

The External Evaluation Report of a Doctoral Study Domain

This report was established on the basis of the self assesment report and on line meetings with different representatives: University officials, students, Alumni, doctoral advsiors, heads of research facilities, external, partners....

For clarity, my comments, conslusions and recommandations are all written in blue.

Prof. Ahcène BOUMENDJEL

Pharmacy School

Université Grenoble Alpes

Grenoble, France

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.).

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.

III. Analysis of ARACIS's performance indicators

Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*



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

- (a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;*
- (b) the Methodology for conducting elections for the position of director of the Council of doctoral school (CSD), as well as elections by the students of their representative in CSD and the evidence of their conduct;*
- (c) the Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies (for the admission of doctoral students, for the completion of doctoral studies);*
- (d) the existence of mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral advisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad;*
- (e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), giving as well proof of the regularity of meetings;*
- (f) the contract for doctoral studies;*
- (g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies.*

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

The regulation for the Doctoral School. The doctoral school applies the Regulation established for the organisation and running of doctoral education within the IODE – UMPH Iasi.

Methodology in conducting the elections for the position of Director of the Doctoral School Council. The doctoral school was elected in 2016 according to the regulations indicated in the code of doctoral education.

The organization and running of the doctorate admission. The organization and running of the admission examination to the PhD studies is annually drawn-up by the doctoral school board according to precise information reported on the web site of the University/doctoral school.

The existence of mechanisms for recognizing the status of a doctoral advisor. The accreditation of the status of doctoral advisor (PhD leader) is awarded upon completion of habilitation to supervise research. The conditions required for either internal or external candidates are given on the web site of the doctoral school.

Functional management structures. This is represented by the doctoral school board. Weekly meetings are held to discuss issues related to the structure.

The contract for doctoral studies. The contractual relationship between the doctoral school, the PhD advisor and PhD student are regulated by the doctoral agreement. The doctoral agreement is structured in 9 sections related to the main issues, such as: partners, term of the agreement, obligations of the parties, grant, termination of the agreement, litigations.

Internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals. The analysis aimed to ensure that the educational process is optimized according to the state of the art in the field of pharmaceutical sciences. The program is revised annually by the Doctoral School Board. The module coordinators as well as the feedback from students following a satisfaction survey are taken into account for the analysis purpose.

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

The facts highlighted above are coherent and convincing. They ensure a good course of doctoral studies and they are conducted in line with the regulation for the organization and running of doctoral education within IODE – UMPH Iasi.

Recommendations:



The indicator is fulfilled

Performance Indicator A.1.1.2. *The doctoral school' Regulation includes mandatory criteria, procedures and standards binding on the aspects specified in Article 17, paragraph (5) of the Government Decision No. 681/2011 on the approval of the Code of Doctoral Studies with subsequent amendments and additions.*

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

The doctoral school regulations includes: the acceptance procedures of new members as PhD leaders (doctoral supervisors); procedures of changing the PhD supervisor supervisors; conditions for interruption of a PhD program; scientific ethics, access to electronic resources; attendance obligations doctoral student.

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

The facts are in line with established standards. PhD students were questioned during the visit and the feedback was very positive.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

There are two softwares that are used, namely: RStudent and RState. The RStudent software allows the management of information related to doctoral students and their academic organization. The RState is used to obtain the organization chart from the doctoral school. It includes PhD supervisors and academic staff.

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

The management related to the track of doctoral students and their academic background are secured.

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

The plagiarism is detected by using a software named antiplagiat.ro. This software is purchased, validated and used by the University. A similarity report is generated by the software and the report is interpreted by the PhD supervisor before approval by the Doctoral School Board.



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

The plagiarism is taken seriously by the doctoral school board. Evidence of the use of the software is provided, however, I'm not able to give an opinion since the information is given in Romanian. The use of the entitled to detect plagiarism is confirmed by students during the discussion with them.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

During the evaluated period (2015 - 2020), there were 15 projects (7 research projects and 8 related to education) were awarded to doctoral advisors of the doctoral school in the frame of national and international calls. The work of doctoral students is encouraged to be part of the application to research calls.

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

The record of the financed projects is quite good. Unfortunately, such as the amounts of the projects, the winners and other details about the research projects were not accessible. The annex related to this point can't be opened.

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

According to the statistics of one year ago (october 2020), the ratio of PhD students who benefited or benefit from additional funding is around 39%. This percentage is based on 31 PhD students.

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



The indicated percentage is almost two fold higher than the predicted 20%, which is a very good performance.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.

Performance Indicator *A.1.3.3.² *At least 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants obtained by the university through institutional contracts and of tuition fees collected from the doctoral students enrolled in the paid tuition system is used to reimburse professional training expenses of doctoral students (attending conferences, summer schools, training, programs abroad, publication of specialty papers or other specific forms of dissemination etc.).*

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

The amount dedicated to training expenses is around 3.400 lei, which represents over 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants.

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

The required percentage (10%) is met. This percentage can be increased, because it is not clear what over 10% means.

Recommendations:

The indicator is 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.

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

According to the written report (no on site visit for the interational evaluator), PhD students are offered high quality services, in line with the european standards. This include teaching spaces updated to European standards; center for advanced experimental medicine research. PhD students have free and unlimited access to the whole research infrastructure in the university, to laboratories, clinics, and

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.



research centers. This also include the facilities offered by the university library and its number of publications and books (either in printed or in electronic form) and databases.

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

The analysis of these indicators is difficult without visiting the research facilities. The information provided in the self assessment report might indicate excellent work conditions.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled (judgement based solely on the self assessment report)

Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

At the end of the evaluated period (2016 - 2020), there were 10 PhD supervisors (7 obtained the habilitation in the last five years) at the pharmacy doctoral school. Conditions required for the obtaining of the habilitation are met in 2020 by all 10 PhD supervisors (100%).

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

The doctoral school is in full agreement with what is requested for this performance indicator.

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

100% of doctoral advisors have a full-time employment.

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

Excellent performance.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled



Performance Indicator A.3.1.3. *The study subjects in the education program based on advanced higher education studies pertaining to the doctoral domain are taught by teaching staff or researchers who are doctoral thesis advisors / certified doctoral thesis advisors, professors / CS I or lecturer / CS II, with proved expertise in the field of the study subjects they teach, or other specialists in the field who meet the standards established by the institution in relation with the aforementioned teaching and research functions, as provided by the law.*

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

According to the analysis for the academic year 2019 - 2020, there were 28 teachers (26 Professors or Associate Professors, 2 others). The two teachers (namely others) who are not doctoral thesis advisors comply with the requirements applied by the doctoral school and they teach within some subjects.

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

Almost the entire educational program related to the doctoral domains are taught by professors working at the faculty of pharmacy.

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

At the pharmacy doctoral school, the 10 PhD supervisors (as of October 2020) were supervising no more than 8 PhD students.

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

The performance is good and it is in line with the rule in force.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

*general description of the standard analysis.

Performance Indicator A.3.2.1. *At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in the evaluated domain have at least 5 Web of Science- or ERIH-indexed publications in magazines of impact, or other achievements of relevant significance for that domain, including international-level contributions that indicate progress in scientific research - development - innovation for the evaluated domain. The*

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.



mentioned 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

At the doctoral school of pharmacy (91%) of doctoral advisors (10 out of 11) have at least 5 publications indexed in Web of Science. Some of the publications are of high standard. Some of the doctoral advisors have international visibility.

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

The international visibility seems to be limited.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled

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

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

At the pharmacy domain of the doctoral school, all PhD supervisors (10 of them) have obtained at least 25% of the score necessary for CNATDCU minimal standards.

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

Excellent performance

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*



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

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

For the evaluation period, the average of number of applicants/number of financed positions was : 26/22, corresponding to a ratio of 1.2.

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

By comparison to the national average for the evaluated period, it is deduced that the performance of the doctoral school is correct.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

The admission and selection of new PhD students are based on a series of criteria: the scientific project proposed by the doctoral advisor, the academic records of the candidate, interview, oral presentation of the project to which the candidate is applying. These procedures are performed under the guidance of the the doctoral school board.

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

The facts are in agreement with standard evaluation and selection criteria. Maybe, the english level of the student should be considered as one of the criteria.

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

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.



During the last five years, there was no drop-out within the Pharmacy doctoral school.

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

The drop-out rate is null.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

The advanced higher education training program includes 10 compulsory modules. Five of them are focused on biomedical, pharmaceutical, clinical and fundamental research methodologies. The statistical processing of data related to pharmaceutical and biomedical research is fully integrated in the program.

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

The facts provided by the doctoral school comply with what it is demanded for the performance indicator.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

A module entitled: Academic ethics and integrity (formerly entitled: Basic principles in the ethics of biomedical and pharmaceutical research) is proposed as part of the 10 modules/compulsory subject's assembly.

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

The doctoral school fulfils its mission in integratiogn ethics and intellectual property in its curricula.

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

Annually, the doctoral school board check whether the training program in the field of pharmacy covers the learning outcomes. All elements surrounding the program and its outcomes are documented over the web site. This includes, the general objectives and aims of the program, number of hours and credits, methods of evaluation, competences and the expected learning outcomes after graduation. The program is adapted annually following the students feedbacks. The main aim behind the continuously updating the curriculum is to provide the student: the knowledge at advanced level in the field of pharmaceutical science and; the professional integrity, autonomy, innovation and creative thinking.

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

The facts taken by the doctoral school seems convincing. They are in line with what is expected from a performant doctoral school.

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

A guidance committee is organized twice a year for PhD students. The committee follows the progress of the research project and detect any anomalies regarding the project and the existence of any conflict between the student and the doctoral advisor.

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

This fact is fulfilled. The aim and objective of the guidance committees are well documented to the student.

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

Regarding the pharmacy doctoral school, the ratio between the number of PhD students and the number of teachers/ researchers ensuring the doctoral guidance is 0.70:1

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

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



The supervision rate falls within the required one.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

A the pharmacy doctoral school, the requirement is two articles minimum for each PhD student in order to defend the PhD thesis. For the evaluated period (5 years), 15 students were defended their theses and 47 articles among which, 32 were indexed in ISI and 15 in BDI.

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

Considering the 32 articles indexed in ISI, the average is 2.13 articles/student.

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

Over the evaluated period and for the 15 theses defended, 28 communications (oral and posters) were delivered by students. Hence the ratio: number of communications/student is 1.86.

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

The ratio is within the recommended criteria.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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



**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

For the period 2016-2020, each invited referee had maximum 2 participations as a jury member of PhDs supervised by the same doctoral advisor.

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

The doctoral school complies with the rule in force.

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

At the pharmacy doctoral school and based on the defended PhD theses (15 theses) in the last five years (2016 - 2020), the rate between the number of PhD theses assigned to a referee from a different IODE and the number of defended PhD is ranked between 0.06 and 0.20.

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

The competence of the Jury of public defense of PhD theses is following the recommended criteria.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*



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

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

At the doctoral school of pharmacy, the process of evaluation and internal quality assurance is managed by the Academic Quality Assurance and Assessment Committee (AQAAC) based on implementing performance indicators. An annual report dealing with the internal self-evaluation process and results is delivered by AQAAC. The annual report is established based on the analysis of the following elements: the content of the advanced higher education training program; scientific activity of the doctoral advisors; the research facilities offered to PhD students; the organization of the PhD studies; the management at the doctoral school. The annual analysis contains measurable performance indicators.

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

The continuous development of the evaluation process is conducted according to established rules where the student interest is put forward. During the meeting of the evaluation panel members with PhD students affiliated to the pharmacy doctoral school, students were questioned about their knowledge of the evaluation process and its inputs. The feedback was yes and was very positive.

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

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

According to the self-evaluation document, the doctoral school implements feedback mechanisms toward PhD students. The mechanism includes mainly the student satisfaction survey regarding the training program. The Academic Quality Assurance and Assessment Committee gather and analyze the survey feedback and materialize it as a report. Based on this report, the Doctoral School conduct specific actions to improve the specific activities.

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

The implemented survey mechanism is coherent and deserves the student interest.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled



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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

- (a) the Doctoral School regulation;*
- (b) the admission regulation;*
- (c) the doctoral studies contract;*
- (d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;*
- (e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies;*
- (f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data;*
- (g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor);*
- (h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis;*
- (i) links to the doctoral theses' summaries to be publicly presented and the date, time, place where they will be presented; this information will be communicated at least twenty days before the presentation.*
 - description of the facts, the findings from the assessed institution's documents and the evaluation visit itself*

The required information is provided at the University website. A specific section of the website is dedicated to the doctoral school where information is given to PhD students for the entire PhD period (from registration until defense). However, the english version of the website looks poor and I'm not sure if non Romanian students can have the desired information.

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

A clear and informative website in english would be beneficial for visibility and attractivity.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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



Online sources are available to PhD students. It includes databases, electronic books, journals from major publishers specialized in pharmaceutical and biomedical sciences. The online access to the facilities is also possible from home.

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

The facts and findings are within the international standards.

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

A software, available at the University is used for plagiarism checking. A similarity coefficient is generated by the software and allows the doctoral advisor as well as the doctoral school to act.

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

The doctoral school take serious measures to detect and stop plagiarism. Students were questioned about this issue during the evaluation and they were aware about the existence of antiplagiarism checking.

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

Based on the self assessment report and discussions with students during the evaluation, no issue was revealed. Students are quite satisfied with the research facilities offered to them. Students do not face any administrative hurdles in accessing research equipments.

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

Very positive opinion.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion C.3. Internationalization

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

Performance Indicator *C.3.1.1. *IOSUD, for every evaluated domain, has concluded mobility agreements with universities abroad, with research institutes, with companies working in the field of study, aimed at the mobility of doctoral students and academic staff (e.g., ERASMUS agreements for the*



doctoral studies). At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences. IOSUD drafts and applies policies and measures aiming at increasing the number of doctoral students participating at mobility periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.

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

In the field of Pharmacy, 6 members went for Erasmus mobility (3 PhD students and 3 doctoral advisors). 9 of 15 students among those who completed their PhD theses conducted internships or went for international scientific conferences (17 presentations were made).

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

The performance indicator is within the demanded criteria.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

Two PhD theses are being jointly conducted through cotutelle agreements with two European universities. During the evaluation period, the doctoral school has invited 15 lectures to deliver courses and seminars.

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

The performance is good but can be improved. The cotutelle should mean also, hosting students from other Universities.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled

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

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

The doctoral school has presented the organisation of its PhD thesis in the ORPHEUS conference (the Organisation for PhD Education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in the European System). Moreover, the Doctoral School is involved in a program supported by the Agence Universitaire de la Francophonie (AUF), dedicated to the "Eugen Ionescu" scholarships.

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



The doctoral has taken concrete action to promote the international exchange at the doctoral level but can do more.

Recommendations:

The indicator is partially fulfilled

IV. SWOT Analysis

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

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	PI	<p>A.1.1.1. The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the Doctoral School of the respective university doctoral study domain:</p> <p>a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;</p> <p>b) the Methodology for conducting elections for the position of director of the Council of doctoral school (CSD), as well as elections by the students of their representative in CSD and the evidence of their conduct;</p> <p>c) the Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies (for the</p>	Fulfilled	For the continuous improvement of the program, the doctoral school can be inspired from other national and abroad programs conducted at pharmacy schools

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		admission of doctoral students, for the completion of doctoral studies); d) the existence of mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral advisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad; e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), giving as well proof of the regularity of meetings; f) the contract for doctoral studies; g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies.		
2.	PI	A.1.1.2. The doctoral school' Regulation includes mandatory criteria, procedures and standards binding on the aspects specified in Article 17, paragraph (5) of the Government Decision No. 681/2011 on the approval of the Code of Doctoral Studies with subsequent amendments and additions.	Fulfilled	The conditions for interruption of a PhD program should be detailed as large as possible and should be communicated to the student upon registration.
3.	PI	A.1.2.1. The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background.	Fulfilled	The means used are effective. No special recommendation
4.	PI	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.	Fulfilled	No special recommendation. The used software is validated by the official authorities, then it should be reliable.
5.	IP	A.1.3.1. Existence of at least one research or institutional / human resources development grant under implementation at the time of submission of the internal evaluation file, per doctoral study domain under evaluation, or existence of at least 2 research or institutional development / human resources grant for the doctoral study domain, obtained by doctoral thesis advisors operating in the evaluated domain within the past 5 years. The grants address relevant themes for the respective domain and, as a rule, are engaging doctoral students.	Fulfilled	Owing to the obtained results. The doctoral school is encouraged to continue on this pace.
6.	PI *	A.1.3.2. The percentage of doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation, who for at	Fulfilled	The doctoral school is encouraged to continue on this pace.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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%.		
7.	PI *	A.1.3.3. At least 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants obtained by the university through institutional contracts and of tuition fees collected from the doctoral students enrolled in the paid tuition system is used to reimburse professional training expenses of doctoral students (attending conferences, summer schools, training, programs abroad, publication of specialty papers or other specific forms of dissemination etc.).	Fulfilled	Although, the required % is met. This one can be increased through adopting a proactive approach.
8.	CPI	A.2.1.1. The venues and the material equipment available to the doctoral school enable the research activities in the evaluated domain to be carried out, in line with the assumed mission and objectives (computers, specific software, equipment, laboratory equipment, library, access to international databases etc.). The research infrastructure and the provision of research services are presented to the public through a specific platform. The research infrastructure described above, which was purchased and developed within the past 5 years will be presented distinctly	Fulfilled	No recommendation, since, I did not take part of the on site visit. However, based on the self assesmnet document, students are offered high standard facilities.
9.	CPI	A.3.1.1. Minimum three doctoral thesis advisors within that doctoral domain, and at least 50% of them (but no less than three) meet the minimum standards of the National Council for Attestation of University Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (CNATDCU) in force at the time when the evaluation is carried out, which standards are required and mandatory for obtaining the enabling certification.	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The doctoral school fulfill its missions
10.	PI *	A.3.1.2. At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.	Fulfilled	Excellent performance. Continue on this pace.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
11.	PI	<p>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.</p>	Fulfilled	No special recommendation since the performance is excellent.
12.	PI *	<p>A.3.1.4. The percentage of doctoral thesis advisors who concomitantly coordinate more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12, who are themselves studying in doctoral programs does not exceed 20%.</p>	Fulfilled	The doctoral school is respecting the rule in force.
13.	CPI	<p>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.</p>	Partially fulfilled	<p>The doctoral advisors should make more efforts in reaching more prestigious journals and attempt to privilege quality over quantity. This goal can be reached through developing collaborations with national and international partners.</p> <p>The doctoral advisors should be proactive by participating in international events (but this depends on the allocated budget)</p> <p>Reaching boards of international publications can be achieved by accepting to lead special issues in journals covering the disciplines of the doctoral advisor.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
14.	PI *	A.3.2.2. At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in a specific doctoral study domain continue to be active in their scientific field, and acquire at least 25% of the score requested by the minimal CNATDCU standards in force at the time of the evaluation, which are required and mandatory for acquiring their enabling certificate, based on their scientific results within the past five years	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The doctoral school fulfills the rule in force.
15.	PI *	B.1.1.1. The ratio between the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions, national or foreign, who have enrolled for the doctoral admission contest within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget, put out through contest within the doctoral domain is at least 0.2 or the ratio between the number of candidates within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget put out through contest within the doctoral studies domain is at least 1,2.	Fulfilled	The actual ratio of number of candidates/number of seats funded is 1.2. This ratio is the minimum and must be increased. This can be achieved through promoting the doctoral programs and the research facilities offered for doctoral students.
16.	PI *	B.1.2.1. Admission to doctoral study programs is based on selection criteria including: previous academic, research and professional performance, their interest for scientific or arts/sports research, publications in the domain and a proposal for a research subject. Interviewing the candidate is compulsory, as part of the admission procedure.	Fulfilled	A high English level should be one of the criteria.
17.	PI	B.1.2.2. The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral students 3, respectively 4, years after admission does not exceed 30%.	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The performance of the evaluated period is excellent.
18.	PI	B.2.1.1. The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant to the scientific research training of doctoral students; at least one of these disciplines is intended to study in-depth the research methodology and/or the statistical data processing.	Fulfilled	No particular recommendation. It is difficult for an international evaluator to make recommendation without having deep knowledge of the training program.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
19.	PI	B.2.1.2. At least one discipline is dedicated to Ethics and Intellectual Property in scientific research or there are well-defined topics on these subjects within a discipline taught in the doctoral program.	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The ethics aspects are taken into account and well integrated in the program.
20.	PI	B.2.1.3. The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities.	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The student feedback (during the evaluation) was extremely positive.
21.	PI	B.2.1.4. All along the duration of the doctoral training, doctoral students in the domain receive counselling/guidance from functional guidance commissions, which is reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting.	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The student feedback received during the evaluation was very positive.
22.	CPI	B.2.1.5. For a doctoral study domain, the ratio between the number of doctoral students and the number of teaching staff/researchers providing doctoral guidance must not exceed 3:1.	Fulfilled	No recommendation. The ratio is far below the maximum requested ratio, which is an excellent performance.
23.	CPI	B.3.1.1. For the evaluated domain, the evaluation commission will be provided with at least one paper or some other relevant contribution per doctoral student who has obtained a doctor's title within the past 5 years. From this list, the members of the evaluation commission shall randomly select 5 such papers / relevant contributions per doctoral study domain for review. At least 3 selected papers must contain significant original contributions in the respective domain	Fulfilled	Although the performance is very good within the evaluated period, it is recommended to push as much as possible for publication in recognized journals and avoid predatory ones.
24.	PI *	B.3.1.2. The ratio between the number of presentations of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years), including posters, exhibitions made at prestigious international events (organized in the country	Fulfilled	Despite the good performance, students should be encouraged to participate in international events through presentations (in english).

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.		
25.	PI *	B.3.2.1. The number of doctoral theses allocated to one specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the evaluated IOSUD should not exceed two (2) in a year for the theses coordinated by the same doctoral thesis advisor.	Fulfilled	The doctoral school complies with the rule in force. Therefore, no recommendation.
26.	PI *	B.3.2.2. The ratio between the doctoral theses allocated to one scientific specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the institution where the defense on the doctoral thesis is organized, and the number of doctoral theses presented in the same doctoral study domain in the doctoral school should not exceed 0.3, considering the 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.	Fulfilled	The performance is good and the doctoral school complies with the rule in force. Therefore, no recommendation
27.	PI	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.	Fulfilled	It would be interesting to have some external (from outside the University) members taking part of the Academic Quality Assurance and Assessment Committee
28.	PI *	C.1.1.2. Mechanisms are implemented during the stage of the doctoral study program to enable feedback from doctoral	Fulfilled	No further recommended actions.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.		
29.	CPI	<p>C.2.1.1. The IOSUD publishes on the website of the organizing institution, in compliance with the general regulations on data protection, information such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the Doctoral School regulation; b) the admission regulation; c) the doctoral studies contract; d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis; e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies; f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data; g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor); h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis; i) links to the doctoral theses' summaries to be publicly presented and the date, time, place where they will be presented; this information will be communicated at least twenty days before the presentation. 	Partially fulfilled	It is highly recommended that the key information should be given in english in addition to Romanian. An informative website for a broad populations of students is crucial for visibility and attractiveness.
30.	PI	C.2.2.1. All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of their thesis.	Fulfilled	The facilities offered to students are of high standard. Therefore, no recommendation regarding this point.
31.	PI	C.2.2.2. Each doctoral student shall have access, upon request, to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works.	Fulfilled	An official and validated software for plagiarism detection is available. Therefore, no further recommendation.
32.	PI	C.2.2.3. All doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the specific	Fulfilled	No recommendation. Students were very positive about the facilities offered to them.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		domain/domains within the Doctoral School, according to internal order procedures.		
33.	PI *	C.3.1.1. IOSUD, for every evaluated domain, has concluded mobility agreements with universities abroad, with research institutes, with companies working in the field of study, aimed at the mobility of doctoral students and academic staff (e.g., ERASMUS agreements for the doctoral studies). At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences. IOSUD drafts and applies policies and measures aiming at increasing the number of doctoral students participating at mobility periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.	Fulfilled	The doctoral school should communicate more about the international mobility and the existence of outgoing mobility opportunities and the available grants. During the recruitment process, students should already be informed about the mobility opportunities.
34.	PI	C.3.1.2. In the evaluated doctoral study domain, support is granted, including financial support, to the organization of doctoral studies in international co-tutelage or invitation of leading experts to deliver courses/lectures for doctoral students.	Partially fulfilled	More efforts can be made in order to improve the cotutelle theses by sending and hosting students. Doctoral advisors should be proactive regarding this point. The European EIT program dedicated to PhD mobility could be an opportunity to take.
35.	PI	C.3.1.3. The internationalization of activities carried out during the doctoral studies is supported by IOSUD through concrete measures (e.g., by participating in educational fairs to attract international doctoral students; by including international experts in guidance committees or doctoral committees etc.).	Partially fulfilled	In addition to the taken actions, the doctoral school can communicate through the romanian embassies about the organisation of its PhD program.

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).

Conclusions:

The evaluation (on line) of the pharmacy doctoral school allowed to assess its performance. The discussions with students, doctoral advisors, heads of research facilities, directors of doctoral schools, partners working in the private sector were very interesting and allowed to clarify some points that were not clear in the internal assessment report.

Taken all together, the school has fulfilled major performance indicators. The school reaches all criteria as established by the University. The two points where the school should be vigilant is its visibility and attractiveness.

General Recommendations:

- Owing to the quality of research activities conducted at the Pharmacy school and the existence of an interesting ecosystem around it are opportunities to take in order to enhance the quality of scientific production of PhD students.
- Avoid as much as possible to publish in obscure and predatory journals
- Develop more international collaborations within European countries and abroad. Push as much as possible students for cotutelle and double diploma theses. The teaching staff can be proactive in participating in European programmes.
- All means should be employed to improve the attractiveness of the doctoral school among international students.

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.*