



Annex No. 3

**The External Evaluation Report of a Doctoral Study Domain
Architecture - "ION MINCU" University | Bucharest | Romania**

Prof. Assoc. Dr. Arta Basha Jakupi,
University of Prishtina' Hasan Prishtina' – Kosovo
ARACIS International Expert Evaluator

December 6, 2021

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 encapsulates the findings and understandings of the ARACIS International Expert Evaluator of the Doctoral Study Domain Architecture within IOSUD, the "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning (UAUIM). ARACIS evaluated the Doctoral Domain of Architecture at the UAUIM Bucharest in view of maintaining accreditation, the procedure of quality assurance aimed to certify fulfillment of operating standards by the institutions organizing university doctoral studies, based on the provisions of art. 4 para. (2) of the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on Quality Assurance of Education, approved by Law No. 87/2006, with subsequent amendments and additions.

The Romanian Agency performed the evaluation processes for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ARACIS), who recruited the following Experts Committee, in charge of Evaluation of the Doctoral Domain Architecture at the "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning Bucharest:

Coordinator:

Prof. Dr. Dorina Nicolina ISOPESCU,
Universitatea Tehnică "Gheorghe Asachi" Iași

International expert:

Prof.asoc.Dr. Arta BASHA JAKUPI,
University of Prishtina, Kosovo

PhD student:

Cornelia-Florina FECHETE
Universitatea Politehnica Timișoara

The evaluation period extended from 22/11/2021 to 26/11/2021, and it was developed in a hybrid model. Therefore the evaluation was conducted both with on-line meetings and on-site visits.

After the appointment as an International Expert Evaluator, information were obtained by the ARACIS (Claudia Georgiana MILEA) via email and by Director (Prof.Dr.Dorian COJOCARU, Universitatea din Craiova) on the preparatory meeting for the main methodological aspects related to the evaluation of doctoral studies, such as:

- Working methodology and the structure of the evaluation panels for IOSUD and doctoral study domains, including contact data;
- Discussing and determining the additional documents to be requested from the institution under review;
- Doctoral Study Domain that was going to be evaluated;
- All important working documents, such as The Guidelines for Periodical External Evaluation the Institution Organising Doctoral Study Programs (IOSUD), respectively of the Doctoral study domains; The Doctoral Studies Code of June 29, 2011, and the Order no.3651/12.04.2021 for the approval of the methodology on evaluating university doctoral studies and of the systems of criteria, standards and

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

performance indicators used in the evaluation; General presentation of the HE and QA systems in Romania.

- Detailed on-line meetings and visit schedule;
- Credentials and how to access the Internal evaluation reports and their annexes uploaded by the evaluated institution;

Background

According to the University Charter, "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning of Bucharest is currently the only independent university in Romania dedicated to training specialists in the field of Architecture and Urban Planning. The IOUSD. - UAUIM currently consists of and provides institutional, administrative and, logistics assistance to the two accredited doctoral schools: Doctoral School of Architecture (SDA) and Doctoral School of Urban Planning (SOU).

The Doctoral School of Architecture has been established within the "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning (UAUIM) since 2003, managing the field of doctoral studies "architecture," responding to the educational needs related to the specific professional training of the third cycle of Bologna university studies. Between 2003 and 2019, the Doctoral School of Architecture, named "Space, Image, Text, Territory" (SD-SITI), was part of the consortium between the University of Bucharest (UB) represented by the Centre of Excellence for the Study of Image (CESI) and UAUIM (Annex 01a-protocols of UAUIM - UB-SITI), represented by the School of Advanced Research and Studies (SCSA). The Center of Hermeneutics (CH), Faculty of Philosophy (FF), within "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University (UAIC) of last with which the UAUIM concluded a collaboration protocol in 2005) joined this consortium. The consortium ended the partnership with the Istituto Italiano di Scienze Umane (SUM), having its seat in Firenze, and with the Università di Siena (US), which is part of the SUM, through a collaboration protocol concluded with the UAUIM in 2007. Further, the official name of Doctoral School of Architecture was retaken (02-changing name SDA).

The Doctoral School of Architecture operates as a department of the Faculty of Architecture (FA) of the "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning (UAUIM), and it has only one field of doctoral studies: "architecture."

Within the doctoral domain, 23 doctoral thesis supervisors carry out their activity in a capacity obtained by the law; among them, 17 (82.6%) are tenured professors and have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period IOSUD-UAUIM.

In the last five years (2015-2020) of 218 students were admitted to the Doctoral School of Architecture, and 67.5% of them have already completed their doctoral thesis. However, the number of students admitted to the doctoral program are showing an increasing trend until 2020, with a slight decrease between 2020 and 2021, when the pandemic conditions have negatively affected this process.

The Doctoral School of Architecture manages doctoral studies in "architecture." A variety of research topics and directions within it can be found both in the issues of the supervised theses and in the coverage of the courses available to students within the curriculum of the first year of the doctoral studies, the



Advanced study-based training program. Of these, are mentioned the four significant types of subject areas associated with the primary essential field of architecture:

1. theory and history of architecture
2. sustainability of the built environment
3. experience and logic of the architectural space
4. architectural design process

According to the Institutional Regulations of Organisation and Functioning of the Doctoral Studies within the IOSUD- UAUIM (RIOF_SD) (Hotararea senatului 51 - 2021 de aprobare a RIOF-SD) - Article 6. (1), Only scientific programs of which purpose is to produce original scientific knowledge, internationally relevant, based on scientific methods, are organized within the IOSUD - UAUIM.

The Doctoral School of Architecture has access to the premises owned by the "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning and its material resources (computers, laboratories, specific software, library, etc.) for its activities. Furthermore, several laboratories within the UAUIM have satisfactory equipment and software. Furthermore, the doctoral students have access to the different research centers with Research, Design, Expertise and Consulting Center, Architectural and Urban Studie, Vernacular Architecture Studies Center. The research facilities and research equipment prove the constant work of the evaluated institution to provide its students with the needed resources for the proper development of their Ph.D. Thesis.

The UAUIM Library includes over 200,000 volumes of specialized books, 542 titles (53,785 tomes until November 7, 2006), specialized periodicals, 109-course titles (32,165 tomes), 259 doctoral theses in the specialty, 1358 scientific papers of the professors and students, 1880 dictionaries, a rich collection of regulations (including over 6,000 STAS standards), floppy disks, CDs and other recording media with specific materials. There is an online catalog of the UAUIM Library, which can be accessed since 2014 at the following link: <http://biblioteca.uauim.ro>. As of 2015, from the Library page, from the link www.anelisplus.ro, it can be accessed to scientific publication platforms, such as Springerlink, ProQuest, Wiley, Taylor & Francis Journal,s and EBSCO Host. In addition, the "Ion Mincu" Virtual Library has been built since 2016, which shall include full-text electronic publications.

II. Methods used

Methods used in this External evaluation process are as follows:

- Analysis of the periodic SER provided by IOSUD-UAUIM for the Doctoral study domain in the field of Architecture
 - Analysis of the Annexes listed in the periodic SER and available on the cloud of ARACIS with on-line access to the cloud
 - Analysis of additional documents provided and explained during the meetings in the week of evaluation
- Internal Evaluation Report*
- The analysis of documents, data, and information available on the IOSUD's website, in - electronic format;
 - The analysis of documents made available via email and on the ARACIS cloud during the on-site evaluation visit (research infrastructure, institutional infrastructure, classrooms, research center, laboratory, library, available equipment, etc.)



- The examination of the findings and understandings of external expert evaluator and information gathered during on-line zoom meetings with various stakeholders (with doctoral domain contact person/person who drafted SER, Ph.D. supervisors and academic staff, director of the research center, and the research laboratory, Ph.D. students, Ph.D. graduates, employers of the Ph.D. graduates; Doctoral School Council members, IOSUD's representatives and Council for Academic Doctoral Studies (CSUD), members of the IOSUD's Ethics Committee and members of IOSUD's Quality Assurance Department, on-line preparatory, organizational and technical meetings of all Expert Panels, and its members, included in Periodic External Evaluation of Doctoral Study Domains of IOSUD)

Self Evaluation Report and Annexes provided by IOSUD-UAUIM - Doctoral study domain in the field of Architecture

The institution has taken the evaluation process very seriously and carefully prepared a Self Evaluation Report of the Architecture Doctoral Domain. This document was available as 78 pages pdf document in the ARACIS cloud, and it was accessed easily, on time, as often as necessary. To support information included in the Self Evaluation Report, the evaluated institution also had a total of 25 Annexes², that were later completed with another six additional folders and 16 documents, a total of 101 documents as requested by the evaluation panel. All these documents were uploaded to the ARACIS cloud and were available for review by the evaluation panel.

Additional information available on-line

To complete this evaluation report, documents, data, and information available on the IOSUD/Doctoral School(s) website, in electronic format, were also frequently rereferred to:

- <https://www.uauim.ro/en/>

- <https://www.uauim.ro/universitatea/managementul-calitatii-educatiei/>

Similarly, webpages corresponding to research facilities mentioned in the Self Assessment Report were consulted to verify the provided information:

- <https://www.uauim.ro/informare-documentare/biblioteca/>

- <https://sita.uauim.ro>

- <https://argument.uauim.ro/>

- <https://uac.incd.ro/>

- <https://conf.incd.ro/>

- <http://www.historiaurbana.icsusib.ro/en/historia-urbana>

- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j7Q85jnEBXo&ab_channel=AtelierExperimentalMacPopescu

- <http://biblioteca.uauim.ro>

- <https://urb.bme.hu/en/doconf2021-call-for-abstract/>

- <https://icar2015.uauim.ro/>

- <https://www.incd.ro/>

- <https://sistemantiplagiat.ro/en/home-2/>

² This is the observation for all Annexes: there is a solid recommendation for preparing all annexes in the English language for future evaluations.



Meeting/discussions with doctoral students in the doctoral study domain under review

The meeting/discussions with doctoral students in the doctoral study domain under review were on-line and took place on 23/11/2021 between 13:00-13:50. At the meeting participated students only from the Ph.D. students of the Architecture domain, belonging to different years (stages) of the Ph.D. program. Students had a favorable opinion about their professors and highly appreciated them. They were convinced of the quality of the study they were receiving at the school. However, they would appreciate greater financial help through scholarships and financial allocations made available to them. As expected at the Ph.D. level, most of the students were self-driven and could find the resources missing in the school. Some of the students were involved in different levels of decision-making. However, they could not recall getting the feedback of the results from the questionnaires that were disseminated to them, regarding the quality of teaching and curricula.

Meeting/Discussions with the graduates of the doctoral study domain under review

Meeting/Discussions with the graduates of the doctoral study domain under review were on-line and took place on 22/11/2021 between 13:00-13:50. At the meeting participated former students from the Architecture domain. Overall, they all seem satisfied with the quality of their development throughout the Ph.D., and it could be observed from the job positions. Some graduates were engaged in foreign research projects and seemed to appreciate the knowledge they received. However, they had some advice that would give to the management, related to the internationalization, a more modern approach to the structure and content of the Ph.D. thesis. These remarks were primarily made from the students who had international experiences and would compare the two systems.

Meeting/Discussions with employers of the graduates in the doctoral study domain under review

The meeting/Discussions with employers of the graduates in the doctoral study domain under review were on-line and took place on 24/11/2021 between 11:00-11:50. At the meeting participated employers of graduate students. Overall, they were all satisfied with the level of training of the graduates and their considerably high level of a multidisciplinary approach and different forms of engagement, but which mainly was happening to the employees who also worked at the School of Ph.D. studies. Therefore, the Ph.D. student's engagement was still related to the academic and more theoretical research. One of the employees from the industry requested a greater involvement of the Ph.D. student in real practical problems. In contrast, their advanced research knowledge would help the industry with practical issues. They all agreed that both employers and the doctoral school could benefit from constant cooperation.

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 Directors of the Doctoral School(s) in which the doctoral study domain under review was operating on-line. It took place on 23/11/2021 between 12:00-12:50. At the meeting participated the doctoral coordinators. It was widely discussed about the last program assessment and the change of assessment criteria from the last time. It was the first time that ARACIS was evaluating the UAUIM Doctoral schools. Further on, it was discussed about the Ph.D. students of the evaluated domain



as well as Ph.D. supervisors and school finances. The participants appropriately answered all discussed matters or supported them with the needed supplementary documents. The same school representatives were met later on the week, on 26/11/2021, when they were informed of some of the findings of the self-evaluation report, and several complementary documents were requested.

Meeting/Discussions with the doctoral advisors in the doctoral study domain under review

The meeting/Discussions with the doctoral advisors in the doctoral study domain under review were on-line and took place on 23/11/2021. At the meeting participated Ph.D. Advisors and generally was discussed the specific research field of the participants, the number of Ph.D. students that they supervise, the way they assist the student during the research, and their involvement in research projects. The research/teaching activities were discussed and how they are regulated within the school. A significant share of discussion was done regarding the international student's enrollment and the research/teaching and language communications—their involvement in international research projects. The evaluation panel addressed questions regarding the average time of development of a Ph.D. Thesis, the student's research training and internships in foreign institutions. All questions were satisfactorily answered, and it seems that the doctoral domain works under the guidelines of a well-established institution, with considerable research potential as well as considerable research output. Ph.D. supervisors support their students, and this is reflected in the quality and quantity of the research output of the evaluated institution.

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 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 were on-line and took place on 22/11/2021 (representatives of the university's management; representatives of the CSUD and of the Doctoral School/Schools; the contact person for IOSUD/ doctoral domains), 22/11/2021 (Ethics Commission), 23/11/2021 (representatives of Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC)/ Quality Assurance Department; CSUD's and CSD's members) and 24/11/2021 (directors of research centers/laboratories). All were joint meetings for IOSUD and different DD panel evaluators. Broad-spectrum issues of organization within the institutions, funding sources, achievements of the last five years, development path, and ongoing and future projects were discussed. It was elaborated and the student-centered learning; student admission progression, recognition, and certification; policy for Quality Assurance; teaching staff; learning resources; whereas the need for more attention is ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programs. The institution faces some difficulties regarding the closed Quality Management circle process with inputs, outputs, changes, and check-ups. The Ethics Committee explained the mission and purpose of the ethics committee and its composition. It was discussed about the kind of complaints the Ethics Committee received and how they were addressed and eventually solved.

The Site Visit

The evaluation visit took place on 25 & 26/11/2021. Due to pandemic traveling restrictions, only the national members of the evaluation panel could participate in the site visit. At the same time, we were



offered photos and videos and extensive discussion within the group. We were provided with factual situations such as research facilities and available equipment at the research centers and laboratories, library, exhibition space, museum, classrooms, etc. Research facilities are satisfactory, as they fulfill all recent requirements in terms of space distribution, allocated areas, available complimentary services, etc. In terms of research infrastructure such as the Hi-Tech Learning center is remarkable, and facilities are exceptionally well equipped with state-of-the-art equipment that can help and motivate students to engage in their research activities properly. The evaluation panel members that were on-site visit were satisfied with the available resources.

There were lots of information provided during the meetings held with IOSUD and Doctoral domain panel members, including the evidence from the on-site visit. By analyzing the specific data provided in the internal evaluation report, the external evaluation report is prepared according to the proposed structure of the report and ARACIS guidelines.

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.*

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.*

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.

Doctoral School of Architecture has its own Internal Regulations, and the latest version of these Internal Regulations was approved by the UAUIM Decision of the Senate no. 51/ 2021. The position of the director is elected and operates according to the methodology for appointing the directors of the Doctoral Schools and the Councils of the Doctoral Schools approved by the UAUIM Senate. The provisions regarding the conduct of elections for the position of director of the Council of Doctoral School (CSD), as well as elections by the students of their representative in the CSD, are also provided by the RIOF- SD and by the Internal Regulations of the Doctoral School of Architecture. In 2015-2019, the appointment of directors was made following a specific methodology. The evidence of the conduct of elections is represented by the schedule of the elections posted on the UAUIM website (protocols of the elections, the results posted on the UAUIM website) whenever the CSD is established or its composition changes. The latest version of the methodology regarding the organization of admission to doctoral studies within the UAUIM was approved by the Senate of the UAUIM, Decision of the Senate no. 51/2021, while the methodology for completing doctoral studies is common to both Doctoral Schools of the UAUIM, by the Decision of the Senate no. 23/2021. The mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral supervisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad are regulated and in place. Council of the Doctoral School holds meetings upon the necessity occurred, ranging from 2-4 sessions per year. The contract for Doctoral Studies is updated every year. It is considered that the evaluated institution provided all required specific regulations and proof of their application at the level of the Doctoral School of the respective university doctoral study domain. When needed, additional documents were provided. Based on the analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's records, and the evaluation visit, this performance indicator is considered to be fulfilled.

Recommendations:

The internal procedures for the analysis and the review of doctoral study programs need to be well defined and efficient, e.g., Internal Annual Reports of the doctoral study programs development including the annual surveys from internal and external stakeholders by assessing the achievements to set new goals and make the necessary alterations into the revised doctoral program.

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.

The evaluated institution in the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Architecture includes, in the latest version adopted by the Council of the Doctoral School of Architecture on October 18, 2018, had mandatory criteria, procedures, and standards binding on the aspects specified in Article 17, paragraph (5) of the Government Decision No. 681/2011 on the Code of Doctoral Studies approval with subsequent



amendments and additions. Based on the analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents, and the evaluation visit itself, this performance indicator is considered to be fulfilled

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.*

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

The assessed institution uses an appropriate IT system, the "Academica" software, to keep track of the doctoral students and their academic background; this software is used at the level of the entire "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture of all three Bologna cycles. The effectiveness of the software is demonstrated by the fact that its use has caused no issues until now.

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.

The assessed institution proved the use of the software "Sistemantiplagiat.ro" (<http://sistemantiplagiat.ro/en/home-2/>), developed by Plagiat.pl, for verifying the percentage of similarity in doctoral theses; this software is used for this purpose at the level of the entire "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning of Bucharest for all three Bologna cycles. The use of plagiarism check software and the percentage of similarity within each Ph.D. thesis is considered sufficient to fulfill this indicator.

Recommendations:

Continue with using the anti-plagiarism software, but in the case of international Ph.D. candidates and the English written Ph.D. thesis, the plagiarism check of the software TURNITIN should be taken into consideration to increase the database of sources to be checked by the software and to ensure the level of originality of doctoral thesis and research papers.

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.*

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 two 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 five years. The grants address relevant themes for the respective domain and, as a rule, are engaging doctoral students.*

According to the documents provided, the assessed institution benefits of 11 research or institutional development grants obtained by the doctoral supervisors in the evaluated domain, in the last five years. The grants address topics relevant to the field and are conducted with the involvement of Ph.D. students insofar as their research topics resonate with those of the grants. This is considered to be a high number of grants, exceeding by far the minimum requirements.

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%.*

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 13.4% less than 20% as indicated in the Performance Indicator.

Recommendations:

The evaluated institution should develop strategies to attract additional funding sources besides government funding, opportunities through research grants such as Horizon, and other European and International funded project grants, should be thrived to achieve.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Performance Indicator *A.1.3.3.³ *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.).*

³ 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.



Certain types of possible expenses for doctoral students have been available and are available within the Doctoral School of Architecture, in addition to that of the doctoral grant/tuition fees, for professional training. Whereas the total sum of these proportions between the income and expenses with the wages/other expenses for the professional training of the doctoral students during the period 2016-2021 is 1.08 %.

Recommendations:

There is a possibility to increase also other self-funding activities by collaboration with local, national and international institutions, public and private sectors, and creating an entrepreneurial environment within the domain of Architecture. In this way, the tuition fees, together with other self-funding sources, will be sufficient to cover even more than 10% of the training and other research expenses of Ph.D. students.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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 five years will be presented distinctly.

The Doctoral School of Architecture of UAUM has premises, utilities, and equipment, allowing the research activities in the field of Architecture to be carried out in line with the assumed mission and objectives. The evaluation panel was provided with factual situations such as research facilities and available equipment at the research centers and laboratories, library, exhibition space, museum, classrooms, etc. Research facilities are satisfactory, as they fulfill recent requirements in terms of space distribution, allocated spaces, available complimentary services, etc. It is remarkable in terms of research infrastructure such as the Hi-Tech Learning center. Facilities are extremely well equipped with state-of-the-art equipment that can help and motivate students to engage in their research activities properly. The evaluation panel members that were on-site visit were satisfied with the available resources. The research infrastructure and research services are presented to the public through specific on-line (website) platforms. A majority of the research facilities and research equipment was either built or acquired in the last five years, which proves the progressive work of the evaluated institution to provide its students with the best resources for the proper development of the Ph.D. thesis. According to analyzed and observed data, this indicator is fulfilled



Recommendations:

Continue keeping and updating research and facility infrastructure.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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.*

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.

Within the doctoral domain, 23 doctoral thesis supervisors carry out their activity. All of them (100%) meet the minimum standards of the National Council for Attestation of University Degrees, Diplomas, and Certificates (CNATDCU) in force when the evaluation is carried out. Which criteria are required and mandatory for obtaining the enabling certification.

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.

Within the-UAUIM Architecture domain, there are 23 doctoral supervisors; a capacity obtained according to the law by affiliation. Among them, 17 (82.6%) are tenured professors and have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD-UAUIM.

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.

The summary of the courses provided at the Doctoral School of Architecture between 2018 and 2020, following the Doctoral School of Architecture curricula, also shows the certification or scientific researcher

level of the course coordinators, altogether with their CVs indicating the fulfillment of the Performance Indicator.

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 programs⁴ does not exceed 20%.

The percentage of the doctoral supervisors who concomitantly coordinate more than eight doctoral students, but no more than 12, who are themselves studying in doctoral programs is 13.1%; thus, it does not exceed 20%. Eventhough within the group of experts it was discussed the findings of 3 professors (who guide more than 12 Ph.D. at the moment; of these, 15 PhD students are in extension, some (5) having special family situations, and others (10) will defend their doctoral theses in sem 1 of the academic year 2021-2022. It is recommended to pay special attention to the observance of the maximum number of doctoral students and to follow consistently towards reaching the limits imposed by the criterion.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

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

****general description of the standard analysis.***

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.

The summary of the meeting of this criterion is shown in Figure.1:

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, 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.

Publications/ contributions	Number of doctoral supervisors within the SDA
minimum 5 Web of Science or ERIH-indexed publications	13
other achievements of relevant significance for the relevant field	30
membership on scientific boards of international publications and conferences	16
membership on boards of international professional associations	8
guests in conferences or expert groups working abroad	16
membership on doctoral defence commissions at universities abroad or co-supervising with universities abroad.	18

Figure 1. The doctoral supervisors within the domain are carrying out a scientific activity visible

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.

The status of each doctoral supervisor concerning the criterion specified above shows that all doctoral supervisors in the field of Architecture continue to be active in their scientific area, obtaining at least 134.5 % of the score requested by the minimal CNATDCU standards in force at the time of the evaluation.

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.*

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.*

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.



According to the provided documents regarding 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 places funded by the State budget, put out through contest within the doctoral school, in the field of Architecture, it is 0.8—exceeding the limit of 0.2.

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.*

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.

The methodology regarding the organization of the admission to doctoral studies within the UAUIM, approved by the Senate Decision no. 25/2021, provides that that admission to doctoral study programs is based on selection criteria including previous academic, research, and professional performance, their interest for scientific research, publications in the domain and a proposal for a research subject. Compulsory interviewing with the candidate is also part of the admission procedure.

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 admission⁵ does not exceed 30%.

During the last five years, the expulsion rate of the doctoral students, including dropping out, three, respectively four years after admission varies, whereas the average of the rates of the expulsion of the doctoral students, in the last five years is 20% after three years, and 15 % after four years, thus less than 30 %.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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.*

⁵ 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.



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.*

The curriculum of the Doctoral School of Architecture of the UAUIM includes several disciplines intended to study in-depth the research methodology and the statistical data processing

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.*

The Doctoral School of Architecture curriculum includes a mandatory course module, "Academic Ethics and Integrity," common to both doctoral schools.

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 activities⁶.*

The IOSUD has developed mechanisms to ensure that the training programs are based on the learning outcomes, but the specific and appropriate learning outcomes are not provided in most syllabuses. The concept of learning outcomes at the level of the doctoral studies must be specific and according to EU guidances. The concept provided in the syllabuses in the doctoral architecture domain do not reach that standard and should be revised.

Recommendations:

To review the format of syllabus development, in accordance with the EU standards, such as the development of definite learning outcomes on the level of the doctoral study. The workload must be clear, explained in the syllabuses. Bloom's taxonomy of knowledge could be used appropriately in line with the doctoral level of study.

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.*

⁶ 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.



The Institutional Regulations provide the obligation to establish guidance commissions and their functioning for the organization and functions of the doctoral studies within the UAUIM (RIOF_SDÂ-Article 27) and the Regulations for the organization and functioning of the Doctoral School of Architecture (Article 20).

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.

The doctoral supervisors provide the guidance same as the members of the guidance commissions. The ratio between the number of doctoral students and the total number of teaching staff/researchers providing doctoral guidance is 0.89 (thus not exceeding the limit of 3).

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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.*

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.

The assessed institution provided a list of significant works of Ph.D. students who have obtained the title of doctor in the last five years and one representative article per student. The doctoral domain of Architecture has an adequate number of scientific papers presented in the English language. The selection of 5 such papers resulted in the assessment that all of them have a relevant contribution to the architecture's doctoral study domain. In addition, all 5 contain significant original contributions in the respective domain, higher than three as required in this indicator.

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.



The regulations of the Doctoral School of Architecture stipulate that each doctoral student is obliged to participate during the studies at least once to present a paper at the scientific communication session of the doctoral schools and at least once to present a paper at another conference, and to publish at least one article in journals associated with UAUIM or in another journal. Therefore the ratio between the number of presentations, including posters, exhibitions, made at prestigious international events (held in the country or abroad) and the number of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies in the evaluated period (last five years) in the field of Architecture, within SDA-UAUIM is 4 and is higher than 1.

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.*

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.

According to the provided documents and findings, it can be noted, the number of doctoral theses allocated to a specific specialist from other institutions than the UAUIM in certain years (2021, 2019, 2017, 2015) exceeds two in a year for the theses coordinated by the same doctoral 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.

The provided documents and findings show that 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 is in average, 0.1, therefore under the limit of 0.3 for the evaluated period, and it does not exceed this limit for any of the scientific specialists.

The indicator is 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.*

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.*

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 participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counseling made available to doctoral students.*

The Doctoral School of Architecture has developed and regularly implements an internal evaluation and monitoring procedure for the evolution of doctoral schools. The activity of the doctoral supervisors being tenured professors within the Doctoral School of Architecture is evaluated each year following the university's procedure. The Doctoral School of Architecture has the necessary infrastructure and logistics to carry out the research activity. The Council of the Doctoral School of Architecture holds meetings aiming to amend the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Architecture Regulations whenever necessary (approx. 2-4 meetings per year). Furthermore, the director of the Doctoral School of Architecture constantly monitors the activity of the doctoral students concerning: endorsing the doctoral students' annual activity reports, monitoring the defense of scientific research reports, monitoring the participation of the doctoral students in the Scientific Communications Session, monitoring the publication of papers.

Recommendations:

The institutions should set out quality principles of Total quality management, referring to the quality management methodology – EFQM (European Foundation of Quality Management) as preconditions and actions required to achieve the Quality Policy.

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.*



The process of data collection and analysis of the results is performed each academic year. In addition, the student survey is conducted regularly. Nevertheless, implementation of surveys and feedbacks from other external stakeholders seems to have various shortages. During the interviews with the Expert Panel, the closed Quality Management circle with inputs, outputs, changes, and check-ups was unclear. It is important to emphasize that according to the plan-do-check-act principle generally accepted in quality assurance, it is essential to close the feedback loop and assess the achievements to set new goals and move forward.

Recommendations:

The student survey is conducted regularly and used efficiently to improve the study domain through the Internal Annual Report. At the same time, external stakeholders (employers, graduates, etc.) should have a formal and systematic survey and feedback regarding survey results.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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.*

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.*

According to the description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents, delivered documents, and the Institution website, it can be concluded that the IOSUD publishes, in compliance with the general regulations on data protection, information related to the Doctoral School regulation; the admission regulation; the doctoral studies contract; the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis; the content of training program based on advanced



academic studies; the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data; the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor); information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis; and, links to the doctoral theses' summaries

Recommendations:

The published documents should be translated into English in order to be more visible as well as attract international students.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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.

Between 2015 and 2016, the UAUIM joined and became a member of the consortium ANELIS PLUS, the beneficiary of a funding program for scientific research at the national level. Therefore it had a subscription to the following scientific databases: 1. Ebsco Art Fulltext; 2. Proquest; 3. SpringerLink Journals; 4. Willey Journals in 2016. While the UAUIM had institutional and mobile access to the following databases between July 2020 and June 2021: EBSCO Art and Architecture Complete, ProQuest Art and Architecture in Video, JSTOR Sustainability Collection. Between July 2021 and June 2022, it has access to 1. EBSCO Art and Architecture Complete; 2. Ebooks DeGruyter.

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.

In the field of Architecture, doctoral student has access, upon request and with the doctoral supervisor's agreement, to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic. The Doctoral School of Architecture uses the software "Sistemantiplagiat.ro" developed by Plagiat.pl, for verifying the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses; this software is used at the level of the entire "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture for all three Bologna cycles.

Recommendations:

In the case of international candidates and the English-written Ph.D. thesis, the plagiarism check of the software TURNITIN should be taken into consideration.

The indicator is fulfilled.



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

In the Architecture field, all doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the specific domain within the doctoral school, according to internal regulations. In addition, several laboratories are operational within UAUIM, as well as other national-level research infrastructure, equipped with modern equipment and necessary software, depending on their particular characteristics:

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion C.3. Internationalization

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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.*

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.*

The Doctoral School of Architecture through IOSUD has concluded Agreements with foreign universities. It maintains collaboration relations with over 80 schools of architecture in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and the USA, and regarding doctoral students who have completed a training period abroad or another form of mobility such as participation in international scientific conferences, is 37.5% > 35%. While the ERASMUS+ program, which provides doctoral students with the opportunity to perform mobility in partner universities that also have programs for cycle 3, are very few.

Recommendations:

To continue participation in ERASMUS+ mobility programs and promote other mobility/grant programs, such as, e.g., OEAD, DAAD, Fulbright scholarships, etc.

The indicator is 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.*

Following the obtained findings of the evaluated doctoral study domain, support is granted, including financial support, to the organization of doctoral studies in international co-tutelage or the invitation of leading experts to deliver courses/lectures for doctoral students even though it is not very satisfactory.

Recommendations:

To continue the good practice and further develop the co-mentorship on the international level and guest lectures and international cooperation with international professors to increase the quality of the doctoral study program.

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.).*

Referring to the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation meetings/interviews, the internationalization of activities carried out during the doctoral studies are supported by IOSUD; primarily by the inclusion of international experts in guidance committees, attracting foreign doctoral students, as well as activities carried out based on collaboration protocols, in which case is not up to the satisfactory level.

Recommendations:

The evaluated institution is encouraged to increase the share of internationalization activities. There should be more publicity of the doctoral domain to the international realm. The whole set of documents and regulations related to the study program should be English. The curriculum must be offered in the English language; the syllabuses should be available in English with correlation and improved learning outcomes corresponding to EU standards of higher education and doctoral level.

The indicator is fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the only independent university in Romania dedicated to the training of specialists in the field of Architecture and Urban Planning - highly qualified Ph.D. advisors, with a substantial number of publications and international visibility; - the presence of research grants in UAUM, including at the level of doctoral supervisors, which capture the interest of doctoral students in research activities related to the doctoral one; - strong work ethics and serious engagement of the professors, willingness to help, adapt to the needs of the nowadays dynamics. 	<p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - low visibility of the program at the international level; - not well-defined and efficient internal procedures for analyzing and reviewing doctoral study programs. - the lack of plagiarism check of the software, such as TURNITIN, for the English-written Ph.D. thesis,
<p><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new Tech Learning center is remarkable; facilities are very well equipped with state-of-the-art equipment that can help and motivate students to engage in their research activities properly. - Increasing the number of co-tutelage doctorate with international schools might be a way of attracting more international students as well as gaining a more international visibility 	<p><u>Threats:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - students lack additional funding sources besides government funding - competitiveness of other institutions of the international universities who can attract local students to work, live and study abroad - the lack of diverse potential employers of graduates, besides the one linked with the school domain (the university itself) - Insufficient robustness at the Domain level regarding the quality assurance within the self-evaluation process

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.		Performance Indicator A.1.1.1.	Fulfilled	The internal procedures for the analysis and the review of doctoral study programs need to be well defined and efficient, e.g., Internal Annual Reports of the doctoral study programs including the annual surveys from internal and external stakeholders by assessing the achievements to set new goals and make the necessary alterations.
2.		Performance Indicator A.1.1.2.	Fulfilled	
3.		Performance Indicator A.1.2.1	Fulfilled	
4.		Performance Indicator A.1.2.2.	Fulfilled	Continue with using the anti-plagiarism software, but in the case of international Ph.D. candidates and the English written Ph.D. thesis, the plagiarism check of the software TURNITIN should be taken into consideration to increase the database of sources to be checked by the software and to increase the level of originality of doctoral thesis and research papers
5.		Performance Indicator A.1.3.1	Fulfilled	
6.	*	Performance Indicator *A.1.3.2	Partially fulfilled	The evaluated institution should develop strategies to attract additional funding sources besides government funding, opportunities through research grants such as Horizon, and other European and International funded project grants, should be thrived to achieve.
7.	*	Performance Indicator *A.1.3.3	Partially fulfilled	There is a possibility to increase also other self-funding activities by cooperation with local, national and international institutions, public and private sectors, and creating an entrepreneurial environment within the domain of Architecture. In this way, the tuition fees, together with other self-

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
				funding sources, will be sufficient to cover even more than 10% of the training and other research expenses of Ph.D. students.
8.	C	Performance Indicator A.2.1.1	Fulfilled	
9.	C	Performance Indicator A.3.1.1.	Fulfilled	
10.	*	Performance Indicator *A.3.1.2.	Fulfilled	
11.		Performance Indicator A.3.1.3.	Fulfilled	
12.	*	Performance Indicator *A.3.1.4.	Partially fulfilled	
13.	C	Performance Indicator A.3.2.1.	Fulfilled	
14.	*	Performance Indicator *A.3.2.2.	Fulfilled	
15.	*	Performance Indicator *B.1.1.1.	Fulfilled	
16.	*	Performance Indicator *B.1.2.1.	Fulfilled	
17.		Performance Indicator B.1.2.2.	Fulfilled	
18.		Performance Indicator B.2.1.1.	Fulfilled	
19.		Performance Indicator B.2.1.2.	Fulfilled	
20.		Performance Indicator B.2.1.3.	Fulfilled	To review the format of syllabus development, in accordance with the EU standards, such as the development of definite learning outcomes on the level of the doctoral study. The workload must be clear, explained in the syllabuses. Bloom's taxonomy of knowledge could be used appropriately in line with the doctoral level of study.
21.		Performance Indicator B.2.1.4.	Fulfilled	
22.	C	Performance Indicator B.2.1.5.	Fulfilled	
23.	C	Performance Indicator B.3.1.1.	Fulfilled	

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
24.	*	Performance Indicator *B.3.1.2.	Fulfilled	
25.	*	Performance Indicator *B.3.2.1.	Partially fulfilled	
26.	*	Performance Indicator *B.3.2.2.	Fulfilled	
27.		Performance Indicator C.1.1.1.	Fulfilled	The institutions should set out quality principles of Total quality management, referring to the quality management methodology – EFQM (European Foundation of Quality Management) as preconditions and actions required to achieve the Quality Policy.
28.	*	Performance Indicator *C.1.1.2.	Partially fulfilled	The student survey is conducted regularly and used efficiently to improve the study domain through the Internal Annual Report. At the same time, external stakeholders (employers, graduates, etc.) should have a formal and systematic survey and feedback regarding survey results.
29.	C	Performance Indicator C.2.1.1	Fulfilled	The published documents should be translated into the English language in order to attract more foreign students.
30.		Performance Indicator C.2.2.1.	Fulfilled	
31.		Performance Indicator C.2.2.2.	Fulfilled	In the case of international candidates and the English-written Ph.D. thesis, the plagiarism check of the software TURNITIN should be taken into consideration.
32.		Performance Indicator C.2.2.3.	Fulfilled	
33.	*	Performance Indicator *C.3.1.1.	Fulfilled	To continue participation in ERASMUS+ mobility programs and promote other mobility/grant programs, such as, e.g., OEAD, DAAD, Fulbright scholarships, etc.
34.		Performance Indicator C.3.1.2.	Fulfilled	To continue the good practice and further develop the co-mentorship on the international level and guest lectures and international cooperation with international lecturers, professors,

No.	Type of Indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
				supervisors, and academic staff to enhance and increase the quality of the doctoral study program.
35.		Performance Indicator C.3.1.3.	Fulfilled	The evaluated institution is encouraged to increase the share of internationalization activities. There should be more advertising of the doctoral domain to international universities and institutions. The whole set of documents and regulations related to the study program should be English. The curriculum must be offered in the English language; the syllabuses should be available in English with correlation and improved learning outcomes corresponding to EU standards of higher education and doctoral level.

VI. Conclusions and general recommendations

The "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning of Bucharest is currently the only independent university in Romania dedicated to training specialists in the field of Architecture and Urban Planning. The major strengths of the doctoral study domain in architecture are the long reputable history background in the academic world. The enrolled P.h.D.candidates to the doctoral school is well prepared and can very easily be adapted to other research institutions, which indicates that the knowledge they obtain in the school is transferrable. There is substantial work ethic and earnest engagement of the academic staff and management to help and adapt to the needs of the academic/research dynamics. I was very pleased to discuss with some very well reputable professors who have gone beyond their duties for the university's development, with the idea that they are leaving a good legacy to future generations. There is a high level of student satisfaction with academic staff and legislative solid support, procedures, and implementation. Research activity is sound, and the scientific contribution of the supervisors and students is high. The infrastructure and the new research facilities are of high quality. During the assessment week and on-line zoom meetings, there was much information distributed and available to external and internal evaluators. The Internal Evaluation Report also offered a broad-spectrum justification of each criterion, standard, and performance indicator. The primary conclusion leads to the assessment of each standard and performance indicator. Out of 35 performance indicators, 29 are assessed as fulfilled and only 6 as partially fulfilled.

However, there is a strong impetus that the views/recommendations of the evaluation team are in line with the European Standards and Guidelines and will only help the Doctoral School of Architecture focus on some issues that will help uncover more of their potential. In this sense, the recommendation (the same extracted from the previous chapter) from this report would focus on:

The Efficiency of the Internal Quality Assurance System:

- The internal procedures for the analysis and the review of doctoral study programs need to be well defined and efficient, e.g., Internal Annual Reports of the doctoral study programs including the annual surveys from internal and external stakeholders by assessing the achievements to set new goals the necessary alterations.
- The institutions should set out quality principles of Total quality management, referring to the quality management methodology – EFQM (European Foundation of Quality Management) as preconditions and actions required to achieve the Quality Policy.
- The student survey is conducted regularly and used efficiently to improve the study domain through the Internal Annual Report. At the same time, external stakeholders (employers, graduates, etc.) should have a formal and systematic survey and feedback regarding survey results.

Cooperation and Internationalization:

- Continue with using the anti-plagiarism software, but in the case of international Ph.D. candidates and the English written Ph.D. thesis, the plagiarism check of the software TURNITIN should be taken into consideration to increase the database of sources to be checked by the software and to increase the level of originality of doctoral thesis and research papers
- The published documents should be translated in the English language to be more present in the international environment and attract more international students.
- In the case of international candidates and the English-written Ph.D. thesis, the plagiarism check of the software TURNITIN should be taken into consideration.
- To continue participation in ERASMUS+ mobility programs and promote other mobility/grant programs, e.g., OEAD, DAAD, Fulbright scholarships, etc.
- To continue the good practice and further develop the co-mentorship on the international level and guest lectures and international cooperation with international lecturers, professors, supervisors, and academic staff to enhance and increase the quality of the doctoral study program.
- The evaluated institution is encouraged to increase the share of internationalization activities. There should be more advertising of the doctoral domain to the international realm. The whole set of documents and regulations related to the study program should be English. The curriculum must be offered in the English language; the syllabuses should be available in English with correlation and improved learning outcomes corresponding to EU standards of higher education and doctoral level.

Resources and Provisions of the Doctoral Domain:

- The evaluated institution should develop strategies to attract additional funding sources besides government funding, opportunities through research grants such as Horizon, and other European and International funded project grants, should be thrived to achieve. In contrast, the Ph.D. topics could be aligned with the project grant; therefore, Ph.D. students could obtain the financial means to conduct the research/education.

- There is a possibility to increase other self-funding activities by cooperation with local, national, and international institutions, public and private sectors, and creating an entrepreneurial environment within the domain of Architecture. In this way, the tuition fees, together with other self-funding sources, will be sufficient to cover even more than 10% of the training and other research expenses of Ph.D. students.

The content of the Doctoral Domain:

- To review the model of syllabus development, including the EU standards for the following: development of specific learning outcomes on the level of the doctoral study for each syllabus and distribution of an appropriate and relevant number of ECTS per each learning outcome. The workload must be clear, explained in the syllabuses, and communicated to students. Bloom's taxonomy of knowledge can be helpful here, and the level of learning outcomes should be appropriate with the doctoral level of study. It is a solid and necessary recommendation for this performance indicator which will ensure compliance with EU standards

Prishtina December 6, 2021

VII. Annexes

- The detailed schedule of the evaluation visit

Nr 6551 / 17.11.2021

Programul de evaluare IOSUD și a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat
Universității de Arhitectură și Urbanism „Ion Mincu” din București (UAUIM București)

*The timetable for the evaluation of IOSUD and doctoral study domains
at the "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning (UAUIM Bucharest)*

Perioada de desfășurare a evaluării / The evaluation period: 22-26.11.2021

Vineri/Friday, 19.11.2021

Data/ora Date/hour (Bucharest time)	Activitate / Activity	Participanți / Participants	Observații/ Responsabil Observation/Responsible
EVALUAREA STUDIILOR UNIVERSITARE DE DOCTORAT / DOCTORAL STUDIES EVALUATION			
18:00 – 20:00	<p>Întâlnirea echipei de evaluare pentru discutarea principalelor aspecte metodologice legate de activitatea de evaluare a studiilor universitare de doctorat</p> <p>Meeting of panel members for discussing main methodological aspects related to the evaluation of doctoral studies</p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (ARACIS 49): LINK</p> <p>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by ARACIS): LINK</p>	<p>Toți membrii echipei de evaluare</p> <p>All evaluation panel members</p>	<p>Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma Zoom ARACIS / Audio-video recording ARACIS Zoom platform</p>

Intervalul orar/ Hour	Activități de evaluare/ Evaluation activities	Participanți/ Participants
Luni/ Monday, 22.11.2021		
09:00-09:50	<p>Întâlnire preliminară online pentru pregătirea și armonizarea etapelor de evaluare, în modul mixt, la nivel de domenii de doctorat și IOSUD</p> <p><i>Online preliminary meeting for the preparation and harmonization of evaluation steps, in hybrid mode, of doctoral study domains and IOSUD</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (ARACIS 49): LINK</p> <p><i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by ARACIS):</i> LINK</p>	<p>Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat</p> <p><i>IOSUD & doctoral domains evaluation panels</i></p>
10:00-10:50	<p>Întâlnirea online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții conducerii universității și ai CSUD</p> <p><i>Online meeting with representatives of the institution and of the Council for Academic Doctoral Studies (CSUD)</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK</p> <p><i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCUREȘTI):</i> LINK</p>	<p>Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat</p> <p><i>IOSUD & doctoral domains evaluation panels</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reprezentanți ai conducerii <i>representatives of the University's management</i> - reprezentanți ai CSUD și ai școlii/școlilor doctorale <i>representatives of the CSUD and of the Doctoral School/Schools</i> - persoana de contact IOSUD/domenii <i>the contact person for IOSUD/ doctoral domains</i>
11:00-11:50	<p>Domenii doctorat: Întâlnire online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu responsabilul domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat și cu echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă</p> <p><i>Doctoral domain: Online meeting with the contact person for the doctoral study domain under review and the team who drafted the internal evaluation report</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI):</p> <p>Arhitectură - LINK</p> <p>Urbanism - LINK</p> <p><i>Meeting links ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCUREȘTI):</i></p> <p>Architecture - LINK</p> <p>Urbanism - LINK</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comisiile de evaluare domenii de doctorat <i>Doctoral domains evaluation panels</i> - responsabilul domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat și echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă <i>The doctoral studies domain contact person and the team who drafted the internal evaluation report</i>

Intervalul orar/ Hour	Activități de evaluare/ Evaluation activities	Participanți/ Participants
12:00-12:50	<p>IOSUD: Întâlnire online cu directorul CSUD/directorii școlilor doctorale din IOSUD supus procesului de evaluare și cu echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă</p> <p><i>IOSUD: Online meeting with the director of CSUD/ directors of doctoral schools and the team who drafted the internal evaluation report</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK</p> <p><i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCUREȘTI):</i> LINK</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - reprezentanți ai CSUD și ai școlii/școlilor doctorale/ IOSUD <i>representatives of CSUD and of doctoral school(s)/IOSUD</i>
13:00-13:50	<p>IOSUD: Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu reprezentanți ai absolvenților IOSUD</p> <p><i>IOSUD: Online meeting with IOSUD graduates</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK</p> <p><i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCUREȘTI):</i> LINK</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - reprezentanți ai absolvenților <i>representatives of doctoral graduates</i>
14:00-14:50	<p>Domenii doctorat: Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu reprezentanți ai absolvenților domeniului</p> <p><i>Doctoral domain: Online meeting with graduates for the respective doctoral study domain</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI):</p> <p>Arhitectură - LINK</p> <p>Urbanism - LINK</p> <p><i>Meeting links ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCUREȘTI):</i></p> <p>Architecture - LINK</p> <p>Urbanism - LINK</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comisiile de evaluare domenii de doctorat <i>Doctoral domains evaluation panels</i> - reprezentanți ai absolvenților <i>representatives of doctoral graduates</i>
15:00-15:50	<p>Întâlnire online cu membrii Comisiei de Etică a universității</p> <p><i>Online meeting with the members of the Ethics Commission</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK</p> <p><i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCUREȘTI):</i> LINK</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat <i>IOSUD & doctoral domains evaluation panels</i> - membrii Comisiei de Etică <i>Ethics Commission members</i>

Intervalul orar / Hour	Activități de evaluare / Evaluation activities	Participanți / Participants
Marti / Thursday, 23.11.2021		
09:00 - 09:50	<p>Întâlnire online cu membrii Comisiei pentru Evaluarea și Asigurarea Calității (CEAC)/ Departamentul de asigurare a calității <i>Online meeting with the Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC) members/ Quality Assurance Department</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK <i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST):</i> LINK</p>	<p>- Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat <i>IOSUD&doctoral domains evaluation panels</i></p> <p>- reprezentanți ai CEAC/Departament AC <i>representatives of Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC)/ Quality Assurance Department</i></p>
10:00 - 10:50	<p>Întâlnire online cu membrii Consiliului Studiilor Universitare de Doctorat al IOSUD și membrii Consiliului școlii/scolilor doctorale (CSD) în cadrul cărora funcționează domeniile evaluate <i>Online meeting with Doctoral University Studies Council (CSUD) and with members Doctoral Schools Council (CSD members)</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK <i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST):</i> LINK</p>	<p>Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat <i>IOSUD&doctoral domains evaluation panels</i></p> <p>- membrii CSUD și CSD <i>CSUD's and CSD's members</i></p>
11:00 - 11:50	<p>IOSUD: Întâlnire online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu personalul didactic aferent școlilor doctorale din IOSUD <i>IOSUD: Online meeting with IOSUD academic staff</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK <i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST):</i> LINK</p>	<p>Comisia de evaluare pentru IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- cadre didactice cu titlul de conducător de doctorat <i>Doctoral coordinators</i></p>
12:00 - 12:50	<p>Domeniu doctorat: Întâlnire online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu personalul didactic aferent domeniului evaluat <i>Doctoral domain: Online meeting with the academic staff corresponding to the doctoral study domain</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): Meeting links ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST): Arhitectură - LINK Arhitecture - LINK Urbanism - LINK Urbanism - LINK</p>	<p>Comisiile de evaluare domenii de doctorat <i>Doctoral domains evaluation panels</i></p> <p>- membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori domeniu <i>members of domain evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- cadre didactice cu titlul de conducător de doctorat <i>Doctoral coordinators</i></p>

Intervalul orar / Hour	Activități de evaluare / Evaluation activities	Participanți / Participants
13:00 - 13:50	<p>Domeniu doctorat: Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu studenții doctoranzi <i>Doctoral domain: Online meeting with PhD students</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (ARACIS): Meeting links ZOOM platform (by ARACIS): Arhitectură - LINK (ARACIS 50) Arhitecture - LINK Urbanism - LINK (ARACIS 51) Urbanism - LINK</p>	<p>- Comisiile de evaluare domenii de doctorat <i>Doctoral domains evaluation panels</i></p> <p>- studenții doctoranzi <i>PhD students</i></p>
14:00 - 14:50	<p>IOSUD: Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu studenții doctoranzi <i>IOSUD: Online meeting with PhD students</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (ARACIS 50): LINK <i>Meeting links ZOOM platform (by ARACIS):</i> LINK</p>	<p>- Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- studenții doctoranzi <i>PhD students</i></p>

Miercuri / Wednesday, 24.11.2021		
09:00 - 09:50	<p>IOSUD: Întâlnire online cu directorii/responsabili centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare IOSUD <i>IOSUD: Online meeting with the Directors/ persons in charge of the research centers/laboratories within IOSUD</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK <i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST):</i> LINK</p>	<p>- Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- directorii centrelor/ laboratoarelor de cercetare <i>Directors of the research centers/laboratories</i></p>
10:00 - 10:50	<p>Domeniu doctorat: Întâlnire online cu directorii/responsabili centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare aferente domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat <i>Doctoral domain: Online meeting with the Directors/ persons in charge of the research centers/laboratories within the doctoral study domain</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): Meeting links ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST): Arhitectură & Urbanism - LINK Architecture & Urbanism - LINK</p>	<p>- Comisiile de evaluare domenii de doctorat <i>Doctoral domains evaluation panels</i></p> <p>- directorii centrelor/ laboratoarelor de cercetare <i>directors of research centers/laboratories</i></p>
11:00 - 11:50	<p>Domeniu doctorat: Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu reprezentanți ai angajatorilor absolvenților domeniului <i>Doctoral domain: Online meeting with employers of Doctoral graduates in the domain</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): Meeting links ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST): Arhitectură - LINK Arhitecture - LINK Urbanism - LINK Urbanism - LINK</p>	<p>- Comisiile de evaluare domenii de doctorat <i>Doctoral domains evaluation panels</i></p> <p>- reprezentanți ai angajatorilor <i>employers' representatives</i></p>
14:00 - 14:50	<p>IOSUD: Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu reprezentanți ai angajatorilor absolvenților <i>IOSUD: Online meeting with employers of doctoral graduates</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire platforma ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK <i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST):</i> LINK</p>	<p>- Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- reprezentanți ai angajatorilor <i>employers' representatives</i></p>

15.00 – 15.50	<p>Întâlnire tehnică online, pentru identificarea aspectelor specifice care trebuie clarificate, dacă este cazul, pe parcursul vizitei la fața locului <i>Online technical meeting to identify specific issues that need to be clarified, if necessary, during the on-site visit</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri platforma ZOOM (ARACIS 49): LINK <i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by ARACIS):</i> LINK</p>	Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat <i>IOSUD&doctoral domains evaluation panels</i>
Joi/ Thursday, 25.11.2021		
09.00-18.00	<p>Continuarea activităților de evaluare a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat și IOSUD (Se lucrează separat.) (Reuniuni de lucru față în față, vizitarea bazei materiale didactice și de cercetare) <i>Continuation of the doctoral study domain and IOSUD evaluation activities (Independent evaluation activities) (Face-to-face working meetings, visiting university and research laboratories)</i></p>	Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat <i>IOSUD&doctoral domains evaluation panels</i>
Vineri/ Friday, 26.11.2021		
09.00-13.00	<p>Continuarea activităților de evaluare a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat și IOSUD (Se lucrează separat.) (Reuniuni de lucru față în față, vizitarea bazei materiale didactice și de cercetare) <i>Continuation of the doctoral study domain and IOSUD evaluation activities (Independent evaluation activities) (Face-to-face working meetings, visiting university and research laboratories)</i></p>	Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat <i>IOSUD&doctoral domains evaluation panels</i>
13.00-13.50	<p>Întâlnire online pentru concluzii <i>Online meeting for conclusions</i></p> <p>Linkuri întâlniri ZOOM (ARACIS 49): LINK <i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by ARACIS):</i> LINK</p>	Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat <i>IOSUD&doctoral domains evaluation panels</i>
14.00-14.50	<p>Întâlnire finală online în vederea prezentării principalelor constatări rezultate în urma evaluării la nivel de domenii de doctorat și IOSUD și a recomandărilor de îmbunătățire a calității <i>Meeting with representatives of the institution under review to discuss on the conclusions of the evaluation process and the main recommendations</i></p> <p>Link întâlnire ZOOM (UAUIM BUCUREȘTI): LINK <i>Meeting link ZOOM platform (by UAUIM BUCHAREST):</i> LINK</p>	Comisiile de evaluare pentru IOSUD și domenii de doctorat <i>IOSUD&doctoral domains evaluation panels</i> - reprezentanți universității <i>university's representatives</i>

Notă:

1. Toate întâlnirile în format on-line vor fi înregistrate audio-video. *All online meetings will be recorded audio and video.*
2. În perioada de evaluare, pot fi solicitate și alte întâlniri, pentru eventuale clarificări. *During the evaluation visit, other meetings may be requested for possible clarifications.*
3. Pentru toate întâlnirile din program unde se menționează domeniu, se vor organiza întâlniri în paralel pentru toate domeniile de studii universitare de doctorat din componența IOSUD. *For all the timetable meetings where the domain is mentioned, meetings will be organized in parallel for all the doctoral university studies domains within IOSUD.*

Director de misiune,
 Prof. univ. dr. Dorian COJOCARU

Director CSUD,
 Conf. dr. arh. Angelica STAN