



Annex No. 3

External Evaluation Report
Doctoral Study Domain: Music
‘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 Music 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, it was conducted partially on-site and partially online. The evaluation team was led by Professor Olguța Lupu (National University of Music), who was assisted by Professor Patrick Zuk (Durham University, UK) and Alexandru Victor Bădoi (doctoral candidate at the Universitatea Națională de Artă Teatrală și Cinematografică „I.L. Caragiale”, Bucharest).

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

A doctoral programme in Music has been offered at UNAGE since 2001 (see Annex 1). At present, ten doctoral advisors act as PhD supervisors. (Annex 4). A total of 37 doctoral candidates are currently registered on UNAGE's programmes (Annex 32).

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;

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



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

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

**general description of domain analysis.*

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 documentation provided to the review panel.

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. They 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;

The relevant regulations are in Annexes 23 and 37.

(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 methodologies in question are described in Annexes 18, 27-28, and 36.

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

These methodologies are outlined in Annexes 21 and 22.

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

The mechanism is explained in Annex 36.



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

The relevant structures are described in Annexes 38 and 39; minutes of pertinent meetings are provided in Annex 36.

f) the contract for doctoral studies;

The contract is given in Annex 39.

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 outlined in Annex 36.

- *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 documentation provided to the reviewers was comprehensive, informative, and in good order. It was generally easy to navigate and to find the information that one sought. Appropriate regulations and procedures are in place for the conduct of doctoral programmes, and are being observed.

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 mostly in accord with government stipulations, although there do not seem to be any formal mechanisms to allow students to suspend their studies or for resolving difficulties that may arise between the student 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. The review panel noted that there have been major upgrades to the institution's IT services recently.

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

A new student records system has recently been instituted, as detailed in Annex 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 41).

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.

Comprehensive details of the doctoral school's financial management are provided in Annex 42. The documentation indicates that financial resources are being deployed wisely and to optimal benefit.

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

Doctoral supervisors in the Music domain have successfully secured research funding in collaboration with UNAGE colleagues representing other domains, as detailed in the institution's self-evaluation report. Activities for the FDI 2020 project 'Art and Research: Contemporary Challenges' afforded scope for the involvement of postgraduate research students—who had opportunities to present at a conference and to contribute to a volume of conference proceedings. In 2021, UNAGE's IOSUD gained funding for an FDI 'DocArt' project, which once again involved PhD supervisors and music students.

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. Additionally, three PhD students received financial support from a cultural organisation based in Cluj-Napoca.

Recommendations:

At their meeting with the review panel on 19 July, the PhD students remarked on 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 own studies. Many students are obliged to support themselves through part-time work, and while this can provide useful professional experience, it can slow student's academic progress. 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.

The review panel noted that the students' comments were not intended to be critical of UNAGE, but simply acknowledged a situation that is also experienced by doctoral students at other Romanian institutions.

The indicator is partially 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

Evidence was provided of institutional support for a range of student activities, including publications and concert activities.

Recommendations:

Ideally, the range and number of activities supported could be more extensive—but the panel once again recognises the practical difficulties created by financial constraints. 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.

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 are available to support high-level doctoral research.

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.*

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.



- 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 7-10. 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 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. The institution also operates a respected academic publisher which issued over 150 items during the period under review, including monographs, analytical studies, and scores.

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 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 Music programmes are figures of national and international eminence in their 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

As evidenced in Annexes 5 and 6, all doctoral supervisors meet the necessary CNATDCU standards.

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

All doctoral supervisors have full tenure, as evidenced in Annexes 4 and 43.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled/partially fulfilled/not 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 possess relevant subject-area expertise and meet the necessary standard.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

In the vast majority of cases, supervisory loads remained within prescribed limits—with only rare exceptions.

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.



Recommendations:

Ensure that all supervisory loads remain within prescribed norms.

The indicator is partially fulfilled

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

The majority of doctoral supervisors meet this criterion.

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 Annex 17, over 50% of doctoral supervisors in Music have developed a significant international profile through their activities as performers or as scholars who contribute to high-ranking publications, and also through service on competition juries or as members of international scholarly bodies.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

The majority of doctoral supervisors satisfy this criterion, as evidenced in Annex 17.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The quality of the doctoral education provided by UNAGE is generally of very high quality and is valued by its students.

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 doctoral programme is quite competitive, and the institution attracts a sizeable proportion of applicants who have previously studied elsewhere.

The data presented in Annex 46 indicates that the ratios of internal and external applicants are respectively 0.8 and 0.4.

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 and the ratio between the total number of applicants and the candidates financed from the state budget comfortably exceeds the minimum (1.6).

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

As evidenced by Annexes 21, 45, and 50, the student cohort is quite diverse, in spite of the stringent admissions criteria: there is a good balance of gender, ethnicities, and ages, and a significant presence of foreign students (including from Italy and China).

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

As detailed in Annexes 21 and 22, applicants must provide writing samples and audition, if appropriate, as well as undergo interview.

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 Music programmes are very good: drop-out rates are low (roughly 5%).

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.

A training programme is in place and students are apprised of appropriate ethical procedures (vide Annexes 13 and 19).

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.

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 musical hermeneutics, aesthetics, and pertinent research methodologies (see Annex 13).

Recommendations:

The training offered could also extend to more practical and general (rather than subject-specific) topics, both to support students in completing their PhD projects and preparing them for professional life. Possible topics could include: the theory and practice of interdisciplinarity; 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 reading skills 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 contact between music 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. (See Annexes 19 and 47.)

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

Annex 19 outlines the skills and competences necessary to achieve the stipulated learning outcomes.

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 outlined in Annexes 24, 25, and 48.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

The staff student ratio is very good: in 2019-20, it was 1.8.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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.



UNAGE's community of doctoral music candidates is very active: the students present their work at a range of professional forums under the guidance of their doctoral supervisors. (See Annex 50).

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 read a range of work by UNAGE's graduates (including publications and recorded performances), which was generally of a very competent standard and made a significant original contribution to the field of study. All graduates met the required standards of the programme.

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*

Annexes 50 and 58 document a wide range of activities, including the production of scholarly publications, conference attendance, participation in master-classes, and appearances in concert in notable national and international venues.

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.

Throughout the review period, UNAGE has consistently engaged notable specialists from other institutions to act as examiners, including staff members from the National University of Music in Bucharest, the „Gheorghe Dima” Academy of Music in Cluj-Napoca; the Academy of Music, Theatre and Fine Arts in Chisinau; and a number of other institutions.

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

On the whole, the guidelines were observed and the institution ensured that the roster of examiners was sufficiently varied. The reviewers were mindful that the number of personnel available with knowledge of some specialised fields can be very small, so the departures from the regulations may have been caused by practical circumstances outside the institution's control (e.g. the availability of specialists to examine who possessed the necessary expertise).

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

This criterion was comfortably satisfied.

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.

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

There is evidence of consistent efforts to review all of the above items and to address issues arising in such a way as to reflect current understandings of best practice. (See Annex 36)

Recommendations:

UNAGE should build on this work to develop internal quality assurance procedures that aim to fulfil the criteria outlined above more explicitly. More detailed records should be maintained of annual reviews of doctoral programmes and mechanisms instituted to ensure that any issues arising are recorded and addressed.

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.*

Students are surveyed annually to elicit feedback on their experiences. The feedback is collated and analysed; suggestions for improvement are noted and acted on whenever feasible and appropriate. The level of student satisfaction is generally high. (See Annexes 33, 34, 36).



- 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.

The indicator is 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.

Extensive 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

Comprehensive 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 through the library website. (See Annexes 8 and 9.)

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 (see Annex 41).

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 (see Annex 41).

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.

The doctoral school is pursuing a consistent internationalisation strategy.

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

As evidenced in Annexes 53-56, staff and students have benefitted from Erasmus exchanges and international mobility programmes. UNAGE has established partnerships with several educational institutions abroad. There is scope for further development in this respect, however.

Recommendations:

The institution should continue the valuable work that has been done on internationalisation to date, and ensure that a larger proportion of supervisors and students can benefit from exchanges. The review panel is aware 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 in the interests of promoting 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

No co-tutelle arrangements were identified. The review panel acknowledged that these arrangements can be complex to set up and may involve a lot of extra administrative work for little tangible benefit. However, more informal kinds of institutional links could be pursued—perhaps to facilitate specific activities. A range of notable Romanian experts have been invited to contribute to seminars.

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 music institutions. Some of these events could be held online, and could feature a mixture of Romanian and foreign 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*

As noted above, the institution's staff and students engage in activities abroad to the extent that resources allow—appearing in concerts and at conferences, and publishing in noted international forums for the dissemination of musicological research.

Recommendations:

The review panel recognises that recruiting foreign students to doctoral programmes can be challenging, and particularly in musicology, especially if the project requires 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 research expertise that might be particularly attractive to foreign students and should be highlighted—Orthodox sacred music, folk music, and topics pertaining to music and ideology (e.g. musical life under Communism, Socialist Realism) could be considered. The internationalisation policy should try to bring into clearer focus what is particularly distinctive about UNAGE's music programmes and staff expertise, and should be developed in tandem with its institutional research strategy. 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 fulfilled/partially fulfilled

IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High-calibre staff with national/international reputations - Excellent reputation of the programme amongst graduates and employers - Strong applicant demand for places on the programme - Research-intensive culture - Institutional publishing house - Generally good facilities - Opportunities for students' professional development (concerts, 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
<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 music institutions 	<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

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	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	Partially fulfilled	<i>UNAGE should investigate the feasibility of providing additional PGR scholarships and support for PGR research activities.</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	Partially fulfilled	<i>Ensure that all supervisory loads remain within prescribed norms.</i>
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	Fulfilled	
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	Partially fulfilled	
25	*	B.3.2.2	Fulfilled	
26	IPC	C.1.1.1	Fulfilled	<i>UNAGE should develop internal quality assurance procedures that aim to fulfil ARACIS criteria more explicitly.</i>
27	IPC	C.1.1.2	Fulfilled	<i>UNAGE 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.</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 ambitious internationalisation strategy</i>
33	IPC	C.3.1.2	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	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 Music doctoral programmes at UNAGE are clearly of excellent quality and are overseen by specialists with significant national and international reputations. There is evidence of intensive research activity in the domain, both on the part of staff and students. The quality of the institutional 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 minor. 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. Demand for places on its Music doctoral programmes is high and it has no difficulty attracting students of very good calibre. Students enrolled on the programmes clearly value the education that they receive and drop-out rates are low. Graduates of the programmes have gone on to develop significant professional profiles and make notable contributions to national artistic and intellectual life. The review panel was particularly struck by the warmly appreciative comments of the Music graduates: they spoke very positively about their experiences and felt that they had received an excellent professional training.



The Music section of UNAGE has already shown much potential and there is ample scope for expansion of its activities. 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 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.

The review panel was struck by the energy and commitment of the Music staff, and there is manifestly no lack of willingness on their part to achieve ambitious goals. The review team recognises, however, that financial and practical constraints may limit what can be realistically achieved in the shorter-term. This makes the development of a long-range internationalisation 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.

ARACIS

ARACIS

VII. Annexes

SCHEDULE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL VISIT

ÎNTÂLNIRI PRELIMINARE / PRELIMINARY MEETING

Vizita de evaluare instituțională - IOSUD / domenii de studii universitare de doctorat a **Universității de**

*The institutional evaluation visit - IOSUD / doctoral study domains of the **University of***

Data/ora Date/hour (Bucharest time)	Activitate / Activity	Participanți / Participants	Observații/ Responsabil Observations/ Responsible
EVALUAREA STUDIILOR UNIVERSITARE DE DOCTORAT / DOCTORAL STUDIES EVALUATION			
Monday, 12th, 11.00 – 12.00 (Romanian Time)	Întâlnirea echipei de evaluare pentru discutarea principalelor aspecte metodologice legate de activitatea de evaluare a studiilor universitare de doctorat Meeting of panel members for discussing main methodological aspects related to the evaluation of doctoral studies	Toți membrii echipei de evaluare All evaluation panel members	platforma ARACIS Ciscowebex/ZOOM <i>ARACIS Ciscowebex /ZOOMplatform</i>

Vizita de evaluare instituțională - IOSUD / domenii de studii universitare de doctorat a

UNIVERSITATEA NAȚIONALĂ DE ARTE "GEORGE ENESCU" DIN IAȘI

The institutional evaluation visit - IOSUD / doctoral study domains of the

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF ARTS "GEORGE ENESCU" OF IAȘI

Programul vizitei de evaluare a domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat MUZICĂ din cadrul

Universității Naționale de Arte "George Enescu" din Iași

The timetable of doctoral study domain MUSIC at the

Evaluarea Externă Periodică a Domeniului de Doctorat MUZICĂ

Periodical External Evaluation of the Doctorate Field - MUSIC

Intervalul orar / Hour	Activitate / Activity	Participanți / Participants	Observații/ Responsabil Comments/ Responsible
Joi/ Thursday, 15.07.2021			
10.00-10.45	Întâlnire online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu responsabilul domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat și echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă	Comisia de evaluare domeniul de doctorat MUZICĂ Responsabilul domeniului de doctorat Muzică și echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă	Înregistrare audio-video platforma ZOOM <i>Audio-video recording ZOOM platform</i>
11.00 -11.45	Întâlnire online a comisiei de experți evaluatori cu cadre didactice cu titlul de conducător de doctorat	Comisia de evaluare domeniul de doctorat MUZICĂ - cadre didactice cu titlul de conducător de doctorat în domeniul MUZICĂ	Înregistrare audio-video platforma ZOOM/ <i>Audio-video recording ZOOM platform</i>
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 ZOOM <i>Audio-video recording /ARACIS 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	Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / ... platform</i>

Intervalul orar / Hour	Activitate / Activity	Participanți / Participants	Observații/ Responsabil Comments/ Responsible
		<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>	
15.00-15.45	Întâlnire cu membrii Consiliului școlii doctorale (CSD)	Comisia de evaluare domeniul de doctorat MUZICĂ - membrii CSD	Înregistrare audio-video platforma ZOOM <i>Audio-video recording ZOOM platform</i>
Vineri / Friday, 16.07.2021			
11:00-11:45	Întâlnire online a comisiei de evaluare cu reprezentanți ai angajatorilor	Comisia de evaluare domeniul de doctorat MUZICĂ - reprezentanți ai angajatorilor	Înregistrare audio-video platforma ZOOM <i>Audio-video recording ZOOM platform</i>
17:00-17:45	Întâlnire online cu directorul centrului de cercetare	Comisia de evaluare domeniul de doctorat MUZICĂ directorul centrului de cercetare	Înregistrare audio-video platforma ZOOM / <i>Audio-video recording ZOOM platform</i>
Sâmbătă/ Saturday, 17.07.2021			
8.30 – 9.30	Continuarea activităților de evaluare a domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat <i>Continuation of the doctoral study domain</i>	Comisia de evaluare DD Muzică <i>Music DD evaluation panel</i> - la nivel de domenii de doctorat <i>at doctoral study domain level</i>	Se lucrează separat. <i>Independent evaluation activities.</i>
10.00-10.45	Activități de evaluare <i>Evaluation activities</i> Întâlnire online cu membrii Comisiei pentru Evaluarea și Asigurarea Calității (CEAC) / Departamentul de asigurare a calității <i>Online meeting with the Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC) members / Quality Assurance Department</i>	Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - toți membrii echipei de evaluare <i>all evaluation panel members</i> - reprezentanți ai CEAC/ Departament AC <i>representatives of Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC) / Quality Assurance Department</i>	Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / platform</i>
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>	Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma <i>Audio-video recording / platform</i>

Intervalul orar / Hour	Activitate / Activity	Participanți / Participants	Observații/ Responsabil Comments/ Responsible
		-membrii Comisiei de Etică <i>Ethics Commission members</i>	
Duminică/ Sunday, 18.07.2021			
13:00-18:00	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>	Comisia de evaluare domeniul de doctorat MUZICĂ Responsabilul domeniului de doctorat Muzică și echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă	Vizită UNIVERSITATE <i>Site visit to the university</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>
11:00 -11.45	Întâlnire online cu studenții doctoranzi din domeniul Muzică	Comisia de evaluare domeniul de doctorat MUZICĂ - studenți doctoranzi din domeniul Muzică	Înregistrare audio-video platforma ZOOM / <i>Audio-video recording ZOOM platform</i>
12:00 -12.45	Întâlnire online cu Reprezentanți ai absolvenților din domeniul de doctorat Muzică	Comisia de evaluare domeniul de doctorat MUZICĂ - Reprezentanți ai absolvenților din domeniul de doctorat Muzică	Înregistrare audio-video platforma ZOOM <i>Audio-video recording ZOOM 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	Comisia de evaluare IOSUD <i>IOSUD evaluation panel</i> - toți membrii echipei de evaluare <i>all evaluation panel members</i>	Înregistrare audio-video/ platforma

Intervalul orar / <i>Hour</i>	Activitate / <i>Activity</i>	Participanți / <i>Participants</i>	Observații/ Responsabil <i>Comments/ Responsible</i>
	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>	- reprezentanții universității <i>university's representatives</i>	<i>Audio-video recording / platform</i>