

The External Evaluation Report of a Doctoral Study Domain

Contents

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

I. Introduction¹

The purpose of this current report is to provide an in-depth, comprehensive, and constructive analysis of the History Doctoral Domain at the „George Emil Palade” University of Medicine, Pharmacy, Sciences, and Technology of Targu Mures. The external expert carried out this task between 3 and 10 September 2021, entirely through an online platform, and additional communication was established via email. On 9 September, the panel coordinator was able to go on a site visit to the Doctoral School.

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

The Doctoral Domain is hosted at the Doctoral School for Letters, Humanities and Applied Sciences.

The institutional information that was transmitted to all members indicates that the Doctoral School was created, initially under a different designation, by Order of the Minister of Education research no. 667 of March 28, 2007, and the History domain was established in 2016 by MENCS Order no. 3235/2016. Its mission includes optimizing advanced training and research capacity, at both national and international levels. Of the seven supervisors, three coordinate dissertations at the Doctoral School.

II. Methods used

The English version of the internal evaluation report on the History domain was made available to the external expert by ARACIS, and was thoroughly analyzed before the online meetings took place. This report offers a structured insight into the holistic reality of the Doctoral School, and focuses its mission, composition, infrastructures, and administrative procedures. It was written in compliance with the requested standards, and posed no general difficulties. The vast majority of the annexed documents were available in Romanian only, but this reviewer had no major issues in understanding their content, in particular when reading forms, titles, or names. Any needed clarifications were given during the meetings.

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



During the course of the evaluation week, some additional documents were requested and immediately provided.

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

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

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

III. Analysis of ARACIS's performance indicators

Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

(a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;

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

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

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

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



f) the contract for doctoral studies;

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

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

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

All required administrative structures are in place, and they address the organic functioning of the doctoral school. Their practical application was discussed during the meetings, and there is sufficient evidence of appropriate managerial and procedural effectiveness.

Recommendations:

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

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

These elements are present, and there is no special comment to be made on them, as they are appropriate.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

*general description of the standard analysis.

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

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

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

A digital platform ensures several levels of integration and user access. Part of the system allows the institution to analyze individual student performance and administrative details.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.



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

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

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

Many plagiarism-checking software options are available. The one adopted by the doctoral school is validated by the ministry.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

*general description of the standard analysis.

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

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

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

Three projects are presented, all coordinated by the same researcher. Two of these had the duration of one year, while the third one is active. They all focus on pedagogical and research matters.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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



The ratio is well above the minimum required percentage.

Recommendations:

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

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

This indicator is not quantified (only the source of tuition is). While financial support for activities such as publications does exist, it is not clear if this and other types of financial assistance effectively correspond to at least 10%.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

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

Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

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



In the specific case of the History domain, the doctoral school is conveniently equipped with physical infrastructures, and especially with library database access, which is a critical research element. A clear focus on digital resources, both as basic source access and as platforms for publication, is to be pointed out.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

The current ratio is more than double the minimum standard.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

The current ratio of tenured advisors is above 50%.

Recommendations:

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

All faculty members are specialized in History, and have adequate doctoral supervision qualification in the field.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

Only one case fits this indicator (corresponding to 14%), which is still below the maximum allowed percentage.

Recommendations:

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.*

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.*

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



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

Some of the publications are not WoS-or Scopus-indexed, but the overall scholarly production of each advisor is solid and coherent. Alternative quality indicators need to be considered, as criteria set by commercial entities (e.g. Elsevier or Clarivate Analytics) are often STEM-oriented, and do not apply as well to History as they do to other fields. In this light, all doctoral advisors present a high quality profile.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

The total number of advisors complies with this standard.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

Standard B.1.1. The institution organizing doctoral studies has the capacity to attract candidates from outside the higher education institution or a number of candidates exceeding the number of seats available.

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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



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

The minimum ratio in both criteria is ensured, as the former is of 0.4 and the latter of 2.1, taking the average of the last five years (four years in the present case, since the PhD program was initiated in 2016).

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

*general description of the standard analysis.

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

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

Conventional, suitable procedures, in line with international practice.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

Dropout level is at 12%, at an acceptable rate.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs

*general description of the criterion analysis.

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



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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

Three of the seminars correspond to History courses, and one is specifically oriented towards research methodologies.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

One such course is offered.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Learning outcomes are identified in the provided individual course files, and can in addition be indirectly inferred from the statistics on success rates.

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



Recommendations:

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

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

This requirement is fully complied with, an assessment based on the provided evidence.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

The proportion of students over faculty exceeds the established limit. Remedial action is to be taken.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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



One paper per student is presented. Five of these have been reviewed, and they all meet the scientific criteria to be considered as both original and relevant.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

This ratio stands at 5.25, well above the minimum requirement.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

This ratio is not exceeded.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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



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

The cases in which this ratio is slightly exceeded correspond to absolute numbers of 2 instead of 1. Such a marginal non-conformity is not a major concern to this reviewer, and can be justified based on the expertise and availability of the external experts.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

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

Evaluation of the different criteria is assured through the institutional procedures of the doctoral school. Quality control is carried out on both the conditions and the outputs of research activity. Supervisors are regularly assessed. Quality control is improved, among others, by synthesising ideas through a SWOT analysis.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.



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

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

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

A questionnaire is used to gather feedback from the students. Results were provided to the committee.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

(a) the Doctoral School regulation;

(b) the admission regulation;

(c) the doctoral studies contract;

(d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;

(e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies;

(f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data;

(g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor);

(h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis;

(i) links to the doctoral theses' summaries to be publicly presented and the date, time, place where they will be presented; this information will be communicated at least twenty days before the presentation.

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

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

All information is provided in a proper way, and is publicly accessible through the website.

Recommendations:



The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

Through the university structure, doctoral school provides online access to the most widely used library databases.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

Anti-plagiarism software, as mentioned above (section A.1.2.2), is available to the students.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

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

The infrastructures and facilities mentioned above in section A.2.1.1 are at the disposal of the PhD students.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion C.3. Internationalization

**general description of the criterion analysis.*



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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

Performance Indicator *C.3.1.1. *IOSUD, for every evaluated domain, has concluded mobility agreements with universities abroad, with research institutes, with companies working in the field of study, aimed at the mobility of doctoral students and academic staff (e.g., ERASMUS agreements for the doctoral studies). At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences. IOSUD drafts and applies policies and measures aiming at increasing the number of doctoral students participating at mobility periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.*

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

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

A comprehensive set of MoU and exchange programs are operational. The listed number of students is 7, slightly under the requested percentage.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled. Recommendation is to stimulate students to engage more in these activities.

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

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

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

This criterion is partially fulfilled, namely in the scope of a longstanding collaboration with the Sapienza University, in which co-tutelage is however absent.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled. Recommendation is to develop effective co-tutelage mechanisms.

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

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

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

Some European promotional outreach has been carried out.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - motivated faculty and students, with coherent viewpoints aligned with the academic strategy of the Doctoral School. - internationalization efforts with tangible results. - appropriate resources for teaching and learning, and for research activities 	<p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduced proportion of young upcoming scholars, and corresponding predominance of established professionals, as PhD students. - limited chronological specializations. <p>Note: both realities were discussed during the meetings, and may also constitute strenghts (as the former brings external expertise into the Doctoral School, and establishes outreach potential with community stakeholders, while the latter may be branded as an image).</p>
<p><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - marketing the Doctoral School's branded image through a clear specificity, from a consumer-centered perspective, and in competition with other Romanian institutions that offer similar programs. - enhancing the integration with the regional stakeholders, namely potential employers and academically relevant partners. 	<p><u>Threats:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a progressively lower student intake may put the relevance and existence of the Doctoral School at risk. - in socio-economic terms, and from an international perspective, History is a field in which younger prospective students may not invest in as heavily as in other STEM or interdisciplinary .

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	PI	<p>A.1.1.1. The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the Doctoral School of the respective university doctoral study domain:</p> <p>a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;</p>	<p>All required administrative structures are in place, and they address the organic functioning of</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<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>	<p>the doctoral school. Their practical application was discussed during the meetings, and there is sufficient evidence of appropriate managerial and procedural effectiveness.</p>	
2.	PI	<p>A.1.1.2. The doctoral school' Regulation includes mandatory criteria, procedures and standards binding on the aspects specified in Article 17, paragraph (5) of the Government Decision No. 681/2011 on the approval of the Code of Doctoral Studies with subsequent amendments and additions.</p>	<p>These elements are present, and there is no special comment to be made on them, as they are appropriate.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
3.	PI	<p>A.1.2.1. The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background.</p>	<p>A digital platform ensures several levels of integration and user access. Part of the system allows the institution to analyze individual student performance and administrative details.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
4.	PI	<p>A.1.2.2. The existence and use of an appropriate software program and evidence of its use to verify the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses.</p>	<p>Many plagiarism-checking software options are available. The one adopted by the doctoral school is validated by the ministry.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
5.	IP	<p>A.1.3.1. Existence of at least one research or institutional / human resources development grant under implementation at the time of submission of the internal evaluation file, per doctoral study domain under evaluation, or existence of at least 2 research or institutional development / human resources grant for the doctoral study domain, obtained by doctoral thesis advisors operating in the evaluated domain within the past 5 years. The grants address relevant themes for the respective domain and, as a rule, are engaging doctoral students.</p>	<p>Three projects are presented, all coordinated by the same researcher. Two of these had the duration of one year, while the third one is active. They all focus on pedagogical and research matters.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
6.	PI *	<p>A.1.3.2. The percentage of doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation, who for at least six months receive additional funding sources besides government funding, through scholarships awarded by individual persons or by legal entities, or who are financially supported through research or institutional / human resources development grants is not less than 20%.</p>	<p>The ratio is well above the minimum required percentage.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
7.	PI *	<p>A.1.3.3. At least 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants obtained by the university through institutional contracts and of tuition fees collected from the doctoral students enrolled in the paid tuition system is used to reimburse professional training expenses of doctoral students (attending conferences, summer schools, training, programs abroad, publication of specialty papers or other specific forms of dissemination etc.).</p>	<p>This indicator is not quantified (only the source of tuition is). While financial support for activities such as publications</p>	<p>The indicator is partially fulfilled.</p> <p>Recommendation is to provide a quantified statement on the use of doctoral fees.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
			does exist, it is not clear if this and other types of financial assistance effectively correspond to at least 10%.	
8.	CPI	A.2.1.1. The venues and the material equipment available to the doctoral school enable the research activities in the evaluated domain to be carried out, in line with the assumed mission and objectives (computers, specific software, equipment, laboratory equipment, library, access to international databases etc.). The research infrastructure and the provision of research services are presented to the public through a specific platform. The research infrastructure described above, which was purchased and developed within the past 5 years will be presented distinctly	In the specific case of the History domain, the doctoral school is conveniently equipped with physical infrastructures, and especially with library database access, which is a critical research element. A clear focus on digital resources, both as basic source access and as platforms for publication, is to be pointed out.	The indicator is fulfilled.
9.	CPI	A.3.1.1. Minimum three doctoral thesis advisors within that doctoral domain, and at least 50% of them (but no less than three) meet the minimum standards of the National Council for Attestation of University Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (CNATDCU) in force at the time when the evaluation is carried out, which standards are required and mandatory for obtaining the enabling certification.	The current ratio is more than double the minimum standard.	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
10.	PI *	A.3.1.2. At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.	The current ratio of tenured advisors is above 50%.	The indicator is fulfilled.
11.	PI	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.	All faculty members are specialized in History, and have adequate doctoral supervision qualification in the field.	The indicator is fulfilled.
12.	PI *	A.3.1.4. The percentage of doctoral thesis advisors who concomitantly coordinate more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12, who are themselves studying in doctoral programs does not exceed 20%.	Only one case fits this indicator (corresponding to 14%), which is still below the maximum allowed percentage.	The indicator is fulfilled.
13.	CPI	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	Some of the publications are not WoS-or Scopus-indexed, but the overall scholarly production of each advisor is solid and coherent. Alternative quality indicators need to be considered, as criteria set by commercial entities (e.g.	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.	Elsevier or Clarivate Analytics) are often STEM-oriented, and do not apply as well to History as they do to other fields. In this light, all doctoral advisors present a high quality profile.	
14.	PI *	A.3.2.2. At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in a specific doctoral study domain continue to be active in their scientific field, and acquire at least 25% of the score requested by the minimal CNATDCU standards in force at the time of the evaluation, which are required and mandatory for acquiring their enabling certificate, based on their scientific results within the past five years	The total number of advisors complies with this standard.	The indicator is fulfilled.
15.	PI *	B.1.1.1. The ratio between the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions, national or foreign, who have enrolled for the doctoral admission contest within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget, put out through contest within the doctoral domain is at least 0.2 or the ratio between the number of candidates within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget put out through contest within the doctoral studies domain is at least 1,2.	The minimum ratio in both criteria is ensured, as the former is of 0.4 and the latter of 2.1, taking the average of the last five years (four years in the present case, since the PhD program was initiated in 2016).	The indicator is fulfilled.
16.	PI *	B.1.2.1. Admission to doctoral study programs is based on selection criteria including: previous academic, research and professional performance, their interest for scientific or arts/sports research, publications in the domain and a proposal for a research	Conventional, suitable procedures, in line with international practice.	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		subject. Interviewing the candidate is compulsory, as part of the admission procedure.		
17.	PI	B.1.2.2. The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral students 3, respectively 4, years after admission does not exceed 30%.	Dropout level is at 12%, at an acceptable rate.	The indicator is fulfilled.
18.	PI	B.2.1.1. The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant to the scientific research training of doctoral students; at least one of these disciplines is intended to study in-depth the research methodology and/or the statistical data processing.	Three of the seminars correspond to History courses, and one is specifically oriented towards research methodologies.	The indicator is fulfilled.
19.	PI	B.2.1.2. At least one discipline is dedicated to Ethics and Intellectual Property in scientific research or there are well-defined topics on these subjects within a discipline taught in the doctoral program.	One such course is offered.	The indicator is fulfilled.
20.	PI	B.2.1.3. The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes“, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities.	Learning outcomes are identified in the provided individual course files, and can in addition be indirectly inferred from the statistics on success rates.	The indicator is fulfilled.
21.	PI	B.2.1.4. All along the duration of the doctoral training, doctoral students in the domain receive counselling/guidance from functional guidance commissions, which is reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting.	This requirement is fully complied with, an assessment based on the provided evidence.	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
22.	CPI	B.2.1.5. For a doctoral study domain, the ratio between the number of doctoral students and the number of teaching staff/researchers providing doctoral guidance must not exceed 3:1.	The proportion of students over faculty exceeds the established limit. Remedial action is to be taken.	The indicator is partially fulfilled.
23.	CPI	B.3.1.1. For the evaluated domain, the evaluation commission will be provided with at least one paper or some other relevant contribution per doctoral student who has obtained a doctor's title within the past 5 years. From this list, the members of the evaluation commission shall randomly select 5 such papers / relevant contributions per doctoral study domain for review. At least 3 selected papers must contain significant original contributions in the respective domain	One paper per student is presented. Five of these have been reviewed, and they all meet the scientific criteria to be considered as both original and relevant.	The indicator is fulfilled.
24.	PI *	B.3.1.2. The ratio between the number of presentations of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years), including posters, exhibitions made at prestigious international events (organized in the country or abroad) and the number of doctoral students who have completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years) is at least 1.	This ratio stands at 5.25, well above the minimum requirement.	The indicator is fulfilled.
25.	PI *	B.3.2.1. The number of doctoral theses allocated to one specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the evaluated IOSUD should not exceed two (2) in a year for the theses coordinated by the same doctoral thesis advisor.	This ratio is not exceeded.	The indicator is fulfilled.
26.	PI *	B.3.2.2. The ratio between the doctoral theses allocated to one scientific specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the institution where the 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 cases in which this ratio is slightly exceeded correspond to absolute numbers of 2 instead of 1.	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.	Such a marginal non-conformity is not a major concern to this reviewer, and can be justified based on the expertise and availability of the external experts.	
27.	PI	<p>C.1.1.1. The Doctoral school in the respective university study domain shall demonstrate the continuous development of the evaluation process and its internal quality assurance following a procedure developed and applied at the level of the IOSUD, the following assessed criteria being mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the scientific work of Doctoral advisors; b) the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity; c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized; d) the scientific activity of doctoral students; e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students; f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students. 	<p>Evaluation of the different criteria is assured through the institutional procedures of the doctoral school. Quality control is carried out on both the conditions and the outputs of research activity. Supervisors are regularly assessed. Quality control is improved, among others, by synthesising ideas through a SWOT analysis.</p>	The indicator is fulfilled.
28.	PI *	<p>C.1.1.2. Mechanisms are implemented during the stage of the doctoral study program to enable feedback from doctoral students allowing to identify their needs, as</p>	<p>A questionnaire is used to gather</p>	The indicator is fulfilled.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>well as their overall level of satisfaction with the doctoral study program in order to ensure continuous improvement of the academic and administrative processes. Following the analysis of the results, there is evidence that an action plan was drafted and implemented.</p>	<p>feedback from the students. Results were provided to the committee.</p>	
29.	CPI	<p>C.2.1.1. The IOSUD publishes on the website of the organizing institution, in compliance with the general regulations on data protection, information such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>All information is provided in a proper way, and is publicly accessible through the website.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
30.	PI	<p>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.</p>	<p>Through the university structure, doctoral school provides online access to the most widely used library databases.</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>
31.	PI	<p>C.2.2.2. Each doctoral student shall have access, upon request, to an electronic</p>	<p>Anti-plagiarism software, as mentioned</p>	<p>The indicator is fulfilled.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works.	above (section A.1.2.2), is available to the students.	
32.	PI	C.2.2.3. All doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the specific domain/domains within the Doctoral School, according to internal order procedures.	The infrastructures and facilities mentioned above in section A.2.1.1 are at the disposal for the PhD students.	The indicator is fulfilled.
33.	PI *	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.	A comprehensive set of MoU and exchange programs are operational. The listed number of students is 7, slightly under the requested percentage.	The indicator is partially fulfilled. Recommendation is to stimulate students to engage more in these activities.
34.	PI	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.	This criterion is partially fulfilled, namely in the scope of a longstanding collaboration with the Sapienza University, in which co-tutelage is however absent.	The indicator is partially fulfilled. Recommendation is to develop effective co-tutelage mechanisms.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
35.	PI	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.).	Some European promotional outreach has been carried out.	The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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

VI. Conclusions and general recommendations

The evaluation identifies no severe shortcomings in the overall quality of the program, and the conditions in which the doctoral school operates. This committee member recognizes the transparency and consideration encountered during the evaluation process, and commends all institutional members for their availability in clarifying all observations and questions. In addition to the comments regarding each individual indicator in the detailed report, some general recommendations are presented below. Main suggestions consist of:

1. either enhancing and strategically diversifying the thematic offerings and faculty profiles (hence becoming more comprehensive) or, alternatively, defining and assuming a specific chronological or geographical niche -- both options can be interesting for the institution, yet the current scenario is that of a wide-ranging mission with a rather narrow range;

2. investing in a coherent international outreach and promotion of the doctoral school, part of which should insist on regional uniqueness as a catalyst for European research integration;

3. investing in the solidification of streamlined articulations with the labour market, in particular with regard to the younger generations of PhD graduates, and with other stakeholders in the wider society;

4. while recognizing public funding and internal accountancy complexities, it is important to push as much as possible for accurate, detailed numbers on the use of tuition and grant revenue for reinvestment in the program;

5. taking into account that the (supra-)European professional mobility, either through a post-doctoral grant or in a fully professional context, is structured according to certain types of normalized



outputs (e.g. quality indexed journals), PhD students need to be stimulated to build competitive research and publication portfolios;

6. *exploring alternative/complementary, and student-centred sources of research capacitation, in strict financial terms, and as a networking effort with industry partners and other higher education institutions.*

Remarks concerning a few partially fulfilled indicators were discussed with representatives from the doctoral school, and in fact had been indicated, to a certain extent, in the self-assessment analysis. They refer to minor technical challenges, to be tackled in what altogether is a credible and solid program, offered in an equally good academic and administrative framework.

Taking this into consideration, the decision is to favorably evaluate the Doctoral School, and to suggest the responsible party to tackle the minor observations provided above.

VII. Annexes

The following types of documents shall be attached:

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

*Adriaan De Man
22 September 2021*