

The External Evaluation Report of a Doctoral Study Domain

This report is written by Prof. Ahcène BOUMENDJEL from the Université Grenoble Alpes, Faculty of Pharmacy who acted as the international evaluator.

For clarity, my comments, conclusions and recommendations are all indicated in red.

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

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.).

The evaluation took place from Monday 06 to Friday 10th of September, entirely on line via zoom with the presence of a translator (Roumanian ↔ English). The expert committee was composed of three members (Prof. Monica HANCIANU (University of Iasi-Roumania), Prof. Ahcène BOUMENDJEL (University Grenoble Alpes-France) and Alexandra STRUGARIU (the student representative)).

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 evaluation report and related annexes were provided prior to the evaluation period (before September 6th, 2021). The report was uploaded using the codes provided by George Emil Palade University. No other

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



documents were shared during the evaluation. The doctoral study representatives have informed us that any additional document that might be considered useful for the evaluation process can be requested.

- The analysis of documents made available by the IOSUD, in physical format, during the evaluation visit (if such documents have been requested);

Since no visit was organized for foreign evaluators, no physical document was provided. The electronic format was safely uploaded over the cloud through secured login and passwords codes.

- 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;
- the student residences;
- the student cafeteria;
- sports ground etc.;

Due to the pandemic situation the visiting session was not possible for foreign evaluators who took part of the visit, remotely.

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

The expert committee met doctoral students (six PhD students were presents) representing the scientific disciplines covered by the doctoral school. The discussion was constructive and covered different aspects. No particular problems were raised regarding the relation student-doctoral advisor. Doctoral students are encouraged to take part of external/international meetings. Regular group meetings are organised where students are invited to present their projects and results.

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

A meeting session was organized with graduates students ...

- 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;

General oral presentations were given by representatives of doctoral advisors regarding the selection process, the available scientific platforms, the publications requirements for the PhD defense, PhD students mobility and international collaborations.

- 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);



Meetings (remotly) were taken with the council of doctoral school, the Quality Assessment and Assurance Commission. Oral discussions regarding the missions of these services and how they operate were constructive. Concrete outcomes of both services were given

- the Career Counselling and Guidance Center;
- student organizations;

No meeting with students 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.*

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*



The current doctoral school regulation which is in place since 2019 addresses key issues related to: interdisciplinarity, promoting high level research equivalent to international standards, co-supervision of doctoral studies with international institutions.

Conducting elections of director of the Doctoral School Council (CSD). Doctoral schools are managed by a doctoral school director and by the Doctoral School Council. The modalities and calendar of their elections are established by the central services of the University. The CDS is elected by doctoral advisors through universal and secret vote for a mandate of 5 years. The doctoral school comprise 9 members, including the director. The other members are doctoral advisors (4, 50%), 2 doctoral students (20%), 2 external members (20%) appointed by the central administration of the University.

Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies. The admission, selection, organization of the doctoral studies, the requirements for the doctoral thesis are provided through 5 web links to the University network.

Mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral advisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad. The candidates apply through an on line platform with all the required administrative and curriculum documents. The application is examined by a commission composed of 3 CSD members. The commission advise on validation or not of the application. For applicants coming from abroad are requested to provide the same documents as local candidates in addition to the PhD thesis translated to Romanian and English or French.

Functional management structures. The coordination of activities of the Doctoral School is ensured by the doctoral school council (CSD). The later meets 4 times per year or more on demand if urgent issues have to be discussed.

The contract for doctoral studies. The elaborated convention is cosigned and produced in triplicate and distributed to doctoral student, doctoral advisor and doctoral school.

Internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals about advanced study programs.

The thesis project is approved during the admission process. For some reasons, the research topic can be changed through a mutual agreement between the doctoral student and the doctoral advisor. The request is analyzed during the CSD and CSUD meetings.

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

The facts outlined above follow the regulation set by the University. Based on the information provided in the evaluation report and during the discussion with the members in charge of the institution organizing doctoral studies, it is apparent that the indicators a-g, mentioned above are of high standard and coherent.

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

The council of the doctoral school establish the main lines of the regulation of the doctoral school. The doctoral advisors are fully associated to the process. The established rules are amended by the University authorities. The main facts deal with the following issues: the rules for recruiting and removal of doctoral advisors, the training programs, access of PhD students to research resources, conflicts (advisor-student) that may occur, attendance of doctoral students to mandatory courses, scientific ethics.



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

The facts declined in the documents and the discussion during the on-line evaluation are pertinent. Doctoral students including those who go for mobility, greatly benefit from the taken measures.

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.

This part of the evaluation is related to the management of doctoral students during the entire period: from admission to graduation. The selection process of students is performed fully on line. The records of admitted students are then imported and processed by the George Emil Palade University that it manages the records of doctoral students and their academic career. The system covers the full academic career from the registration until the graduation. Teachers and administrative staff take part of the system to organize the students studies, including: courses organization, exams and scoring. The student records are secured at the national level through another system hosted by the ministry of education and research.

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

The facts highlighted above are well defined in the submitted documents. Complementary information were obtained during the evaluation visit.

The facts are appropriate and seem to simplify the students life during the doctoral studies. There is no much to add, except that continuous improvement of the system should be a priority. This task can be facilitated by conducting satisfaction surveys among students, teachers and administrators.

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

High consideration to scientific ethics is by the doctoral school. Different aspects that may fall under the scientific ethics domain are considered, including: fabrication of inexistent results/data, falsifying existing results/ data, conflict of interest and plagiarism. For plagiarism detection and tracking, the doctoral school uses *Sistemantiplagiat.ro* software that is approved by the higher education authorities.

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



The rules and requirements followed by the doctoral school level are relevant and are those met in common recognized universities. The exchanges during the visit revealed no major problems occurred within the doctorate school regarding the scientific ethics.

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

Four grants were obtained and carried out during the period 2016 - 2020 and two are being implemented. These grants were obtained through national and international calls. The grants were granted to projects dealing with pharmaceutical disciplines, including: separation science, biocompatible materials, biomolecules and drug delivery.

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

The balance of grants seems appropriate, although it can be improved with regard to the size of the doctoral school and the number of doctoral advisors. The administrative information provided in the documents (annexes) are not quite informative for the international reviewers (non Romanian speaking).

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially 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

At the pharmacy doctoral school, 23 doctoral students (~ 94%) have benefited additional funding during the period 2016 - 2020. The additional funding amounts are equivalent to 6 months salary.

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



Owing to the information given in the assessed institution documents, the percentage of doctoral students who received additional funds seems excellent. It would have been interesting to compare with the previous evaluation period (2012 – 2016).

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

The description is based on the data provided in the documents, since this aspect was not discussed during the visit. The institution use around 160 800 lei to finance the students expenses related to training. This represent around 35% of the total amount of doctoral grants (438 000 lei). This represents an average of 10720 lei /student. The indicated analysis is the result of a survey conducted on 15 students who received doctoral grants.

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

The facts given are clearly explained. However, the annexes were not examined by the reviewer because of the language.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled (by comparison to my own institution, foreign institution).

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

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.



Doctoral students affiliated to Pharmacy benefit from two main research centers: a) a laboratory equipped with analytical tools, including chromatography, electrophoresis and spectroscopic instruments, mostly dedicated to analysis of drugs and biomolecules; b) Drug testing laboratory, equipped with important instruments such as HPLC coupled to mass spectrometers; samples preparation and storage. Besides these research facilities, students have access to other facilities affiliated to the doctoral school of medicine. The access to the two research facilities is done through a simple e-mail request and students can do experiments by themselves after training. A website is dedicated to these research facilities. A strategy to purchase new equipment is established where doctoral advisors are the main actors and decision makers.

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

The two research centers are well managed through a collegial functioning. Regarding the drug testing laboratory, the name is misleading. It is apparent that this laboratory is mostly dedicated to drug analysis and preparation rather than biological testing of drugs/biomolecules.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled (progress is being made to gain in quality offer)

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

There are 9 doctoral advisors at the doctoral school of Pharmacy and 6 of them meet the minimum standards as defined by CNATDCU.

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

The facts related to performance indicator A.3.1.1. are excellent.

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

Seven out of nine doctoral advisors have permanent positions at the University.



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

The performance indicator related to the % of doctoral advisors having a permanent positions is excellent.

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

According to the assessed institution documents, the 10 disciplines in the training programme based on advanced university studies are taught by professors who have the quality of doctoral / habilitated advisor, university professor or associate professor.

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

All disciplines are taught by professors doctoral/habilitated advisor, university professors or associate professors are not disciplines related to basic science.

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

According to information provided in the documents, among the 9 advisors, no one is supervising more than 8 students.

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

It is indicated that one doctoral advisor is supervising more than 8 doctoral students, which is in disagreement with the provided table (page 33 of the assessed institution document !).

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.

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



**general description of the standard analysis.*

Performance Indicator A.3.2.1. *At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in the evaluated domain have at least 5 Web of Science- or ERIH-indexed publications in magazines of impact, or other achievements of relevant significance for that domain, including international-level contributions that indicate progress in scientific research - development - innovation for the evaluated domain. The aforementioned doctoral thesis advisors enjoy international awareness within the past five years, consisting of: membership on scientific boards of international publications and conferences; membership on boards of international professional associations; guests in conferences or expert groups working abroad, or membership on doctoral defense commissions at universities abroad or co-leading with universities abroad. For Arts and Sports and Physical Education Sciences, doctoral thesis advisors shall prove their international visibility within the past five years by their membership on the boards of professional associations, membership in organizing committees of arts events and international competitions, membership on juries or umpire teams in artistic events or international competitions.*

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

6 out of 9 doctoral advisors have at least 5 publications that are considered of international level.

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

According to the information provided in the annexes, some publication are of high level. However, many of the articles are published in national journals with low impact (Farmacia, Brazilian J Pharm Sci, Saudi Pharma Sci, ...). With regard to the quality of research activity and the available research facilities, higher level can be reached.

Recommendations:

The indicator partially 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

According to the bibliometric data provided in Annex 41-00-18.1.3, all doctoral advisors are active in the scientific field, with scientific results published in the past years. 66 % of the doctoral advisors meet the minimum CNATDCU standards. The most active doctoral advisor reach 20 publication during the evaluation period, which is a very good record.

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

The facts provided in the assessed institution's documents (in annexes) are informative and allows the evaluator to have a clear idea about the scientific production of individuals.

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

In pharmacy, most of the students are recruited after completing their long-term undergraduates program (5 years). Therefore, no requirements for having a master degree to candidate for doctoral studies. For this reason, only very few students from other national or international institutions apply to the doctoral school. Despite the later fact, the number of applicants is higher than the available scholarships. The ratio between the number of applicants versus available scholarships varies from 1.2 to 2.

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

The number of applicants is low. Candidates from outside the institution should be encouraged to apply and should be selected according to the same rules as local students.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially 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

Students entering doctoral studies are selected through a series of criteria, including: academic records (20% of the final score); the scientific activity accomplished by the applicant (30% of the final score); written test and oral presentation of the research project for which the applicant is candidating (50% of the



final score). Finally, the performance of the doctoral advisor is taken into account based on the Hirsh index.

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

The selection criteria are logical and follow international standards. However, the appreciation of the performance of doctoral advisor is not clear. Is it taken on the activity of one year, two years, 3 years..or on the entire period of the contract ?

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

In Pharmacy, no expulsion of doctoral was occurred during the 4 years period after the admission.

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

The rate of doctoral students expelled from studies is zero.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

Two disciplines, namely: in-depth study of research methodology; statistical data processing are included in the program. For each discipline, the objectives and the skills acquired by the student upon completion of the courses are presented. For the program elaboration, the curricula from some prestigious Universities worldwide were consulted and used as sources of inspiration.

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

The programs of the two indicated disciplines are accurate and well imagined in which the autonomy of the doctoral students is searched.

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.



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

One discipline namely: Ethics and academic integrity is included in the training program. The objectives of the discipline and the acquired skills are detailed. The objectives are declined in 6 items and acquired skills in 7 items.

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

The facts related to performance indicator B.2.1.2. are accurate.

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

The learning outcomes set by the IOSUD are of two folds: provide competences linked to the professional project of the student and offering her/him transversal competences. This include Knowledge of the biostatistical principles; how to carry research projects; improve the capacity for analysis and synthesis; evaluation of risks; improve the writing skills of research articles; decision making; creative thinking; management...

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

The learning outcomes adressed are excellent and convincing. The objectives are elegantly designed.

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

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.



In pharmacy, doctoral students are guided by a monitoring committee consisting of 3 members. The members can be internal or external professors and researchers. The role of the monitoring committee is to follow the progress of the research, make sure that the research project is not a bottleneck, the publishing activity, participation in meetings, detect any conflict between the student and the doctoral advisor.

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

The role of the guidance commission is relevant and useful. Following the discussions during the visit, the input of the monitoring commission is well appreciated by students.

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

At the Pharmacy doctoral school, 18 doctoral students were supervised by 20 professors among which 9 are doctoral advisors. Hence, the ratio between the number of doctoral students and the number of professors/researchers providing supervision is 0.90.

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

The doctoral supervision capacity is sufficient.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

This part was not evaluated. The access to the annex (41-00-27.1.3) is impossible. It is not working. This annex is supposed to give the bibliometric data related to Performance indicator B.3.1.1. E-mails were sent to have these informations but no answers were received.



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

The analysis was not performed for the reasons highlighted above.

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

The ratio between the number of presentations of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies in the evaluated period and the number of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies in the evaluated period is 3 (33 presentations for 11 defended PhD thesis)

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

The average of 3 presentations/ doctoral student is correct.

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

For the pharmacy doctoral school, **two** is the number of doctoral theses coordinated by the same doctoral advisor in one year allocated to a certain reviewer coming from another higher education institution.

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

This point was not discussed during the visit. Details given in Annex 41-00-29.1.3 support the provided analysis.

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

The ratio between the number of doctoral theses assigned to a certain scientific examiner from another higher education institution and the number of doctoral theses defended varies between 0,09 to 0,18.

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

The facts are in agreement with what is recommended in performance indicator B.3.2.2.

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

Doctoral schools are regularly audited according to the quality requirements established by the implemented quality standards. The audit report is drafted and communicated to doctoral school members and beneficiaries. The continuous development of the evaluation process covers the following criteria (Information are provided to students through the web site of the University): Doctoral advisors assessment; Research centers assessment (Center of advanced science in medicine and pharmacy (CCAMF); Integrated Centre for Dentistry- Simulation Centre (CIMD); Integrated Centre for Pharmaceutical Education - Botanical Garden); The regulations and procedures (transparency, ethics, the doctoral study contract that define the rights and duties of the doctoral student); The scientific activity



of doctoral students (an annual report is established to discuss the progress of the research project, problems encountered, plans,...); The training program; The social and academic support.

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

The continuous development of the evaluation process and the internal quality assurance established by the doctoral school follow standard international rules. The first beneficiaries from the continuous development are doctoral students.

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

A satisfaction survey document is provided to doctoral students. The document comprise 11 items regarding the quality of teaching, the infrastructures and overall services offered by the doctoral school. According to the latest survey and based on the answer of 43 participants, the average of the answers having the rating "very good", was between 3.25 and 4. The rating "good" for possible improvements had an average between 2.50 and 3.25.

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

The main improvements that were highlighted by students was related to the increasing the number of scholarships awarded and establishing agreements with research centers in the EU in order to increase mobility. According to the documents and exchanges during the visit, concrete actions were taken following the satisfaction survey process.

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

Web sites are dedicated to every indicator shown above. The web links appear at the web site of the University (<https://www.umfst.ro>)

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

Information given on the web sites are in Romanian. After some translation efforts I would say that the provided informations are accurate and validate the performance indicators.

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

Doctoral students have access to diverse scientific resources (on line). These resources can be accessed through the university network or through VPN from outside the University. Some of the scientific resources are accessible through the network of the association of universities and research centers in Romania (ANELIS PLUS).

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

The indicated scientific resources give access to the doctoral students to a wide range of services: scientific articles, reports; academic documentations,... This point was discussed during the evaluation visit and the students opinion was very positive.

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

Plagiarism prevention and anti-plagiarism verification of scientific productions are performed through the program: Sistemantiplagiat.ro, that is approved by the Ministry of Education and Research.

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

Issues related to plagiarism are taken seriously and its systematic detection in publications, doctoral thesis and scientific reports is implemented.

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

Doctoral students benefit from different scientific research centers operating in medical and pharmaceutical domains. The major one is the center for advanced medical – pharmaceutical research (CCAMF) that was opened in 2017. In addition to CCAMF, Pharmacy doctoral students have access to the Integrated Centre for Pharmaceutical Education - Botanical Garden. Moreover the two instrumental centers dedicated to drug analysis and drug testing are at the disposition of students affiliated to the Pharmacy doctoral school.

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

The research facilities are consequent and some (according to the web site) are equipped with state of the art instruments. However, not having visited the facilities, it is difficult to give an objective analysis.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled (this recommendation is based solely on the written report)

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

The internationalization activity is under the auspices of the International Relations Office. The latter establish, conclude and manage the agreements with universities and research centers in Europe and abroad. At the doctoral level, the main objective is to push for mobilities and co-supervision of doctoral theses. Erasmus and its mobilities represent the major international program. Doctoral schools encourage doctoral students for participation in international scientific conferences and publication in ISI-indexed journals to improve the international visibility.

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

The mechanisms used to implement and improve the international activity is coherent. The participation of doctoral students in international conferences is important. 66% of doctoral students have accomplished mobility during the doctoral studies, including participation in international conferences.

Recommendations:

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

The organization of international jointly supervised doctorates is encouraged by IOSUD. Annually, the University select 4 doctoral students to international jointly supervised doctorates. Students are selected according to their merit and also according the ranking (Shanghai ranking) of the foreign hosting university. 26 foreign professors and scientists have visited the research teams and laboratories linked to the doctoral school. Some of them have participated in teaching activity for doctoral students.

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

It can be noted that there is a real effort in promoting the organization of doctoral studies in international co-tutelage. However the number of visitors remains low with regard to the size and ambition of the University.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially 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 of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

Actions to attract international students: providing useful information (in english) on the university web site, In the same vein, IOSUD has a procedure for the recognition of doctoral diplomas which facilitates the integration of researchers from abroad in the Doctoral School.



The participation of international experts in commissions for the supervision of doctoral students and for public defense of doctoral theses.

The Doctoral School was represented at two events (in 2017 and 2018) organized by the European Association for International Education Conference.

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

The performance indicators are in line with the standard met in European Universities. More efforts in hosting international conferences can be a tool to attract international students and researchers.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><u>Strengths:</u> - the strengths identified throughout the report will be resumed as part of the indicators' analysis. Other general strengths that do not fall within a particular indicator may be formulated.</p>	<p><u>Weaknesses:</u> - 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.</p>
<p><u>Opportunities:</u> - possible lines of action for the development of the institution under review shall be identified; - 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.</p>	<p><u>Threats:</u> - 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; - 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.</p>

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>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	The only recommendation we made is related to what it said in the report (<i>For some reasons, the research topic can be changed through a mutual agreement between the doctoral student and the doctoral advisor</i>). All efforts should be made to avoid the change of the research topic of PhD students. If this can happen, it should take place very early in the program.
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>	Fulfilled	The doctoral students should be clearly informed about the role and missions of the council of the doctoral school. The web site is not very sufficient (based on my own experience). An annual presentation should be sufficient.
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>	Fulfilled	A systematic survey should be conducted at the end of the doctoral thesis for all of the defended thesis about the rules to improve.
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>	Fulfilled	The doctoral school should establish a guide with all details regarding the scientific ethics and alert the students to what is not allowed to do. The sanctions in case of scientific fraud should be explained and clearly indicated in the document. The

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
				student has to sign the document once she/he register for the first time.
5.	IP	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.	Partially fulfilled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multidisciplinary projects should be privileged. - Doctoral advisors should approach the international relations of the University to seek information and help for how to get involved in European projects. - Develop international collaborations and use them as an instrument to obtain grants
6.	PI *	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%.	Fulfilled	No special recommendation. The results are already excellent.
7.	PI *	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.).	Fulfilled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High priority should be given to training and attending conferences. - Funding of publication fees should be covered by the budget of the research team.
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	Partially fulfilled	The services offered by the two research centers need to be enriched in order to reinforce the impact of such centers on the research of doctoral students. The presence of a botanical garden within the campus and the emergence of the research center on medicinal plants is an excellent opportunity.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		platform. The research infrastructure described above, which was purchased and developed within the past 5 years will be presented distinctly		
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.	Fulfilled	No special recommendation. Just continue on this page.
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.	Fulfilled	No special recommendation. Just continue on this page.
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.	Fulfilled	It is pertinent to get involved non academic speakers (for example, private pharmaceutical sector)
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%.	Fulfilled	It is strongly recommended to limit the number of doctoral students/doctoral advisor. The maximum of 8 doctoral students is incredibly high.
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	Partially fulfilled.	It is important to privilege the quality over quantity. One of the keys to reach such ambition is to privilege interdisciplinarity projects. - Keep away from publishing in predatory journals

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>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.</p>		
14.	PI *	<p>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</p>	Fulfilled	<p>Although the record of the evaluated period is very good. More efforts should be made by focusing on high impact journals.</p>
15.	PI *	<p>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.</p>	Partially fulfilled	<p>Candidates from outside the institution should be encouraged to apply and should be selected according to the same rules as local students. This would enhance competitiveness and raise the level of doctoral students.</p>
16.	PI *	<p>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</p>	Fulfilled	<p>One of the criteria to select and award the scholarships is the performance of the doctoral advisor. The way how to evaluate the performance should be well defined and should take into account several aspects: discipline, experience, publications record,</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		and a proposal for a research subject. Interviewing the candidate is compulsory, as part of the admission procedure.		the performance of graduated students supervised, the professional insertion of the graduated students....
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%.	Fulfilled	No recomandations, because there was no expelling during the period 2016-2020.
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.	Fulfilled	- Doctoral school is encouraged to keep an eye on what happening in other Universities (woldwide). - When bulding the program the local/national scientific ecosystem should be taken into account.
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.	Fulfilled	No special recomandation. The issue is considered seriously.
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.	Fulfilled	The academic program should be adapated on regular basis to keep it on line with the evolution of the national needs and emerging doamins.
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.	Fulfilled	Include in the guidance committee members at least one expert from outside the University. On line meetings can facilitate the organization.
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.	Fulfilled	No special recomandation. This activity is working well.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
23.	CPI	<p>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</p>	Fulfilled	<p>Despite the problem of not having access to the documents, my own research on the PubMed and the web site of the University made me to make the following recommendation.</p> <p>Original contributions in the Pharmacy domain, can be reached by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working on new research problems and hot topics - Collaborations with complementary research groups
24.	PI *	<p>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.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>Oral presentations should be privileged. It is an excellent tool to train students on presenting their work.</p>
25.	PI *	<p>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.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>The opportunity for inviting experts from outside the institution for theses evaluation should be taken whenever is possible.</p>
26.	PI *	<p>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</p>	Fulfilled	<p>The doctoral school is encouraged to continue on this way.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		been presented within the past five years should be analyzed.		
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. 	Fulfilled	Better achievements can be reached if students (alumni) and experts from the private pharmaceutical industry are fully involved in te continuous development process.
28.	PI *	<p>C.1.1.2. Mechanisms are implemented during the stage of the doctoral study program to enable feedback from doctoral students allowing to identify their needs, as well as their overall level of satisfaction with the doctoral study program in order to ensure continuous improvement of the academic and administrative processes. Following the analysis of the results, there is evidence that an action plan was drafted and implemented.</p>	Fulfilled	Mobility of doctoral students during the doctoral studies (sandwich thesis) and after (post-docs) should be a high priority.
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 	Fulfilled	Provide systematically the english version of the web sites.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.		
30.	PI	C.2.2.1. All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of their thesis.	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The existing tools are satisfactory.
31.	PI	C.2.2.2. Each doctoral student shall have access, upon request, to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works.	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The existing tools are satisfactory.
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.	Fulfilled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The internal procedures should be simplified to maximum. - Favorize the autonomy of student in operating the scientific instruments
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.	Fulfilled	Funds must be found to push further for doctoral students mobility not only for attending international scientific events but particularly for performing co-directed doctoral theses.
34.	PI	C.3.1.2. In the evaluated doctoral study domain, support is granted, including financial support, to the organization of doctoral studies	Partially fulfilled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hosting co-tutelage students is highly encouraged

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		in international co-tutelage or invitation of leading experts to deliver courses/lectures for doctoral students.		- Improve the number of visitors (professors and teachers). The objectives above could be reached through inviting international thesis evaluators and take advantage of their visit to set collaborations, PhD co-tutelage,...
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.).	Fulfilled	More efforts in hosting international conferences can be a tool to attract international students and researchers.

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).

The conclusions and recommendations given in the present report are solely based on the documents provided by the doctoral school and the discussions during the on line meetings. The document is informative and useful, except for some inaccessible annexes. Due to the pandemic crisis, it was not possible to organize the face to face visit for the international evaluator.

Conclusions :

- In overall, the Pharmacy doctoral school is well managed.



- The doctoral advisors panel is young and seems enthusiastic despite the heavy tasks of supervising doctoral students.
- The discussion with the doctoral school representatives and students did not detect disfunctions during the evaluated period(2016-2020).
- Doctoral students seem to be proud to work within the doctoral school environment.
- The research outcomes are good but can be improved.
- True internationalization politic is implmented but can be improved.

Recommandations

- Review the rules regarding the maximum number of students to be supervised by one doctoral advisor (*the maximum of 8 students is aberrant, it is too much*).
- Privilege research on hot topic areas
- Privilege multidisciplinary research
- Focus on high impact publication rather than on quantity and avoid tu publish in predatory journals
- Make more efforts to improve doctoral mobility, including co-supervised theses, double diploma theses, sandiwish theses....
- Make more efforts in attracting external doctoral students
- The internationalization within the school is good but can be improved through incoming interantional speakers and also outgoing of teachers and professors from the doctoral school.

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.*