

DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION OF EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE AND AI INTEGRATION WITHIN ARACIS

Florin MIHAI, Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

The ARACIS case: integrated workflows, structural compliance checks and experimental consistency

Context

External quality assurance has moved from document-based processes towards integrated digital workflows. ARACIS is developing a SharePoint-based platform and testing AI components as support tools for procedural completeness and methodological consistency

1. Integrated digital workflow

An integrated platform currently under development by an external provider, incorporating artificial intelligence functionalities to support and streamline external quality assurance processes

2. AI-assisted checks

Structural compliance checks of uploaded Internal Evaluation Reports (IER) and Experimental consistency checks applied to External Evaluation Reports (EER)

Key contribution

This case illustrates how AI can be integrated as a support layer within external quality assurance processes, without transferring the evaluation authority to the system.

- before evaluation: verifies the integrity of the Internal Evaluation Report (IER)
- after evaluation: examines the coherence between evidence, analysis, recommendations and indicator-level conclusions in the External Evaluation Report (EER)
- overall: enhances completeness, consistency and traceability while preserving expert responsibility and human judgement

Main message

AI supports review capacity; expert judgement remains central

From uploaded evidence to traceable decision

The new platform integrates university document submission, ARACIS workflow management and targeted AI-assisted checks

HEI submission

Drafting and submission of the Internal Evaluation Report (IER), directly to the SharePoint-based platform

AI verification

Verifies the integrity of the Internal Evaluation Report (IER)

Evaluation panel

Establish the experts panel for external quality evaluation

On-Site visit

On-site visit and discussions with representatives of the management of the RI, the coordinator, students, alumni, professors, employers or other stakeholders

External Evaluation Report

Drafting of the External Evaluation Report (EER), and assess the level to which indicators are fulfilled

Analysis

*in the Permanent Speciality Commission that advances a proposal * by the Higher Education Study Evaluation Department and the ARACIS Council; validation of the decision

Publishing the EER

the EER and the Decision of the ARACIS Council are published on the ARACIS website

Future AI support modules

Planned support for ARACIS staff and validation-stage consistency workflows. The AI layer remains advisory.

Experimental AI consistency agent

Currently tested on External Evaluation Reports. It flags consistency issues before/during validation, without issuing formal evaluation decisions.

post-evaluation

consistency

human review

AI checks: two levels of support

1. Internal Evaluation Report

Structural completeness checks

- Detects whether all indicators are addressed
- Verifies the presence of required sections and supporting documentations
- Flags missing or incomplete areas prior to evaluation
- Does not assess the quality or level of fulfilment

pre-evaluation

completeness

no verdict

2. External Evaluation Report

Experimental methodological consistency agent

- Maps text blocks according to criteria, standards and indicators
- Distinguishes factual presentation, analysis, recommendations and conclusions
- Checks the coherence between evidence, analysis and evaluation outcomes
- Flags contradictions, insufficient evidence and unclear recommendations

post-evaluation

consistency

advisory

Prototype output: per-indicator feedback

Mapping

Identifies the relevant indicator, corresponding conclusion and the text blocks used by the evaluation panel.

Consistency verdict

Explains whether the conclusion is coherent with evidence, analysis and recommendations.

Score

A qualitative score supports prioritisation, but never replaces the detailed textual analysis.

What is missing?

Highlights gaps such as missing evidence, implicit references to standards insufficient justification or unclear argumentation.

Human-in-the-loop

AI flags potential issues for expert review; evaluation panel and ARACIS decision-making bodies retain full responsibility for the final judgement.

Governance and safeguards

Scope control

AI checks presence and consistency, not final compliance decisions.

Traceability

Each flag should be linked to report sections, indicators and documentary evidence.

Data governance

Access rights, versioning and document history are managed in the platform.

Progressive deployment

Modules are tested incrementally and refined on real evaluation workflows.

Take-away

Digitalisation standardises the workflow; AI increases review capacity; expert judgement remains central.