

## **The External Evaluation Report of a Doctoral Study Domain**

### Contents

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

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

In this chapter, the following shall be summarized:

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

### **II. Methods used**

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

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

---

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



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

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

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

*\*general description of domain analysis.*

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

*\*General description of the criterion analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text and one table, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links (unfortunately, not enabled). The information describes the framework and the background of the doctoral school, specifically the university, other doctoral schools and the Doctoral School of Humanities.*

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

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the sections below in the form of text supported by links and annexes available online.*

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

*(a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;*

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



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

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

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

f) the contract for doctoral studies;

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

**Description:** The self-assessment report supplies a wealth of data and information with reference to everyone of the criteria listed in the indicator, supported by annexes available online and links. Additionally to standard management, details are given to the effect of the pandemic on the normal running of the school, where relevant. Further to the above, additional evidence of student election as council members, and composition of the council was supplied online on 12/10/21.

**Analysis:** The report and the annexes evidence the existence of a well-attested legal framework for the doctoral school and of its procedures and regulations.

The links to the English version of the documents available online lead to a site where no information is actually available (CSUD | Consiliul Studiilor Universitare de Doctorat (uvt.ro)). Availability of this information in, at least, English is of relevance for the visibility of the school (e.g. as regards attracting foreign students) and deserves urgent attention.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to implement easier access to the admission methodology, online and otherwise.

The recommendation is also to schedule more regular meetings (or the possibility for them, even if they are to be cancelled because no decision-making or reporting is needed, but at least the possibility must be there).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** The self-assessment report supplies specific and sufficient data and information supported by annexes available online and via a link, and with reference to requirements set by the indicator. The information includes special cases and how they are addressed (e.g. choice of subjects outside the doctoral school in question, need for additional supervisors, supervisor removal, supervisor replacement...) and reference to specific paragraphs within articles of legal text.

Additional information was required as follows:

- i) with regard to article 7.2. (a) of the Organising and Functioning Regulation of the Doctoral School of Humanities, whether additional payment is required for time extension beyond 3 years' doctoral studies and, if so, how much, and
- ii) with regard to article 3.4. (vi) of the Organising and Functioning Regulation of the Doctoral School of Humanities, what the procedure is for antiplagiarism software consultation, esp. concerning accessibility (e.g. cost, channel).



**Analysis:** *The self-assessment report and the additional evidence supply a wealth of data and information with reference to the requirements set by the indicator.*

*The information supplied during online interviews and in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 successfully addressed points i) and ii). The report and the annexes evidence the existence of a well-attested set of criteria, procedures and standards at the doctoral school.*

**Recommendations:** *N/A*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**\*General description of the standard analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the sections below in the form of text supported by annexes available online and a link.*

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

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online.*

**Analysis:** *The report and the annex evidence the existence of an IT system as per the requirements of the indicator. No evidence of effectiveness is supplied.*

**Recommendations:** *The recommendation is to measure the appropriateness and evidence of the effectiveness of the IT system as regards the users (students), the university administrative staff, and the faculty, if they (need to) access the system. While it can be understood that the choice and maintenance of such a system is run by the university for all schools and faculties, upgrades and revised versions may have to be requested by specific schools or for specific needs, and the requests can only come from users based on their feedback. Hence the recommendation for collecting feedback on the effectiveness of the IT system.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online and a link.*

**Analysis:** *The report and the annex evidence the existence of an IT system as per the requirements of the indicator. Appropriateness is attested by the number of users, by the results obtained and by the fact that plagiarism has been prevented completely in the last five years.*

*The information supplied during online interviews and in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 attest fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator.*

**Recommendations:** *N/A*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**



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

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

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

**Description:** The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online, with details of funding programmes, timeframes, budgets and participants.

**Analysis:** The report and the annex evidence twice as many times the minimum requirement set by the indicator, i.e. four grants for research or institutional development/human resources for the Doctoral School of Humanities.

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

The recommendation is for doctoral advisors to devote as much attention as possible to submit international research bids until more successful applications are secured than are attested at present.

The recommendation is to maintain the effort to support applied research in Philology but also to foster base research.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** The self-assessment report describes and refers to groups of students classified by projects. No additional evidence or support is given in annexes available online or links.

**Analysis:** The description available in the self-assessment report does not allow to actually see that the funded student ratio is at least 20%, as in the requirements set by the indicator, for two reasons:

- i) the figures given are absolute values, not percentages, and
- ii) no evidence is given or referenced.

The information supplied in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 confirms partial fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator. This is because several indicators were reportedly established in 2019/20, following replacement of CNATDCU (The National Council for Academic Titles and Degrees) by ARACIS (The Quality Assurance Agency), and the latter's new criteria are applied retrospectively as far back as 2015.

While the percentage since 2015 averages 18.47%, the last two years attest 26.85% and 28.27%. This means that the indicator can be considered to have been fulfilled since the new regulations came in force.



**Recommendations:** *The recommendation is to maintain the measures taken in the last two years, esp. in view of the marked increase that they have meant compared with previous years. Alternatively/Additionally, the recommendation is to find ways to raise funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (above 20% doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation) set by the requirements set by the indicator.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes and refers to groups of students classified by projects. No additional evidence or support is given as evidence that a given percentage (10%) has been reached in any of the two sections of the self-assessment report numbered A.1.3.3., either via annexes available online or via links. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the second section numbered A.1.3.3's reference to Annex 20UVT evidences a most relevant document as the procedure for student's access to support from this source.*

**Analysis:** *The description available in the self-assessment report does not allow to actually see that 10% of the sum raised via doctoral grants has been used for student training, as in the requirements set by the indicator, for two reasons:*

- i) no actual figures are given, either as absolute values or as percentages, nor there is the possibility to make out the percentage, and*
- ii) no description of the actions undertaken with the amount used for student training is given or referenced.*

*The information supplied in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 confirms partial fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator. This is because, not managing a budget of their own, doctoral schools appear to have no means to attest fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator. In turn, the Financial Department of the university appears not to attest fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator.*

*Still the school confirms meeting the students' travel expenses for conference participation. This means that, even if the indicator cannot be considered fulfilled insofar as the investment has not been attested, the school attests the right use of their venituri proprii with regard to this indicator.*

**Recommendations:** *The recommendation is, for the university's Financial Department, to find the way to supply the evidence needed to prove attestation of fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator.*

**The indicator is partially fulfilled.**

---

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



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

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

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

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

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

**Description:** The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online and via specific links. Additional evidence was supplied on 13/10/21 as a photo gallery.

**Analysis:** The resources available as regards facilities, equipment and online resources are as per the requirements set by this indicator by large. A number of premises are listed as available to host specific courses. Journal suscription and publications, database suscription and facilities are evidenced, even if details of whether they are from the past 5 years or not are not always clear. Reference to a current project and to a new European project bid within the field of Philology is added.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is for the university to maintain and upgrade the software as regularly as possible and provide specific training.

The recommendation is also to maintain the effort as regards EU-partnered project bids or at least as regards international projects.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

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

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

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

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

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



**Analysis:** The percentage achieved by the doctoral school exceeds by far the requirements set by the indicator (95,83% attested vs. 50% required by the indicator). The percentage where the requirement is not met is due to retirement and the expectation is that complete fulfilment will be achieved over time.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is for the university to maintain the level that it has achieved, such that new advisors meet the requirements before or soon after joining the school as advisors.

The recommendation is also to maintain the effort as regards EU-partnered project bids or at least as regards international projects.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

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

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report attests fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator. The ratio required and the ratio attested are identical, so there is the risk that the indicator may not be fulfilled if any of the tenured advisors ceased to act as an advisor. The likelihood for the 12 external advisors to become tenure faculty or for the university to attract tenured advisors is not described.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is for the university to provide the means to attract tenured advisors.

The recommendation is for advisors to strive towards fulfilment of the requirements to reach tenure.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** The self-assessment report refers to information attested by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report attests teaching by faculty with varying degrees of expertise.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is for the university to provide the means to maintain faculty with expertise in charge of these courses and to supply the means for increased expertise.

The recommendation is for faculty to undertake work towards these courses and towards higher expertise.

**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 programs<sup>3</sup> does not exceed 20%.*

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online.*

**Analysis:** *The self-assessment report and Annex 13F limit highest supervision to 12 students (Prof. Adriana Babeți).*

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

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

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

**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:** *The self-assessment report refers to information attested by an annex available online. It is unclear what the report means by '[...] the criteria set out by the indicator' and which of such criteria are attested for each of the groups of advisors according to the number of criteria attested. It is necessary to specify how many advisors attest publications as per the requirements set by the indicator, or which alternative achievements are considered instead, and for how many advisors in each case.*

**Analysis:** *Annex 9F evidences supervision experience, international expertise and relevance (research leave, publications, refereeing, event organization, scholarships, and project participation) and international networking (teaching experience, committee membership) to varying degrees.*

*The information supplied in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 specifies, for each advisor who attests fulfilment of at least one criterion, their fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator as regards five criteria:*

---

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



- i) international articles, where 20 out of 22 advisors meet the criterion, i.e. 90.91%,
- ii) scientific and editorial boards, where 12 out of 22 advisors meet the criterion, i.e. 54.55%,
- iii) professional boards/membership, where 4 out of 22 advisors meet the criterion, i.e. 18.18%,
- iv) invited speaker, where 12 out of 22 advisors meet the criterion, i.e. 54.55%, and
- v) doctoral board, where 4 out of 22 advisors meet the criterion, i.e. 18.18%.

Of these, every advisor meets at least one of the criteria, the average number of criteria fulfilled per advisor being 2.37, and the major one (international articles) being attested for all but two advisors. Only two advisors do not have any activity within any of the criteria listed above.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to divert a substantial amount of the research effort disseminated in national publishers, journals and conferences to international forums, especially in the medium-high impact range. The actions that apparently need further effort (i.e. where fewer records are attested but at the same time are most significant) are:

- i) publication in medium-high impact journals,
- ii) review of international publications,
- iii) membership of scientific committees of scientific events organized abroad,
- iv) membership in international expert panels, and
- v) co-supervision of foreign theses.

The recommendation is, also, for the advisors who attest fewest criteria, to strive towards a more complete research record and come in line with the average of the advisors' performance.

The recommendation is, also, for the advisors who do not attest any of the criteria, to strive towards a research record and come in line with the requirements of advisors' performance.

**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:** The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** Annex 9F evidences scientific activity as per the requirements set by the indicator. While the percentage of scientifically active advisors exceeds by far the requirements set by the indicator (95.83% attested vs. 50% required by the indicator), the scores attested range from fairly low to high on a range where only eight advisors, i.e. one third of the total, score above half as much as the highest. This means, in practice, that the group is broken into a smaller higher ranking third, and a bigger lower ranking two-thirds.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is for the university to provide the resources to help the lower-ranking advisors score higher and secure fulfillment of this requirement in the future.

The recommendation is for lower-ranking advisors to strive towards a higher score.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**



## **Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

*\*general description of domain analysis.*

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

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links. The information describes the profile (provenance, funding) and number of students of the doctoral school.*

*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.** N/A

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

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

**Analysis:** *The self-assessment report and the table immediately before indicator B.1.1.1. evidence ratios between candidates and budgeted places that are, at worst (1.86 attested in 2020 vs. 1.2 required by the indicator), well above the requirement set by the indicator. Annexes 16F and 17F evidence ratios of student candidate/financed position that are, at worst (0.21 attested in 2019 vs. 0.2 required by the indicator), above the limit set by the indicator.*

**Recommendations:** *The recommendation is to provide the means to keep ratios as they have been in the past five years and thus secure fulfillment of this requirement in the future, by attracting sustained interest by candidates and sustained budget support.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

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

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

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online. Failing my ability to understand Romanian, the annex in question (allegedly Annex 17F) shows results of the admission process rather than the actual criteria for admission. The criteria are listed*



but no point allocation is specified and the additional documents do not show how each criterion is graded. While the description of the indicator gives sufficient details of other aspects of the admission process (committee membership), other details are also left undescribed.

**Analysis:** The information supplied in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 specifies admission requirements (CV + research proposal), and attests samples of project submissions with marks.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to disseminate as far as possible (online and otherwise) the criteria and the grades each criterion is allocated. In practice, this means to supply as much public information as possible concerning specific criteria or guidelines for preparation of an application, and also for presentation of the candidates' records and projects, so candidates can prepare successful project proposals and the committees be presented properly oriented records to measure and assess.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** The self-assessment report does not present the indicator as a separate section, even if it can easily be identified where it is. The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** Failure to complete doctoral studies, for whichever the reason, does not exceed the requirement set by the indicator (30% attested in the worst year, 2020, vs. 30% required by the indicator). There is, however, a marked tendency towards failure, especially in 2020 but also in previous years when the pandemic cannot have been the reason for failure, specifically 2015, 2016 and 2019.

Additional information gathered during online interviews reported two main causes for failure:

- i) financial limitations, and
- ii) doctoral supervisor-candidate incompatibility.

**Recommendations:** The recommendations are twofold:

- i) concerning identification of reasons for failure:
  - a. to keep track of the reasons under which students are expelled ('Neîndeplinirea obligațiilor contractuale') and supply the means to address them, and
  - b. to identify the reasons why there is a marked increase in failure to complete doctoral studies over the recentmost past years and supply the means to address them.
- ii) concerning management of reasons for failure:
  - a. to maintain the effort to raise funding and create finance opportunities for support of doctoral students, and
  - b. to find ways of managing doctoral supervisor-candidate incompatibility such that failure/dropping out is prevented.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

---

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



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

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

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

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

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

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online.*

**Analysis:** *The self-assessment report lists four courses relevant to scientific research training vs. three required by the indicator. The courses are described in detail in Annex 19F.*

**Recommendations:** *The recommendation is to offer a wider range of courses in research methodology, in the case of Philology, for example, with a focus on:*

- i) applied statistics,*
- ii) lexical database design and use,*
- iii) research dissemination strategies,*
- iv) international networking and*
- v) publication policies.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online cited for indicator B.2.1.1.*

**Analysis:** *The self-assessment report lists one course relevant to research ethics, as in the requirement set by the indicator. The course is described in detail in Annex 19F. An additional course (Academic writing) is described as relevant in the matter, and academic ethics is listed among the transversal competencies.*

**Recommendations:** *The recommendation is to ensure that courses in research ethics are maintained and, if possible, supplemented with additional formative actions in this field, e.g. by analysing evidence on (self-)plagiarism gathered over past courses.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

**Performance Indicator B.2.1.3.** *The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities<sup>5</sup>.*

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online cited for indicator B.2.1.1.*

**Analysis:** *The self-assessment report describes the structure of the syllabus, and the evidence available from Annex 19F attests mechanisms towards addressing learning outcomes with specification of ‘[...] knowledge, skills and responsibility and autonomy [...]’, e.g. by description of competencies and objectives.*

**Recommendations:** *The recommendation is to ensure that the learning outcomes are revised and updated as necessary to stay in line with the target knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy required by each course and their overall training.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes counselling/guidance in detail and information is attested by an annex available online.*

**Analysis:** *The self-assessment report describes a number of training actions that result in counselling/guidance.*

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

- i) to revise and disseminate the range of contents that can be covered within counselling/guidance,*
- ii) to involve postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peers,*
- iii) to provide a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings, and*
- iv) more important, to enforce guidance regularity, i.e. to ensure that students make use of guidance at least at the beginning and at the end of the academic year, in order to allow feedback on the university’s performance, prevent potential dropout, and to identify weaknesses/deviations that may become structural, systematic obstacles during the PhD studies.*

**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:** *The self-assessment report describes information attested by an annex available online.*

---

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



**Analysis:** The self-assessment report declares a ratio that is actually under half as much as in the requirements set by the indicator (1.46:1 attested vs 3:1 required by the indicator).

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to provide the means to ensure that the ratio remains as close to optimal as possible, and in any case as per the requirements set by this indicator.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** Relevant information is presented in detail, especially as regards progress tracking and presentation/revision/resubmission in the form of text, with reference to information attested in an annex available online.

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

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

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

**Description:** Relevant data are overviewed, supported by a list of references in an annex available online (Annex 23F). The links in the annex are unfortunately not enabled.

**Analysis:** Fulfilment of this indicator is assessed based on five papers selected at random as follows:

Paper 1. Haneş Ioana-Gianina. 2019. Ulysses as modern prototype of Homo Viator. *Journal of Humanistic and Social Sciences*, 10, i: 27-36.

(Review based on the full-text English paper).

The paper is a contrastive description of classical references in J. Joyce's *Ulysses* and in W. Faulkner's *Soldier's Pay*. The conclusion, namely '[...] that the exclusion of the heroic nature is the modernist approach of dealing with rewriting' is relevant as confirmation of a critical view of the hero in these specific works. Other conclusions are not original (e.g. '[...] the rewriting of canonical works [...] by modernist authors involves distancing and even the deconstructing of the old system of significations. The repudiation of the past is followed by the reconstruction based on new aesthetic values'). The paper's contribution could have been more substantial, if the focus had been on less well-known characters, or on less well-known literary works.

Paper 2. Potre, Andreea. (2019). Island literature in the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century. *Journal of Romanian Literary Studies*, 16: 1150-1157.

(Review based on the online translation of full-text Romanian paper).

The paper is an argumentation on the nature of gender dynamics rather than an analysis or description of the subject topic. The final point, namely that 'Feminist and postcolonial hermeneutics prove essential in the analysis of the changes in optics recorded in the evolution of island literature' is argued for, not proven. The value of the paper lies in presenting a viewpoint that may be used for literary analysis and is here assessed as such.

Paper 3. Bobaru, Nicolae. (2016). Elemente ale imaginarului marin spaniol și portughez în romanul postmodern românesc. *Quaestiones Romanicae* VIII, 1: 215-225.

(Review based on the online translation of full-text Romanian paper).

The paper is a very specific piece of research as regards both the genre, the domain and the type of novel. The analysis uses a low number of references considering the topic, and the conclusions, not very obvious, are descriptive and conservative, considering.

The value and the originality of the paper lie in the specific niche it targets, probably one of the few papers to research this area.

Paper 4. Sandor, Iozefina. Teacher talk: Personal standardised creation? [Full-reference not available online, at least not by standard searches]

(Review based on the full-text English paper).

The paper is a corpus study of teacher input in the English class. While the corpus design is not entirely uncontroversial, the paper has clear objectives, addresses them successfully, and evidences a relevant approach to a potentially substantial research field. The conclusions are proper to such an initial approach and do not go far beyond natural expectation ('[...] that the teachers' mainly pedagogic role in the classroom determines and influences their talk.'). So the contribution lies more in the research potential evidenced here and as a pilot study, than in the actual conclusions of the paper.

Paper 5. Frîncu, Simina. (2019). Făt-Frumos cu ceas rupt din Soare. Folclorul românesc și astronomia. In Marc Frîncu & Simina Frîncu (eds.), *Astronomia străbunilor. Arheoastronomie și etnoastronomie pe teritoriul României*. Szeged: JATEPress Kiadó; 345-362.

(Review based on the online translation of full-text Romanian paper).

The paper seems to find its place more in the field of research in the humanities (esp. in Philosophy or Anthropology) than in Philology. While the topic is appealing and worth looking into, the results of the approach used here do not result in a contribution nor in new knowledge: the conclusions are a sequence of statements unsupported by data or developed by argumentation (e.g. 'We are eminently solar beings. From the first moment of our existence on earth to the last, we need the Sun. Its rays make photosynthesis possible, warm our bodies, provide us with the well-known vitamin D that protects us against so many serious diseases.').

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

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

**The indicator is fulfilled.**





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

**Description:** *The self-assessment report describes information attested by an annex available online cited for the previous indicator.*

**Analysis:** *The indicator's wording is for a ratio of 1 between presentations by doctoral students who have completed their studies and doctoral students who have graduated. As most students attest more than one such presentation, their output compensates for the lack of such presentations in others whose record lists one reference at events that may not appear to qualify as 'at prestigious international events' (e.g. references for Bayar Azamsher, Diana Botosan, Ali Tahseen, Bassim Hussein Al Nawashi). In this sense, the indicator is fulfilled. It must however be noted that this is not the standard, as this type of ratio in rankings is intended to ensure that students produce at least one such presentation each. The latter is not the case: a more precise wording in the indicator would have resulted in partial fulfilment for the output attested for this indicator. This double analysis justifies both the recommendation and the final assessment.*

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

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

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**\*General description of the standard analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to subsequent sections of the report (cf. sections under C).*

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

**Description:** *Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.*

**Analysis:** *The self-assessment report declares unfulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator according to Annexes 24F and 25F: two advisors (Adriana Babeți and Ioan Viorel Boldureanu) gather more than two students.*

*However, the information supplied in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 confirms fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator. This is because several indicators were applied retrospectively on a*



part of the period when they were not in force. This report considers only the period since the new indicators came in force and, thus, the indicator is considered fulfilled.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to provide the means to secure fulfillment of this requirement in the future by attracting more doctoral students and supervisors.

**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:** The self-assessment report describes information attested by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report declares a ratio that is virtually under half as much as in the requirements set by the indicator (between 0.01 and 0.17 attested –Moldovan Rareș, Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai din Cluj-Napoca– vs 0:3 required by the indicator).

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to provide the means to ensure that the ratio remains as close to optimal as possible, and in any case as per the requirements set by this indicator.

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

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

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

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

- (a) the scientific work of Doctoral advisors;
- (b) the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity;
- (c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized;
- (d) the scientific activity of doctoral students;
- (e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students;
- (f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students.



**Description:** The self-assessment report describes information attested by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report describes procedures that are supported by annexes or links. The criteria deserve specific comments as follows:

- i) criterion a) refers to a link (<http://urap.uvt.ro>) that requests a login and a password that have not been made available and, therefore, these resources remain within the university's intranet. Remarkably, the system to track the supervisor's scientific activity is at present being implemented, so it may not be fully operational. Even so, the description supplies specific data to meet the requirements by the indicator,
- ii) criterion b) is extremely concise and does not refer to an annex or link. The information used for evaluation is the same as under indicator A.2.1.,
- iii) criterion c) refers to a link (Program admitere sesiunea septembrie 2021 | CSUD (uvt.ro)) where, maybe for my failure to understand Romanian, the procedure for admission in the field of Philology is not obvious. Details of other stages of the procedure throughout the doctoral studies are referred to links and have also been considered elsewhere in the report,
- iv) criterion d) is fairly concise and does not refer to an annex or link. The information used for evaluation is partly the same as under indicator B.3.1.1. A substantial number of Web of Science records is declared,
- v) criterion e) refers to a link as evidence of contract and the contents therein, and
- vi) criterion f) refers to a link and to an annex, and describes results from a SWOT analysis.

The criteria attest close attention to the requirements set by the indicator.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to try and give an international dimension to points (a), (d) and (e), for greater visibility and relevance, and for higher research quality.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online and a link.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report describes quality assessment procedures and instruments.

Additional evidence gathered during online interviews identified three major issues:

- i) not all quality assessment committees use a proactive agenda,
- ii) not all quality assessment committees have a binding capacity, and
- iii) resistance to quality assessment recommendations is reported.

The self-assessment report also describes procedures and instruments for student feedback attested by annexes or links. In this regard, subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the necessary channels are available and guarantee the possibility for increased improvement according to student feedback.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is, for the QEE commission, to implement a proactive agenda and act not only at the request of student feedback, e.g. collecting evidence of needs and potential improvement areas regardless of student's elicited feedback.

The recommendation is also to operate through as many modes as possible (oral, in written, online) questionnaires and channels to enable student feedback.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**



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

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

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

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

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

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text and a table, supported by annexes available online and with a link (Annex C6, not available online or in the self-assessment report).

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report lists specific links for each of the points (a) through (f) required by the indicator, and one reference to a social network. The links evidence both the availability of the information listed in points (a) through (i) and the online publication of such information. An English version of the webpages in question is not available: as in indicator A.1.1.1., the links to the English version of the documents available online lead to a site where no information is available (CSUD | Consiliul Studiilor Universitare de Doctorat (uvf.ro)). As in that indicator, it is important to underline that availability of this information in at least English is of relevance for higher visibility of the school (e.g. attracting foreign students).

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to make information as accessible as possible, including access to information in English.

The recommendation is also to ensure that links remain active and lead to up-to-date information.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

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



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

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

**Analysis:** The links cited for this indicator evidence online access to a number of relevant databases, including the main ones that are available in the field of Philology.

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

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

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

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report declares availability of technical means for fulfilment of this indicator. As noted for indicator A.1.2.2, the information supplied during online interviews and in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 attest fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to supply the means for appropriate maintenance and upgrade of the software in question.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by links that are both general of the university and specific of doctoral schools.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report lists and describes facilities with specification of equipment, as in the case of libraries with general guidelines on the internal order procedures for access.

**Recommendations:** If there are specific procedures, the recommendation is to make them publicly available online and otherwise. If there are not, the recommendation is to set a number of criteria to operationalize access to laboratories, and such similar centres.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

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

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

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

**Performance Indicator \*C.3.1.1.** IOSUD, for every evaluated domain, has concluded mobility agreements with universities abroad, with research institutes, with companies working in the field of study, aimed at the mobility of doctoral students and academic staff (e.g., ERASMUS agreements for the doctoral studies). At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other



mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences. IOSUD drafts and applies policies and measures aiming at increasing the number of doctoral students participating at mobility periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online and links.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report lists and describes international agreements in the framework of the Erasmus (+) programme and doctoral grants. Several figures cited in the self-assessment report raised questions:

- i) does the 60% percentage of 'attendance at international scientific mobility' refer to (meet) the requirement of 'at least 35% students [doing] a training course abroad or other mobility forms', to the 20% 'participating at mobility periods abroad', or to both? and
- ii) does the phrase 'over 250 national and international conferences' refer to conferences in the country or abroad?

The information supplied in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 successfully addressed points i) and ii), with specification of exchange programmes, partner universities and participants per exchange.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to strive towards diversification of international mobility opportunities, both within and outside the Erasmus network.

The recommendation is to identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in these programmes, if any, decide so.

The recommendation is to identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in international conferences and training abroad, if any, decide so.

The recommendation is to divert a good part of the effort put to conferences in Romania (whether national or international) to international conferences and training abroad.

**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.

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report lists a number of foreign guest lecturers, and Annex 23F evidences lectures by a guest lecturer.

The information supplied in the email received on 12/10/21 in response to the undersigned's request for additional evidence sent by email on 11/10/21 evidences co-tutelle programmes in force, with specification of partner countries and funding agencies.

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

The recommendation is also to build a bigger network of partner universities beyond what is evidenced by Annexes C.3.1.2.a through C.3.1.2.d, both within and beyond the Erasmus framework.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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



**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by an annex available online and links.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report lists a number of actions aimed at international activity as per the indicator's requirements. The proportion between participation at international higher education fairs and participation of foreign experts in doctoral thesis examination is not well-balanced and the latter needs closer attention.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to implement a formal programme of international events to diversify activities and bring them into a permanent programme in addition to the events hosted occasionally, e.g. by way of permanent annual events or scientific meetings, but mainly of international participation at PhD co-supervision and examination.

As in the previous indicator, the recommendation is also to build a bigger network of partner universities, both within and beyond the Erasmus framework.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

#### IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><b><u>Strengths:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Sustained effort and exceptionally high quality on all fronts: management, teaching, research.</li> <li>ii) Full potential for successful partnership in EU and international research project bids.</li> <li>iii) Good infrastructure.</li> <li>iv) Extreme care for students and for quality control.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Weaknesses:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Need for quality research regardless of quantity, e.g. publications in medium/high impact journals.</li> <li>ii) Need for specific student training, e.g. in publication and dissemination strategies.</li> <li>iii) Need for internationalization.</li> <li>iv) Some advisor's need for an improved research record, i.e. bigger international relevance, publications in high-quality forums, international participation in committees, co-supervision, etc.</li> <li>v) Need for a more efficient cooperation with institutions/entities to ensure real transfer of knowledge and quality research output.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Opportunities:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) International dissemination of their strengths for capitalization of the high quality achieved, e.g. by way of available contacts and development of new ones towards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. thesis co-supervision and assessment,</li> <li>b. research output co-authorship.</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii) Increasing awareness of the potential of linguistic, literary and cultural studies as successful research partners for applied research.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Threats:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) To rely on a marked tendency towards publication in national forums (journals, conferences) and disseminate at home events, even if they are international in scope.</li> <li>ii) Not to supply the necessary training for upgrade of research skills, e.g. as specialized courses as well as for postdoctoral career-making, e.g. as regards fund-raising resources and international networking.</li> <li>iii) To accept and bear with complex and difficult access to basic research tools: bibliographies, data, archives...</li> </ul>

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

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	PI	<p><b>A.1.1.1.</b> The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the Doctoral School of the respective university doctoral study domain:</p> <p>a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;</p> <p>b) the Methodology for conducting elections for the position of director of the Council of doctoral school (CSD), as well as elections by the students of their representative in CSD and the evidence of their conduct;</p> <p>c) the Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies (for the admission of doctoral students, for the completion of doctoral studies);</p> <p>d) the existence of mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral advisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad;</p> <p>e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), giving as well proof of the regularity of meetings;</p> <p>f) the contract for doctoral studies;</p> <p>g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To implement easier access to the admission methodology, online and otherwise.</i></p> <p><i>Also, to schedule more regular meetings (or the possibility for them, even if they are to be cancelled because no decision-making or reporting is needed, but at least the possibility must be there).</i></p>
2.	PI	<p><b>A.1.1.2.</b> The doctoral school' Regulation includes mandatory criteria, procedures and standards binding on the aspects specified in Article 17, paragraph (5) of the Government Decision No. 681/2011 on the approval of the Code of Doctoral Studies with subsequent amendments and additions.</p>	Fulfilled	N/A
3.	PI	<p><b>A.1.2.1.</b> The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To measure the appropriateness and evidence of the effectiveness of the IT system as regards the users (students), the university administrative staff, and the faculty, if they (need to) access the system. While it can be understood that the choice and maintenance of such a system is run by the university for all schools and faculties, upgrades and revised versions may have to</i></p>



No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
				<i>be requested by specific schools or for specific needs, and the requests can only come from users based on their feedback. Hence the recommendation for collecting feedback on the effectiveness of the IT system.</i>
4.	PI	<b>A.1.2.2.</b> The existence and use of an appropriate software program and evidence of its use to verify the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses.	Fulfilled	N/A
5.	IP	<b>A.1.3.1.</b> Existence of at least one research or institutional / human resources development grant under implementation at the time of submission of the internal evaluation file, per doctoral study domain under evaluation, or existence of at least 2 research or institutional development / human resources grant for the doctoral study domain, obtained by doctoral thesis advisors operating in the evaluated domain within the past 5 years. The grants address relevant themes for the respective domain and, as a rule, are engaging doctoral students.	Fulfilled	<i>For the university, to supply additional resources for doctoral advisors to be able to submit successful bids and support international research funding. For doctoral advisors, to devote as much attention as possible to submit international research bids until more successful applications are secured than are attested at present. To maintain the effort to support applied research in Philology but also to foster base research.</i>
6.	PI *	<b>A.1.3.2.</b> The percentage of doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation, who for at least six months receive additional funding sources besides government funding, through scholarships awarded by individual persons or by legal entities, or who are financially supported through research or institutional / human resources development grants is not less than 20%.	Fulfilled	<i>To maintain the measures taken in the last two years, esp. in view of the marked increase that they have meant compared with previous years. Alternatively/Additionally, to find ways to raise funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (above 20% doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation) set by the requirements set by the indicator.</i>
7.	PI *	<b>A.1.3.3.</b> At least 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants obtained by the university through institutional contracts and of tuition fees collected from the doctoral students enrolled in the paid tuition system is used to reimburse professional training expenses of doctoral students (attending conferences, summer schools, training, programs abroad, publication of specialty papers or other specific forms of dissemination etc.).	Partially fulfilled	<i>For the university's Financial Department, to find the way to supply the evidence needed to prove attestation of fulfillment of the requirements set by the indicator.</i>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
8.	CPI	<b>A.2.1.1.</b> The venues and the material equipment available to the doctoral school enable the research activities in the evaluated domain to be carried out, in line with the assumed mission and objectives (computers, specific software, equipment, laboratory 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	Fulfilled	<i>For the university, to maintain and upgrade the software as regularly as possible and provide specific training. Also, to maintain the effort as regards EU-partnered project bids or at least as regards international projects.</i>
9.	CPI	<b>A.3.1.1.</b> Minimum three doctoral thesis advisors within that doctoral domain, and at least 50% of them (but no less than three) meet the minimum standards of the National Council for Attestation of University Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (CNATDCU) in force at the time when the evaluation is carried out, which standards are required and mandatory for obtaining the enabling certification.	Fulfilled	<i>For the university, to maintain the level that it has achieved, such that new advisors meet the requirements before or soon after joining the school as advisors. Also, to maintain the effort as regards EU-partnered project bids or at least as regards international projects.</i>
10.	PI *	<b>A.3.1.2.</b> At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.	Fulfilled	<i>For the university, to provide the means to attract tenured advisors. For advisors, to strive towards fulfilment of the requirements to reach tenure.</i>
11.	PI	<b>A.3.1.3.</b> The study subjects in the education program based on advanced higher education studies pertaining to the doctoral domain are taught by teaching staff or researchers who are doctoral thesis advisors / certified doctoral thesis advisors, professors / CS I or lecturer / CS II, with proved expertise in the field of the study subjects they teach, or other specialists in the field who meet the standards established by the institution in relation with the aforementioned teaching and research functions, as provided by the law.	Fulfilled	<i>For the university, to provide the means to maintain faculty with expertise in charge of these courses and to supply the means for increased expertise. For faculty, to undertake work towards these courses and towards higher expertise.</i>
12.	PI *	<b>A.3.1.4.</b> The percentage of doctoral thesis advisors who concomitantly coordinate more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12,	Fulfilled	<i>To keep supervision as evenly distributed among advisors as possible, both for supervision quality and for the advisors' more efficient research record.</i>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		who are themselves studying in doctoral programs does not exceed 20%.		
13.	CPI	<b>A.3.2.1.</b> At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in the evaluated domain have at least 5 Web of Science- or ERIH-indexed publications in magazines of impact, or other 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.	Fulfilled	<i>To divert a substantial amount of the research effort disseminated in national publishers, journals and conferences to international forums, especially in the medium-high impact range. The actions that apparently need further effort (i.e. where fewer records are attested but at the same time are most significant) are:</i> <i>i) publication in medium-high impact journals,</i> <i>ii) review of international publications,</i> <i>iii) membership of scientific committees of scientific events organized abroad,</i> <i>iv) membership in international expert panels, and</i> <i>v) co-supervision of foreign theses.</i> <i>Also, for the advisors who attest fewest criteria, to strive towards a more complete research record and come in line with the average of the advisors' performance.</i> <i>Also, for the advisors who do not attest any of the criteria, to strive towards a research record and come in line with the requirements of advisors' performance.</i>
14.	PI *	<b>A.3.2.2.</b> At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in a specific doctoral study domain continue to be active in their scientific field, and acquire at least 25% of the score requested by the minimal CNATDCU standards in force at the time of the evaluation, which are required and mandatory for acquiring their enabling certificate, based on their scientific results within the past five years	Fulfilled	<i>For the university, to provide the resources to help the lower-ranking advisors score higher and secure fulfillment of this requirement in the future.</i> <i>For lower-ranking advisors, to strive towards a higher score.</i>
15.	PI *	<b>B.1.1.1.</b> The ratio between the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions, national or foreign, who have enrolled for the doctoral admission contest within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state	Fulfilled	<i>To provide the means to keep ratios as they have been in the past five years and thus secure fulfillment of this requirement in the future, by attracting sustained interest by candidates and sustained budget support.</i>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.		
16.	PI *	<b>B.1.2.1.</b> Admission to doctoral study programs is based on selection criteria including: previous academic, research and professional performance, their interest for scientific or arts/sports research, publications in the domain and a proposal for a research subject. Interviewing the candidate is compulsory, as part of the admission procedure.	Fulfilled	<i>To disseminate as far as possible (online and otherwise) the criteria and the grades each criterion is allocated. In practice, this means to supply as much public information as possible concerning specific criteria or guidelines for preparation of an application, and also for presentation of the candidates' records and projects, so candidates can prepare successful project proposals and the committees be presented properly oriented records to measure and assess.</i>
17.	PI	<b>B.1.2.2.</b> The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral students 3, respectively 4, years after admission does not exceed 30%.	Fulfilled	<p><i>Concerning identification of reasons for failure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i) to keep track of the reasons under which students are expelled ('Neindeplinirea obligațiilor contractuale?') and supply the means to address them, and</i></li> <li><i>ii) to identify the reasons why there is a marked increase in failure to complete doctoral studies over the recentmost past years and supply the means to address them.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Concerning management of reasons for failure:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i) to maintain the effort to raise funding and create finance opportunities for support of doctoral students, and</i></li> <li><i>ii) to find ways of managing doctoral supervisor-candidate incompatibility such that failure/dropping out is prevented.</i></li> </ul>
18.	PI	<b>B.2.1.1.</b> The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant to the scientific research training of doctoral students; at least one of these disciplines is intended to study in-depth the research methodology and/or the statistical data processing.	Fulfilled	<i>To offer a wider range of courses in research methodology, in the case of Philology, for example, with a focus on:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>iii) applied statistics,</i></li> <li><i>iv) lexical database design and use,</i></li> <li><i>v) research dissemination strategies,</i></li> <li><i>vi) international networking and</i></li> <li><i>vii) publication policies.</i></li> </ul>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
19.	PI	<b>B.2.1.2.</b> At least one discipline is dedicated to Ethics and Intellectual Property in scientific research or there are well-defined topics on these subjects within a discipline taught in the doctoral program.	Fulfilled	<i>To ensure that courses in research ethics are maintained and, if possible, supplemented with additional formative actions in this field, e.g. by analysing evidence on (self-)plagiarism gathered over past courses.</i>
20.	PI	<b>B.2.1.3.</b> The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities.	Fulfilled	<i>To ensure that the learning outcomes are revised and updated as necessary to stay in line with the target knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy required by each course and their overall training.</i>
21.	PI	<b>B.2.1.4.</b> All along the duration of the doctoral training, doctoral students in the domain receive counselling/guidance from functional guidance commissions, which is reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting.	Fulfilled	<i>To ensure that the training actions described remain available and are revised/enlarged on, based on the students' feedback. Potential room for improvement may involve:</i> <i>i) to revise and disseminate the range of contents that can be covered within counselling/guidance,</i> <i>ii) to involve postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peers,</i> <i>iii) to provide a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings, and</i> <i>iv) more important, to enforce guidance regularity, i.e. to ensure that students make use of guidance at least at the beginning and at the end of the academic year, in order to allow feedback on the institution's performance, prevent potential dropout, and to identify weaknesses/deviations that may become structural, systematic obstacles during the PhD studies.</i>
22.	CPI	<b>B.2.1.5.</b> For a doctoral study domain, the ratio between the number of doctoral students and the number of teaching staff/researchers providing doctoral guidance must not exceed 3:1.	Fulfilled	<i>To provide the means to ensure that the ratio remains as close to optimal as possible, and in any case as per the requirements set by this indicator.</i>
23.	CPI	<b>B.3.1.1.</b> For the evaluated domain, the evaluation commission will be provided with at	Fulfilled	<i>To supply the conditions for high quality research, e.g.:</i>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>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</p>		<p><i>i) by specific training in:</i>  <i>a. frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis,</i>  <i>b. new technologies,</i>  <i>c. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.</i>  <i>ii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students,</i>  <i>iii) by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors, and</i>  <i>iv) all in all, by encouraging prioritization of quality over quantity.</i></p>
24.	PI *	<p><b>B.3.1.2.</b> The ratio between the number of presentations of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years), including posters, exhibitions made at prestigious international events (organized in the country or abroad) and the number of doctoral students who have completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years) is at least 1.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>As in the previous indicator, to supply the conditions for high quality research, e.g.:</i>  <i>i) by specific training in:</i>  <i>a. frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis,</i>  <i>b. new technologies,</i>  <i>c. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.</i>  <i>ii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students,</i>  <i>iii) by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors, and</i>  <i>iv) all in all, by encouraging prioritization of quality over quantity.</i></p>
25.	PI *	<p><b>B.3.2.1.</b> The number of doctoral theses allocated to one specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the evaluated IOSUD should not exceed two (2) in a year for the theses coordinated by the same doctoral thesis advisor.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To provide the means to secure fulfillment of this requirement in the future by attracting more doctoral students and supervisors.</i></p>
26.	PI *	<p><b>B.3.2.2.</b> The ratio between the doctoral theses allocated to one scientific specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the institution where the defense on the doctoral thesis is organized, and the number of doctoral theses presented in the same doctoral study domain in the doctoral school should not exceed 0.3, considering the past</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To provide the means to ensure that the ratio remains as close to optimal as possible, and in any case as per the requirements set by this indicator.</i></p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		five years. Only those doctoral study domains in which minimum ten doctoral theses have been presented within the past five years should be analyzed.		
27.	PI	<p><b>C.1.1.1.</b> The Doctoral school in the respective university study domain shall demonstrate the continuous development of the evaluation process and its internal quality assurance following a procedure developed and applied at the level of the IOSUD, the following assessed criteria being mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the scientific work of Doctoral advisors;</li> <li>b) the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity;</li> <li>c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized;</li> <li>d) the scientific activity of doctoral students;</li> <li>e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students;</li> <li>f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students.</li> </ul>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To try and give an international dimension to points (a), (d) and (e), for greater visibility and relevance, and for higher research quality.</i></p>
28.	PI *	<p><b>C.1.1.2.</b> Mechanisms are implemented during the stage of the doctoral study program to enable feedback from doctoral students allowing to identify their needs, as well as their overall level of satisfaction with the doctoral study program in order to ensure continuous improvement of the academic and administrative processes. Following the analysis of the results, there is evidence that an action plan was drafted and implemented.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>For the QEE commission, to implement a proactive agenda and act not only at the request of student feedback, e.g. collecting evidence of needs and potential improvement areas regardless of student's elicited feedback.</i></p> <p><i>Also, to operate through as many modes as possible (oral, in written, online) questionnaires and channels to enable student feedback.</i></p>
29.	CPI	<p><b>C.2.1.1.</b> The IOSUD publishes on the website of the organizing institution, in compliance with the general regulations on data protection, information such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the Doctoral School regulation;</li> <li>b) the admission regulation;</li> <li>c) the doctoral studies contract;</li> <li>d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;</li> <li>e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies;</li> </ul>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To make information as accessible as possible, including access to information in English.</i></p> <p><i>Also, to ensure that links remain active and lead to up-to-date information.</i></p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data;</p> <p>g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor);</p> <p>h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis;</p> <p>i) links to the doctoral theses' summaries to be publicly presented and the date, time, place where they will be presented; this information will be communicated at least twenty days before the presentation.</p>		
30.	PI	<p><b>C.2.2.1.</b> All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of their thesis.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To expand the list of available databases to new ones as they appear, as well as to additional relevant resources.</i></p>
31.	PI	<p><b>C.2.2.2.</b> Each doctoral student shall have access, upon request, to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To supply the means for appropriate maintenance and upgrade of the software in question.</i></p>
32.	PI	<p><b>C.2.2.3.</b> All doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the specific domain/domains within the Doctoral School, according to internal order procedures.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>If there are specific procedures, to make them publicly available online and otherwise. If there are not, to set a number of criteria to operationalize access to laboratories, and such similar centres.</i></p>
33.	PI *	<p><b>C.3.1.1.</b> IOSUD, for every evaluated domain, has concluded mobility agreements with universities abroad, with research institutes, with companies working in the field of study, aimed at the mobility of doctoral students and academic staff (e.g., ERASMUS agreements for the doctoral studies). At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences. IOSUD drafts and applies policies and measures aiming at increasing the number of doctoral students participating at mobility periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.</p>	Fulfilled	<p><i>To strive towards diversification of international mobility opportunities, both within and outside the Erasmus network.</i></p> <p><i>To identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in these programmes, if any, decide so.</i></p> <p><i>To identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in international conferences and training abroad, if any, decide so.</i></p> <p><i>To divert a good part of the effort put to conferences in Romania (whether national or international) to international conferences and training abroad.</i></p>



No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
34.	PI	<b>C.3.1.2.</b> In the evaluated doctoral study domain, support is granted, including financial support, to the organization of doctoral studies in international co-tutelage or invitation of leading experts to deliver courses/lectures for doctoral students.	Fulfilled	<i>To implement a permanent seminar of international guest lecturers and researchers, whether online or not, to widen the offer of supervisors. Also, to build a bigger network of partner institutions beyond what is evidenced by Annexes C.3.1.2.a through C.3.1.2.d, both within and beyond the Erasmus framework.</i>
35.	PI	<b>C.3.1.3.</b> The internationalization of activities carried out during the doctoral studies is supported by IOSUD through concrete measures (e.g., by participating in educational fairs to attract international doctoral students; by including international experts in guidance committees or doctoral committees etc.).	Fulfilled	<i>To implement a formal programme of international events to diversify activities and bring them into a permanent programme in addition to the events hosted occasionally, e.g. by way of permanent annual events or scientific meetings, but mainly of international participation at PhD co-supervision and examination. As in the previous indicator, also to build a bigger network of partner institutions, both within and beyond the Erasmus framework.</i>

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

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

## **VI. Conclusions and general recommendations**

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

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

**Conclusions:** Based on the analyses listed above, the undersigned concludes that the conditions for consideration of fulfilment of most indicators are met. One indicator is partially fulfilled:

- i) A.1.3.3, because attestation of fulfilment of the indicator depends on the university's Financial Department rather than on the Doctoral School of the Humanities. It is a different level's responsibility to evidence fulfilment of the requirements set by this indicator. The expectation is for complete fulfilment in three years.



### **General recommendations:**

Maintain the effort made this far.

Further support the faculty who contributed to fulfilment of indicators.

Focus on training, on internationalization, and on publication quality over quantity.

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

Encourage an interdisciplinary approach as regards knowledge transfer (also for improved research opportunities and for employability).

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

### **Recommendations for supervisors and candidates:**

Disseminate at fewer conferences, and divert the effort towards papers in medium/high impact journals.

Disseminate less as home publications, and divert the effort towards more international interaction (not necessarily publications: e.g. international project bids).

### **Recommendations for the university/national institutions:**

Streamline project application in national calls, i.e. make the administrative procedures efficient.

Streamline supply and maintenance of technical support, esp. in the field of computing services, e.g. for corpus linguistics, to ensure technical/administrative procedures do not block research.

Bring PhD studies organization in line with what the field requires, specifically as regards Philology and its counterpart studies at BA and MA levels, to secure successful PhD supervision.

Bring working sub-domains within Philology's PhD domain study (e.g. corpus linguistics, cultural heritage, digital humanities), as long as they exist for BA and MA studies.

Include new fields as courses of the syllabus, e.g. gender studies, corpus linguistics, cultural heritage, to secure future frontline avenues for research.

## **VII. Annexes**

*The following types of documents shall be attached:*

- *The detailed schedule of the evaluation visit – MANDATORY.*  
No additional meetings were held further to those scheduled in the ARACIS calendar.
- *The survey questionnaire applied to doctoral students or academic staff in the doctoral study domain under review, the results - optional (e.g., in graphic form) and their interpretation - if applicable.*
- *Scanned documents – any document requested from the IOSUD during the evaluation visit and received, which is not found in the internal evaluation file received before the visit and referred to in the report.*
- *Pictures – if relevant issues are raised regarding the condition of the student residences, cafeterias, premises for teaching and learning activities, library etc.*
- *Screenshots/Print screens of the Doctoral School/IOSUD website proving specific claims in the report, accompanied by the date when they were accessed and saved.*
- *Any other documents relevant to the evaluation process referred to in the report.*

Signed in Granada, Spain, 02/11/21

Salvador Valera