Anatoliy Kruglashov

Analysis and recommendation regarding evaluation of PhD Program, University of Suceava

| Strengths: | Weaknesses: |
|---|---|
| * the strengths identified throughout the report will be resumed as part of the indicators' analysis. Other general strenghts that do not fall within a particular indicator may be formulated. | *the weaknesses identified throughout the report will be resumed as part of the indicators' analysis. Other general weaknesses that do not fall within a particular indicator may be formulated. |
| **Opportunities:** | **Threats:** |
| *possible lines of action for the development of the institution under review shall be identified; <br> *examples of opportunities: a favorable economic environment in the proximity of the assessed institution, the uniqueness of the study programs and their relevance to the local/national market, the overall attractiveness of the study programs etc. | *the possible causes of the deficient aspects (= the causes of the identified weaknesses), which are practically the threats to the proper functioning of the institution, shall be identified; <br> *besides, there may be external threats, such as: the inopportune economic environment in the proximity of the assessed institution, the conduct of low attractiveness study programs for both candidates and the labor market etc. |

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

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | PI | **A.1.1.1.** The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the IOSUD, respectively at the Doctoral School(s): <br> a) the internal regulations of the administrative structures (the institutional regulations for the organization and conduct of doctoral studies programs, the regulation(s) of Doctoral | **My opinon is that this criteria is met** | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | School(s); b) the Methodology for conducting elections at the level of the Council of University Doctoral Studies (CSUD), respectively at Doctoral School(s) including elections by the students of their representatives in CSUD/Council of the Doctoral School (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 CSUD/Council of the Doctoral School with evidence of the regularity of meetings; f) the contract for doctoral studies; g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals about doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies. | It seems to be OK<br><br>OK<br><br><br>OK<br><br><br>Acceptable<br><br>OK<br><br><br>Looks good | |
| 2. | PI | 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. | Yes, it is done | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. | PI * | **A.1.1.3**. Doctoral schools included in IOSUD are organized as disciplinary or interdisciplinary disciplines/thematic, according to Article 158, paragraph (7) of the Law of National Education No. 1/2011 with subsequent amendments and additions. | In general, yes | |
| 4. | PI | **A.1.2.1.** The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background. | It functions, but might and should be improved | |
| 5. | CPI | **A.1.2.2.** The existence and use of a software program and evidence of its use to verify the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses. | | |
| 6. | PI | **A.2.1.1.** The IOSUD/the doctoral school(s) present proof of posessing or having rented adequate spaces for research activity specific to doctoral studies (laboratories, experimental fields, research stations etc.) | satisfactory | |
| 7. | PI | **A.2.1.2.** The IOSUD/doctoral school(s) has/have collaboration agreements with higher education institutions, research institutes, research networks for joint partnerships and have access for using various research infrastructures; the offer for research services is presented publicly using a dedicated platform. | It's well done | |
| 8. | PI | **A.2.1.3.** The IOSUD/doctoral school(s) proves that it is/are | It has happened | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|
| | | concerned with permanent renewal of the research infrastructure to provide doctoral students access to up-dated research resources, by applying to various funding competitions and using own university resources for acquiring new research infrastructure. | for recent years several times | |
| 9. | PI * | A.3.1.1. The share of Doctoral advisors coordinating simultaneously more than 8 doctoral students but not more than 12 during their doctoral studies does not exceed 20%. | It's so | |
| 10. | CPI | A.3.1.2. At least 50% of all teaching/research staff involved in teaching/research activities related to training programs for advanced university studies or in individual research/art creation programs have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD. | Yes | |
| 11. | PI * | B.1.1.1. 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. | Yes | |
| 12. | PI | B.1.1.2. The IOSUD/doctoral school(s) have a policy for stimulating enrollment of doctoral students coming from disadvantaged social environments, by allocating | Not sure | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|-----|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------|-----------------|
| | | reserved positions in the admission procedure and/or granting special scholarships, as well as organising support programs to prevent drop-outs. | | |
| 13. | PI | **B.2.1.1.** The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant to the scientific research training of doctoral students; at least one of these disciplines is intended to study in-depth the research methodology and/or the statistical data processing. | OK | |
| 14. | PI | **B.2.1.2.** At least one discipline is dedicated to Ethics and Intellectual Property in scientific research or there are well-defined topics on these subjects within a discipline taught in the doctoral program. | **Yes** | |
| 15. | PI | **B.2.1.3.** The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses "the learning outcomes", specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities. | OK | |
| 16. | PI | **B.3.1.1.** For the doctoral school there are in place mechanisms for valorification of the results of doctoral studies in accordance with the specificity of the particular domain (i.e. technologial transfer, products, patents in the case of exact sciences; products and services for social sciences and humanities; festivals, contests, | **Yes, it works** | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | recitals, sports competitions; cultural-arts orders in the vocational domain; presentations ar national and international conerences, publication of research results in national and international publications, engaging doctroal students in writing research-development projects etc.) | | |
| 17. | CPI | **B.4.1.1.** At the level of IOSUD, the percentage of theses non-validated, at the level of General Council of the National Council for Attestation of University Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (CNADTCU), without the right of further amendments and re-organizing the process of public defending, is not exceeding 5% in the last 5 years. | **OK** | |
| 18. | PI | **C.1.1.1.** The IOSUD 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 doctoral school(s), 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 academic and social services (including participation to various events, publication of papers etc.) and counselling | **Yes, visibale affords applied** | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | | made available to doctoral students. | | |
| 19. | PI | **C.1.1.2.** Students' associations and, according to the case, representatives of students organise elections in the community of doctoral students, for positions in the CSUD, by universal vote, direct and secret, all doctoral studnets having the right of electing or being elected. | **The rights of PhD students are respected in general** | |
| 20. | PI | **C.1.1.3.** Students' associations and, according to the case, representatives of students organise elections in the community of doctoral students at the level of each doctoral school, for positions in the councils of doctoral schools, by universal vote, direct and secret, all doctoral students having the right of electing or being elected. | **Ok** | |
| 21. | PI * | **C.1.1.4.** Following the internal evaluation, IOSUD and the doctoral schools draft strategies and policies aiming to eliminate the identified deficiencies and to stimulate scientific and academic performance of IOSUD. | **Yes, in general.**<br><br>**Some more intiatives might be better to apply** | |
| 22. | CPI | **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 IOSUD/Doctoral School regulation; b) the admission regulation; c) the doctoral studies contract; d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public | **All is fine** | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | | presentation of the thesis; e) the content of the training study 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) information on the opportunities for doctoral students aiming to attend conferences,to publish articles, awarding scholarships etc. j) links to the doctoral theses's 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. | | |
| 23. | CPI | C.2.2.1. All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of the their thesis. | Yes, tiull this access might be improved and widen | |
| 24. | PI | C.2.2.2. Each doctoral student shall have access, upon request, to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works. | Not sure | |
| 25. | PI | C.2.2.3. All doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the | Yes | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | specific domain/domains within the Doctoral School, according to internal order procedures. | | |
| 26. | PI * | C.3.1.1. IOSUD, for every doctoral school, 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%, wich is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area. | This activity is well organized and perfomes well | |
| 27. | PI | C.3.1.2. IOSUD supports, including providing financial support, to the organization of doctoral studies in international co-tutelage or invitation of leading experts to deliver courses/lectures for doctoral students. | It takes place. Still might be improveed | |
| 28. | PI * | C.3.1.3. At least 10% of the doctoral theses of every doctoral schools of the IOSUD are drafted and/or submitted in an international foreign language or are organised in international co-tutelage. | More that this indicator requires is realized | |
| 29. | PI | C.3.1.4. The internationalization of activities carried out during | Should be | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|
| | | 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.). | **improved** | |
| 30. | PI | **C.4.1.1.** IOSUD, applies the current provisions regulating ethics, deontology/academic integrity, respectively to academic freedom and has developed:<br>- policies based on prevention regarding possible violations of the Code of ethics and academic integrity, demonstrated by public postioinings, studies, analyses or measures taken;<br>- practices and mechanisms for preventing fraud, from an institutional perspective as well as from the perspective of the doctoral students;<br>- practices for preventing possible fraud in academic activity, research or any other activity, including active measures for preventing and avoiding plagiarism of any kind, as well as promoting ethical and integrity/deontology principles or observing intellectual property norms, authors' rights and other related rights, among all members of the academic community;<br>- administrative instruments which allow applying effective and eliminatory sanctions;<br>- mechanisms and measures to | **OK in general, inckying somne trainings provided** | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | assure equal opportunities and protection against intolerance and discrimination of any kind; IOSUD monitors and permanently evaluates these practices and can prove they are applied to all activities and engagement of students in all these processes, and the results of the monitoring is made public yearly or whenever it becomes necessary. | | |
| 31. | PI | C.4.1.2. All intimations regarding suspicion of plagiarism related to doctoral theses have been analysed and resolved by the IOSUD within the time interval legally established for expressing in writing its position regarding the intimation received. | Yes | |
| 32. | PI | C.4.1.3. Annual Reports of the Ethics commission of the IOSUD contain information on the stage of solving each case of intimation or own-intiative intimation regarding violation of norms or ethical aspects relevant for university doctoral studies. description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself. | Ok | |
| 33. | CPI | C.4.1.4. The measures taken by IOSUD after the final decision of CNADTCU to withdraw the title of "doctor" following accusations of plagiarism have addressed all the aspects mentioned in CNADTCU's decision and in the current legislation. | Not applicable | |
| 34. | PI | C.4.1.5. The measures aiming to | | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | prevent academic fraud in the doctoral studies, taken by IOSUD, could be:<br>a) Suspension of the right to advise newly enrolled doctoral students, for a period of 3 years, in the case of doctoral advisors having coordinated a doctoral thesis with a definitive decision of withdrawal of the "doctor" title for plagiarism;<br>b) Exclusion from the IOSUD of the doctoral advisor having coordinated at least two doctoral theses with definitive decisions of withdrawal of the "doctor" title for plagiarism;<br>c) Suspension of the right to organize the admission process of new doctoral students in the Doctoral studies domain, for a period of 2 years, if in the respective domain a doctoral thesis has been finalized and defended with a definitive decision of withdrawal of the "doctor" title for plagiarism. | | |
| 35. | PI * | C.4.1.6. The scientific reviewers members in the commissions for public defense of two or more doctoral theses with definitive decisions of withrawal of the "doctor" title for plagiarism, have not been nominated in other commissions for public defence of doctoral theses for a period of at least 3 years. | | |
| 36. | PI | C.4.1.7. IOSUD has a database open to the public containing all the doctoral theses defended in the institution beginning at least in 2016 in a format including: the domain, author, doctoral advisor, title of the | Ok | |

| No. | Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | thesis and the thesis in electronic format (if there is an agreement of the author). | | |

**My general opinion about the PhD Program, Domain of History.**

Suceava Stefan cel Mare University made a considerable progress for recent decades. It covers also Domain of History. There work together well-repudiated scholars and researches with solid academic background.

My positive impression about PhD School in Domain embraced but not all-comprehensively some points as follow. The academic staff is active in both research and education activity. They have storing motivation to keep up and develop further PhD studies. All of them are responsible Academic Supervisors and this Students have to regret or complain while working with them together. Communications of PhD Students and academic staff work well and seems to be adequate to contemporary norms and requirement.

Infrastructure of the PhD School is enough developed and Administration of Faculty and University care about its further advancement. It includes e-technology and facilities.

International and national cooperation of the School gets better for recent years. It comprises academic exchanges and research grants.

PhD stints and their supervisors are active and fruitful with making their research. They publish results of them and make disseminations well. Those results are presented via National and International Conferences, Seminars etc, and are published in Academic periodicals, including prestigious Journals (Scopus and WoS, Erich +).

University provides some support for PhD students activity and tries to meet their requests. Existing national regulations and standards of academic ethics are met and respected.

The PhD School in domain of History has respectful records and merits, which allows to value them highly.

**In the same time there could be observed some weakness and problems, which require some more attention from Suceava University leadership and managers:**

1. The academic Supervisors in domain of History are not completely satisfied criteria of the evaluation process. It's explained that one more habilitation will take place soon at this fall. Should it be guaranteed with the University under that condition we might agree that this indicator will be meet in the nearest future.
2. The existence of only one Research Center (Carnatic) is unlikely enough to make research agenda of the Doctoral School in History be up-to-date and covering all the aspects of Regional, National and World History covered.
3. The topics of the researcher are less oriented towards cross-cultural issues as the most precious for Bukovina cultural heritage. And they lack focus on comparative studies, including neighboring countries historical issues and the agenda of CEE regional history.

4. The enrolment of foreign students is well done with regard to candidate from Moldova and Ukraine, that's is good. Still making PhD studies at Suceava University attractive for students from some more countries remains important and perspective task.
5. Students seems to be partly unsatisfied to a full extend need for their horizontal communications and cooperation. It looks like that expectations should be realized with some more measures implied.
6. PhD students are not certain with their prospect on the market. They are not professionally and psychologically well-prepared for looking around for their professional carried after graduation and PhD Thesis defense.
7. The existing viability of e-sources and data might be also widening and enriched, Especially under circumstances of ongoing pandemic situation.

**Some recommendations might be regarded to overcome these deficiencies. In the same order as some problems are enlisted above:**

1. it makes sense to plan well in advance the promotion of researches to the rank of Full professor. Meantime it's worthy to invite foreign Professor to be academic Supervisors, because it might be an asset as far as PhD Studies in History further prospect is concerned.

2. The formation of some more research Centers and Temporal Research groups could be regarded by the Faculty and Professors, discussed together with PhD Students.

3. The topics of the PhD Thesis have to include cross-cultural and cross border issues wider. They are to be place into a broader context of Regional, European and World history.

4. The University and Faculty might analyze the existing demands from foreign students to study at Suceava University PhD School and elaborate information and marketing campaign for doing so more aggressively.

5. it worthy to organize regular meetings of PhD students with their supervisors and other University teachers. Launching a common Internet platform for the professional communications, where publish news, inform about opportunities, share announcements< practical advices, both by the Professors ad PhD students on the web-site of Suceava University.

6. University could propose training course on Academic carrier perspective for PhD students, being adopted to National and International experience. Some direct meetings with principal employers in the field of History and around must be practiced annually.

7. PhD students should be better prepared to use big data and e-sources, collecting and analyzing information for their research. Granting them more access to the financial resources for a field studies and trips on competitive ground is of pivotal importance for the further prospect.