

Quality assurance plan

PROVISIONAL TRANSLATION¹

2024.

Approval: 2024. 02. 07.
Entry into force: 2024. 03. 01.
Responsible: Head of the Doctoral School
Planned review: 2025.

Table of contents

I. Mission Statement of the Roska Tamás Doctoral School of Sciences and Technology.....	2
II. Regulatory environment.....	2
III. RTDSST's quality policy and quality principles (ESG 1.1)	3
IV. Implementation of the PPKE quality assurance system (ESG 1.1).....	4
V. Quality assurance aspects of doctoral training elements: assessment, decision and feedback points and procedures	5
VI. Methods and forums for data collection for quality assurance, data evaluation and use (ESG 1.7)	9
VII. Review periods (ESG 1.8, 1.9).....	11
VIII. Internal audit	11

¹ In the event of a dispute, the Hungarian language version shall prevail with respect to the Quality assurance plan of the doctoral school.

I. Mission Statement of the Roska Tamás Doctoral School of Sciences and Technology

The mission of the Roska Tamás Doctoral School of Sciences and Technology (RTDSST) is to train new generations of scientists who are able to reach the frontiers of knowledge in their fields of research and actively shape scientific research and innovation in the service of humanity, while respecting the values of the Catholic Church.

To fulfil the above mission of the Doctoral School (DS):

- It seeks to attract the most talented and productive students and teachers,
- emphasises and supports intensive disciplinary and interdisciplinary training,
- helps students and teachers achieve internationally recognised results and academic progress,
- continuously evaluates student and staff performance and regularly reviews and improves its procedures and policies to improve them,
- maintains a regular dialogue on strategic and ethical issues with the management of the PPKE and the PPKE-ITK.

II. Regulatory environment

II. 1. Related regulations

The DS Quality Assurance Plan is in line with the following regulatory documents, which (also) include quality assurance elements:

- [PPKE University Quality Assurance Policy \(UQAP\)](#)
- [PPKE University Doctoral Regulations \(UDR\)](#)
- [PPKE Study and Examination Regulations \(SER\)](#)
- [RTDSST Rules of Procedure \(RTDSST DSRP\)](#)
- [RTDSST Training Plan \(TP\)](#)

This plan may contain overlapping content with the documents listed above, provided that they play an important role in ensuring the quality of doctoral training. Furthermore, the Quality Assurance Plan of the RTDSST does not conflict with any faculty or institutional regulations or decisions and is consistent with their content on quality assurance.

II. 2. ESG 2015 standards

The plan indicates how the elements and processes of quality assurance in the DS relate to the following standards of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area ([ESG 2015](#)):

ESG 1.1 Quality assurance policy

Standard: Institutions should have a public quality assurance policy that is part of their strategic management. This should be communicated to internal stakeholders [i.e. students, faculty and staff non-training staff], through appropriate structures and processes, with the involvement of external stakeholders [users, employers, partners].

ESG 1.2 Design and approval of training programmes

Standard: Institutions should have processes in place for the development and approval of their training programmes. Training programmes should be designed to achieve their stated objectives, including expected learning outcomes. The qualifications to be obtained through the programme should be clearly defined

defined and communicated, with reference to the appropriate level of the national qualifications framework and, through this, to the qualifications framework of the European Higher Education Area.

ESG 1.3 Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Standard: Institutions should ensure that their training programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to play an active role in the learning process. Students' assessment should reflect this approach.

ESG 1.4 Admission, progression, recognition and award of qualifications

Standard: Institutions consistently apply their pre-defined and published policies covering the whole student life cycle, for example on admission, progression, recognition and award of qualifications.

ESG 1.5 Trainers

Standard: institutions should ensure that their trainers have the appropriate competences. Institutions should ensure that their trainers are competent and have the necessary competences.

ESG 1.6 Learning support and student services

Standard: Institutions have adequate funding for learning and teaching activities and provide adequate and easily accessible learning support facilities and student services.

ESG 1.7 Information management

Standard: Institutions collect, analyse and use relevant information to guide their training programmes and other activities.

ESG 1.8 Public information

Standard: Institutions should publish clear, accurate, objective, up-to-date and easily accessible information about their activities, including their training programmes.

ESG 1.9 Continuous monitoring and regular evaluation of training programmes

Standard: Institutions should continuously monitor and periodically review their training programmes to ensure that they are achieving their objectives and meeting the needs of students and society. These evaluations should lead to continuous improvement of programmes. Any measures planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all stakeholders.

ESG 1.10 Systematic external quality assurance

Standard: institutions should be subject to external quality assurance at regular intervals in accordance with the ESG.

III. RTDSST's quality policy and quality principles (ESG 1.1)

The most important objective of the DS's quality policy is to fulfil the mission described in point I at the highest possible level. The quality of doctoral training is determined by the values of the University and the DS, the knowledge transfer skills and academic performance of the lecturers and supervisors, the infrastructure available, the support system for student training, and the DS's national and international network.

In developing quality assurance processes for doctoral education, we aim to apply the following principles in accordance with Chapter VII of the EDPS:

- *Professional control*: it is necessary to enforce the control of scientific public opinion throughout the whole process of doctoral training and degree acquisition.
- *Publicity*: the DS's policies, public documents and results should be widely available to the professional and scientific community.
- *Feedback*: teachers, students and supervisors involved in doctoral training should receive continuous feedback on the quality of their activities and have the opportunity to give feedback on their experiences. The results obtained will be evaluated and used by the DS to improve the training process.
- *Allocation of tasks and individual responsibilities*: it should be clear who is responsible for what and why among doctoral students.
- *Documentation*: documentation (including in electronic format) should be provided on the evaluation and decision points related to doctoral training and degree awarding.
- *Efficiency principle*: Doctoral training should make efficient use of human (teachers, supervisors, students), infrastructural and financial resources.
- *Practical applicability principle*: Research results should be evaluated in terms of the socio-economic issues they can help address. Where this is meaningful, the principle of practical applicability should also be taken into account in the choice of topics.

IV. Implementation of the PPKE quality assurance system (ESG 1.1)

IV.1. The quality assurance structure of the PPKE

The University Quality Assurance Committee is responsible for the coordination of quality assurance activities at the university level (Article 5 of the MSZ). Within the university quality assurance system, the quality assurance of the doctoral schools is distinct from the quality assurance of the faculty (Article 9 of the MSZ). The basic tasks of the University Doctoral and Habilitation Council (UDHC), the discipline/field doctoral and habilitation councils and the Heads of DS in relation to quality assurance are set out in the UDR. The University Doctoral Quality Assurance Committee (UDQAC) acts as an advisory and advisory body to University Doctoral and Habilitation Council in the development of the principles and methods of quality assurance in doctoral training and degree acquisition (Article 11 of the MSZ). The Doctoral School Quality Assurance Committee (DSQAC) acts as an advisory and advisory body to the disciplinary/field councils and doctoral schools, the composition and responsibilities of which are set out in Article 14 of the MSZ.

Based on the proposal of the DSQAC, the Multidisciplinary Doctoral Council of Technology and Sciences (MDCTS) drafted the mission statement of the DS, keeping in mind the mission of the university, and also drafted the quality policy of the DS and named the quality assurance principles relevant to the DS from among the principles identified in the EDPS. (The UDHC has the right to set the principles in the EDPS on the proposal of the UDQAC.)

The quality management system (Quality Policy, Quality Plan) regulates the activities necessary to implement the quality policy. The basic task of the quality assurance committees of the doctoral quality assurance subsystem is to plan and monitor the implementation of quality development within the framework defined by the quality policy, to formulate proposals for quality development and measures, and to give preliminary opinions on matters requiring a decision by the Doctoral Council. The mission statement and the quality policy, the principles and the regulations provide the framework for the formulation of the Quality Assurance Plan and for the setting, implementation, review and continuous improvement of annual quality objectives.

The Quality Assurance Plan is submitted by the Head of the DS, on the recommendation of the DSQAC, to the Doctoral and Habilitation Council for approval, which is also monitored by the UDQAC.

Doctoral students are involved in quality assurance work both individually and through their representative body (DÖK), including membership of quality assurance committees. External partners are also involved in quality improvement work, in particular employers (research institutions, companies) employing graduates.

The DSQAC is involved in the implementation of the quality plan and more specifically the annual quality objectives and action plans on the basis of an annual work plan.

Quality assurance processes follow the PDCA cycle:

For ESG 1.1, planning will be completed with the drafting and adoption of the above-mentioned regulatory documents as described above.

Implementation means the implementation of the work plan, quality objectives, any action plan and overall quality activities related to the other standards as set out in the Quality Assurance Plan, but also includes the collection of indicators to measure the effectiveness of implementation, the carrying out of surveys and other data collection.

The monitoring is carried out by the DS through mid-year, end-of-year and end-of-cycle monitoring of implementation, examination of relevant indicators and evaluation of surveys, which form the chapters of the quality assurance report as set out in the SAO.

Annual quality assurance report:

- a) a summary of the results of the surveys carried out during the period;
- b) a summary of the test results for the indicators assessed over the period;
- c) a report on the (periodic) implementation of the action plans;
- d) assessing the achievement of quality objectives; and
- e) proposals for improvements and measures

chapter by chapter, following the ESG 2015 thematic framework. The report is prepared by the DSQAC in cooperation with the head of the DS, trainers and administrator, reviewed by the MDCTS and the UDQAC, approved by the UDHC and communicated to the UDSQC.

Every five years, an accreditation self-assessment is carried out on the basis of the annual quality assurance report, in the same circle of preparers, reviewers and decision-makers.

Intervention is necessary if the inspection reveals an anomaly or an opportunity for improvement. In this case, a review of the rules, modifications or active corrections to the processes should be carried out.

V. Quality assurance aspects of doctoral training elements: assessment, decision and feedback points and procedures

V. 1. Doctoral training curriculum and trainers (ESG 1.2, 1.5)

The Doctoral Training Plan (DTP) is prepared by the core members and approved by the MDCTS on the proposal of the Head of the DS. Amendments to the training plan (acceptance of subjects for training, including the names of the lecturers responsible for the subjects) are also approved by the MDCTS in accordance with the same procedure. The subjects of the training programme are reviewed by the Head of the DS together with the programme leaders before each announcement and, if necessary, changes to the document are initiated. The DS's current training plan and the list of tutors are available in the doktori.hu database, and the subject descriptions are publicly available on the DS website and in detail for doctoral students and tutors in the NEPTUN system.

DS lecturers must have at least a PhD degree in the subject area taught. The doctoral school regularly collects and analyses data on the training plan and on the lecturers (in accordance with the schedule of the Survey Plan) in the framework of the satisfaction survey and the OMHV, and through doctoral forums and informal channels, and provide feedback in the annual quality assurance report and at the forthcoming doctoral forums.

Data on the quality of the training process is regularly collected and analysed by the doctoral school through satisfaction surveys and career tracking surveys, as well as through doctoral forums and informal channels, and fed back in the annual quality assurance report and at the next doctoral forums.

It is primarily the responsibility of the DS manager to monitor the training plan and the composition of the teaching staff on an ongoing basis and to initiate any necessary changes and interventions.

V. 2. Announcement of doctoral topics (ESG 1.2, 1.5)

The first step is a brief written evaluation of the proposed doctoral topics by the relevant programme leaders. The MDCTS decides on the acceptance of the evaluated draft topics. The MDCTS will only support the publication of topics for which the scientific and infrastructural background of the research is assured and for which it is realistic to expect that a sufficiently high-quality PhD thesis can be submitted within 4 years. Another important criterion for funding is that the topic leader must have a good track record. A basic requirement for the topic leader is that his/her academic performance in the five years preceding the publication of the topic must exceed the publication requirements for the degree of the student being led (see also V.3). In the case of a new topic leader who has not yet obtained a terminal degree, special attention will be paid to the preliminary assessment of the topic leader's suitability, taking into account the following:

- 1) publication activity: the list of publications, including the publication record over the last five years, must meet the criteria for subject leaders set out in the MSZ,
- 2) university teaching (lectures and tutorials, ~~has~~ dissertations and the evaluation of these in the OMHV),
- 3) topic management of student research projects, competition results of topic-managed students.

V. 3. Entrance examination (ESG 1.4)

The basic requirements of the admission procedure are laid down in the DDA and the DIMS, as well as in the TVSZ. Twice a year (autumn and spring), the DS issues a call for applications for admission to doctoral studies, which contains the subject descriptions and the formal and substantive requirements for admission to doctoral studies. The composition of the admission committee is appointed by the UDHC on the recommendation of the DS, based on the opinion of the MDCTS. The majority of the members of the admission committee are university professors, and the non-university professors hold a habilitation or a doctorate of the HAS. The chairman of the selection committee is a full member of the DS. At least one person from each of the disciplines covered by the DS is represented on the Selection Committee. The aim of the oral examination is to assess the applicant's research ability and the scientific quality and feasibility of the research plan with the candidate supervisor. During the interview, the selection board will assess the candidate's academic record (at least a good degree is required), language skills, previous scientific achievements (if any), knowledge and motivation in the discipline and research area to be addressed, and the relevance, expected novelty, relevance and feasibility of the research objectives. The scoresheet for the admission test is publicly available on the DS website. The Committee's recommendation for admission is graded in three stages: 'strongly recommended', 'recommended', 'not recommended'. The recommendation for admission to scholarship places is made in order of the scores obtained in the entrance examination. The MDCTS decides on the admission of doctoral candidates on the basis of the recommendation of the admission committee.

Recognition and crediting of prior studies is carried out at the request of the applicant during the admission procedure in accordance with the provisions of the Study and Examination Regulations.

The student may lodge a legal remedy as set out in the Student Remedies Policy (HJSZ), or a complaint or public interest report as set out in the Code of Conduct for the Handling of Incidents that Violate Integrity (Integrity Policy). If the above mentioned person or body acting in the

course of the procedures detects a systemic problem or deficiency relevant from a quality assurance point of view, it shall report it to the DSQAC or UDQAC concerned and to the Quality Assurance and Legal Department (MBO). The competent body may, after evaluating the indication, recommend action to the body or person entitled to take a decision.

V. 4. The academic part of doctoral training (ESG 1.4, 1.3)

Doctoral training is one of the most student-centred types of training, due to the small number of students and the personalised approach. The study and reporting requirements for the training are set out in the TP. Doctoral students prepare a work plan at the beginning of each semester, which is approved by the supervisor and the programme leader. The work plan includes the courses to be taken and the research and publication plan for the semester. The work plan must be submitted to the Doctoral Office in the format provided. Failure to submit the approved work plan by the specified deadline is grounds for dismissal. At the end of the semester, doctoral students will prepare a written report in which they will record the courses and units completed, summarise their research achievements and list their submitted and accepted publications. In the report, the supervisor evaluates the doctoral student's work for the semester, both in writing and with a mark. The report shall be approved by the supervisor and the programme leader. One of the conditions for the successful completion of the semester is the submission of the report to the Doctoral Office by the given deadline.

During the course of the training, the doctoral student may have recourse to legal remedies as set out in the HJSZ, and may lodge a complaint or a public interest report as set out in the Integrity Policy. If a person or body acting in the course of the above procedures detects a systemic problem or deficiency relevant from a quality assurance point of view, it shall report it to the DSQAC or UDQAC concerned and to the MBO. The competent body may, after evaluating the indication, recommend action to the body or person entitled to take a decision.

Data on the quality of the training process are regularly collected and analysed by the doctoral school through the NEPTUN system, satisfaction surveys, career tracking surveys, doctoral forums and informal channels, and fed back in the annual quality assurance report and at the next doctoral forums.

V. 5. The complex exam (ESG 1.4)

The complex examination is one of the most important assessment and feedback points in doctoral studies. The procedure for the organisation of the complex examination and the requirements for the examination are laid down in the DPA, the DS and the TOR. An important prerequisite for taking the complex examination is to have a sufficient number of credits (at least 90) and to have completed the minimum number of publication credits (at least 20) as specified in the WP, i.e. in addition to the subject knowledge required by the examination, doctoral candidates must at this point demonstrate their ability to produce a scientific publication of a sufficient quality in English. In the case of individual candidates, the successful completion of the complex examination is the start of the doctoral studies. The examination board is chaired by a professor or Professor Emeritus or a researcher with the title of Doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. All members of the examination board hold an academic degree. The examination boards are established by the MDCTS. The complex examination is also subject to the right of appeal as set out in the HJSZ and the right to lodge a complaint or a public interest report as set out in the Integrity Code. If a person or body involved in the above procedures identifies a systemic problem or deficiency relevant from a quality assurance point of view, he or she shall report it to the DSQAC or UDQAC concerned and to the MBO. The competent body may, after evaluating the indication, recommend action to the body or person entitled to take a decision.

V. 6. Research component of doctoral training (ESG 1.3, 1.4)

Doctoral training is one of the most student-centred types of training, due to the small number of

students and the personalised approach. Encouraging students to play an active role throughout the doctoral in training, but especially in the research and dissertation phase. In addition to the preparation and evaluation of the work plan and the report on the research activities carried out, as indicated in point V.4, the DS organises an annual "PhD Proceedings" conference in English, which, in addition to developing the skills of English-language presentations, also serves as the obligatory annual oral report. At least two core members participate in the committees of each section of the conference. The committees give their comments, suggestions and criticisms to the lecturers and forward them to the head of the DS. The main overall assessment point for the research results of the first two years is the dissertation part of the complex examination (see V.5). In the second phase of doctoral training, the DS assesses the effectiveness of the research activity mainly on the basis of peer-reviewed publications. According to the TP, a minimum of 80 publication credits is required for the award of the degree, which should be equivalent to the internationally expected level of academic achievement.

Doctoral students may also exercise legal remedies in respect of the research activities carried out during the course of their studies in accordance with the HJSZ, and may lodge complaints and public interest reports in accordance with the Integrity Rules. If a person or body acting in the course of the above procedures detects a systemic problem or deficiency relevant from a quality assurance point of view, it shall report it to the DSQAC or UDQAC concerned and to the MBJO. The competent body may, after evaluating the indication, recommend action to the body or person entitled to take a decision.

Data on the quality of the training process are regularly collected and analysed by the doctoral school in the NEPTUN system, in the quality assurance data table, through satisfaction and career tracking surveys, doctoral forums and informal channels, and fed back in the annual quality assurance report and at the next doctoral forums.

V. 7. PhD degree (ESG 1.4, 1.8)

The awarding of qualifications is a concept more geared towards undergraduate courses. In doctoral training, the award of a degree is the concept that best corresponds to this, which is a separate procedure. The doctoral thesis to be submitted in the framework of the degree-awarding procedure must be submitted for a working discussion before submission (EDPS). The minimum publication requirement for peer review is at least one published or accepted for publication in final form and one submitted refereed English-language journal article in a disciplinary relevant and sufficiently high quality journal. The in-service discussion is an important step in the quality assurance of the theses, aiming to assess the adequacy of the content and form of the thesis and the thesis points and to prepare the thesis for public discussion. This is the point at which the theses can be substantially clarified and any errors corrected. During the debate, the thesis is evaluated by two referees (including at least one external referee) with at least a PhD degree in a relevant discipline. The supervisor of the workplace debate will be a professor or a doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. A record of the workplace debate shall be made, including the questions raised and any opinions or suggestions regarding the revision and submission of the dissertation. The minutes shall be accompanied by the referees' opinions.

To obtain a PhD degree, research results must be published according to the conditions set out in the DSRP. This means publication of at least two high quality peer-reviewed journal articles in English that have not been used for the PhD degree. After the submission of the thesis, the relevant programme leader or the head of the DS will carry out a scientific habitus check, including a verification of the publication requirements. The thesis may only be sent out after a positive habitus test to referees who hold at least a PhD degree in a relevant discipline, at least one of whom is a principal external referee. An important quality assurance factor is that the chairperson of the public debate must be a professor or a doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The UDHC, on the recommendation of the MDCTS, will ensure the appropriate composition of the referees. The DS publishes all defenses publicly on its website, in its doctoral and staff circulars and in the database

doktori.hu. ESG Standard 1.8 is also published here in the process is intended to inform the public. A record of the public debate is kept. The award of the PhD degree is decided by the UDHC on the basis of a proposal from the MDCTS.

The right of appeal or complaint is also available to the candidate in the degree procedure, as it is throughout the course. The feedback procedure is also the same as the feedback procedure during the training process.

Degree attainment indicators are managed and analysed by the School in the Quality Assurance Data Table, and related data are collected through career tracking surveys, alumni conferences and informal channels, and fed back in the annual Quality Assurance Report and at upcoming alumni conferences.

V. 8. Evaluation of topic leaders (ESG 1.5)

The topic leader is the topic writer for whose advertised topic a student is accepted and enrolls in the doctoral school. It is important to note that subject leader effectiveness overlaps with, but is not identical to, academic effectiveness. Subject leader effectiveness is assessed using the following data:

- summary publication data for the last five years, with a separate indication of the number of publications with doctoral students
- subject supervision data and success rate (number of doctoral students assigned to subject supervision, number of currently active students, number of successful subject supervision, number of ongoing degree programmes, number of students who have discontinued their studies, number of unsuccessful subject supervision).

Subject Leaders are assessed by the Head of the DS on the basis of the data collected in the Quality Assurance Data Table as part of the annual quality assurance report. In case of an unsatisfactory evaluation of the subject leader, the DS will not accept a new subject proposal for the given year and will not support the application of new doctoral students to the subject leader with an unsatisfactory rating.

The continuous high level of scientific activity (scientific excellence) required from the core members is monitored by the Head of the DS primarily on the basis of the MTMT publication database (its annual extract in the quality assurance data table) and the annual researcher performance evaluation carried out by the PPKE-ITK, with important additional data provided by the <https://tudomanymetria.com/> portal, which is also used for national scientific applications.

V. 9. Student services (ESG 1.6)

The University provides a wide range of student services as set out in the Academic Handbook. The DS records data on the scope of these services annually in the Quality Assurance Data Table and seeks feedback from students on the quality of the services through the Student Satisfaction Survey, doctoral forums or even informally.

Feedback is provided in the annual quality assurance report and at the next doctoral forums.

VI. Methods and forums for data collection for quality assurance, data evaluation and use (ESG 1.7)

VI. 1. Data sources (ESG 1.7)

The most important and most comprehensive of the data collections for quality assurance purposes is the quality assurance data table with indicators, which currently covers the following areas in addition to the basic data of the doctoral school and DSQAC:

- degree data
- effectiveness as a theme leader
- publication data

- doctoral activity in scientific conferences and research projects
- doctoral mobility (study visits, part-time training abroad, Erasmus trips, summer schools)
- data on study and social support for doctoral students
- data on the FDI's international relations
- infrastructure improvements (e.g. laboratories, equipment)
- data on support for the scientific activities of doctoral students
- communication data (publications, self-organised conferences, project days, forums, social media)
- information and links on the DS website

The data table will be continuously updated by the doctoral school and the quality assurance committee of the doctoral school, with a final deadline of 28 February.

With regard to the teaching and research activities of the doctoral school's lecturers, in addition to the relevant data in the above table, we also have **OMHV evaluations** (which are conducted every academic semester according to the University Assessment Plan) and the annual **faculty researcher performance evaluations of the PPKE-ITK** (as an external data source in this respect).

In addition to the above, the DS conducts its own annual anonymous **satisfaction** survey among **doctoral students** on their satisfaction with the supervision, the functioning of the DS, the research environment and infrastructure, and their suggestions. The questionnaire collects data on:

- student's doctoral programme
- Proportional credit achievement and credit index
- scholarship index
- how well the chosen seminars contribute to professional development
- satisfaction with the scientific depth of the knowledge taught
- satisfaction with the subject guidance (followability, appropriate motivation, time management)
- satisfaction with the work of programme managers and the DS manager
- satisfaction with the administration of the DS
- satisfaction with the work of the doctoral student council
- satisfaction with the material conditions of the research
- overall satisfaction with the functioning of the DS
- other textual comments, suggestions

At least once a year, the DS organises special **forums for subject leaders and students**, which aim to provide subject leaders and students with updates and feedback on the quality improvement measures taken in the past period, as well as to discuss directly with the stakeholders any problems and suggestions that arise, and to gather further comments from teachers and students. A brief note of the subject leader and student forums will be produced. The DS receives data on the careers of graduates through the PPKE **career tracking system**.

In addition, the DS organises an annual **PhD alumni conference**, to which students, doctoral students and doctoral graduates are invited. The primary aim of the conference is to share the work experiences of graduates and to stimulate and strengthen motivation for a career in research. The detailed arrangements for the surveys are set out in the University's Quality Assurance Procedures for Measurement, Evaluation and Improvement.

VI. 2. Processing, evaluation and use of data

The data from the sources listed in VI.1. will be summarised by the DSQAC Chair and an executive summary of the current data will be prepared for the next DSQAC meeting. On the basis of this information, the DSQAC may make recommendations to the Head of the DS and the MDCTS for the further development of the DS's operations and quality objectives.

VII. Review periods (ESG 1.8, 1.9)

The DS

- review the progress towards the annual quality objectives at least once during the implementation period,
- review the training plan every six months in the light of legislative changes, staff changes and updating of the curriculum (ESG),
- review the quality assurance plan annually,
- prepare an annual quality assurance report with an analysis of the indicators in the quality dashboard, a summary of the surveys and the actions taken or planned as a result, a summary of the achievement of the quality objectives and the action plan
- review the rules annually (DSRP, TP)
- comprehensively review the training plan every five years with the involvement of doctoral students and external partners,
- prepare a self-assessment every five years based on the MAB guidelines (ESG 1.10).

The doctoral school's website and the more restricted data content of the doctoral.hu database, the basic data of the Doctoral School, data on its core membership, subject writers, subject leaders, additional lecturers, institutional regulations and procedures concerning the operation of the Doctoral School, the training plan, subject descriptions, admission notices, and notices of training, data relating to the awarding of degrees (dates of examinations, theses, dissertations, theses, graduates), the quality assurance plan, data on events organised within the framework of the DI, data on research activities carried out within the framework of the DI, data on quality assurance activities, results of surveys carried out and their feedback.

VIII. Internal audit

The operation and quality assurance system of the DS is reviewed and evaluated by a university committee delegated by the MBO as part of an internal audit, as necessary, but at least once a year. The findings and recommendations of the audit are recorded in a report. The report is evaluated by the DSQAC and may be used as a basis for making recommendations to the MMT DHT for improving the functioning of the DS. This is considered as a specific implementation of ESG 1.10.

1. Annex

Quality objectives for the 2023/2024 academic year

Adopted by the Quality Committee of the Tamás Roska Doctoral School of Science and Technology on 30 August 2023.

Quality objective 1:	Increasing the completion rate of the student satisfaction questionnaire among doctoral students
Measurement:	completion rate in %
Target value:	70%
Initial situation:	61% (2022.)
Quality objective 2:	Increase the availability of regulatory and information documents in all the languages of the School on the School's website
Measurement number:	% of documents accessible
Target value:	100%
Initial situation:	The most important documents and policies are currently available in English, but a translation of the new training plan, quality plan and revised operating rules will be needed.
Quality objective 3:	Developing a set of requirements for supervisors and co-supervisors
Measurement number:	% completion of document describing requirements
Target value:	100%
Initial situation:	The operational rules currently contain a few sentences on the general requirements for subject leaders, which need to be clarified (10%).
Quality objective 4:	Review of PhD degree publication requirements
Measurement:	% completion of document describing requirements
Target value:	100%
Initial situation:	The current minimum publication requirement in the Code of Conduct is 2 high quality international journal articles, but this needs to be clarified and further specified (20%) based on the experience of the past years and the recommendations of the MAB.
Quality objective 5:	Increasing the completion rate of OMHV questionnaires
Measurement:	Occupancy rate in %
Target value:	30%
Initial situation:	The last OMHV questionnaire did not receive enough responses, i.e. no course has a completion rate of at least 25%, but the completion rate at the University (and at the ITK) is increasing, reaching 25% continuously. In order to ensure continuous measurement feedback, the questionnaire should be further promoted among doctoral students, highlighting its role and importance.

2. Annex

Membership and rules of procedure of the RTDSST Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)

Composition of the DIMB in 2023:

chairman: Prof. Dr. Péter Szolgay, professor, member of the staff, former head of the RTDSST members:

Zsófia Balogh-Lantos, PhD student

Prof. Dr. Gábor Szederkényi, professor, core member of the RTDSST, head of the RTDSST

Dr. Péter Polcz, RTDSST QAC Secretary

Dr. Kálmán Tornai, Associate Professor, Head of Quality Management, PPKE-ITK

Tivadarné Vida, Dr., Head of the RTDSST Doctoral Office

Proposal: 6/2023(VIII.30.)/RTDSST

Decision: 41/2023(IX.15.)/ MMT DHT

The RTDSST MB's Rules of Procedure:

The general rules of procedure of the quality assurance committees of the PPKE can be found here:

<https://ppke.hu/en/quality-policy-5>