

The External Evaluation Report of a Doctoral Study Domain

Contents

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

I. Introduction¹

The purpose of this current report is to provide an in-depth, comprehensive, and constructive analysis of the History Doctoral Domain at the West University of Timisoara. The external expert carried out this task between 11 and 15 October 2021, entirely through an online platform, and additional communication was established via email. On 14 October, the panel coordinator was able to go on a site visit to the Doctoral School.

The committee was formed by Prof. Sorin Damean (Coordinator), Mr. Olah Roland (PhD student) and Prof. Adriaan De Man (International expert).

The Doctoral School of Humanities hosts two domains, Philology and History. All meetings were held in articulation with both domain committees.

The institutional information that was transmitted to all members indicates that the Doctoral School was created by Order of the Minister of Education no. 5037/13.09.201 and HG 595/22.07.2015, for the purpose of providing tertiary programs at the Faculty of Letters, History and Theology, building on substantial tradition at the West University (UVT). It aims at both national and international intake. Philology constitutes a larger section, with 24 PhD supervisors, as opposed to 6 PhD supervisors in History. Currently, the Doctoral School counts 64 PhD graduates in Philology and 4 in History.

II. Methods used

The English version of the internal evaluation report on the History domain was made available to the external expert by ARACIS, and was thoroughly analyzed before the online meetings took place. This report offers a structured insight into the holistic reality of the Doctoral School, and focuses its mission, composition, infrastructures, and administrative procedures. It was written in compliance with the requested standards, and posed no general difficulties. The vast majority of the annexed documents were

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



available in Romanian only, but this reviewer had no major issues in understanding their content, in particular when reading forms, titles, or names. Any needed clarifications were given during the meetings. During the course of the evaluation week, some additional documents were requested and immediately provided.

The coordinator, who carried out the site visit, was in permanent close contact with the student and the international expert, which is why all committee members had an adequate perspective of the physical reality, namely the buildings and equipment. Photographic evidence was also made available.

In addition to this written and oral information, and the internal general meetings of all panel members with university representatives, this expert's feedback is also based on the interaction with faculty members acting in different administrative capacities, as well as current and former students, during online meetings focusing specifically on the History domain. The former included discussions with the Doctoral School contact person, the members that wrote the internal report, and the PhD supervisors, mainly on technical topics, while the latter consisted of conversations with selected alumni and students, on a wide range of matters related to perceived quality and individual inputs that converged towards a common positive outlook. In all instances, a student-centered preoccupation was very noticeable, and had to do with expected dimensions such as employability and career enhancement.

Upon request, student survey details were shared with the committee.

In addition to all these methods, a proactive exploration of the online website resources was useful to the assessment, and the recommendations below.

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.

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

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

The items are both present as statutory elements (referred to in the description of the institutional capacity), and as operational ones, as evidenced by the report, the supporting documentetation, and the discussions during the technical meetings.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

One recommendation is that any proposed external members are to be confirmed by the supervisors of the Doctoral School.

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

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

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

Components are integrated and clearly outlined with proper detail.

Recommendations:

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 background.

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



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

The system is robust and articulates with the university matriculation and registration database.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

A computer program is available to, and used by, students and faculty (esp. the dissertation supervisor). In addition to its availability, it is also used in practice to double-check all final versions of the thesis.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**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 2 research or institutional development / human resources grant for the doctoral study domain, obtained by doctoral thesis advisors operating in the evaluated domain within the past 5 years. The grants address relevant themes for the respective domain and, as a rule, are engaging doctoral students.*

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

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

The indicator is met from either perspective, and indeed exceeds the minimum required standard in terms of research grants.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled



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

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

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

Some thresholds are met, in the global calculation for the doctoral school.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled

Recommendation consists of seeking additional funding, complementing the governmental one, and improving the support for students with financial needs.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

This indicator is not quantified (only the source of tuition is). While financial support for activities such as research grants involving students does exist, it is not clear if this and other types of financial assistance effectively correspond to at least 10%. It is admittedly complicated from a financial accounting perspective to obtain this sort of data.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Recommendation is to provide a quantified statement on the use of doctoral fees.

Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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



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

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

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

Recommendations:

The physical and online resources of the doctoral school are integrated with the rest of the university infrastructures. In addition to offices lecture rooms, and library facilities, the school offers fully operational access to digital databases. These combined resources are appropriate for carrying out research.

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.*

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

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

Recommendations:

All advisors meet the CNATDCU standards.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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



Recommendations:

Only two out of six advisors are employed by the university, which means that this indicator is currently not fully complied with. One reason for this is the non-replacement of two deceased faculty members.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Recommendation is to add at least one qualified, full-time/tenured faculty member (which would increase the percentage to 50% by replacing one of the affiliated coordinators), or two new faculty members (thus obtaining a tenured-affiliated proportion of 4:4).

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

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

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

Recommendations:

All teaching staff is qualified and specialized, and meet the requirements to teach the seminars.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

This indicator does not apply to the present evaluation, as no supervisor coordinates more than eighth students.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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



**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.*

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

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

Recommendations:

The quality of the outputs is high and generally appropriate in terms of publication standards (regarding journals and book series). The individual profiles meet the expected standards for senior academics, including in academic service, professional membership, and participation in international activities.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

The totality of doctoral advisors has provided evidence of continued recent activity, all well above the minimum required standards.

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.*

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

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

Recommendations:

The external attraction ratio has consistently been above 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.*

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

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

Recommendations:

The administrative procedures followed by the selection committee fully comply with the requirements. They focus on both the applicant's profile and the research topic to be developed.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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.



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

Recommendations:

Dropout rates do not reach the maximum limit, with some students opting for extensions instead of dropping out.

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.*

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

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

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

Recommendations:

More than three such seminars are available in the study plan. While they all contain research-intensive elements, one of them clearly concentrates on methodology.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

A seminar on ethics and integrity is offered in the study plan.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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



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

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

Recommendations:

Evidence provided on this indicator include a statement on the subject sheets, which include the program learning outcomes. It is also mentioned that the doctoral plan needs to take these outcomes into account. It is not entirely clear which specific mechanisms are in place to ensure that the program addresses the outcomes.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Despite fulfilling the criteria for the indicator, a recommendation is to indicate which precise mechanisms are in place, in order to support the descriptive elements on the program learning outcomes.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Mentoring and counseling are permanently ensured at several stages, in articulation with a supervision committee.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

The ratio stands at about half of the maximum limit, and is therefore not problematic.

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.

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

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

Recommendations:

The provided bundle of papers reflects a fine scientific production by recent doctoral graduates. The texts written in English are limited in number, but the overall quality is satisfactory, with contributions to the field.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

This quantitative criterion is met.

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.

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

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

Recommendations:

Indicator is met, as there is a considerable pool of external specialists collaborating with the doctoral school.

The indicator is fulfilled.



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

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

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

Recommendations:

This indicator is met, based on the same data, and with the same comment given for indicator B.3.2.1.

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

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

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

Recommendations:



All criteria are successfully addressed. There is a regular assessment of the supervisors, and taking into account the conditions, rules and regulations of the doctoral school, among others. A SWOT analysis allows for improving the quality control set in place.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Student input is collected through assessment sheets, surveying criteria on the quality of the program and the human resources. Such information is used in periodical changes to the curriculum.

The indicator is 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.

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



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

Recommendations:

The required website sections are functioning. One observation is that some parts are not available in English (which might impact the internationalization efforts).

Recommendation is to maintain the quality of the website.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

*general description of the standard analysis.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Students receive login credentials for accessing the main databases, as well as individual publisher platforms.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Anti-plagiarism software is available to all students.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

Libraries, labs, and other research infrastructures are subject to university rules and regulations, and grant student access in accordance.

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.*

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

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

Recommendations:

MoU-based agreements and international mobility programs prompt doctoral students to participate in conferences abroad, mostly in the form of conferences and ERASMUS stays. The latter was less used in the History domain, partly explainable by the fact that many PhD candidates carried out a professional activity during their studies.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Recommendation is to increase the number of students to engage in academic mobility.

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

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

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

Recommendations:

A variety of international and national experts delivered lectures and debates at the doctoral school.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Recommendation is to invest in co-supervision.

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



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

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

Recommendations:

A considerable number of participations in institutional fairs, educational conferences, and other internationalization activities aims at university /doctoral school outreach, recruitment and reputation.

The indicator is fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality of supervisors and of infrastructures. - Reputation at national level, which constitutes a competitive advantage. - Enthusiastic alumni network. 	<p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mainly regional/national scope of the doctoral school (both on research topics and on the demographics of both faculty and students). - Administrative and financial limitations regarding the faculty hiring procedures.
<p><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internationalization efforts, for instance through mobility programs, can be intensified. - Interdisciplinary articulation between History and other fields/doctoral schools. 	<p><u>Threats:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PhD program seems attractive mainly for established professionals but may be less so for young aspiring academics, thus affecting current and future student intake.

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	PI	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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; 	<p>The items are both present as statutory elements (referred to in the description of the institutional capacity), and as operational ones, as evidenced by the report, the supporting documentetation, and the</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p> <p>One recommendation is that any proposed external members are to be confimed by the supervisors of the Doctoral School.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>c) the Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies (for the admission of doctoral students, for the completion of doctoral studies);</p> <p>d) the existence of mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral advisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad;</p> <p>e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), giving as well proof of the regularity of meetings;</p> <p>f) the contract for doctoral studies;</p> <p>g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies.</p>	<p>discussions during the technical meetings.</p>	
2.	PI	<p>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.</p>	<p>Components are integrated and clearly outlined with proper detail.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
3.	PI	<p>A.1.2.1. The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background.</p>	<p>The system is robust and articulates with the university matriculation and registration database.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
4.	PI	<p>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.</p>	<p>A computer program is available to, and used by, students and faculty (esp. the dissertation supervisor). In addition to its availability, it is also used in practice to double-check all final versions of the thesis.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
5.	IP	<p>A.1.3.1. Existence of at least one research or institutional / human resources development grant under implementation at the time of submission of the internal evaluation file, per doctoral study domain under evaluation, or existence of at least 2 research or institutional development / human resources grant for the doctoral study domain, obtained by doctoral thesis advisors operating in the evaluated domain within the past 5 years. The grants address relevant themes for the respective domain and, as a rule, are engaging doctoral students.</p>	<p>The indicator is met from either perspective, and indeed exceeds the minimum required standard in terms of research grants.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
6.	PI *	<p>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%.</p>	<p>Some thresholds are met, in the global calculation for the doctoral school.</p>	<p>The indicator is partially fulfilled.</p> <p>Recommendation consists of seeking additional funding, complementing the governmental one, and improving the support for students with financial needs.</p>
7.	PI *	<p>A.1.3.3. 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.).</p>	<p>This indicator is not quantified (only the source of tuition is). While financial support for activities such as research grants involving students does exist, it is not clear if this and other types of financial assistance effectively correspond to at least 10%. It is admittedly complicated from a financial accounting perspective to</p>	<p>The indicator is partially fulfilled.</p> <p>Recommendation is to provide a quantified statement on the use of doctoral fees.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
			obtain this sort of data.	
8.	CPI	A.2.1.1. The venues and the material equipment available to the doctoral school enable the research activities in the evaluated domain to be carried out, in line with the assumed mission and objectives (computers, specific software, equipment, laboratory equipment, library, access to international databases etc.). The research infrastructure and the provision of research services are presented to the public through a specific platform. The research infrastructure described above, which was purchased and developed within the past 5 years will be presented distinctly	The physical and online resources of the doctoral school are integrated with the rest of the university infrastructures. In addition to offices lecture rooms, and library facilities, the school offers fully operational access to digital databases. These combined resources are appropriate for carrying out research.	The indicator is fulfilled.
9.	CPI	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.	All advisors meet the CNATDCU standards.	The indicator is fulfilled.
10.	PI *	A.3.1.2. At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.	Only two out of six advisors are employed by the university, which means that this indicator is currently not fully complied with. One reason for this is the non-replacement of two deceased faculty members.	The indicator is partially fulfilled. Recommendation is to add at least one qualified, full-time/tenured faculty member (which would increase the percentage to 50% by replacing one of the affiliated coordinators), or two new faculty members (thus obtaining a tenured-affiliated proportion of 4:4).

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
11.	PI	<p>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.</p>	<p>All teaching staff is qualified and specialized, and meet the requirements to teach the seminars.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
12.	PI *	<p>A.3.1.4. The percentage of doctoral thesis advisors who concomitantly coordinate more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12, who are themselves studying in doctoral programs does not exceed 20%.</p>	<p>This indicator does not apply to the present evaluation, as no supervisor coordinates more than eighth students.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
13.	CPI	<p>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</p>	<p>The quality of the outputs is high and generally appropriate in terms of publication standards (regarding journals and book series). The individual profiles meet the expected standards for senior academics, including in academic service, professional membership, and participation in international activities.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.		
14.	PI *	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 totality of doctoral advisors has provided evidence of continued recent activity, all well above the minimum required standards.	The indicator is fulfilled.
15.	PI *	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.	The external attraction ratio has consistently been above the limit of 0.2.	The indicator is fulfilled.
16.	PI *	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 administrative procedures followed by the selection committee fully comply with the requirements. They focus on both the applicant's profile and the research topic to be developed.	The indicator is fulfilled.
17.	PI	B.1.2.2. The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral	Dropout rates do not reach the maximum limit,	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		students 3, respectively 4, years after admission does not exceed 30%.	with some students opting for extensions instead of dropping out.	
18.	PI	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.	More than three such seminars are available in the study plan. While they all contain research-intensive elements, one of them clearly concentrates on methodology.	The indicator is fulfilled.
19.	PI	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.	A seminar on ethics and integrity is offered in the study plan.	The indicator is fulfilled.
20.	PI	B.2.1.3. The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities.	Evidence provided on this indicator include a statement on the subject sheets, which include the program learning outcomes. It is also mentioned that the doctoral plan needs to take these outcomes into account. It is not entirely clear which specific mechanisms are in place to ensure that the program addresses the outcomes.	The indicator is fulfilled. Despite fulfilling the criteria for the indicator, a recommendation is to indicate which precise mechanisms are in place, in order to support the descriptive elements on the program learning outcomes.
21.	PI	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	Mentoring and counseling are permanently ensured at several stages, in	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting.	articulation with a supervision committee.	
22.	CPI	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 ratio stands at about half of the maximum limit, and is therefore not problematic.	The indicator is fulfilled.
23.	CPI	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 provided bundle of papers reflects a fine scientific production by recent doctoral graduates. The texts written in English are limited in number, but the overall quality is satisfactory, with contributions to the field.	The indicator is fulfilled.
24.	PI *	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.	This quantitative criterion is met.	The indicator is fulfilled.
25.	PI *	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.	Indicator is met, as there is a considerable pool of external specialists collaborating with the doctoral school.	The indicator is fulfilled.
26.	PI *	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	This indicator is met, based on the same data, and with the same	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>defense on the doctoral thesis is organized, and the number of doctoral theses presented in the same doctoral study domain in the doctoral school should not exceed 0.3, considering the past five years. Only those doctoral study domains in which minimum ten doctoral theses have been presented within the past five years should be analyzed.</p>	<p>comment given for indicator B.3.2.1.</p>	
27.	PI	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the scientific work of Doctoral advisors; b) the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity; c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized; d) the scientific activity of doctoral students; e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students; f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students. 	<p>All criteria are successfully addressed. There is a regular assessment of the supervisors, and taking into account the conditions, rules and regulations of the doctoral school, among others. A SWOT analysis allows for improving the quality control set in place.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
28.	PI *	<p>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.</p>	<p>Student input is collected through assessment sheets, surveying criteria on the quality of the program and the human resources. Such information is used in periodical changes to the curriculum.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
29.	CPI	<p>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:</p>	<p>The required website sections are functioning. One observation is</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p> <p>Recommendation is to maintain the quality of the website.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.	that some parts are not available in English (which might impact the internationalization efforts).	
30.	PI	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.	Students receive login credentials for accessing the main databases, as well as individual publisher platforms.	The indicator is fulfilled.
31.	PI	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.	Anti-plagiarism software is available to all students.	The indicator is fulfilled.
32.	PI	C.2.2.3. All doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the specific domain/domains within the Doctoral School, according to internal order procedures.	Libraries, labs, and other research infrastructures are subject to university rules and regulations, and grant student access in accordance.	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
33.	PI *	<p>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.</p>	<p>MoU-based agreements and international mobility programs prompt doctoral students to participate in conferences abroad, mostly in the form of conferences and ERASMUS stays. The latter was less used in the History domain, partly explainable by the fact that many PhD candidates carried out a professional activity during their studies.</p>	<p>The indicator is partially fulfilled.</p> <p>Recommendation is to increase the number of students to engage in academic mobility.</p>
34.	PI	<p>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.</p>	<p>A variety of international and national experts delivered lectures and debates at the doctoral school.</p>	<p>The indicator is partially fulfilled.</p> <p>Recommendation is to invest in co-supervision.</p>
35.	PI	<p>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.).</p>	<p>A considerable number of participations in institutional fairs, educational conferences, and other internationalization activities aims at university /doctoral school outreach, recruitment and reputation.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>



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

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

VI. Conclusions and general recommendations

The joint panel conclusions are to be presented as a final combined statement. In individual terms, this reviewer's conclusions are that the Doctoral School, and in particular the History domain, operates within the stipulated norms and regulations. Apart from this formal compliance, there is also a strategic point to be made, which is the need for rethinking the social place of History in the near future. The Doctoral School exists only if students continue to find relevance in joining it, and this has not directly to do with individual administrative criteria, but rather with societal perceptions and even to a simple employment outlook. Many of these factors are of course not controlled by the people working at the Doctoral School. In short, recommendations are linked to investing in HR (hiring new faculty), communication (website), internationalization (more students engaging in substantial exchange programs), and in student support (essentially financial).

VII. Annexes

The following types of documents shall be attached:

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

26 October 2021
Adriaan De Man