

## **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. Introduction<sup>1</sup>**

In this chapter, the following shall be summarized:

- the context in which this external evaluation report was drafted (**the type of evaluation, the period of the evaluation visit, the composition of the Experts Committee** etc.);
- details about the doctoral school(s) of which the doctoral domain under review is part (number of doctoral advisors, number of students, institutional context, short history etc.);
- details about the doctoral study domain under review (number of students, institutional context, short history etc.).

### **II. Methods used**

This chapter will contain the methods and tools used in the external evaluation process, before and during the evaluation visit, including at least:

- The analysis of the internal evaluation report of the doctoral study domain under review and its Annexes;
- The analysis of documents made available by the IOSUD, in physical format, during the evaluation visit (if such documents have been requested);
- The analysis of documents, data and information available on the IOSUD/Doctoral School(s) website, in electronic format;
- Visiting the buildings included in the institution's property, comprising (indicative and non-exhaustive list, which shall be changed according to the context):
  - classrooms;
  - laboratories;
  - the institution's library;
  - research centers;
  - the Career Counselling and Guidance Center;
  - lecture halls for students;

---

<sup>1</sup> Each time when applicable the information shall be presented gender-wise.



- the student residences;
- the student cafeteria;
- sports ground etc.;
- Meeting/discussions with doctoral students in the doctoral study domain under review;
- Meeting/Discussions with the graduates of the doctoral study domain under review;
- Meeting/Discussions with employers of the graduates in the doctoral study domain under review;
- Meeting/Discussions with the school officials of the Doctoral School(s) in which the doctoral study domain under review is operating;
- Meeting/Discussions with the doctoral advisors in the doctoral study domain under review;
- 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 University Senate, the Board of Directors, the Quality Assessment and Assurance Commission, the Quality Assurance Department, the Ethics Commission (including with the student representatives of these structures);
  - the Career Counselling and Guidance Center;
  - student organizations;
  - secretariats;
  - various departments/administrative offices (Social/Student residences-Cafeterias etc.);
- Application of questionnaires to doctoral students or academic staff in the doctoral study domain under review.



### III. Analysis of ARACIS's performance indicators

#### **Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY**

*\*general description of domain analysis.*

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

*\*General description of the criterion analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text and a table, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links. The information describes the administrative and legal framework and the background of the university as regards the doctoral schools, and of the doctoral schools themselves, DSL, DSLCI, DSLCS and DSSITT / CEIS, with focus on their major regulations, structures, resources, organization and procedures.*

*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.*

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the sections below in the form of text and a table with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links.*

**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: The self-assessment report refers in detail to each of the criteria listed in the indicator, supported by annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The report and the annexes evidence the availability of a well-attested, fully comprehensive framework for the doctoral schools and of their procedures and regulations. Availability of such information as, e.g. admission to doctoral studies, is of relevance for the higher international visibility of the school (e.g. as regards attracting foreign students) and deserves attention.*

*Special detail is given on the DSL, even though all DSLCI, DSLCS and DSSITT / CEIS's profiles are described in accordance with the requirement set by the indicator. Responsibilities managed by the university's central offices (e.g. quality management) are also described. More important, prospective measures are described for the immediate future, with special regard to quality research.*



Recommendations: *The recommendation is to implement easier access to documents in English, like the admission procedure, which may be of relevance for foreign candidates and/or co-supervisors.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

**Performance Indicator A.1.1.2.** *The doctoral school' 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: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online, specifically for DSLCI, DSCLS and DSSITT / CEIS). Special detail is given on the DSSITT / CEIS's criteria, regulations and procedures. DSL data are not explicitly available therein but, based on data available elsewhere, the requirements set by the indicator are believed to be met in the domain.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report and the information supplied declare the existence of a well-attested set of criteria, procedures and standards at the doctoral schools.*

Recommendations: *N/A*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

\*General description of the standard analysis. *Relevant information is presented in the sections below in the form of text.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information about the requirements set by the indicator.*

Analysis: *The report refers to the availability of the UMS programme as an IT system managed by the university's central services. No evidence of effectiveness is supplied.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to measure the appropriateness and effectiveness of the IT system as regards the users (students), the university administrative staff, and the faculty, if they (need to) access the system, esp. as regards the specific needs of the doctoral schools.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information about the requirements set by the indicator.*

Analysis: *The report refers to the availability of two software packages (Turnitin and SistemAntiplagiat.ro) managed by the university's central services and run on all theses since 2016 (10% up to 2015). No evidence of effectiveness or appropriateness is supplied.*

Recommendations: *N/A*

**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.*

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the sections below in the form of text with reference to annexes available online.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to actions covered by a university programme to foster research excellence, with reference to information attested by an annex available online.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report refers to an annex for attestation of DSSITT/ CEIS's fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator. DSL, DSLCI, DSLCS data are not explicitly available therein but, based on data available elsewhere, the requirements set by the indicator are met in the domain.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is for the university to supply additional resources for doctoral advisors to be able to submit successful bids, and also to support international research funding.*

*The recommendation is for all doctoral advisors to become actively involved in the submission of additional bids until more successful applications are secured than are attested at present.*

**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: The self-assessment report refers to information attested by annexes available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: Out of the four doctoral schools, only the DSSITT / CEIS attests a specific percentage (27.27%). The remaining schools do not count on information from the financial department, but they attest a number of projects (e.g. POSDRU) and mobility actions. DSL, DSLCI, DSLCS data are not explicitly available therein but, based on data available elsewhere, the requirements set by the indicator are believed to be met in the domain.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to implement measures:*

- i) to clearly identify the actual percentage in each case for future assessment actions, and*
- ii) to raise funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (above 20% doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation) set by the requirements set by the indicator.*

**The indicator is 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: The self-assessment report refers to information attested by annexes available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.

Analysis: No separate percentages are available for each of the four doctoral schools. Even so, the DSSITT / CEIS attests sums that may lead to a percentage above 10%. Two other schools attests specific amounts (DSL's 8301 RON and DSLCI's 1852,04€ -currency as per the European source-). DSLCS attests numerous training actions. The resulting estimate is believed to comply with the requirements set by the indicator.

Recommendations: The recommendation is to implement measures:

- i) to clearly identify the actual percentage in each case for future assessment actions, and
- ii) to invest funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (at least 10%) set by the requirements set by the indicator.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

## **Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure**

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** Relevant information is presented in the form of text.

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

\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text.

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information about investment on university facilities and premises both for the university and specifically for each doctoral school.

Analysis: The resources available as regards facilities, equipment and online resources are as per the requirements set by this indicator. The research laboratories evidence an extremely active agenda, with organization of training actions, workshops, conferences and publication of research.

Recommendations: The recommendation is for the university to increase the support to the doctoral schools at least in the following respects:

- i) upgrade of library funds,
- ii) upgrade of research infrastructure of the DSL as described in the self-assessment report, and
- iii) upgrade/maintenance of a library for DSLCI (instead of leaving it to the PhD candidates' initiative).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.



### **Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources**

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

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

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested in annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares that the members of the doctoral schools meet the requirements set by the indicator, and in many cases attest higher standards than required by the CNATDCU.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested in annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The percentage achieved by the doctoral school exceeds the requirements set by the indicator (51 out of 88 doctoral supervisors, i.e. 57.95% attested vs. 50% required by the indicator).*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to seek cosupervisors meeting the requirements set by the indicator. The recommendation is, for faculty, to attain tenure as far as possible.*

**The indicator is partially 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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information about the DSL and DSSITT / CEIS attested in annexes available online. DSLCI and DSLCS annexes are not available. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report attests teaching by over 30 professors at the DSL, 12 at DSLCI, 3 at DSLCS and and 4 at DSSITT / CEIS.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to allocate supervision to faculty meeting the requirements set by the indicator by attracting cooperation with external supervisors and/or recruiting faculty as per the requirements set by the indicator.*

**The indicator is partially 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 programs<sup>3</sup> does not exceed 20%.*

Description: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested in annexes available online.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report declares that only 2 out of 44 supervisors at DSL and not any of the supervisors at the other doctoral schools coordinate between 8 and 12 doctoral students.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to keep supervision as evenly distributed among advisors as possible, both for supervision quality and for the advisors' more efficient research record.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

\*General description of the standard analysis. *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information about the DSL and DSSITT / CEIS attested in annexes available online. DSLCI and DSLCS data/annexes are not explicitly available for some indicators.*

**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: *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information about the DSL and DSSITT / CEIS attested in annexes available online. DSLCI and DSLCS data/annexes are not explicitly available for this criterion.*

Analysis: *Regardless of how international awareness is measured and which points are attested therein, (research leave, publications, refereeing, event organization, scholarships, project participation, international networking, teaching experience, committee membership...?), the self-assessment report declares fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator as regards the DSL and DSSITT / CEIS. DSLCI and DSLCS data are not explicitly available therein but, based on data available elsewhere, the expectation is for an estimate complying with the requirements set by the indicator.*

Recommendations: *N/A*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.





**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information about the DSL and DSSITT / CEIS attested in annexes available online. DSL and DSLCI data/annexes are not explicitly available for this criterion. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: The documents added after request by this committee attest fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator as regards the DSLC and DSSITT / CEIS. DSL and DSLCI data/annexes are not explicitly available therein but, based on data available elsewhere, the expectation is for an estimate complying with the requirements set by the indicator.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

## **Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

*\*general description of domain analysis.*

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

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

*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.*

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

**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: The self-assessment report refers to information attested in annexes available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: The DSL attests a ratio of ca. 1.56. The documents added after request by this committee attest fulfilment of the first requirements set by the indicator, i.e. the 0.2 ratio between the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions [...] and the number of seats funded by the state budget [...]. This is attested for the DSL (0,19) and DSSITT / CEIS (0.33). No figures are available for DSLCI and DSLCS in the self-assessment reports, even if the information supplied at a subsequent stage declares 10 and 17 students (absolute values: ratio cannot be calculated). The self-assessment report of the DSLCS seems to have used a different version of the report document, as its indicator*



*B.1.1.<sup>14</sup> reads as B.1.2.1 of the version used here (similarly, the self-assessment reports refer to indicator B.4, which is not in this annex). Overall, the figures given lead to expect the estimate of the overall ratio to be in accordance with the ratio of 0.2.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is for DSLCI and DSLCS to clearly identify the ratio for the first requirement set by the indicator for future assessment actions.*

*The recommendation is also, for all schools except DSL, to clearly identify the ratio for the second requirement set by the indicator (1.2) for future assessment actions.*

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

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

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

***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: The self-assessment report describes information about the requirement set by the indicator.*

*Analysis: The admission process is described in general clearly. Additional information gathered during online interviews underlined use of strict criteria.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to disseminate as far as possible (online and otherwise) the specific criteria and grades, as well as any other relevant information also in English for attraction of potential foreign students.*

***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 admission<sup>5</sup> does not exceed 30%.*

*Description: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested in annexes available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares that failure to complete doctoral studies is far below the percentage set by the indicator (below 5% vs. 30% in requirements set by the indicator) for all four doctoral schools. Additional data specified the percentages as 4.66% for DSL and 12.5% for DSSITT / CEIS. The absolute values for DSLCS was specified as 2. Overall, the figures given lead to expect that the estimate of the overall ratio does not exceed 30%.*

---

<sup>4</sup> Indicator B.1.1.1. Admission to doctoral programmes is based on selection criteria which includes: previous professional performance of the candidates, an interest for scientific or artistic/sporting research, publications in the field and a proposal for a research theme. An interview with the applicant is a compulsory step of the admission process.

*As clarified in the SDSLC Regulations and in the Admission Regulations and in Annex B.1.1.1, admission to SDSLC is made up of two exams, an oral exam (the interview) and a written exam. The final grade results from the average of the two grades received by the candidate.*

<sup>5</sup> 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.



Recommendations: *The recommendations are twofold:*

- i) *concerning identification of reasons for failure:*
  - a. *to keep track of the reasons for which students are expelled, and supply the means to address them, and*
  - b. *to keep track of the reasons for which students drop out, and supply the means to address them.*
- ii) *concerning management of reasons for failure, to maintain the effort to raise funding and create finance opportunities for support of doctoral students.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

## **Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs**

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

*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.*

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested in annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report attests the necessary number of courses offered by all four doctoral schools to comply with the requirements set by the indicator. The description of the courses is especially detailed for the DSL, where the courses are described with reference to the candidates' field of specialization.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to broaden as far as possible the range of courses in research methodology for Philology, for example, with a focus on:*

- i) *research dissemination strategies, and*
- ii) *international networking and publication policies.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes information about the requirements set by the indicator.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report refers to centralized university initiatives ranging from specific projects to a seminar of lectures and courses. The DSSITT / CEIS additionally refers to a specific course on academic ethics and integrity.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

**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 activities<sup>6</sup>.*

*Description: The self-assessment report describes information about the requirements set by the indicator. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares compliance with the requirements set by the indicator. Additionally, the DSL and the DSSITT / CEIS describes the essentials of the curriculum design as evidence of the commitment towards addressing learning outcomes.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to remain aware of potential improvements as a result of the contents of other (inter)national programmes, as long as full priority is given to the faculty’s feedback and initiatives regarding the academic training program.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes counselling/guidance in general, and specific information is described and attested by an annex available online for DSSITT / CEIS. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report describes a number of actions within counselling/guidance, all relevant and in accordance with the requirements set by the indicator.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to ensure that the training actions described remain available and are revised/enlarged on, based on the students’ and supervisors’ feedback. Potential room for improvement that the schools might want to consider may involve:*

- i) to consider the possibility of occasional training events for specific needs according to the students’ and supervisors’ feedback,*
- ii) to publicize as far as possible the contents covered within counselling/guidance,*
- iii) to involve postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peer,*
- iv) to provide a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings, and*
- v) to enforce guidance regularity so as to ensure that students make regular use of guidance through the academic year (not just upon request, if that is the case), in order to allow feedback, prevent potential dropout, and identify weaknesses/deviations that may become structural, systematic obstacles during their PhD studies.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

---

<sup>6</sup> 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.



**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: The self-assessment report describes information attested in an annex available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.

Analysis: The self-assessment report for DSSITT / CEIS declares a figure 2.3. The additional clarification declared 1.34 for DSL, and a revised 0,7 for DSDITT / CEIS. No figures are explicitly available therein for DSLCI nor DSLCS, partly as a result of a recent implementation of this criterion. Based on data available elsewhere, the expectation is for the requirements set by the indicator to be met in the domain.

Recommendations: The recommendation is, for DSLCI and DSLCS, to identify the actual ratio for future assessment actions.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** Relevant information is presented in the form of text, and a table with, reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.

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

**\*General description of the standard analysis.** Relevant information is presented in the form of text and a table, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.

**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: Relevant data are overviewed, supported by a list of references in annexes available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.

Analysis: Fulfilment of this indicator is assessed based on five papers selected at random as follows: the first paper in English listed in the annexes, one paper per doctoral school except DSL, where two papers are reviewed, one starting from each end of the list of papers:

Paper 1. [DSL] Agopian, Ana. 2018. For a new novel. Alain Robbe-Grillet. Screenplay versus novel. *Close Up: Film and Media Studies*, 2(1): 43-55.

The paper is an analysis of the genre *screenplay* vs. the genre *novel* in Alain Robbe-Grillet's production. It reviews properties of each, the author's production and the context of his production. The paper proposes a critical outline of characteristics and then revises it. The structure of the paper is not entirely clear as regards use of sections, even if it is well-balanced and has a clear objective and a valid conclusion. The bibliographical review is not entirely comprehensive and leaves room for improvement. Despite the above shortcomings, it is a relevant and original contribution.

Paper 2. [DSLCS] Voichici, Oana. 2017. Gossip, rumours, urban legends. In P.G. Bârlea & R.F. Toma (coordinators), *Studia de didactică a limbii şiliteraturii*. Bucharest: MLR; 185-190.

The paper goes into the distinction/connection between urban legends, gossip and rumour. This is a most relevant topic that is here approached tentatively. The analysis is not exhaustive, but can lead to interesting ideas, starting with the separation between the three concepts and how some set the background for others. The paper does not have a very clear structure, but is easy to follow, partly also because it is well-written. The contribution is limited, but paves the way for further research in the field. The references can be updated for a more exhaustive bibliographical research of the analysis of the topic.

Paper 3. [DSLCS] Nae, Andre. 2016. Immersion at the intersection of technology, subjectivity and culture: An analysis of *Silent Hill 2*. In *Acta Univ. Sapientae, Film and Media Studies*, 13: 7-19.

The paper is a very specific piece of research on the gaming experience, the role of player freedom, and the concepts of immersion, interactivity and immediacy, with a final review of the relationship between videogames and movies. The background for all the above is a videogame by the name *Silent Hill 2*, involving first and third person shooters. The paper has sufficient background on specific concepts, which make the main structure of the paper. The style is in line with academic standards, the questions are relevant for the field, and the conclusions lead to a concept of immersion where interactivity and immediacy are defined. The references are abundant but could be updated, especially as this is a dynamic field.

Paper 4. [DSLCS] Biţună, Gabriel. 2014. On loaned consonants in the spoken Arabic of Siirt. In *Roma-Arabica XIV*, 77-88.

The paper reviews phonetic shift in a given variety of spoken Arabic. It sets a comprehensive background for the language context and for the concepts, has a clear objective (overview), and then focuses on specific shift processes, by assimilation of foreign words in Arabic or otherwise. In this regard, it is basically a checklist of attested change and an ensuing classification. The paper has a clear structure and is well-written, although the bibliographical review does not allow to see the extent of the originality of the contents. The paper is a relevant contribution as a part of doctoral studies research.

Paper 5. [DSSITT / CEIS] Irimia, Alexandra. 2020. Matters of Timein László Krasznahorkai's and Béla Tarr's *Satantango*. *Ekphrasis* 2(1): 213-225.

The paper compares the literary and cinematic versions of one and the same novel, with an analysis of the aesthetic approach in each case and the resources used to present the contents. To that end, it analyzes passages and elements of both, and collects and researches a corpus of data. The paper stands out for its clarity as regards the structure and the style, for its detail and for the presentation of the theoretical framework. The result is a relevant contrastive study of two versions of the same work of art through different media. The references are abundant and up-to-date. The paper deserved a high-ranking journal.

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to supply the conditions for high profile research, e.g.:*

- i) *by specific training in:*
  - a. *frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis, and*
  - b. *encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.*
- ii) *by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students, and*
- iii) *by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**



**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: *The self-assessment report describes information attested in an annex available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report for DSSITT / CEIS declares a figure 6.36. The additional clarification declared 5.95 for DSL, and numerous conference participations for DSSITT / CEIS for DSLCI nor DSLCS, even if no specific figures are declared for the latter two.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is, for DSLCI and DSLCS, to identify the actual ratio for future assessment actions.*

*As in the previous indicator, the recommendation is to supply the conditions for high quality research, e.g.:*

- i) by specific training in:
  - a. frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis, and*
  - b. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.**
- ii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for supervisors and for students, and*
- iii) by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

*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.*

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text and a table, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

**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: *Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported in an annex available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report declares occasional unfulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator, partly because several indicators were applied retrospectively on a part of the period when the criterion in question was not in force. No supervisor is identified to have supervised more than two theses in the conditions set by the requirements set by the indicator at the DSSITT / CEIS.*

*The additional data supplied show that more than two students per year have been supervised by for Profs. Constatinescu, Panea, Patraş, Spiridon and, systematically, Mecu at the DSL. More than two students per year are identified for Profs. Dobre and Lupu at the DSLCI. More than two students per year are identified for Profs. Bechet, Botez, Geambaşu, Girbea and Mariette, Guţu, Moraru, Olteanu, Siupiur, Toma, Vişan, Vianu and, more markedly, Irimia at the DSLCS.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to distribute more evenly the number of thesis supervision, both for the supervisor' and for the candidates' better academic record and performance.*

*The recommendation is to avoid systematic or markedly high number of students per supervisor.*

**The indicator is partially fulfilled.**



**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: *The self-assessment report refers to 'explanations above', and gives information for the DSSITT / CEIS.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report declares a maximum ratio of 0:3 for DSSITT / CEIS, as required by the indicator. The rest of the schools are assumed to be over the ratio as a result of the application of the criterion at a later stage or through the period under evaluation.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to distribute more evenly the number of thesis supervision, both for the supervisors' and for the candidates' better academic record and performance.*

**The indicator is partially fulfilled.**

## **Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT**

*\*general description of domain analysis.*

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

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

*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.*

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes in detail information attested in annexes available online and links, with reference to central committees, to doctoral schools' committees, and to their method, actions, and criteria for continuous quality evaluation.*





*Analysis: The self-assessment report describes procedures, both central and specific for each doctoral school, that evidence fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to encourage and supply the means towards an international dimension to points (a), (d) and (e), for greater visibility and relevance, and higher research quality.*

***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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text and charts, supported by annexes available online and a link. The DSSITT / CEIS also includes a detailed description of mechanisms to ensure use of student feedback, incl. a questionnaire.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report describes the university's general procedure to collect student feedback and apply conclusions drawn therefrom. The necessary channels are available and guarantee the possibility for increased improvement according to student feedback.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

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

***\*General description of the criterion analysis.*** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in an annex available online and links.*

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

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in an annex available online and links.*

***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: Relevant data are presented in the form of text, supported by links.*



*Analysis: The self-assessment report refers to specific links for the points required by the indicator. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, I believe that the contents of the criteria listed (a) through (f) can be accessed via the links given, i.e. the links evidence both the availability of the information listed in points (a) through (i). An English version of the webpages in question is available at News – UniBuc – Universitatea din București. Availability of this information in at least English is of relevance for higher visibility of the school (e.g. attracting foreign students).*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to make all information that may be relevant for potential doctoral students as accessible as possible in English (e.g. the information at Studii Universitare de Doctorat | Site doctorat (unibuc.ro)).*

**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.*

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in an annex available online and links.*

**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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested by links.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares availability of online access to a number of relevant databases through the central services of the university, and also through specific services declared by the DSL and the DSSITT / CEIS.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to expand the list of available databases to new ones as they appear, as well as to additional relevant resources.*

**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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested by a link.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares availability of technical means for fulfilment of this indicator through the central services of the university, and also through specific services declared by the DSLCS.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

**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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report lists and describes facilities, equipment and premises for the DSL, the DSLCI and the DSSITT / CEIS. The DSLCS refers to access to the FLLS's facilities.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

### **Criterion C.3. Internationalization**

*\*General description of the criterion analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

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

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online.*

**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: Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares that, except for the DSL (amounting to 10.75%, largely as a result of its field of specialisation in Romanian) the percentage is attested in all schools, with a percentage of up to 52.77% in the case of DSSITT / CEIS via various frameworks (mainly Erasmus+ and international scientific conferences). Additional data declare difficulties for DSLCI and DSLCS to precisely identify figures for this indicator due to their high number.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to implement measures:*

- i) to clearly identify the actual percentage in each case for future assessment actions, and*
- ii) to invest funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (at least 20%) set by the requirements set by the indicator.*

***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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text and annexes available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares international cosupervision for all doctoral schools. Additional data identified 2 theses in international cosupervision for the DSL, 2 for the DSLCI, 6 for the DSLCS, and 3 for the DSSITT / CEIS. The self-assessment report also declares the existence of specific agreements in force or being finalized for DSLCI, DSLCS and DSSITT / CEIS. Courses, events and lectures by guest specialists are also declared for DSL.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to implement a permanent seminar of international guest lecturers and researchers, whether online or not, to widen the offer of potential supervisors.*

***The indicator is 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: *Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text and annexes available online. Clarification was requested and received from the self-assessment committees.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report lists a number of actions aimed at international activity as per the indicator's requirements: further to international cosupervision, as in the former indicator, all schools declare guest lectures, guest conferences, guest specialists for doctoral committees, participation in education fairs, theses written in foreign languages and/or summer schools. Additional data identified international participation in 5 theses of the DSL, 9 of the DSLCI, 12 of the DSLCS, and 3 of the DSSITT / CEIS.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to implement a formal programme of international events to diversify activities and bring them into a permanent programme in addition to events hosted by way of permanent annual events or scientific meetings.*

*The recommendation is, for the doctoral schools and especially for the university, to find ways to financially support these actions.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

#### IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><b><u>Strengths:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Full potential for successful partnership in EU and international research project bids.</li> <li>ii) Full potential for high-quality research and international visibility.</li> <li>iii) Extreme care for quality control.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Weaknesses:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Need for more PhD supervisors.</li> <li>ii) Need for further internationalization in various respects (research dissemination, cosupervision, ...).</li> <li>iii) Need for better access to research resources, esp. to databases, library funds and research software.</li> <li>iv) Need for streamlined cosupervision procedures.</li> <li>v) Need for better information and transparency on, e.g. funding opportunities, short-term mobility actions.</li> <li>vi) Need for better use of student feedback on the relevance of their courses.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Opportunities:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) International dissemination of their strengths for capitalization of the high quality achieved, e.g. by way of available contacts and development of new ones towards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. thesis co-supervision and assessment,</li> <li>b. research output co-authorship.</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii) Increasing awareness of the potential of linguistic and cultural studies as successful research partners for applied research.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Threats:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Limited training for upgrade of research skills, e.g. as specialized courses and postdoctoral career, e.g. as regards fund-raising, dissemination strategies and international networking.</li> <li>ii) To retain a tendency towards publication in national forums (journals, conferences) and disseminate at home events.</li> <li>iii) Limited internationalization and networking, esp. towards student training abroad.</li> <li>iv) Lacking enough fund support for iii) and iv).</li> </ul>

## V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	PI	<p><b>A.1.1.1.</b> The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the Doctoral School of the respective university doctoral study domain:</p> <p>a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>c) the Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies (for the admission of doctoral students, for the completion of doctoral studies);</p> <p>d) the existence of mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral advisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad;</p> <p>e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), giving as well proof of the regularity of meetings;</p> <p>f) the contract for doctoral studies;</p> <p>g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies.</p>	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement easier access in English to documents, like the admission procedure, which may be of relevance for foreign candidates and/or supervisors
2.	PI	<p><b>A.1.1.2.</b> The doctoral school' 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.</p>	Fulfilled	N/A
3.	PI	<p><b>A.1.2.1.</b> The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background.</p>	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to measure the appropriateness and effectiveness of the IT system as regards the users (students), the university administrative staff, and the faculty, if they (need to) access the system, esp. as regards the needs of the doctoral schools.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
4.	PI	<b>A.1.2.2.</b> The existence and use of an appropriate software program and evidence of its use to verify the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses.	Fulfilled	N/A
5.	IP	<b>A.1.3.1.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is for the university to supply additional resources for doctoral advisors to be able to submit successful bids, and also to support international research funding. The recommendation is for all doctoral advisors to become actively involved in the submission of additional bids until more successful applications are secured than are attested at present.
6.	PI *	<b>A.1.3.2.</b> 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%.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement measures: i) to clearly identify the actual percentage in each case for future assessment actions, and ii) to raise funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (above 20% doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation) set by the requirements set by the indicator.
7.	PI *	<b>A.1.3.3.</b> 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.).	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement measures: i) to clearly identify the actual percentage in each case for future assessment actions, and ii) to invest funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (at least 10%) set by the requirements set by the indicator.
8.	CPI	<b>A.2.1.1.</b> 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	Fulfilled	The recommendation is for the university to increase the support to the doctoral schools at least in the following respects: i) upgrade of library funds,

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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		ii) upgrade of research infrastructure of the DSL as described in the self-assessment report, and iii) upgrade and maintenance of a library for DSLCI.
9.	CPI	<b>A.3.1.1.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	N/A
10.	PI *	<b>A.3.1.2.</b> At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.	Partially fulfilled	The recommendation is to seek cosupervisors meeting the requirements set by the indicator. The recommendation is, for faculty, to attain tenure as far as possible
11.	PI	<b>A.3.1.3.</b> 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.	Partially fulfilled	The recommendation is to allocate supervision to faculty meeting the requirements set by the indicator by attracting cooperation with external supervisors and/or recruiting faculty as per the requirements set by the indicator.
12.	PI *	<b>A.3.1.4.</b> 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 programs does not exceed 20%.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to keep supervision as evenly distributed among advisors as possible, both for supervision quality and for the advisors' more efficient research record.
13.	CPI	<b>A.3.2.1.</b> 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	Fulfilled	N/A

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>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.</p>		
14.	PI *	<p><b>A.3.2.2.</b> 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</p>	Fulfilled	N/A
15.	PI *	<p><b>B.1.1.1.</b> 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.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is for DSLCI and DSLCS to clearly identify the ratio for the first requirement set by the indicator for future assessment actions.</p> <p>The recommendation is also, for all schools except DSL, to clearly identify the ratio for the second requirement set by the indicator (1.2) for future assessment actions.</p>



No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
16.	PI *	<b>B.1.2.1.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to disseminate as far as possible (online and otherwise) the information in English too for attraction of potential foreign students.
17.	PI	<b>B.1.2.2.</b> The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral students 3, respectively 4, years after admission does not exceed 30%.	Fulfilled	The recommendations are twofold: i) concerning identification of reasons for failure: a. to keep track of the reasons for which students are expelled, and supply the means to address them, and b. to keep track of the reasons for which students drop out, and supply the means to address them. ii) concerning management of reasons for failure, to maintain the effort to raise funding and create finance opportunities for support of doctoral students.
18.	PI	<b>B.2.1.1.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to broaden as far as possible the range of courses in research methodology for Philology, for example, with a focus on: i) research dissemination strategies, and ii) international networking and publication policies.
19.	PI	<b>B.2.1.2.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	N/A
20.	PI	<b>B.2.1.3.</b> 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 activities.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to remain aware of potential improvements as a result of the contents of other (inter)national programmes, as long as full priority is given to the faculty's feedback and initiatives regarding the academic training program.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
21.	PI	<b>B.2.1.4.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is to ensure that the training actions described remain available and are revised/enlarged on, based on the students' and supervisors' feedback. Potential room for improvement that the schools might want to consider may involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) to consider the possibility of occasional training events for specific needs according to the students' and supervisors' feedback,</li> <li>ii) to publicize as far as possible the contents covered within counselling/guidance,</li> <li>iii) to involve postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peer,</li> <li>iv) to provide a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings, and</li> <li>v) to enforce guidance regularity so as to ensure that students make regular use of guidance through the academic year (not just upon request, if that is the case), in order to allow feedback, prevent potential dropout, and identify weaknesses/deviations that may become structural, systematic obstacles during their PhD studies.</li> </ul>
22.	CPI	<b>B.2.1.5.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is, for DSLCI and DSLCS, to identify the actual ratio for future assessment actions.
23.	CPI	<b>B.3.1.1.</b> 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	Fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is to supply the conditions for high profile research, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) by specific training in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis, and</li> <li>b. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		selected papers must contain significant original contributions in the respective domain		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students, and</li> <li>iii) by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors.</li> </ul>
24.	PI *	<p><b>B.3.1.2.</b> 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.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is, for DSLCI and DSLCS, to identify the actual ratio for future assessment actions.</p> <p>As in the previous indicator, the recommendation is to supply the conditions for high quality research, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) by specific training in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis, and</li> <li>b. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for supervisors and for students, and</li> <li>iii) by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors.</li> </ul>
25.	PI *	<p><b>B.3.2.1.</b> 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.</p>	Partially fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is to distribute more evenly the number of thesis supervision, both for the supervisor' and for the candidates' better academic record and performance.</p> <p>The recommendation is to avoid systematic or markedly high number of students per supervisor.</p>
26.	PI *	<p><b>B.3.2.2.</b> 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.</p>	Partially fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is to distribute more evenly the number of thesis supervision, both for the supervisor' and for the candidates' better academic record and performance.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
27.	PI	<p><b>C.1.1.1.</b> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the scientific work of Doctoral advisors;</li> <li>b) the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity;</li> <li>c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized;</li> <li>d) the scientific activity of doctoral students;</li> <li>e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students;</li> <li>f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students.</li> </ul>	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to encourage and supply the means towards an international dimension to points (a), (d) and (e), for greater visibility and relevance, and higher research quality.
28.	PI *	<p><b>C.1.1.2.</b> 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.</p>	Fulfilled	N/A
29.	CPI	<p><b>C.2.1.1.</b> The IOSUD publishes on the website of the organizing institution, in compliance with the general regulations on data protection, information such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the Doctoral School regulation;</li> <li>b) the admission regulation;</li> <li>c) the doctoral studies contract;</li> <li>d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;</li> <li>e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies;</li> <li>f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data;</li> </ul>	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to make all information that may be relevant for potential doctoral students as accessible as possible in English (e.g. the information at Studii Universitare de Doctorat   Site doctorat (unibuc.ro)).

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor);</p> <p>h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis;</p> <p>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.</p>		
30.	PI	<p><b>C.2.2.1.</b> All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of their thesis.</p>	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to expand the list of available databases to new ones as they appear, as well as to additional relevant resources.
31.	PI	<p><b>C.2.2.2.</b> 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.</p>	Fulfilled	N/A
32.	PI	<p><b>C.2.2.3.</b> 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.</p>	Fulfilled	N/A
33.	PI *	<p><b>C.3.1.1.</b> 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.</p>	Partially fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is to implement measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) to clearly identify the actual percentage in each case for future assessment actions, and</li> <li>ii) to invest funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (at least 20%) set by the requirements set by the indicator.</li> </ul>
34.	PI	<p><b>C.3.1.2.</b> 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</p>	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement a permanent seminar of international guest lecturers and researchers, whether online or not, to widen the offer of potential supervisors.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		leading experts to deliver courses/lectures for doctoral students.		
35.	PI	<b>C.3.1.3.</b> 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.).	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement a formal programme of international events to diversify activities and bring them into a permanent programme in addition to events hosted by way of permanent annual events or scientific meetings. The recommendation is, for the doctoral schools and especially for the university, to find ways to financially support these actions.

*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**

*Several important issues raised during the evaluation are resumed and some general conclusions are drawn on the quality of the education provided within the doctoral study domain under review; the Experts' Panel also presents general assessments about the institution. Other general recommendation may also be presented, which cannot be related to a specific indicator and have not been presented at point V.*

*A decision is proposed, together with the reasons for granting it (if the Experts' Panel members do not reach a consensus, each of them can propose and argue his/her own decision).*

**Conclusions:** Based on the analyses listed above, the undersigned concludes that the conditions for consideration of fulfilment of indicators are met, except for the following partially fulfilled indicators:

- i) A.3.1.2
- ii) A.3.1.3
- iii) B.3.2.1
- iv) B.3.2.2
- v) C.3.1.1

It is the belief of the undersigned, that the requirements set by these indicators can be fulfilled within three years as per the regulations. In the case of the first four indicators, mainly by recruiting cosupervisors meeting the criteria set and distributing supervision over the resulting number of potential supervisors. In the fifth case, by enlarging on the available network of partners to secure mobility and internationalization.

### **General recommendations:**

Further support the faculty who contributed to fulfilment of indicators.

Aim at further training abroad, on networking and on internationalization.

Seek contacts for international cooperation re Phd theses (co-supervision, examination panels).

Raise funding for international research and international actions outside the Erasmus Programme.



## VII. Annexes

*The following types of documents shall be attached:*

- *The detailed schedule of the evaluation visit – MANDATORY.*  
An additional meeting for the committee was held further to those scheduled in the ARACIS calendar: 13:00-14:00 (Romanian time), Fri 03/12/21.
- *The survey questionnaire applied to doctoral students or academic staff in the doctoral study domain under review, the results - optional (e.g., in graphic form) and their interpretation - if applicable.*
- *Scanned documents – any document requested from the IOSUD during the evaluation visit and received, which is not found in the internal evaluation file received before the visit and referred to in the report.*
- *Pictures – if relevant issues are raised regarding the condition of the student residences, cafeterias, premises for teaching and learning activities, library etc.*
- *Screenshots/Print screens of the Doctoral School/IOSUD website proving specific claims in the report, accompanied by the date when they were accessed and saved.*
- *Any other documents relevant to the evaluation process referred to in the report.*

Signed in Granada, Spain, 04/12/21

Salvador Valera