develop its positive feedback culture.** Such a feedback culture should not only involve students and staff, but also go beyond the perspectives of the university’s internal stakeholders. The team found rather scarce evidence of a systematic involvement of external stakeholders (see also section 6, Service to Society) and thus advises the institution to **involve more external stakeholders (e.g. health care professionals, alumni, strategic partners) in its evaluation and development efforts, e.g. in programme evaluations, curriculum reforms and strategy assessment.**

Quality assurance systems have a tendency to grow, and it is important to balance effectiveness and efficiency and not let the system become too exhaustive and bureaucratic. If new procedures and tasks are simply added to the previous ones, the danger of evaluation fatigue will again become imminent, and members of the university community might become preoccupied with the extra burdens and documentation work, losing sight of the system’s main functions and how the university benefits from it. Therefore, the team recommends **to**

be cautious in the further development of the QMS and not just to add to the pre-existing procedures and instruments but to evaluate carefully where UMFTGM can ease the documentation work.

4. Teaching and learning

The university is striving to modernise the way its students are taught and learn by introducing case-based learning and team-based learning at all levels, and it has clearly made the reform of its curricula a high priority. This seems to be one of the most important endeavours of the current administration and team was impressed by the work achieved in the first phase and appreciates the ambition and complexity of the project. By setting up a central curriculum development unit (the Office of Internal Evaluation of Study Programmes and Curriculum Development), the university not only followed the recommendations from the initial IEP evaluation, but also tasked a group of highly engaged people with organising and supporting the overall process. Even though it became clear that the reform process is not met with enthusiasm by all the teachers, it was visible that this is a university-wide project and that the success of the first implementation phase, in particular with regard to student feedback, is pulling the reform further forward. The process is also flexible enough in terms of adapting the formats to the specific disciplines and their needs. Allowing for some variation of the formats and a well-balanced implementation process seems like a good idea.

With the curriculum reform taking up so much time and effort and being focused mostly on the “big” programmes such as medicine, pharmacy and dentistry, there is a slight risk that the shorter and smaller programmes gain less attention: for example, case-based learning and practices are also needed at Master level. **The team therefore recommends not to lose sight of the fact that the university offers many more programmes than medicine, dentistry and pharmacy, and to update all the curricula in a similar way and within a reasonable time frame.**

The students met by the team were overall very satisfied with the university and appreciate the progress made during the last years. They also mentioned the benefits of working with real patients, e.g. in the case of dentistry. In addition, the new Simulation Centre is a highly effective addition to their learning opportunities. However, during the interviews across all institutional groups, several concerns were voiced regarding the student-faculty ratio in some subjects, the need for more capacity in the clinical part of the studies, and also the need for new teaching rooms. The university has invested a lot in its infrastructure in recent years and seems to be in a financially solid situation (see also section 2). It might be necessary to channel further funds in those areas where the perceived gaps are particularly high or growing, especially when the curriculum reform process unfolds to its full effect. Several of the new teaching and learning formats will be more time-consuming and will also at least partially require small class sizes. **Consequently, the fit between student numbers, available staff, teaching/clinical infrastructure and patients to work with should be closely monitored and if the student numbers are to be maintained or even increased, the university needs to provide enough teaching and learning capacities, including health care facilities.**

It should be noted that student numbers are not increasing across the whole of the university: in medicine and dentistry the numbers are growing, but in pharmacy, there has been a

decline in recent years. There can be various reasons for this, e.g. that a career in the pharmaceutical sector is not as appealing now as it was 5-10 years ago, yet the team still finds that **more effort could be put into offers for attracting more students in pharmacy**. The team is confident that the new building for the Faculty of Pharmacy will be of major help in so doing. Collaborations with the pharmaceutical industry may also lead to possible new career paths for graduates in pharmacy. The comparatively low number of Master level students is largely due to the way the degrees are structured in Romania, but is still something to consider for the future.

Last but not least, and considering UMFTGM's ambition to further strengthen its internationalisation efforts (see also section 7), it will be important to also keep in mind the issue of diversity. A multicultural and multilingual student body (and teaching and support staff) sometimes also requires diverse approaches, not least with regard to the language of instruction. As recommended in section 7, this might require all of the key faculty and staff to improve their English language skills, but it might also be good to offer the students even more complementary language training. **Hungarian language students, for example, would benefit from additional Romanian language courses for clinical practice according to their needs**, as they themselves voiced.

In summary, the team came to a similar conclusion as with the initial evaluation: the teaching and learning facilities, the motivation of the teaching staff and the willingness of the students to learn and engage, build an important foundation for all the curricular and didactic endeavours the university is currently undertaking. In addition, there is a strong sense that UMFTGM is rapidly moving towards a culture of student-centered learning as recommended in the initial evaluation.

5. Research

The research output in terms of ISI publications and research projects has increased over the last five years, as research remains a high strategic priority for the university. The team that carried out the initial IEP evaluation stated that this priority still needed to be put into practice and the follow-up evaluation team note that there has been considerable progress since then. Research is organised in research groups within the three faculties and organised around two main research areas. The new centre for laboratory research is a good investment for conducting research and attracting new researchers, even though it seemed currently rather underused. The operational budget, however, does not foresee significant resources to finance priority areas for research and provide seed funds. Therefore, and following up on the recommendations from the initial evaluation that the university should take a more active role in acquiring research funds from abroad and also dedicate internal funds to research to get new projects started, **the team advises UMFTGM to invest (in the form of research staff and seed money) in selected focus areas where the university is already strong or sees potential (e.g. with regard to regional needs) in order to become more competitive in seeking international research funding.**

Another ongoing challenge is for the faculty to find time for carrying out research. The clinical staff in particular find it difficult to deal with all the expectations at once and research ideas remain unpursued, at least partly because there is a lack of time for setting up studies. Some voiced the conviction that a lot could be gained in this regard by partnering with academic staff from the basic disciplines such as chemistry or biology that are more research-experienced and where the scientists are more familiar with laboratory research. In this regard, the university is once more reminded of the advice to further encourage and support research collaborations between different departments as well as across the three faculties. **More structured institutional support for research cooperation (clinical/fundamental, interdisciplinary, interinstitutional e.g. with UPM and/or local industry partners) would create new research initiatives.**

In practice, however, the university seems to have found an alternative way of increasing the research output: with senior academic staff often lacking the time and experience with research methods and technology (also due to their clinical work), a comparatively high percentage of the actual research is carried out by PhD students. The team acknowledges the effectiveness of some of the measures taken in this respect (with doctoral education having made a considerable leap forward, see below), but is also convinced that within a university, research should be a strong part of every academic profile. Thus, the team recommends **to relieve top research staff of some other duties and to provide research assistance in order to overcome obstacles related to a lack of technical know-how.** Such initiatives might increase productivity in the already strong areas and take some pressure off staff with different profiles.

As already been indicated above, doctoral education is one of the main pillars of UMFTGM's research efforts. The university's doctoral school, IOSUD, organises and coordinates four-year scientific PhD programmes and is also entitled to award the resulting degree. The university takes considerable pride in the fact that UMFTGM is the only medical university in the country where all doctoral degrees awarded have been accepted by the Ministry of National Education without exception. The team definitely commends the university on the successful make-over of its doctoral education and appreciates also the efforts to create research opportunities for students. This had been one of the recommendations from the initial evaluation and, overall, the situation seems to have improved. However, the demand for student participation in research still surpasses the available offers and Master level students in particular would require more practice with regard to writing papers or project management. **The team therefore advises UMFTGM to further increase the number of research projects involving students but also to make the research education at the Master level more practice-oriented and experiential**, e.g. by allowing students to develop hypothetical project applications or coaching them in writing papers.

Lastly, doctoral students mentioned the feeling of being somewhat isolated and using too much time to develop their individual research projects rather than learning within existing research groups and developing their theses cooperatively within the framework and environment of the group. This would also come closer to how research will be conducted later in their careers. The team supports this and is also convinced that **PhD students would benefit from operating in or near research groups**. This would also further help stimulate a wider and more prosperous research climate within the university.

6. Service to society

As in the initial evaluation, the team found the university to be well aware of its important role for the city and within the region and, including that it is the primary provider of healthcare professionals for its relevant community. During the visit, the team met only a few external stakeholders, but still found considerable evidence that UMFTGM is one of the defining institutions in the city and also in Mures county. The main impact of the institution obviously lies in its highly qualified graduates. During the visit it was frequently mentioned that the brain drain (in the form of graduates leaving for other regions or countries) is a problem for the county, but this can also be regarded as a sign that the medical professionals trained at UMFTGM are highly sought after.

But graduates are not the only link to society: the university provides medical services (through its two hospitals but also through other institutions such as the dental clinic), aims at educating the public (e.g. in terms of prevention or public health) and contributes to its community in the form of various events or through media work. However, according to some interviews, initiatives to provide additional services (education of the public, prevention courses, information at schools or in the county) seem mostly to happen on an individual or departmental level and even appear to decrease because of a lack of time (see also section 2, Governance and Decision-making). The team therefore suggests **that the university develop strategy-led additional services to the community and support them on an institutional level and to help the academic and support staff to dedicate time to this.** In the tradition of service learning, it is also recommended to **let students participate.**

As has been stated above, the university is well aware of its responsibility and status and the current leading team works hard at taking the institution forward. Impulses for development come from various sources and are also often inspired by examples outside UMFTGM. However, the team found only little evidence that external needs are brought into the university via external stakeholder representatives. On the one hand, this accentuates UMFTGM's leading role within its relevant community, but on the other hand, there is also a risk of falling prey to one's own blind spots. **Consequently, it would be advisable to get a better understanding of the needs of the society by establishing a systematic dialogue with external stakeholders, potentially in the form of an advisory board at the faculty and/or university level and resulting in new research initiatives or programme developments.**

In relation to the above, and in revisiting the recommendations from the initial evaluation, the team also found little progress with regard to the university's alumni work and therefore suggests to renew the efforts **to strengthen relations with alumni in order to bind them more closely to the university and the region, and to reinforce institutional graduate tracking efforts.** Alumni and doctoral degree holders can be seen as "true ambassadors" of the university.

Finally, the report of the initial evaluation had also touched upon the idea of a metropolitan university and, as a first step, a closer collaboration with the University Petru Maior. Since

then the links between the two universities have grown stronger (e.g. sharing infrastructure or exploring options for joint research), but there is still room for more development. As already mentioned in section 2, many of those interviewed saw a more structured cooperation with UPM (research, knowledge transfer, shared facilities etc.) as potentially beneficial. On the other hand, the university members and the team are also aware that an even closer relationship would not only bring technical and financial, but also social and cultural ones. In this respect, the team **suggests to carefully develop existing and future partnerships, not only with UPM, but also with clinics, industry and other healthcare institutions based on an analysis of potential risks and benefits.**

7. Internationalisation

Internationalisation is considered a key objective of the current management team of UMFTGM and the university is commended for its ambition to move beyond a regional or national frame of reference. The main responsibilities for UMFTGM's internationalisation efforts are shared by the Rector and the Vice-Rector for Quality Assurance and International Relations, who is assisted by the Department for International Relations. The team found an increase in bilateral partnership agreements and outgoing students since the initial evaluation, as well as of faculty and staff going abroad, for at least a short time. The number of incoming students has also increased, although this is still rather small compared to the number of outgoing students.

More surprising, though, was the university's claim of not planning to increase the number of international students, i.e. in the English language programmes. According to the university leadership, the quality of the international students applying to study at UMFTGM is not always up to the institution's standards, and in addition the teaching and room capacities are already at their limit (see also section 4). This contributes to the team's impression that it is not fully clear what the university wants to achieve through its internationalisation efforts. There are a considerable number of international projects and mobility programmes, but the overarching strategic goal remains elusive. As a consequence, the team **suggests that UMFTGM develops an internationalisation strategy, formulates clearly how and where internationalisation benefits the university and its students, and selects partners that support the institutional strategic goals.** Within the strategy, the university **is advised to develop partnership models beyond student and faculty exchange (strategic partnerships, joint and double degree, research partnerships, etc.) in order to establish a sustainable international network.** The first steps in this direction are already apparent.

First steps have also been taken with regard to measuring and increasing UMFTGM's international visibility by attempts to be included and recognised in international rankings. Rankings may be often regarded as an ambivalent tool, but it is undebatable that the inclusion in some rankings is already an important signal to the international community, and high ranking positions are a valuable entry card for high profile cooperations. In this regard, the team suggests that the university **further develop and professionalise the efforts to participate in international higher education rankings.**

In addition, internationalisation should be experienced by all students and not be confined to special programmes, contributing to the creation of a cosmopolitan culture and helping to break down barriers. This seems even more important considering the multicultural nature of the university, which is deeply rooted in the institution's origin and history. Whether it is by following models such as the "international classroom at home" or bringing students from different backgrounds together, internationalisation very much starts in the university and not just in its relationships with other institutions. Overcoming language barriers might be

one step in this direction, but this will also require the **encouragement of English language proficiency not only for the staff teaching in the English programmes.**

8. Conclusions

In summary, the team finds the university substantially developed, compared to the findings of the initial evaluation, with many improvements having been achieved in a rather short time. Many of the recommendations of the previous evaluation have been followed up and members of the university community have worked hard to develop UMFTGM in many areas, particularly in the core areas of teaching and learning, and research.

There is a great deal of openness towards impulses that encourage institutional development. The team found all those interviewed willing to defend and explain, but also to reflect and adapt their current views. From the start, the evaluation was framed as a learning opportunity for the university and the team was encouraged to find ways of helping the institution to identify blind spots and areas for improvement.

There is a strong capacity for change in UMFTGM, which was clear not only through the interviews and SER, but which also became tangible in noting the achievements since 2013. The vision of the Rector and the senior management, as well as the dedication and hard work of the university community, are a major asset for future improvements.

There is, however, also a risk of putting too much stress on the organisation and its members, and there is a need to balance the different efforts on an individual as well as on an institutional level. This will be an important condition for the university's sustainable future development.

In addition, new challenges are arising while the current strategy is implemented and might need to **be addressed with a strategic horizon that goes beyond the remaining term of the current Administrative Board.**

Yet overall, the team is confident that the university will be able to muster the energy necessary to face the challenges and keep its will to become a university of excellence.

The findings and recommendations described in this report are intended to help the university on this path. The most important recommendations of the team are summarised below.

With regard to governance and decision-making:

- ◆ to implement a process of systematic intermediate monitoring (in addition to the regular annual reports and *ad hoc* discussions at the faculty and university level) and linking it to budgetary reports, which will help to identify problems in time and also to keep track of the vast catalogue of measures and sub-targets;
- ◆ to keep a close eye on the workload and time management of its academic staff and to find solutions that allow securing time research, pedagogical training, service to society or personal development;

- ◆ to make staff recruitment, staff development and staff well-being a strategic priority and to find ways to strengthen the considerable intrinsic motivation of the people carrying out the institutional advancement;
- ◆ to give recognition to the non-academic health care professionals who participate in the teaching process;
- ◆ to introduce risk-based budgeting in order to allow for contingency planning for the mid-term future;
- ◆ to address newly emerging challenges with a strategic horizon that go beyond the remaining term of the current Administrative Board.

With regard to Quality Culture:

- ◆ to find ways to demonstrate more clearly what changes have been made as a result of stakeholder feedback (in particular student feedback) and the internal quality assurance processes in order to help the staff share a common understanding of the purpose and logic behind the QMS;
- ◆ to further develop its positive feedback culture;
- ◆ to involve more external stakeholders (e.g. health care professionals, alumni, strategic partners) in its evaluation and development efforts, e.g. in programme evaluations, curriculum reforms and strategy assessment;
- ◆ to be careful not just to add to the pre-existing procedures and instruments but to evaluate carefully where documentation work can be eased.

With regard to Teaching and Learning:

- ◆ to update all the curricula in a similar way and within a reasonable time frame;
- ◆ to closely monitor the fit between student numbers, available staff, teaching/clinical infrastructure and patients to work with and, if the student numbers are to be maintained or even increased, to provide enough teaching and learning capacities, including health care facilities;
- ◆ to put more effort into offers for attracting more students to pharmacy;
- ◆ to offer additional Romanian language courses for clinical practice for Hungarian students.

With regard to Research:

- ◆ to invest (in the form of research staff and seed money) in selected focus areas where the university is already strong or sees potential (e.g. with regard to regional needs) in order to become more competitive in seeking international research funding;
- ◆ to provide more structured institutional support for research cooperation (clinical/fundamental, interdisciplinary, interinstitutional e.g. with UMP and/or local industry partners) in order to create new research initiatives;
- ◆ to relieve top research staff of other duties and to provide research assistance in order to overcome obstacles related to a lack of technical know-how;
- ◆ to further increase the number of research projects involving students but also to make the research education at the Master level more practice-oriented and experiential;
- ◆ to give PhD students the opportunity of operating in or near research groups.

With regard to Service to Society:

- ◆ to develop strategy-led additional services to the community and support them on an institutional level and to help the academic and support staff to dedicate time to this and to let students participate;
- ◆ to get a better understanding of the needs of the society by establishing a systematic dialogue with external stakeholders, potentially in the form of an advisory board at the faculty and/or university level;
- ◆ to strengthen relations with alumni in order to bind them more closely to the university and the region, and to reinforce institutional graduate tracking efforts;
- ◆ to carefully develop existing and future partnerships, not only with UPM, but also with clinics, industry and other healthcare institutions based on an analysis of potential risks and benefits.

With regard to Internationalisation:

- ◆ to develop an internationalisation strategy, formulate clearly how and where internationalisation benefits the university and its students, and select partners that support the institutional strategic goals;

- ◆ to develop partnership models beyond student and faculty exchange (strategic partnerships, joint and double degree, research partnerships, etc.) in order to establish a sustainable international network;
- ◆ to further develop and professionalise the efforts to participate in international higher education rankings;
- ◆ to encourage English language proficiency not only for the staff teaching in the English programmes.