

The External Evaluation Report of a Doctoral Study Domain

Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Methods used
- III. Analysis of performance indicators
- IV. SWOT Analysis
- V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations
- VI. Conclusions and general recommendations
- VII. Annexes

I. Introduction¹

This report summarizes the main concluding remarks about the assessment performed for the Doctoral Study Domain of Medicine (within the fundamental domain of Biological and Biomedical sciences) in the “Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați (DJUG). This assessment has been part of a process of the periodic external Evaluation of Doctoral Study Domains carried out by the Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ARACIS). I have participated as a external and international evaluator, from the University of Malaga (southern Spain), according to the Methodology approved by the ORDER 3651 of 12.04.2021 of the Minister of Education for evaluation of doctoral studies. The Experts Committee of my domain (Medicine) was also composed by Professor dr. Laurențiu Mogoantă, from the University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova (Romania) and by the PhD student Ms Simona Zamfir, from the University of Iași (Romania). Professor Mogoantă, expert of the ARACIS for a long time, has acted as the coordinator of this Committee.

The doctoral studies at the School for Biomedical Sciences was established in 2018 by Professor dr. Aurel Nechita, doctoral supervisor within IOSUD Bucharest since 2005. Three members from other Schools for Doctoral Studies in Medicine was joined: Professor dr. Dorel Firescu (University of Medicine and Pharmacy Craiova), Professor dr. Alin Laurențiu Tatu (“Transilvania” University of Brașov), and Professor dr. Anamaria Ciubara (University of Oradea), according to the Senate Decision no. 140 from October 7th, 2019. Thus, this date remarks the incipient character of this doctoral school. The Director of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences is the Professor dr. Dana Tutunaru.

The evaluation has taken place remotely for all the Expert Committees from 12th to 16th of July of 2021, in addition to an on-site visit to the buildings, facilities and laboratories by the coordinators for each domain. Moreover, a wide range of internal evaluation reports and summaries about the Doctoral Studies for each domain has been provided in advance by the University, and then, others upon requests. During the mentioned week, several virtual sessions with PhD students, employers, Doctoral School and other staff involved in Doctoral studies in “Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați were organized in order to answer and clarify certain aspects of such documents. The meetings were arranged by Professor Daniel Botez, from the University Vasile Alecsandri Bacau (Romania) and on

¹ Each time when applicable the information shall be presented gender-wise.



behalf of ARACIS, and mostly conducted by Professor Ion Popa, the Evaluation director, and by Professor Aurel Nechite where applicable (especially for the Domain of Medicine).

II. Methods used

The methodology used in my evaluation included:

- The analysis of the internal evaluation report of the doctoral study domain under review and its appendices.
- The analysis of documents, data and information available on the Doctoral School website, in electronic format;
- Online meeting/discussions with doctoral students in the doctoral study domain of Medicine (twice, one of them as required by Ms Simona Zamfir and myself);
- Online meeting/discussions with employers of the graduates in the doctoral study domain of Medicine;
- Online meeting/discussions with the doctoral advisors in the doctoral study domain of Medicine;
- Online meeting/discussions with the representatives of the various structures of the IOSUD/Doctoral School(s) in which the doctoral study domain under review is operating: The Council of the Doctoral School, the Board of Directors, the Quality Assessment and Assurance Commission, the Quality Assurance Department, and the Ethics Commission;
- Other specific documents required and provided by Professor Aurel Nechita;

The online sessions were scheduled from Monday to Friday (from 12th until 16th of July, 2021).

III. Analysis of ARACIS's performance indicators

Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

This section assesses the organizational structures and financial resources, as well as the research infrastructure of the "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, especially concerning to Medicine domain in the Doctoral Studies for Biomedical Sciences, and according different indicators.

Criterion A.1. The administrative, managerial institutional structures and the financial resources

Standard A.1.1. The institution organizing doctoral studies (IOSUD) has implemented the effective functioning mechanisms provided for in the specific legislation on the organization of doctoral studies.

Performance Indicator A.1.1.1. The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the Doctoral School of the respective university doctoral study domain:

- (a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;***
- (b) the Methodology for conducting elections for the position of director of the Council of doctoral school (CSD), as well as elections by the students of their representative in CSD and the evidence of their conduct;***



c) the Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies (for the admission of doctoral students, for the completion of doctoral studies);

d) the existence of mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral advisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad;

e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), giving as well proof of the regularity of meetings;

f) the contract for doctoral studies;

g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

Information regarding this indicator is provided in the folder 1.1.1. All the internal regulations and general rules of the Doctoral School of the University of Galati (all domains) are shown in the Appendix Anexa 2 la Hotărârea Consiliului de Administrație nr. 18 din 5 martie 2021. Specifically, they reported the dates of the election procedure, candidates within PhD students group and results of the membership elections for the Doctoral School Council (C.S.D.). Anyway, it is surprising the way of voting for PhD students, sending an email to the address iuliana.ion@ugal.ro (corresponding to the secretary of the doctoral school), which would not respect the anonymity of a vote and consequently would compromise the freedom of voting. Below it is shown a screenshot of the pdf provided.

The participation rates of the PhD students was roughly the half of them (41 out of 91).

In addition, the organization and development of the procedure of selection of the management structures of the Doctoral Schools from IOSUD - "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați is also specified in a pdf (11_10_Metodologie_si_calendar_alegeri_CSD_2017.pdf, attached as Appendix), provided by Professor Aurel Nechita upon request. The document is intended to different doctoral schools others than that of Medicine domain (Doctoral School of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Doctoral School of Fundamental and Engineering Sciences and Doctoral School of Socio-Human Sciences). Anyway, we assumed the same procedure for all the doctoral schools from IOSUD – DJUG. Additionally, a pdf with the results of the members election for the doctoral school of Biomedical Sciences was also provided by Professor Aurel Nechita upon request (PV alegeri membri CSD 2020.pdf, attached as Appendix too).

Moreover, the participation of different PhD students was verified; they corroborated the quality of the curriculum and the good functioning of the school. PhD students were specially satisfied with the reimbursement of publication fees and future expectations. There are also two satisfaction forms (rating different items), one of them for doctoral students and another one for supervisors:



<https://www.ugal.ro/studii/doctorat/scoli-doctorale/scoala-doctorala-de-stiinte-biomedicale/mecanisme-de-feedback-sd-sbm>

Council of the doctoral school met regularly, whereas meetings among PhD students and supervisors are also frequent (whenever necessary). However, the member of C.S.D. on behalf of PhD students, Ms. Diana-Andreea Ciortea, was asked by the participation in making decisions within C.S.D. Although she assured her opinions were always listened and considered, an example was given where this fact was not fulfilled.

Regarding completion of doctoral studies, Professor Nechita gave some reasons for abandonment, but none of them related to financial troubles. Only three people had drop out the doctoral program because of personal reasons (finding a job abroad).

It is also possible the recognition of the quality of a doctoral supervisor and the habilitation in the field of doctoral university studies, even when this certification has been obtained abroad. There is a specific form provided: ANEXĂ la Metodologia privind recunoașterea automată de către Universitatea „Dunărea de Jos” din Galați a calității de conducător de doctorat obținută în instituții de învățământ universitar acreditate din străinătate.

The contracts for doctoral studies were also provided, both for scholarships holders and not sponsored students. Students with scholarships can carry out teaching activities (4-6 hours / week). The satisfaction level with this task was high according to the opinion of all the PhD students asked during online sessions.

Finally, it also provided all the information regarding section g) (internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies). Anyway, this participation could be scarce, as we realized when some of the employers of PhD students in the hospital were asked in the online sessions. They also received very well the suggestion of introducing a bioinformatics discipline in the training program during first year.

Recommendations: I strongly suggest an electronic way of voting which respects and enables anonymous votes. Additionally and according to the answers given during the online sessions, PhD students are not familiarized with the voting system. This fact might be the reason for a low participation rate, so I encourage emphasizing the candidates' promotion and voting procedures in next elections. PhD students did not know very well their rights and obligations either, so this deficiency would need to be amended. An informative dossier and presentations given by PhD students in the third year of doctoral studies, might provide such information at the beginning of the doctoral program.

According to one of the main objectives of this doctoral school, to be leaders in Genomics issues, I recommend the introduction of an optional discipline strongly related to this area (Bioinformatics, Genomic Analysis, etc.) in the content of the doctoral study program.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator A.1.1.2. The doctoral school's Regulation includes mandatory criteria, procedures and standards binding on the aspects specified in Article 17, paragraph (5) of the Government Decision No. 681/2011 on the approval of the Code of Doctoral Studies with subsequent amendments and additions.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself



- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself.

All the procedures were collected in different documents: the process of withdrawal / revocation of the quality of member of the School for Doctoral Studies (https://www.ugal.ro/files/doctorat/2019/ProceduraRevocareMembruCSUD_151019.pdf), conflict mediation procedures (<http://www.ugal.ro/studii/doctorat/regulamentul-privind-organizarea-studiilor-universitare-de-doctorat>), period of interruptions and extensions (https://www.ugal.ro/files/hotarari/ca/2021/HCA_18_2021_anexa_2_RegScDoct.pdf), etc.

In addition, we could access to the program antiplagiarism used (<https://sistemantiplagiat.ro/>). There were no claims by PhD students about this software, so we supposed a proper functioning of this.

In addition, equipments of laboratories seemed to be enough in opinion of some PhD students. They also worked as residents at the hospital at the same time of carrying out their thesis, and they assured to have a completely free access to any facilities and laboratories upon request.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Standard A.1.2. The IOSUD has the logistical resources necessary to carry out the doctoral studies' mission.

Performance Indicator A.1.2.1. The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

Some screenshots of the program used to track doctoral students enrolled in the "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați were shown in Anexa_A.1.2.1.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator A.1.2.2. The existence and use of an appropriate software program and evidence of its use to verify the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself.

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself.

Folder A.1.2.2. includes the antiplagiarism procedures and documents approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Galati and used both for thesis and scientific reports (manuscripts suitable to publish, communications in scientific meetings, etc.). The access to anti-plagiarism detection



system is through <https://sistemantiplagiat.ro/> The PhD students also mentioned the usefulness of ethical disciplines in the content of their doctoral program to avoid plagiarism issues.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Standard A.1.3. The IOSUD makes sure that financial resources are used optimally, and the revenues obtained from doctoral studies are supplemented through additional funding besides governmental funding.

Performance Indicator A.1.3.1. Existence of at least one research or institutional / human resources development grant under implementation at the time of submission of the internal evaluation file, per doctoral study domain under evaluation, or existence of at least 2 research or institutional development / human resources grant for the doctoral study domain, obtained by doctoral thesis advisors operating in the evaluated domain within the past 5 years. The grants address relevant themes for the respective domain and, as a rule, are engaging doctoral students.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

The internal report (Folder_ A.1.3.1) exposes at least two research grants won through national and international competitions by the doctoral supervisors of the doctoral field of MEDICINE during the period assessed (2016-2020). Specifically, there are 6 research grants mentioned.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator *A.1.3.2. The percentage of doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation, who for at least six months receive additional funding sources besides government funding, through scholarships awarded by individual persons or by legal entities, or who are financially supported through research or institutional / human resources development grants is not less than 20%.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

As provided in appendix A.1.3.2, 10 doctoral students of "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, SD-SBM out of 91 (11%) were granted by tax exemptions. A total of 25 doctoral students financially supported (27.5%) was mentioned in the evaluation performed by ARACIS, but I was completely unable to find this information. In addition, ARACIS report suggests not to evaluate this criterion because any doctoral student had finished the doctoral training program during the evaluation period (2016-2020).



A new document was received at 16th of August in order to justify this indicator (REZULTATE_FINALE_GT3_ANTREPRENORDOC.pdf). This pdf is attached as appendix, and it led me to consider this indicator partially fulfilled. In this additional document is explained that 3 additional students were included within an European Project.

Recommendations: The ARACIS report shows awareness of this situation. Anyway, I suggest working hard to improve this fact once the current COVID-19 crisis is over, even with external collaborations with private companies. There are plenty of PhD students (almost a hundred) and the percentage of them financially supported has to be increased.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Performance Indicator *A.1.3.3.² At least 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants obtained by the university through institutional contracts and of tuition fees collected from the doctoral students enrolled in the paid tuition system is used to reimburse professional training expenses of doctoral students (attending conferences, summer schools, training, programs abroad, publication of specialty papers or other specific forms of dissemination etc.).

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

The average of the last five years is slightly over 10% of the total obtained through doctoral fees and institutional grants.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure

Standard A.2.1. The IOSUD has a modern research infrastructure to support the conduct of doctoral studies' specific activities.

Performance Indicator A.2.1.1. The venues and the material equipment available to the doctoral school enable the research activities in the evaluated domain to be carried out, in line with the assumed mission and objectives (computers, specific software, equipment, laboratory equipment, library, access to international databases etc.). The research infrastructure and the provision of research services are presented to the public through a specific platform. The research infrastructure described above, which was purchased and developed within the past 5 years will be presented distinctly.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

² The indicators marked with an asterisk (*) hold a special status, referring exclusively to the evaluation of doctoral studies domains, as per Article 12 from the annex No.1 of the Order of the minister of education No. 3651/12.04.2021 approving the Methodology for evaluating university doctoral studies and the system of criteria, standards and performance indicators used in the evaluation. In case they are not met, the Agency extends a period of maximum 3 years to IOSUD to correct the respective deficiencies.



- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

According to information provided (Folder A.2.1.1), there existed plenty of infrastructures and facilities related to different topics (dental Medicine, Microbiology, Radiology, etc.), enough to make possible the doctoral studies of the huge amount of PhD students enrolled in this domain. PhD students also confirmed the completely free access to these different facilities and equipments.

During the last 5 years, the internal report especially highlights the purchase of 25 equipments. In addition, an abstract of an email sent by Professor Aurel Nechita, upon request, and attached as Appedix (Genomic Research centre explanation and planned purchases.pdf) gave me all the explanations about the constitution of an outstanding Genomics research center, functional by the end of this year. He also provided me the sheet evaluating the budgets for the different equipments which will be purchased during next months (Oferta 2 Elta-2.pdf). Among these planned equipments, I have to highlight the massive genomic sequencing devices.

Finally, the access to scientific publications (printed and online), national and international ones, was also confirmed through the DJUG library. Members of DJUG had granted access to different databases too; this point was also confirmed with the PhD students during the online sessions.

Recommendations: I suggest a specific training in the Genomics equipment as well as in the interpretation of data retrieved from it, both for professors in charge and for the PhD students enrolled in a thesis concerning this topic. This is the only way to ensure the maximum performance of the equipment once purchased

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources

Standard A.3.1. At the level of each domain there are sufficient qualified staff to ensure the conduct of doctoral study program.

Performance Indicator A.3.1.1. Minimum three doctoral thesis advisors within that doctoral domain, and at least 50% of them (but no less than three) meet the minimum standards of the National Council for Attestation of University Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (CNATDCU) in force at the time when the evaluation is carried out, which standards are required and mandatory for obtaining the enabling certification.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

According to folder A.3.1.1, there 12 doctoral supervisors in the field of Medicine able to carry out their activity.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.



Performance Indicator *A.3.1.2. At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

During the period assessed (2016-2020), all the doctoral supervisors, who guided and evaluated the activity of each doctoral student in the Domain of Medicine, already had a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator A.3.1.3. The study subjects in the education program based on advanced higher education studies pertaining to the doctoral domain are taught by teaching staff or researchers who are doctoral thesis advisors / certified doctoral thesis advisors, professors / CS I or lecturer / CS II, with proved expertise in the field of the study subjects they teach, or other specialists in the field who meet the standards established by the institution in relation with the aforementioned teaching and research functions, as provided by the law.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

The doctoral program carried out within the Doctoral School includes: a) a training program based on advanced university studies; b) an individual scientific research program. The first one is shown in Folder A.3.1.3, which also included the Europass curriculum vitae of the corresponding teachers. The training path includes mandatory disciplines for all the PhD students, and other ones optional according to every individual scientific research program.

Moreover, training courses, both mandatory and optional ones, are very appreciated by PhD students, as they mentioned during the online sessions. Special mention for Ethical and Biostatistic training.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator *A.3.1.4. The percentage of doctoral thesis advisors who concomitantly coordinate more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12, who are themselves studying in doctoral programs³ does not exceed 20%.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

³ 3 years for the doctoral university studies with the duration stipulated at Article 159, paragraph (3), respectively 4 years for the doctoral university studies with the duration stipulated at Article 174, paragraph (3) of the Law of national education No.1/2011 with subsequent amendments and additions, with additional extension periods approved as per Article 39, paragraph (3) of the Code of doctoral studies approved by the GD No. 681/2011 with subsequent amendments and additions.



There are three doctoral supervisors of the SD-SBM exceeding the threshold of 12 doctoral students under their supervision, as shown in Appendix A.3.1.4: Professor Firescu is supervising 16 doctoral students; Prof. Ciubara, 15 doctoral students; Prof. Nechita is supervising 14 PhD students at this moment. There are other two more concomitantly coordinating more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12: Prof. Kamel 11 PhD students; and Prof. Tutunaru 8. So, in total there are five out a total of 12 supervisor, so this represent a percentage of 41.6%.

Recommendations: The non-compliance of this criterium would compromise the quality of the supervision and even the research performed. PhD students, especially during the first stages of their doctoral studies, need a coordination, and investment of time difficult to manage when so many students are under supervision of an unique person. As told during the online sessions, there are other 6 other teachers being assessed by ARACIS to supervise doctorates, so I encourage their incorporation very soon.

The indicator is not fulfilled.

Standard A.3.2. The Doctoral advisors within the domain are carrying out a scientific activity visible at international level.

Performance Indicator A.3.2.1. At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in the evaluated domain have at least 5 Web of Science- or ERIH-indexed publications in magazines of impact, or other achievements of relevant significance for that domain, including international-level contributions that indicate progress in scientific research - development - innovation for the evaluated domain. The aforementioned doctoral thesis advisors enjoy international awareness within the past five years, consisting of: membership on scientific boards of international publications and conferences; membership on boards of international professional associations; guests in conferences or expert groups working abroad, or membership on doctoral defense commissions at universities abroad or co-leading with universities abroad. For Arts and Sports and Physical Education Sciences, doctoral thesis advisors shall prove their international visibility within the past five years by their membership on the boards of professional associations, membership in organizing committees of arts events and international competitions, membership on juries or umpire teams in artistic events or international competitions.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

All the supervisors possess at least 5 publications indexed in ISI Web of Science during the period being assessed (2016-2020). They also showed international visibility taking part in the organizing committee of GALMED meeting (Congresul Național cu participare internațională pentru Studenți, Farmaciști, Medici Rezidenți, Medici Dentiști, Asistenți Medicali Generaliști și Moașe) from 2015.

Recommendations: Despite meeting the performance indicator, I encourage a wider range of international activities to gain more visibility abroad. This suggestion might also provide a greater attraction of international talent to the doctoral school (new candidates for PhD students and coordinators).



The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator *A.3.2.2. At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in a specific doctoral study domain continue to be active in their scientific field, and acquire at least 25% of the score requested by the minimal CNATDCU standards in force at the time of the evaluation, which are required and mandatory for acquiring their enabling certificate, based on their scientific results within the past five years.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

All the PhD supervisors in the domain of Medicine meet at least 25% of the score required by the minimum standards CNATDCU in force at the date of evaluation, necessary and mandatory to obtain the certificate of qualification.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Criterion B.1. The number, quality and diversity of candidates enrolled for the admission contest

Standard B.1.1. The institution organizing doctoral studies has the capacity to attract candidates from outside the higher education institution or a number of candidates exceeding the number of seats available.

Performance Indicator *B.1.1.1. The ratio between the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions, national or foreign, who have enrolled for the doctoral admission contest within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget, put out through contest within the doctoral domain is at least 0.2 or the ratio between the number of candidates within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget put out through contest within the doctoral studies domain is at least 1,2.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

In the last 5 years, 56 was the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions and 24 the number of places financed from the budget, so the ratio is 2.33, over the threshold (B.1.1.1. Absolventii de master, 5 ani_SD-SBM_v2.xlsx, provided upon request). Many students from other institutions from the same Romania (mainly from Bucarest) and others from Republica Moldova, and even Ukraine, attended the doctoral program in Medicine domain from DJUG.



Students from Moldova were not being supported by any scholarship, so this fact could represent a handicap to apply for this doctoral program.

Despite the recent creation of this school and the current situation with the pandemic, the rate assessed is high, so this fact showed the ability to attract talent from other institutions.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Standard B.1.2 Candidates admitted to doctoral studies demonstrate academic, research and professional performance.

Performance Indicator *B.1.2.1. Admission to doctoral study programs is based on selection criteria including: previous academic, research and professional performance, their interest for scientific or arts/sports research, publications in the domain and a proposal for a research subject. Interviewing the candidate is compulsory, as part of the admission procedure.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

In my opinion, the procedure for admission to doctoral studies was fairly established and also explained by the online sessions. It was drawn as a merit-based competition and further interviews with the coordinators of each field, according to the particular interest of the candidates. The schedule for all the steps of admission process for 2021 has already published in the web of DJUG and provided as a proof of transparency and equal access opportunities.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator B.1.2.2. The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral students 3, respectively 4, years after admission⁴ does not exceed 30%.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

During the period assessed, only one drop-off was registered after a period of 3 years for the Medicine domain (3.7%). The calculation criteria assuming the expulsion rate 4 years after admission is not applicable, because of the recent creation of the doctoral school.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs

⁴ 3 years for the doctoral university studies with the duration stipulated at Article 159, paragraph (3), respectively 4 years for the doctoral university studies with the duration stipulated at Article 174, paragraph (3) of the Law of national education No. 1/2011 with subsequent amendments and additions.



Standard B.2.1. The training program based on advanced university studies is appropriate to improve doctoral students' research skills and to strengthen ethical behavior in science.

Performance Indicator B.2.1.1. The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant to the scientific research training of doctoral students; at least one of these disciplines is intended to study in-depth the research methodology and/or the statistical data processing.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

The training program was very well established, with professional and transversal competences precisely described, specially concerning disciplines relevant for scientific research training of doctoral students. The educational plan in the field of Medicine contains 5 courses relevant for the scientific training of doctoral students. Moreover, Folder B.2.1.1 contained all the disciplines included in the training program as well as the teachers in charge. As above mentioned, the training program was very appreciated by PhD students, as they mentioned during the online sessions. Special mention for Ethical and Biostatistic training.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator B.2.1.2. At least one discipline is dedicated to Ethics and Intellectual Property in scientific research or there are well-defined topics on these subjects within a discipline taught in the doctoral program.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

Folder B.2.1.2 shows three disciplines related to Ethics and Intellectual Property, one of them mandatory for doctoral studies in DJUG and the other two specific of the doctoral program in the domain of Medicine. As also clarified during the online session with Ethics Department, this issue - *Ethics and Intellectual Property*- is a main concern in any doctoral program from DJUG.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator B.2.1.3. The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities⁵.

⁵ Or by what the graduate should know, understand and to be able to do, according to the provisions of the Methodology of 17 March 2017 regarding inscription and registration of higher education qualifications in the National Register of Qualifications in Higher Education (RNCIS) approved by the Order No.3475/2017 with subsequent amendments and additions.



- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

The disciplines offered, mandatory and specific ones, are relevant and suitable for the development of a research career in different specialized fields of the domain of Medicine. Folder 2.1.3 contain a detailed description of each discipline, with the aims to achieve, competencies, hours required to complete the course, resources needed -powerpoint, seminar, laboratories-, means of evaluation, and useful references.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator B.2.1.4. All along the duration of the doctoral training, doctoral students in the domain receive counselling/guidance from functional guidance commissions, which is reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

This indicator is fully met, with the submission of a report of the progress and achievements (presentations on scientific conferences, stays in other national and international institutions, etc.) by each doctoral student at least once every 12 months. Thus, each doctoral student is assessed every year. The documentation report is accessible through:

<https://www.ugal.ro/informatii/informatii-publice/hotarari/hotarari-csud/89-hotarari-csud-2020/8313-hotararea-csud-nr-28-30-10-2020>

The Folder B.2.1.4 also includes the office hours for each supervisor. Anyway, the PhD students could ask for a meeting whenever they need, as confirmed during the online sessions, both with coordinators and doctoral students.

As results of this guidance and supervision actions, they provide a list of all the publications by the with the members of the supervising committees from this doctoral school. In addition, Prof. Alin Tatu, one of the supervisors, commented two prizes for some publications.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator B.2.1.5. For a doctoral study domain, the ratio between the number of doctoral students and the number of teaching staff/researchers providing doctoral guidance must not exceed 3:1.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself



In folder B.2.1.5, we can find the number of doctoral students (92) and the number of teaching staff (33), so the current ratio 2,78, below the threshold of 3.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion B.3. The results of doctoral studies and procedures for their evaluation.

Standard B.3.1. Doctoral students capitalize on the research through presentations at scientific conferences, scientific publications, technological transfer, patents, products and service orders.

Performance Indicator B.3.1.1. For the evaluated domain, the evaluation commission will be provided with at least one paper or some other relevant contribution per doctoral student who has obtained a doctor's title within the past 5 years. From this list, the members of the evaluation commission shall randomly select 5 such papers / relevant contributions per doctoral study domain for review. At least 3 selected papers must contain significant original contributions in the respective domain.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

This criterion is not applicable, since there is not any graduates at ths moment of assessment.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is not applicable.

Performance Indicator *B.3.1.2. The ratio between the number of presentations of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years), including posters, exhibitions made at prestigious international events (organized in the country or abroad) and the number of doctoral students who have completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years) is at least 1.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

This criterion is not applicable, since there is not any graduates at ths moment of assessment.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is not applicable.

Standard B.3.2. The Doctoral School engages a significant number of external scientific specialists in the commissions for public defense of doctoral theses in the analyzed domain.



Performance Indicator *B.3.2.1. The number of doctoral theses allocated to one specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the evaluated IOSUD should not exceed two (2) in a year for the theses coordinated by the same doctoral thesis advisor.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

This criterion is not applicable, since there is not any graduates at this moment of assessment.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is not applicable

Performance Indicator *B.3.2.2. The ratio between the doctoral theses allocated to one scientific specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the institution where the defense on the doctoral thesis is organized, and the number of doctoral theses presented in the same doctoral study domain in the doctoral school should not exceed 0.3, considering the past five years. Only those doctoral study domains in which minimum ten doctoral theses have been presented within the past five years should be analyzed.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

This criterion is not applicable, since there is not any graduates at this moment of assessment.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is not applicable

Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

**general description of domain analysis.*

Criterion C.1. Existence and periodic implementation of the internal quality assurance system

Standard C.1.1. There are an institutional framework and procedures in place and relevant internal quality assurance policies, applied for monitoring the internal quality assurance.

Performance Indicator C.1.1.1. The Doctoral school in the respective university study domain shall demonstrate the continuous development of the evaluation process and its internal quality assurance following a procedure developed and applied at the level of the IOSUD, the following assessed criteria being mandatory:

(a) the scientific work of Doctoral advisors;

(b) the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity;

(c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized;

(d) the scientific activity of doctoral students;

(e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students;



f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

All the information about these criteria is gathered in Folder C.1.1.1. Regarding item a), all the ISI Articles where each supervisor is author and co-author are listed, as well as the Hirsch Web of Science Index for all of them.

Related to items b) and f), it is worth mentioning that doctoral students asserted the free access to the library within IOSUD-DJUG; the library made available to them the following categories of online databases: Subscribed databases, free trial databases, open access databases, institutional digital repositories and other digital libraries. Moreover, doctoral students' research results can be awarded from IOSUD-UDJG every year; the best scientific articles/papers can be proposed within a committee and be awarded. The selection criteria and the different stages for the award of research results by doctoral students are explained in the following link:

https://www.ugal.ro/files/hotarari/hcsud/2020/Hotararea_CSUD_nr_31_din_24_11_2020_Anexa.pdf

Professor Alin Tatou mentioned the achievement of two prizes.

All the methodology for organizing and conducting doctoral studies seems to be on accordance to that approved by the Senate Decision number 91 of 12.06.2020. Furthermore, documentation about periodic evaluation of the study program is also provided.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator *C.1.1.2. Mechanisms are implemented during the stage of the doctoral study program to enable feedback from doctoral students allowing to identify their needs, as well as their overall level of satisfaction with the doctoral study program in order to ensure continuous improvement of the academic and administrative processes. Following the analysis of the results, there is evidence that an action plan was drafted and implemented.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

DJUG meets this indicator, and the feed back mechanisms (questionnaires and forms) are included in Folder C.1.1.2. Moreover, during online sessions, PhD students showed a good level of satisfaction with the doctoral study program and school.

Recommendations: However, it would have been interesting some report of the results got during the period assessed (number of consultations, rate of satisfaction after an inquiry, etc.) in order to make me a better idea of the real implementation and performance of this indicator. I strongly suggest the adoption of the statistical data to show the performance of this indicator.

The indicator is fulfilled.



Criterion C.2. Transparency of information and accessibility of learning resources

Standard C.2.1. Information of interest to doctoral students, future candidates and public interest information is available for electronic format consultation.

Performance Indicator C.2.1.1. The IOSUD publishes on the website of the organizing institution, in compliance with the general regulations on data protection, information such as:

- (a) the Doctoral School regulation;***
- (b) the admission regulation;***
- (c) the doctoral studies contract;***
- (d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;***
- (e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies;***
- (f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data;***
- (g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor);***
- (h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis;***
- (i) links to the doctoral theses' summaries to be publicly presented and the date, time, place where they will be presented; this information will be communicated at least twenty days before the presentation.***

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

The website of the organizing institution is flourished with plenty of links to the corresponding procedure. So, it is clear for me that The Doctoral School of DJUG pays special attention to the dissemination of information of interest to doctoral students, but also to teachers, supervisors, potential candidates.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Standard C.2.2. The IOSUD/The Doctoral School provides doctoral students with access to the resources needed for conducting doctoral studies.

Performance Indicator C.2.2.1. All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of their thesis.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

PhD students have at their disposal the DJUG Library and free access to the resources offered by it, as mentioned in Performance indicator C.1.1.1: Subscribed databases, free trial databases, open access databases, institutional digital repositories and other digital libraries..



Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator C.2.2.2. Each doctoral student shall have access, upon request, to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

Folder C.2.2.2 includes the procedure to evaluate the degree of similarity of a thesis with other scientific creations. Specifications antiplagiarism, with the different items, are also gathered in other pdf in this folder.

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator C.2.2.3. All doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the specific domain/domains within the Doctoral School, according to internal order procedures.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

Folder C.2.2.3 included all the facilities available for doctoral students, already cited in Section A. They also mentioned the availability to use them (always according to the internal regulations of each research unit).

Recommendations: No recommendations.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion C.3. Internationalization

Standard C.3.1. There is a strategy in place and it is applied to enhance the internationalization of doctoral studies.

Performance Indicator *C.3.1.1. IOSUD, for every evaluated domain, has concluded mobility agreements with universities abroad, with research institutes, with companies working in the field of study, aimed at the mobility of doctoral students and academic staff (e.g., ERASMUS agreements for the doctoral studies). At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences. IOSUD drafts and applies policies and measures aiming at increasing the number of doctoral students participating at mobility periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.



- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

The DJUG, specifically in the field of Medicine, possesses agreements with different higher education institutions. There are also ERASMUS agreements with the following universities: Medical University Sofia, from Bulgaria; Université Bordeaux Segalen, from France; Universität Duisburg-Essen, from Germany; Università di Foggia, University of L'Aquila and Università degli Studi di Genova, all of them from Italy; Universidade Nova de Lisboa, from Portugal; Afyon Kocatepe University, Gaziantep University, Dokuz Eylul University, Ahi Evran University, KTO Karatay University, Mersin University, Namik Kemal University and Erzincan University, all of them from Turkey.

For doctoral studies in the domain of Medicine, the doctoral school possesses agreements with the following education institutions through DJUG: Université Bordeaux Segalen, from France; Università di Foggia, University of L'Aquila, University of Palermo, and Università degli Studi di Genova, all of them from Italy; Afyon Kocatepe University, Erzincan University, Gaziantep University, Dokuz Eylul University, Ahi Evran University, Mersin University, Namik Kemal University, all of them from Turkey. Anyway, none of the PhD students enrolled seem to have granted by an ERASMUS scholarships and enjoyed of a short stay abroad. Nevertheless, 19 out of 91 students (20.9%, <35%) have attended and presented their research results in any international conference. There are 45 presentations in international scientific conferences though.

Recommendations: It is necessary to make a greater effort of internalization. Maybe, holding specific presentation days with students already awarded with Erasmus scholarships (even from other domains) or other kind of grants would be encouraging. There are interest of dissemination the research results abroad though, as shown with plenty of communications in international scientific meetings.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Performance Indicator C.3.1.2. In the evaluated doctoral study domain, support is granted, including financial support, to the organization of doctoral studies in international co-tutelage or invitation of leading experts to deliver courses/lectures for doctoral students.

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

DJUG has organized plenty of editions of Scientific Conference organized by the Doctoral Schools of "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galati (SCDS-UDJG). In all of them, leading international experts has been invited. However, specifically no members from the evaluated doctoral study domain, Medicine, appear in the scheduled program of them as lecturers neither in the organizing or scientific committees, until reaching the last editions (in 2019, Anamaria CIUBARA; and in 2021, Dana TUTUNAR and Anamaria CIUBARA). This fact can be confirmed through the website of this conference: <http://www.cssd-udjg.ugal.ro/> Some of the visiting professors in such conferences have also belonged to Medicine field: Prof. Dr. Hakan Kar from the Mersin University Medical Faculty (Turkey), Prof. dr. Marc



Auriacombe from the University of Bordeaux (France), Prof. Ahcène Boumendjel, from the University of Grenoble (also from France).

Additionally, at this moment there are no coordinators from any university other than Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați. This is a different feature from other doctoral schools from the same University of Galati (such as the School for Doctoral Studies in Socio-Humanities and The School for Doctoral Studies in Fundamental and Engineering Sciences), with international co-tutelages. This information can be found in the following link: <https://www.en.ugal.ro/education/study-programmes/doctoral-studies/domains-and-coordinators>

Recommendations: Within this indicator, there two facts to improve: the number of doctoral theses in the domain of Medicine under international co-supervision. This was zero during the period assessed. In my opinion, this fact could indirectly be related to the previous indicator, so an increasing of students in other international centres might make easier the collaboration and agreements with universities abroad. The other fact to improve is the participation in the organizing committees of scientific meeting arranged by DJUG. The participation of two of the members in the last editions might give an idea of the slow but increasing role of the doctoral school in the domain of Medicine in the set of doctoral schools of DJUG.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Performance Indicator C.3.1.3. The internationalization of activities carried out during the doctoral studies is supported by IOSUD through concrete measures (e.g., by participating in educational fairs to attract international doctoral students; by including international experts in guidance committees or doctoral committees etc.).

- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution’s documents and the evaluation visit itself

- analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution’s documents and the evaluation visit itself

Appendix C.3.1.3. includes an example of internationalization activity organized by DJUG with foreign participants (but not specifically for the Doctoral school in the domain of Medicine).

Recommendations: The international activity is scarce. Thus, I suggest as one of the best strategy for the internationalization of the doctoral school in the domain of Medicine would be to attract doctoral supervisors from other prestigious universities with which already existing agreements (listed in the previous indicator). Moreover, they could also participate in co-tutelage of doctoral thesis.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

| <u>Strengths:</u> | <u>Weaknesses:</u> |
|---|--|
| -Willingness to improve and become one of the leading team in cutting-edge topics such as Genomics. -Genomics and Molecular Diagnosis of different | -The number of PhD students directed by some supervisors is excessive. A lower number of supervised students might enhance many outcomes (specially international publications |



| | |
|---|---|
| <p>infectious diseases (i.e., coronavirus, <i>Influenzavirus</i>, etc.) are strong topics within this Domain, with publications of high impact factor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Incorporations of members from other universities in the setting up of the doctoral school. -Certain level of expertise exchange and internationalization. The School for Doctoral Studies in Biomedical Sciences (CSD-SBM) brought members of other universities at the beginning (in the creation). CSD-SBM is also composed by members from the University of Bordeaux (France) and Bucharest (Romania). -Ethical procedures are always considered and, moreover, some mandatory training courses in the domain of Medicine are teaching ethical issues. -Good consideration by employers of the knowledge and skills acquired through doctoral studies. -Despite the recent creation of this school and the current situation with the pandemic, the rate of students from other institution is high, so this fact showed the ability to attract talent from other institutions from the same Romania or close places (mainly Moldova and Ukraine). | <p>and meetings, and fundings search).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Low rate of internationalization, with no students granted by Erasmus program and other doctoral programs awarding stays abroad. -At this moment there are no coordinators from any university other than Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați. This is a different feature from other doctoral schools from the same University of Galati (such as the School for Doctoral Studies in Socio-Humanities and The School for Doctoral Studies in Fundamental and Engineering Sciences). -Some procedures, like election of the representatives among PhD students, are not fairly established (votation must be anonymous). |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The partnership with the "Kore" University of Enna (Sicily, Italy) and the Proserpina Fund (https://www.ugal.ro/facultati/extensiunea-facultatii-de-medicina-si-farmacie-in-enna-italia) available for Medicine degree, should also represent an opportunity to enhance the internationalization of the doctoral program in Medicine in the University of Galati. I encourage CSD-SBM to work with ARACIS in the international mention for a joint program with the University of Enna. -Any internalization chance should be taken advantage of, enhancing exchange of doctoral students or even professors with other institutions. Erasmus programs and partnerships, already existing, should be taken advantage of. | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Threats:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -No obvious or important threats for the functioning of the institution have been found, apart from those caused by the current pandemic impact and, above all, the recent creation of this doctoral school. -The legal term of scholarships is 4 years, but the amount of these is not high enough. So, they mentioned as challenging was a part-time job while doing the experimental and clinical tasks of their own doctoral thesis. This fact might be a threat to the quality and impact of the results when the focus is on different matters. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>-They have to work hard to distinguish themselves and enhance the uniqueness of the research carried out by their Genomic research centre Focusing on the diagnosis of infectious diseases might be relevant enough to make it stand out. The equipment planned to be purchased by the end of the year could boost that centre.</p> <p>-New funding sources, as that already applied at the European level they mentioned, could be represent a good opportunity of consolidation in Genomic area.</p> <p>-A more favorable economic environment could be set up in close collaboration with private companies; clinical studies could support some PhD programs.</p> <p>-Availability of documents and forms in English language would make easier the attraction of foreign researchers and students.</p> | |
|--|--|

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

| No. | Type of indicator (*, C) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|-----|--|-----------------------|-----------|---|
| 1 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.1. The administrative, managerial institutional structures and the financial resources | A.1.1.1 | Fulfilled | I strongly suggest a electronic way of voting which respects and enables anonymous votes. Additionally and according to the answers given during the online sessions, PhD students are not familiarized with the voting system. This fact might be the reason of a low participation rate, so I encourage emphasizing the candidates promotion and voting procedures in next elections. PhD students did not know very well their rights and obligations either, so this deficiency would need to be amended. An informative dossier and presentations given by PhD students in the third year of doctoral studies, might provide |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---------|---------------------|--|
| | | | | <p>such information at the beginning of the doctoral program.</p> <p>According to one of the main objectives of this doctoral school, to be leaders in Genomics issues, I recommend the introduction of an optional discipline strongly related to this area (Bioinformatics, Genome Analysis, Molecular Epidemiology, etc.) in the content of the doctoral study program.</p> |
| 2 | <p>Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY</p> <p>A.1. The administrative, managerial institutional structures and the financial resources</p> | A.1.1.2 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 3 | <p>Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY</p> <p>A.1. The administrative, managerial institutional structures and the financial resources</p> | A.1.2.1 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 4 | <p>Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY</p> <p>A.1. The administrative, managerial institutional structures and the financial resources</p> | A.1.2.2 | Fulfilled | No recommendations |
| 5 | <p>Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY</p> <p>A.1. The administrative, managerial institutional structures and the financial resources</p> | A.1.3.1 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 6 | <p>Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY</p> <p>A.1. The administrative, managerial institutional structures and the financial resources</p> | A.1.3.2 | Partially fulfilled | <p>The ARACIS report shows awareness of this situation. Anyway, I suggest working hard to improve this fact once the current COVID-19 crisis is over, even with external collaborations with private companies. There are plenty of PhD students (almost a</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---------|---------------|---|
| | | | | hundred) and the percentage of them financially supported has to be increased. |
| 7 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.1. The administrative, managerial institutional structures and the financial resources | A.1.3.3 | Fulfilled | No recommendations |
| 8 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.2. Research infrastructure | A.2.1.1 | Fulfilled | I suggest a specific training in the Genomics equipment as well as in the interpretation of data retrieved from it, both for professors in charge and for the PhD students enrolled in a thesis concerning this topic. This is the only way to ensure the maximum performance of the equipment once purchased |
| 9 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.3. Quality of Human Resources | A.3.1.1 | Fulfilled | No recommendations |
| 10 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.3. Quality of Human Resources | A.3.1.2 | Fulfilled | No recommendations |
| 11 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.3. Quality of Human Resources | A.3.1.3 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. Training courses, both mandatory and optional ones, are very appreciated by PhD students. Special mention for Ethical and Biostatistic training. |
| 12 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.3. Quality of Human Resources | A.3.1.4 | Not fulfilled | The non-compliance of this criterium would compromise the quality of the supervision and even the research performed. PhD students, especially during the first stages of their doctoral studies, need a coordination, and investment of time difficult to manage when so many students are under supervision of an unique person. As told during the online sessions, there are other 6 other teachers being assessed by ARACIS to |

| | | | | |
|----|--|---------|-----------|--|
| | | | | supervise doctorates, so I encourage their incorporation very soon. |
| 13 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.3. Quality of Human Resources | A.3.2.1 | Fulfilled | Despite meeting the performance indicator, I encourage a wider range of international activities to gain more visibility abroad. This suggestion might also provide a greater attraction of international talent for the doctoral school (new candidates for PhD students and coordinators). |
| 14 | Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY A.3. Quality of Human Resources | A.3.2.2 | Fulfilled | No recommendations |
| 15 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.1. The number, quality and diversity of candidates enrolled for the admission contest | B.1.1.1 | Fulfilled | No recommendations |
| 16 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.1. The number, quality and diversity of candidates enrolled for the admission contest | B.1.2.1 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 17 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.1. The number, quality and diversity of candidates enrolled for the admission contest | B.1.2.2 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 18 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.2. The content of doctoral programs | B.2.1.1 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 19 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.2. The content of doctoral programs | B.2.1.2 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 20 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS | B.2.1.3 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---------|----------------|--|
| | B.2. The content of doctoral programs | | | |
| 21 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.2. The content of doctoral programs | B.2.1.4 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 22 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.2. The content of doctoral programs | B.2.1.5 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 23 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.3. The results of doctoral studies and procedures for their evaluation | B.3.1.1 | Not applicable | No recommendations. |
| 24 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.3. The results of doctoral studies and procedures for their evaluation | B.3.1.2 | Not applicable | No recommendations. |
| 25 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.3. The results of doctoral studies and procedures for their evaluation | B.3.2.1 | Not applicable | No recommendations. |
| 26 | Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS B.3. The results of doctoral studies and procedures for their evaluation | B.3.2.2 | Not applicable | No recommendations. |
| 27 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.1. Existence and periodic implementation of the internal quality assurance system | C.1.1.1 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 28 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.1. Existence and periodic | C.1.1.2 | Fulfilled | It would have been interesting some report of the results got during the period assessed (number of consultations, rate of |

| | | | | |
|----|--|----------|---------------------|--|
| | implementation of the internal quality assurance system | | | satisfaction after an inquiry, etc.) in order to make me a better idea of the real implementation and performance of this indicator. |
| 29 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.2. Transparency of information and accessibility of learning resources | C.2.1.1. | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 30 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.2. Transparency of information and accessibility of learning resources | C.2.2.1 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 31 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.2. Transparency of information and accessibility of learning resources | C.2.2.2 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 32 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.2. Transparency of information and accessibility of learning resources | C.2.2.3 | Fulfilled | No recommendations. |
| 33 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.3. Internationalization | C.3.1.1 | Partially fulfilled | It is necessary to make a greater effort of internalization. Maybe, holding especific presentation days with students already awarded with Erasmus scholarships (even from other domains) or other kind of grants would be encouraging. There are interest of dissemination the research results abroad though, as shown with plenty of communications in international scientific meetings. |
| 34 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.3. Internationalization | C.3.1.2 | Partially fulfilled | Within this indicator, there two facts to improve: the number of doctoral theses in the domain of Medicine under international co-supervision. This was zero |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---------|---------------------|---|
| | | | | during the period assessed. In my opinion, this fact could indirectly be related to the previous indicator, so an increasing of students in other international centres might make easier the collaboration and agreements with universities abroad. The other fact to improve is the participation in the organizing committees of scientific meeting arranged by DJUG. The participation of two of the members in the last editions might give an idea of the slow but increasing role of the doctoral school in the domain of Medicine in the set of doctoral schools of DJUG. |
| 35 | Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT C.3. Internationalization | C.3.1.3 | Partially fulfilled | The international activity is scarce. Thus, I suggest as one of the best strategy for the internationalization of the doctoral school in the domain of Medicine would be to attract doctoral supervisors from other prestigious universities with which already existing agreements (listed in the previous indicator). Moreover, they could also participate in co-tutelage of doctoral thesis. |

The recommendations contained in the report shall be resumed in the indicators' analysis. Other general recommendations may be made that do not fit within a particular indicator.

VERY IMPORTANT!!! – Each identified weakness must be correlated with at least one recommendation to improve the situation!

VI. Conclusions and general recommendations

The thoroughly reading and assessment of all the internal reports, the clarification of some inquiries during online sessions as well as consulting the website of DJUG has led me to confirm that most of the critical performance indicators are fulfilled, with the exceptions for A.1.3.2, and A.3.1.4 and the C.3. indicators of Internationalization (C.3.1.1, C.3.1.2, and C.3.1.3), which are partially fulfilled. In addition, due to the recent creation of this doctoral school, the indicators B.3.1.1, B.3.2.1, B.3.2.2 were not assessed.



In my opinion, an enhancement of collaborations with other institutions (national and international) and with private companies must be done. Regarding these latter, they could be interested on some research topics whose supervision (and funding) could be shared between university and companies. In addition, I also encourage the incorporation of other teachers authorized to supervise doctorates as soon as possible, in order to the compliance of performance indicator A.3.1.4.

For the rest of indicators, only some recommendations for some standards are given from my side. Specifically, I encourage the doctoral school to improve its international presence and partnerships in Doctoral programs with other universities. In that sense, it would be worth it holding presentation days with members of different institutions (Romanian and other European countries) showing different ways of funding, a website with documents in English and taking advantage of already existing agreements with other international institutions at Medicine degree level.

There is a strong opportunity with the development of an outstanding Genomic Research Centre, whose equipment is planned to be completed with more devices. I encourage a support from DJUG to achieve this goal in the near future.

The Doctoral School of DJUG for the domain of Medicine possesses a good structure and organization, and if its growth and consolidation can be solid if it is well supervised in this path by the higher institutions (ARACIS and IOSUD, the Council for University Doctoral Studies of DJUG). A doctoral title got from this school has a great prestige and it is highly appreciated by the different employers too. In addition, the quality system at the doctoral study domain level works acceptably, with objective items periodically and thoroughly evaluated (internal and externally). Thus, we have assessed 35 critical indicators, and only one of them is not fulfilled and the other four are partially met (so, 85.7% of critical indicators are met). Moreover, ARACIS is aware of some weaknesses and, moreover, the own institution of the DJUG, so it seems to be on the path of emending them.

VII. Annexes

- *The detailed schedule of the evaluation visit and sessions online, both for all the domains and the specific domain of Medicine (Timetable Eval_IOSUD_DD_ Dunarea de Jos final_v2.docx and Medicine Domain specific scheduled meetings.docx).*
- *The procedure of selection of the management structures of the Doctoral Schools from IOSUD - "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați (11_10_Metodologie_si_calendar_alegeri_CSD_2017.pdf), provided by Professor Aurel Nechita upon request;*
- *Results of the election of the members for the doctoral school of Biomedical Sciences (PV alegeri membri CSD 2020.pdf), provided by Professor Aurel Nechita upon request;*
- *Detailed explanations about the constitution of an outstanding Genomics research center, with the planned purchases by the end of this year (Genomic Research centre explanation and planned purchases.pdf). This attached file is an abstract of an email sent by Professor Aurel Nechita upon missing information request;*



- *Sheet evaluating the budgets for the different equipments which will be purchased during next months (Oferta 2 Elta-2.pdf).*
- *Spreadsheet with the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions and the number of places financed from the budget (B.1.1.1. Absolventii de master, 5 ani_SD-SBM_v2.xlsx, provided by Professor Aurel Nechita upon request).*
- *A new document was received at 16th of August in order to justify the indicator A.1.3.2:REZULTATE_FINALE_GT3_ANTREPRENORDOC.pdf*

In Malaga (Spain), at 22nd of August of 2021