



Annex No. 3

External Evaluation Report
Doctoral Study Domain: Visual Arts
'George Enescu' National University of the Arts, Iași

Professor Patrick Zuk (Durham University, UK)



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

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 visit to evaluate doctoral programmes in Visual Arts at the George Enescu National University of the Arts (UNAGE) was undertaken between 15 and 19 July 2021. Due to ongoing difficulties created by the COVID19 pandemic, the visit was conducted partially on-site and partially online. The evaluation team was led by Professor Adriana Lucaciu (Universitatea de Vest din Timișoara), who was assisted by Professor Patrick Zuk (Durham University, UK) and Cosmina Florina Maria-Anghel (doctoral candidate, Universitatea Națională de Arte din București).

A doctoral programme in Plastic and Decorative Arts was instituted at UNAGE in 2007, and subsequently in Visual Arts since 2013 (see Annexes 1, 2, and 24). At present, ten doctoral advisors act as PhD supervisors. (Annex 10). A total of 42 doctoral candidates are currently registered on UNAGE's Visual Arts programmes (Annex 13).

I offer cordial thanks to Professor Irina Cozmîncă, the ARACIS Technical Secretary of the IOSUD evaluation team, for her administrative support, and Professor Matei Bejenaru, Director of IOSUD-UNAGE, for his assistance with the practicalities of the visit.

II. Methods used

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

- The analysis of the internal evaluation report of the doctoral study domain under review and its Annexes;
- The analysis of documents made available by the IOSUD, in physical format, during the evaluation visit (if such documents have been requested);

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



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

The review was informed by an analysis of the categories of documentation described above, which was made available by IOSUD-UNAGE and uploaded to ARACIS's cloud storage system for reference. This data was supplemented by evidence obtained during meetings with staff and students, which were recorded and also uploaded to the ARACIS site. At the request of the review team, the doctoral school provided supplementary documentation to clarify a number of issues: a list of these supplementary annexes is provided in the final section of the present report.

The review team found the documentation provided by IOSUD-UNAGE to be comprehensive and generally in good order—though not always presented in a way that was convenient to navigate and to locate the necessary information. We recognise, however, that preparing for a review of this nature imposed a considerable additional administrative burden on institutions, especially given the additional pressures created by the prevailing COVID19 pandemic. The institution's staff responded in a very helpful



and co-operative way to queries and requests for additional information and did their utmost to facilitate the work of the review panel.

III. Analysis of ARACIS's performance indicators

Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

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

IOSUD-UNAGE adheres to official regulations on the conduct of doctoral programmes and to prescribed quality assurance procedures, as well as to its own internal governance regulations. Detailed information on programme regulations is available on the institutional website, and pertinent institutional structures and processes are outlined in Annexes 6, 22, and 25-27.

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.

The reviewers confirmed that the required mechanisms had been implemented and were functioning effectively for the most part. Institutional processes had also undergone periodic review and emendation in the interests of continuing quality assurance.

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;

These regulations are summarised in Annexes 5 and 25, supplemented by the documents 'Regulament instituțional de organizare și desfășurare a programelor de studii universitare de doctorat în arte' and 'Regulament de organizare și desfășurare a programului de studii universitare de doctorat domeniul: arte vizuale' (on the institutional website).

(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;

The methodology is outlined in §9, 'Regulament instituțional de organizare și desfășurare a programelor de studii universitare de doctorat în arte'. Supplementary information is available in Annexes 27 & 28.

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



The relevant methodologies are outlined in §§28-35 and 56-76 of the document 'Regulament instituțional de organizare și desfășurare a programelor de studii universitare de doctorat în arte'; see also Annex 28.

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

Annex 10 attests that all doctoral advisors in this domain have been approved to supervise; see also Annexes 31 and 33.

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

The relevant structures are described in Annex 28; minutes of pertinent meetings are provided in Annex 29.

f) the contract for doctoral studies;

The terms of the contract for doctoral studies are stipulated in §§8-10 of Annex 50. Examples of contract pro formas were provided as supplementary annexes 2, 3, and 4.

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

These procedures are described in IOSUD-UNAGE's self-evaluation report, and in Annexes 5, 35, and 37.

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

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

Recommendations:

The 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



The doctoral school's regulations are in accord with government stipulations, although there do not seem to be any formal mechanisms in place to process requests from students to suspend their studies or for resolving difficulties that may arise between students and their supervisory team.

Recommendations:

The doctoral school should give consideration to devising processes for dealing with the circumstances outlined above.

The indicator is partially fulfilled

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

The facilities are in place to support doctoral-level study, as evidenced in Annexes 18, 43, and 62.

The indicator is fulfilled

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

An effective student records system is employed, as detailed in Annex 39 and 40.

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

The doctoral school deploys appropriate anti-plagiarism software (see Annex 42).

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.

Information about the doctoral school's financial management is provided in Annexes 38, 54 and 57. The documentation presented to the review team suggests that financial resources are used optimally.

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

As detailed in the self-evaluation report, the Visual Arts staff have been conspicuously successful in securing research grant funding and are involved in an impressive range of research projects. (See Annex 57.)

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

Details are provided in the institution's self-evaluation report. Of the 41 students currently enrolled on the doctoral programme, 23% receive funding from other sources. Evidence is provided in Annex 54 of external funding obtained by students for research projects, though the sums obtained are comparatively small.

Recommendations:

The review panel noted the difficulty of securing scholarships and funding for research activities such as conference attendance, which represents a significant impediment for those who are unable to self-finance their studies. The panel recognises the financial challenges inherent in increasing levels of postgraduate



studentship and research funding, but recommends that UNAGE should investigate the feasibility of providing additional support and of diversifying its external research income streams.

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

The self-evaluation report indicates that support was provided for a range of student activities, including publications and exhibitions. Annex 38 provides evidence of purchases of equipment, but does not provide detail on the nature of other research activities such as conference attendance.

Recommendations:

From the documentation provided, it is difficult to assess the range and number of activities supported. Neither is it clear how such funding opportunities are advertised to students and the mechanism by which funding decisions are made.

We recommend that the institution explores ways of increasing financial support for participation in high-profile national and international events that would be of particular benefit for students' professional development.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

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.

The documentation provided and the onsite visit confirmed that appropriate facilities and infrastructure are available to support high-level doctoral research.

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



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

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

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

Key evidence for this aspect of the evaluation was provided by Annexes 16, 17, 18, and 43a. Teaching facilities, classrooms, and performance spaces are generally well-equipped, though it is self-evidently important that the institution is provided with an sufficient budget to maintain instruments, specialist equipment, and so on to the necessary standard to support high-quality doctoral study. The intensity of the institution's research activity is supported by several research centres into which staff and students can be integrated . The library is well stocked and students have access to a range of online resources (for example, JSTOR) and search aids. IT provision is also good.

Recommendations:

Although the library holdings are quite extensive, there is always scope for enhancement—for example, in increasing access to major international music periodicals and acquisition of notable foreign-language publications. The institution should develop a strategy to ensure the long-term maintenance and enhancement of facilities if such a strategy is not already in place.

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.

The quality of UNAGE's staff is one of its greatest strengths. Doctoral supervisors on its Visual Arts programme are figures of national and international eminence in their respective fields.

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

Five of the ten doctoral supervisors meet the necessary CNATDCU standards, as evidenced in Annex 31.

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

8 of the ten doctoral supervisors have full tenure, so this criterion is comfortably fulfilled.

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 doctoral supervisors teaching these subjects possess relevant subject-area expertise and meet the necessary standard, as evidenced by Annexes 32-34 and 45.

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%.*

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



- 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

In all cases, supervisory loads remained within prescribed limits, as evidenced in Annex 11.

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.

The Visual Arts doctoral supervisors satisfy this criterion, as evidenced in Annexes 19 and 32.

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

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

As evidenced in Annexes 32 and 58, the doctoral supervisors have developed significant international profiles through their activities as scholars who contribute to high-ranking publications and as creative artists whose work is represented in notable expositions.

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*

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.



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

All doctoral supervisors satisfy this criterion, as evidenced in Annex 31 and 32.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The quality of the doctoral education provided by UNAGE is generally of very high quality.

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

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.

Demand for places on UNAGE's Visual Arts doctoral programme is quite competitive. From the documentation provided, it is difficult to assess how many foreign students the programme attracts. It would also have been useful to get a more detailed breakdown of the institutions at which external students have previously studied.

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

Both criteria are satisfied. 0.43 of applicants have previously studied elsewhere.

Recommendations:



The indicator is fulfilled

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

All candidates admitted to the doctoral programme are of a suitable standard and are expected demonstrate the necessary skills and competencies to complete the programme successfully.

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

According to the procedures outlined in "Metodologia de admitere a Școlii doctorale Arte Vizuale", all applicants must submit appropriate supporting documentation (e.g. degree transcripts) and undergo interview (pp. 3-4). The institution's self-evaluation report did not specially reference this performance indicator or indicate relevant documentation as evidence, but it is clear that procedures are in place and are being followed consistently.

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

UNAGE's retention and completion statistics for its doctoral programmes are very good: drop-out rates for visual arts programmes are low (under 8%). See Annex 49c.

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.

A training programme is in place and students are apprised of appropriate ethical procedures.

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*

The training provided satisfies these requirements, including courses in hermeneutics, aesthetics, and pertinent research methodologies. Module proformas for some of the supporting courses taught are provided in Annexes 9 and 52.

Recommendations:

The training offered could also extend to more practical and general (rather than subject-specific) areas, both to support students in completing their PhD projects and preparing them for professional life. Possible topics could include: the theory and practice of interdisciplinary research; academic writing and writing for publication; oral presentation skills; preparation for the viva voce examination; communicating research findings to non-academic audiences; working with external organisations; training in the effective use of social media to publicise research; and so on. I would also welcome greater support for developing proficiency in foreign languages, and more formalised opportunities to undertake work placements as part of the students' training and professional development. Ideally, I would also like to see opportunities for greater interaction between visual arts PhD students and doctoral candidates in related arts and humanities fields—for example, history, cultural studies, literary studies.

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*

Students are apprised of fundamental ethical principles guiding the practice of research to ensure its integrity. A module pro forma for a course on ethics is provided in Annex 53.



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

Specific learning outcomes for the courses comprising the academic training programme are provided in the module pro formas compiled in Annex 9.

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

Students have the opportunity to avail of guidance of this nature, as evidenced by Annex 35. The records of feedback are very brief, however, so it is difficult to tell how detailed and precise the feedback might be.

Recommendations:

More detailed written records should be maintained of feedback to students—especially in cases where there are concerns about students’ academic progress. This is important to protect supervisors from vexatious complaints and other difficulties, so that they can demonstrate that they have exercised their duty of care and advised students that they are not meeting the criteria to complete the programme successfully.

The indicator is partially fulfilled

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.



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

According to the self-evaluation report, the ratio currently exceeds this figure and is 4.2:1 (see Annex 11). However, this figure turned out to be erroneous: from supplementary annex 12 (RAPORTUL STUDENȚI DOCTORANZI / ÎNDRUMĂTORI), it emerges that the correct ratio is 1.48 (40 students to 27 supervisors).

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

UNAGE's community of doctoral visual candidates is very active: the students present their work at a range of professional forums under the guidance of their doctoral supervisors. Annex 55 gives a lengthy and impressive list of conference presentations, exhibitions, and other events, including outreach and public engagement activities (e.g. radio broadcasts).

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

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

The review panel had the opportunity to consult a range of publications by UNAGE's graduates which was provided in Annex 55a. These were generally of a very competent standard and made a significant original contribution to the field of study.

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

According to the data reported in Annexes 13, 14, 19, and 59, this criterion is satisfied.

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.*

Although the self-evaluation form states that this criterion has been satisfied, no information regarding external examiners and their institutional affiliation was initially available to the panel. From supplementary annex 14 (Referenți comisii sutinere publica), it is evident that significant numbers of external specialists have been engaged to examine doctoral theses, but it would have been helpful if the data had been presented in a way that made it possible to get a convenient overview.

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

Although the self-evaluation form states that this criterion has been satisfied, no information regarding external examiners and their institutional affiliation was initially made available to the review panel. From supplementary annex 14 (Referenți comisii sutinere publica), it is evident that significant numbers of external specialists have, in fact, been engaged to examine doctoral theses, but it would have been helpful if the data had been presented in a way that made it possible to get a convenient overview.

Recommendations:

The institution should aim to increase the percentage of international specialists on PhD Committees, if possible to at least 20%.

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

Insufficient information was initially provided to make it possible to answer this question, but from Supplementary Annex 15 (Situatie TEZE sustineri 2015 – 2020), it emerges that this ratio was only exceeded in one instance.

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

The review team found that appropriate quality assurance procedures are in place.

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.

Information about the relevant procedures and policies is given in Annexes 6, 20, 22, 23, and 27. While there are clearly procedures in place, it is less clear from the documentation how internal quality assurance processes operate on a continuous basis. The review team is informed that an annual review of postgraduate research programmes does take place, but did not see any records of these reviews. It is not clear how areas for potential improvement are identified and appropriate actions to address concerns are formulated and implemented.

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

(a) *the scientific work of Doctoral advisors;*

(b) *the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity;*



- (c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized;
 - d) the scientific activity of doctoral students;
 - e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students;
 - f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students.
- description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself
 - analysis of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself

Recommendations:

UNAGE should develop internal quality assurance procedures that aim to fulfil the criteria outlined above more explicitly and consistently. Records should be kept of annual reviews of postgraduate programmes and mechanisms put in place to make sure that any actions arising are actually implemented and followed through.

The indicator is partially 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.

The self-evaluation form states that students are surveyed periodically to elicit their feedback on the programme. A student questionnaire template is provided in Annex 4. No information is provided about the data elicited through these questionnaires or the levels of satisfaction that students report. Neither is it clear how any problems reported by the students are addressed.

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

Recommendations:

The doctoral school should consider setting up a staff-student consultative forum which meets once or twice a year, to afford opportunities for informal discussion of issues arising and to elicit suggestions for training activities and research events. More detailed records should be kept of student feedback and a system put in place to address student concerns.

The indicator is partially fulfilled



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

The institution satisfactorily ensures accessibility of learning resources and makes information available in a transparent way.

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

Information is available on the institutional website for current and prospective students, and for members of the general public.

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*

Information on all of the above is available on the institutional 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.

This finding has been confirmed by the review panel.

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

As detailed above in A.2.1.1, the students have access to a range of databases and search aids through the library website.

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

All students have access to anti-plagiarism software.

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 review panel is satisfied that students have access to the necessary facilities.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion C.3. Internationalization

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



Although the institution clearly aspires to achieve a higher level of internationalisation, it is not clear from the supporting documentation whether a concrete strategy is in place with clearly identified and realistic aims.

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

Over 35% of students have undertaken Erasmus exchanges during the review period, as detailed in Annex 60. The restrictions imposed by the CV19 pandemic are noted, but the criterion is met.

Recommendations:

The institution should continue the valuable work that has been done on internationalisation to date, and ensure that a larger proportion of students can benefit from foreign placements and exchanges, as well as opportunities to participate in international research fora. The review panel recognises that financial constraints may impose limitations on what it is possible to achieve in the shorter term, but encourages the institution to think more ambitiously in its longer-term strategy. Greater support for foreign language acquisition for students should be considered to foster professional mobility

The indicator is partially 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

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

The self-evaluation report identifies one student whose supervision was shared with an external institution, but no formal long-term co-tutelle arrangements appear to be in place. (The relevance of Annex 61 was unclear.) Similarly, the report alludes to the institution's plans to invite guest specialists, but no supporting documentation is provided that evidences activity during the review period.

Recommendations:



The institution should explore the possibility of hosting visiting foreign fellows and artists-in-residence, and affording opportunities for students to avail of their expertise. This could be a valuable way of making useful foreign contacts and fostering international links. A regular guest lecture/seminar series would also be a good idea, perhaps involving collaboration with other Romanian third-level institutions. Some of these events could be held online, and could feature a mixture of Romanian and foreign participants. Funding could be sought to establish research networks with international participants.

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*

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

Again, the information provided in the supporting documentation is very sketchy, which makes it difficult to assess the extent to which this criterion is being met. The self-evaluation report alludes merely to the invitation of an Austrian specialist to act as external examiner. There is at best weak evidence of a coherent and well-considered internationalisation strategy.

Recommendations:

The review panel recognises that recruiting foreign students to doctoral programmes can be challenging, and particularly in art history/art criticism, especially if research projects require a high level of proficiency in Romanian. That said, there is still potential to be explored here—especially if supervisors are proficient in a second language. If the school has not done so, it would be worth considering whether there are specific areas of staff research expertise that might be particularly attractive to foreign students and which could be highlighted—Byzantine religious art and architecture is one area that comes to mind. Another way of recruiting foreign students would be through doctoral studentships built into collaborative external research grants with institutions abroad, for projects that allow scope for students to avail of staff supervisory expertise.

The indicator is partially fulfilled

IV. SWOT Analysis

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High-calibre staff with national/international reputations - Good reputation of the programme amongst graduates and employers - Strong applicant demand for places on the programme - Generally good facilities - Opportunities for students' professional development (exhibitions, publications, conference attendance) | <p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need for greater financial support for postgraduate research, both in terms of scholarships and in funding for student research activities (conference attendance, foreign travel) - Training offering for postgraduate students could be more diverse and practical, rather than narrowly subject-specific – helps to enhance employability, as many PhD graduates do not pursue careers in academia. - quality assurance procedures generally good and working well, but some issues need attention (especially in regard of mechanisms to capture and act on student feedback) - need to develop a more coherent internationalisation strategy |
| <p><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunities to intensify research activity and develop stronger international presence through participation in multi-institutional research projects, introducing programme of visiting fellows, scholars - Introduction of post-doctoral positions to nurture outstanding talent - Devising innovative training for postgraduate researchers, in collaboration with other visual arts institutions (perhaps as part of a consortium structure). | <p><u>Threats:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deterioration in economic situation with deleterious effects for the arts sector (potentially exacerbated by COVID19 pandemic) - reduction in state support for arts education - excessive supervisory/teaching and administrative workloads for staff - insufficient administrative support for postgraduate research |

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

| No. | Type of indicator (*, C) | Performance indicator | Judgment | Recommendations |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1 | IPC | A.1.1.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 2 | IPC | A.1.1.2 | Partially fulfilled | <i>The doctoral school should devise mechanisms to allow students to suspend their studies or for resolving difficulties that may arise between the student and their supervisory team.</i> |

| | | | | |
|----|-----|----------|---------------------|---|
| 3 | IPC | A.1.2.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 4 | IPC | A.1.2.2. | Fulfilled | |
| 5 | IPC | A 1.3.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 6 | IPC | A.1.3.2 | Fulfilled | <i>UNAGE should investigate the feasibility of providing additional PGR scholarships and support for PGR research activities and of diversifying external sources of funding.</i> |
| 7 | * | A.1.3.3 | Partially fulfilled | <i>Ideally, the range and number of activities supported could be more extensive. If possible, a higher level financial support should be provided—especially for participation in high-profile national and international events that would be of particular benefit for students’ professional development.</i> |
| 8 | IPC | A.2.1.1 | Fulfilled | <i>There is scope for enhancement of library resources—for example, in increasing access to major international music periodicals and acquisition of notable foreign-language publications</i> |
| 9 | IPC | A.3.1.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 10 | * | A.3.1.2 | Fulfilled | |
| 11 | IPC | A.3.1.3 | Fulfilled | |
| 12 | * | A.3.1.4 | fulfilled | |
| 13 | IPC | A.3.2.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 14 | * | A.3.2.2 | Fulfilled | |
| 15 | IPC | B.1.1.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 16 | * | B.1.2.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 17 | IPC | B.1.2.2 | Fulfilled | |
| 18 | IPC | B.2.1.1. | Fulfilled | <i>Introduce greater variety of training, including elements with a more practical focus. Enhance support for foreign language acquisition.</i> |
| E | IPC | B.2.1.2 | Fulfilled | |
| 20 | IPC | B.2.1.3 | Fulfilled | |
| 21 | IPC | B.2.1.4 | Partially Fulfilled | <i>Fuller records should be kept of student feedback and actions taken to address student concerns. Student feedback should be sought more extensively.</i> |
| 22 | IPC | B.2.1.5 | fulfilled | |
| 22 | IPC | B.3.1.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 23 | * | B.3.1.2 | Fulfilled | |
| 24 | * | B.3.2.1 | Fulfilled | <i>Consider engaging a higher proportion of international specialists as examiners</i> |
| 25 | * | B.3.2.2 | Fulfilled | |
| 26 | IPC | C.1.1.1 | Partially fulfilled | <i>UNAGE should develop internal quality assurance procedures that aim to fulfil ARACIS criteria more explicitly.</i> |
| 27 | IPC | C.1.1.2 | Partially fulfilled | <i>The doctoral school should consider setting up a staff-student consultative forum which meets once or twice a year, to afford opportunities for informal discussion of issues arising and to elicit suggestions for training activities and research</i> |

| | | | | |
|----|-----|---------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | | | <i>events. More detailed records should be kept of student feedback and a system put in place to address student concerns.</i> |
| 28 | IPC | C.2.1.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 29 | IPC | C.2.2.1 | Fulfilled | |
| 30 | IPC | C.2.2.2 | Fulfilled | |
| 31 | IPC | C.2.2.3 | Fulfilled | |
| 32 | * | C.3.1.1 | Partially fulfilled | <i>UNAGE should develop a more coherent internationalisation strategy and work to increase student professional mobility</i> |
| 33 | IPC | C.3.1.2 | Partially fulfilled/not fulfilled | <i>UNAGE should consider introducing schemes for international fellows/artists-in-residence, running more internationally visible guest lecture series and other events</i> |
| 34 | IPC | C.3.1.3 | partially fulfilled | <i>The doctoral school should consider applying for large collaborative research grants with foreign institutions which could include PhD studentships. It should also explore the feasibility of highlighting staff expertise and resources that may be especially attractive to foreign applicants.</i> |

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

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

VI. Conclusions and general recommendations

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

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

The visual arts doctoral programme is clearly of excellent quality and is overseen by high-calibre staff members with significant national and international reputations. There is a high concentration of research activity in the domain, both on the part of staff and students. The quality of the facilities is generally very good and they are appropriate to support the conduct of high-quality postgraduate research.

Such reservations as the review panel identified were mostly minor. On the whole, appropriate quality assurance mechanisms are in place and appear to be working well for the most part, with the exception of the few issues identified above.



As an institution, UNAGE enjoys a very good reputation nationally. Demand for places on the visual arts doctoral programme is quite competitive and it has no difficulty attracting students of suitable calibre. Students enrolled on the programme clearly value the education that they receive and drop-out rates are low. Graduates of the programme have gone on to develop significant professional profiles and make notable contributions to national artistic and intellectual life.

The visual arts section of UNAGE has considerable potential that has yet to be realised more fully. The director and staff are aware of the opportunities for development, and should be supported by the institutional management in formulating a more ambitious and concrete strategy to achieve their aims.

One area that needs particular work is the development of a more coherent internationalisation strategy. The institution should identify key areas of staff expertise that are likely to be especially attractive to international students and aim to make these more visible. It should also aim to bring into focus what is distinctive about UNAGE's programmes and highlight their unique features of strength and attractiveness. Modes of blended study (online/onsite) should be explored as a means of boosting international recruitment. Ideally, there should be a stronger presence of visiting international specialists as visiting fellows or artists in residence, and also as external examiners. Efforts should be made to increase student participation on foreign exchange programmes and placements.

There is manifestly no lack of willingness on the part of the staff to achieve these goals, but the review team recognises that financial and practical constraints may limit what can be realistically achieved in the shorter-term. This makes the development of a long-range internalisation strategy with concrete aims all the more important, and it should be developed in tandem with the institutional research strategy and plans to capture external grant income.

Consideration should also be given to diversifying and expanding financial support for doctoral studentships and increasing funding for postgraduate student research activities, as the comparatively low levels of funding available are clearly insufficient.

I would also encourage the institution to consider expanding its programme of training for postgraduate researchers, and extending the focus to include a range of practical skills that will enhance graduate employability, transferrable skills, and the development of more rounded professional competence.



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.*

(i) List of supplementary annexes provided by IOSUD-UNAGE which were not included in the original set of documentation:

| | |
|-----|--|
| S1 | Alegeri studenți |
| S2 | Contract de studii 1 |
| S3 | Contract de studii 2 |
| S4 | Contract de studii 3 |
| S5 | Date Sedințe Consiliul SDAV |
| S6 | Eval.periodica_studenti-CD-rezultate chestionare |
| S7 | Fise disciplina profesori |
| S8 | Grad de ocupare CD-DDAV |
| S9 | Plan managerial Director SDAV |
| S10 | PV-CSDA-Avizare Aree tematice-cercetare |
| S11 | PV-CSDA-Avizare Plan-stat functii |
| S12 | Raport studenti-indrumatori |
| S13 | Referate parțiale cercetare doctoranzi |
| S14 | Referenți comisii sustinere publica |
| S15 | Situatie TEZE sustineri - 2015 – 2020 |
| S16 | Studenți inmatriculati DDAV-2015-2021 |

(ii) The schedule of the evaluation visit

Programul vizitei de evaluare instituțională - IOSUD / domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat a

Universitatea Națională de Arte "George Enescu" din Iași
The timetable of the institutional evaluation visit - IOSUD / doctoral study domains at the National University of Arts "George Enescu" of Iași

Perioada de derulare a vizitei: 15.07.2021 – 19.07.2021
The evaluation period: 15.07.2021 - 19.07.2021

Evaluarea Externă Periodică a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat
Periodical External Evaluation of the doctoral study domain Visual Arts

| Intervalul orar / Hour | Activitate / Activity | Participanți / Participants | Observații/ Responsabil Comments/ Responsible |
|----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| JOI/ THURSDAY, 15.07.2021 | | | |
| 12.00-12.45 | Întâlnire preliminară online pentru pregătirea și armonizarea etapelor de evaluare, în modul mixt, la nivel de domenii de doctorat și IOSUD <i>Online preliminary meeting for the preparation and harmonization of evaluation steps, in hybrid mode, of doctoral study domains and IOSUD</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD/domenii <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - toți membrii echipei de evaluare <i>all evaluation panel members</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma ARACIS Ciscowebex/ZOOM <i>Audio-video recording /ARACIS Ciscowebex / ZOOM platform</i> |
| 13.00-13.45 | Întâlnirea online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții conducerii universității și ai CSUD <i>Online meeting with representatives of the institution and of the Council for Academic Doctoral Studies (CSUD)</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD/domenii <i>IOSUD/domains evaluation panel</i> - toți membrii echipei de evaluare <i>all evaluation panel members</i> - reprezentanți ai conducerii <i>representatives of the University's management</i> - reprezentanți ai CSUD și ai școlii/școlilor doctorale <i>representatives of the CSUD and of the Doctoral School /Schools</i> - persoana de contact IOSUD/domenii <i>the contact person for IOSUD / doctoral domains</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / ... platform</i> |
| 15:00-15:45 | Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i> Domeniu: Întâlnire online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu responsabilul domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat și cu echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă <i>Domain: Online meeting with the contact person for the</i> | Comisia de evaluare domeniu Arte vizuale <i>Domain evaluation panel Visual Arts</i> -membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori domeniu <i>members of domain evaluation panel</i> - responsabilul domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat și echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / ... platform</i> |

| Intervalul orar / Hour | Activitate / Activity | Participanți / Participants | Observații/ Responsabil Comments/ Responsible |
|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | <i>doctoral study domain under review and the team who drafted the internal evaluation report</i> | <i>The doctoral studies domain contact person and the team who drafted the internal evaluation report</i> | |
| 16:00-18:00 | Continuarea activităților de evaluare a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat și IOSUD <i>Continuation of the doctoral study domain and IOSUD evaluation activities</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - la nivel de IOSUD <i>at IOSUD level</i> - la nivel de domenii de doctorat <i>at doctoral study domain level</i> | Se lucrează separat. <i>Independent evaluation activities.</i> |
| VINERI / FRIDAY, 16.07.2021 | | | |
| 10:00-10:45 | Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i> Domeniu: Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu studenții doctoranzi. <i>Domain: Online meeting with PhD students</i> | Comisia de evaluare domeniu <i>Domain evaluation panel</i> - membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori domeniu <i>members of domain evaluation panel</i> - studenții doctoranzi <i>PhD students</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma ARACIS Ciscowebex/ZOOM <i>Audio-video recording /ARACIS Ciscowebex / ZOOM platform</i> |
| 11:00-11:45 | Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i> Domeniu: Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu reprezentanți ai absolvenților domeniului. <i>Domain: Online meeting with graduates for the respective doctoral study domain</i> | Comisia de evaluare domeniu <i>Domain evaluation panel</i> - membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori domeniu <i>members of domain evaluation panel</i> - reprezentanți ai absolvenților <i>representatives of doctoral graduates</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / platform</i> |
| 12:00-12:45 | Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i> Domeniu: Întâlnire online cu directorii/responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare aferente domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat <i>Domain: Online meeting with the Directors/ persons in charge of the research centers/laboratories within the doctoral study domain</i> | Comisia de evaluare domeniu <i>Domain evaluation panel</i> - membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori domeniu <i>members of domain evaluation panel</i> -directorii centrelor / laboratoarelor de cercetare <i>directors of research centers/laboratories</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / Platform</i> |
| 13:00-13:45 | Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i> | Comisia de evaluare domeniu <i>Domain evaluation panel</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma |

| Intervalul orar / Hour | Activitate / Activity | Participanți / Participants | Observații/ Responsabil Comments/ Responsible |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | <p><u>Domeniu:</u> Întâlnire online cu membrii Consiliului școlii /școlilor doctorale (CSD) în cadrul cărora funcționează domeniul evaluat</p> <p><i>Domain: Online meeting with Doctoral Schools Council (CSD members)</i></p> | <p>- membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori domeniu <i>members of domain evaluation panel</i></p> <p>-membrii CSD <i>CSD's members</i></p> | <p><i>Audio-video recording / ... platform</i></p> |
| 14:00-14:45 | <p>Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i></p> <p><u>Domeniu:</u> Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu reprezentanți ai angajatorilor absolvenților domeniului</p> <p><i>Domain: Online meeting with employers of Doctoral graduates in the domain</i></p> | <p>Comisia de evaluare domeniu <i>Domain evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori domeniu <i>members of domain evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- reprezentanți ai angajatorilor <i>employers' representatives</i></p> | <p>Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / ... platform</i></p> |
| 15:00-17:00 | <p>Continuarea activităților de evaluare a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat și IOSUD</p> <p><i>Continuation of the doctoral study domain and IOSUD evaluation activities</i></p> | <p>Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- la nivel de IOSUD <i>at IOSUD level</i></p> <p>- la nivel de domenii de doctorat <i>at doctoral study domain level</i></p> | <p>Se lucrează separat. <i>Independent evaluation activities.</i></p> |
| SÂMBĂȚĂ/ SATURDAY, 17.07.2021 | | | |
| 9:00-10:00 | <p>Continuarea activităților de evaluare a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat și IOSUD</p> <p><i>Continuation of the doctoral study domain and IOSUD evaluation activities</i></p> | <p>Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- la nivel de IOSUD <i>at IOSUD level</i></p> <p>- la nivel de domenii de doctorat <i>at doctoral study domain level</i></p> | <p>Se lucrează separat. <i>Independent evaluation activities.</i></p> |
| 10.00-10.45 | <p>Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i></p> <p>Întâlnire online cu membrii Comisiei pentru Evaluarea și Asigurarea Calității (CEAC) / Departamentul de asigurare a calității</p> <p><i>Online meeting with the Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC) members / Quality Assurance Department</i></p> | <p>Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i></p> <p>- toți membrii echipei de evaluare <i>all evaluation panel members</i></p> <p>- reprezentanți ai CEAC/Departament AC <i>representatives of Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC) / Quality Assurance Department</i></p> | <p>Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / ... Platform</i></p> |

| Intervalul orar / Hour | Activitate / Activity | Participanți / Participants | Observații/ Responsabil Comments/ Responsible |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 11.00-11.45 | Întâlnire online cu membrii Comisiei de Etică a universității <i>Online meeting with the members of the Ethics Commission</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD/domenii <i>IOSUD/domains evaluation panel</i> - toți membrii echipei de evaluare <i>all evaluation panel members</i> -membrii Comisiei de Etică <i>Ethics Commission members</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / Platform</i> |
| 12:00-13:00 | Continuarea activităților de evaluare a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat și IOSUD <i>Continuation of the doctoral study domain and IOSUD evaluation activities</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - la nivel de IOSUD <i>at IOSUD level</i> - la nivel de domenii de doctorat <i>at doctoral study domain level</i> | Se lucrează separat. <i>Independent evaluation activities.</i> |
| S 13:43 – D 07:14 | Deplasare spre Iași (plecare din - Sâmbătă 17.07.2021, 13:43-sosire la Iași - Duminică 18.07.2021, 07:14) | coordonatorul echipei de evaluare domeniu | |
| DUMINICĂ/SUNDAY, 18.07.2021 | | | |
| 9:00-14:00 | Reuniuni de lucru față în față, vizitarea bazei materiale didactice și de cercetare <i>Face-to-face working meetings, visiting the educational and research infrastructure</i> | - coordonatorul echipei de evaluare domeniu <i>the coordinator of the domain evaluation panel</i> - reprezentanți ai universității <i>university's representatives</i> | Vizită UNIVERSITATE <i>Site visit to the university</i> |
| 15:00-18:00 | Continuarea activităților de evaluare a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat și IOSUD <i>Continuation of the doctoral study domain and IOSUD evaluation activities</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - la nivel de IOSUD <i>at IOSUD level</i> - la nivel de domenii de doctorat <i>at doctoral study domain level</i> | Se lucrează separat. <i>Independent evaluation activities.</i> |
| LUNI/ MONDAY, 19.07.2021 | | | |
| 10:00 -10.45 | Întâlnire tehnică online, pentru identificarea aspectelor specifice care trebuie clarificate, dacă este cazul, pe parcursul vizitei la fața locului <i>Online technical meeting to identify specific issues that need to be clarified, if necessary, during the on-site visit</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - toți membrii echipei de vizită <i>all evaluation panel members</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / platform</i> |

| Intervalul orar / Hour | Activitate / Activity | Participanți / Participants | Observații/ Responsabil Comments/ Responsible |
|------------------------|---|--|--|
| 9:00/11.00 - 12:45 | Finalizarea documentelor <i>Completion of the evaluation documents</i> | Comisia de evaluare domeniu <i>Domain evaluation panel</i> - la nivel de domenii de doctorat <i>at doctoral study domain level</i> | Se lucrează separat. <i>Independent evaluation activities.</i> |
| 13:00-13:45 | Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i> Domeniu: Întâlnire online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu personalul didactic aferent domeniului evaluat. <i>Domain: Online meeting with the academic staff corresponding to the doctoral study domain</i> | Comisia de evaluare domeniu <i>Domain evaluation panel</i> -membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori domeniu <i>members of domain evaluation panel</i> -cadre didactice cu titlul de conducător de doctorat <i>Doctoral coordinators</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / platform</i> |
| 14.00-14:45 | Întâlnire online pentru concluzii <i>Online meeting for conclusions</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - toți membrii echipei de evaluare <i>all evaluation panel members</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma ARACIS Ciscowebex/ ZOOM <i>Audio-video recording /ARACIS Ciscowebex / ZOOM platform</i> |
| 15:00-15:45 | Întâlnire finală online în vederea prezentării principalelor constatări rezultate în urma evaluării IOSUD și a recomandărilor de îmbunătățire a calității <i>Meeting with representatives of the institution under review to discuss on the conclusions of the evaluation process and the main recommendations</i> | Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - toți membrii echipei de evaluare <i>all evaluation panel members</i> - reprezentanții universității <i>university's representatives</i> | Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / platform</i> |