

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.).

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);
- 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;

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



- 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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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.

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: Details of every aspect are given except for point e), as regards proof of the regularity of the meetings. In this regard, this point of the indicator is described as subject to the doctoral school director ('The Council of the "Alexandru Piru" Doctoral School holds meetings whenever necessary when convened by the doctoral school Director'). Not that this is necessarily wrong in any way, but it does not evidence regularity or periodicity, as requested in point e). As the school director is in the best position to be aware of the need for calling a meeting, the indicator is described as fulfilled.

Recommendations: Additionally to the school director's criterion, a regularity or periodicity (e.g. X meetings per semester) can be implemented, if only to meet this point's requirement. If the meeting's agenda does not involve any decision-making, it may be announced so and then replaced by online document sharing, but again within a certain periodicity.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: (Subject to my failure understanding Romanian), details of the two major points of this indicator are given in Annex 17 d and Annex 18 d (same document?), and in the directives of the *Reglamentul Institutional* [...].

Recommendations: N/A

The indicator is fulfilled.



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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: (Subject to my failure understanding Romanian), this performance indicator is attested to be fulfilled by way of Annex 6 IOSUD, here taken to be a sample of the records kept for every student (while this document apparently refers to a student's records, it is assumed the same is issued for every student).

Recommendations: Annex 7 IOSUD, apparently a manual for antiplagiarism software, could have been replaced/supplemented by the antiplagiarism record (i.e. attestation of a clean record) for the same student referred to in Annex 6 IOSUD, or for any other student, if this point is viewed to encompass such information as a student's 'academic background'. It seems this annex is more relevant in the next point.

Similarly, annexes with 'annual or current statistical data on doctoral students of IOSUD' and of 'the doctoral students' academic performance in the Student Register and generates tables with graduates', as referred to in this section, would have evidenced this point further.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The process is evidenced with all relevant documents, including examples of procedures for a specific student (Annex 8 IOSUD).

Recommendations: It would be relevant to specify the period allowed for a student to revise their submission, whenever revision is due based on the results returned by the antiplagiarism system.

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.

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: Attestation is evidenced in Figure 5 by a number of grants meeting the requirements of the performance indicator. The number of grants exceeds by far the minimum requirements set for the indicator, both as project members (36) and as project leaders (13).

Recommendations: Provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, specifically by prospective design of research projects eligible within the relevant grant calls and strengthening of research avenues that have led to fulfilment of the indicator in this call of the evaluation process.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: A research programme is briefly described, only to find some students are not eligible as a result of belonging in the domain *Philology*, here described as '*not part of the "smart" fields*'. It is assumed that this reference alludes to the division between experimental and/or applied sciences versus humanities (rather than between basic versus applied research, insofar experimental research includes basic research too, and vice versa, i.e. research in the humanities can cover applied research too).

Recommendations: Unless the Humanities are explicitly excluded by the terms of specific research project calls, an appeal to interdisciplinary research and to applied research is in order here, to encourage research projects in the Humanities to team up with Computing and with Social Sciences.

A fine example for the former was presented during the online meeting with employers of Doctoral graduates (13:45 to 14:45, Tuesday 06/07/21), where research is funded within the context of library and museum activity. Admittedly, this niche has limitations, and a deeper knowledge of the funding availability in a field like Philology (insofar as this is explicitly mentioned in the self-evaluation report) is needed to see viable research project designs within the national context.

As an example of publicly funded research in the Humanities involving a field that is not typically within the so-called Applied Sciences, a project may be considered to develop tourism infrastructure where the humanities would be in charge of highlighting and presenting materials at historical landmarks, sites, with cultural references (classical, mediaeval, etc.).

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The evidence supplied does not specify actual figures, aside from Annex 19 D.FIL (even in this annex, it cannot be seen whether the necessary 10% of the amount of doctoral grants went to the purpose set by this indicator).

Recommendations: Actual amounts could have been cited in the self-evaluation report (with apologies if such figures are given in any other annex, in this section or not).

Otherwise, two types of actions are cited: conferences and proceeding publications. This report encourages to undertake other actions both for the sake of variety and also to bring more diverse benefits and extend them to participants who, for one or the other reason, may/will not have (had) the chance to take part in conference and their ensuing publications. Specifically, training and mobility are advised, as the needs for equipment are described to have been met (note that the link regarding this point - https://litere.ucv.ro/litere/sites/default/files/litere/Invatamant/Doctorat/infrastructura_didactica_si_de_cercetare_0.pdf - is more about equipment than about actual research training actions). The funding may go to spread the equipment cited in the link towards software purchase and upgrade/update, e.g. for database-based research in the humanities.

The indicator is partially unfulfilled.

Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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*

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.



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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The self-evaluation report focuses on facilities and hardware equipment rather than on software. While the former are indeed necessary, the latter is not detailed.

Recommendations: Software training is a major field for potential research projection, as it may help develop applied research e.g. in the form of corpora, both general and specific.

Online meetings have evidenced the existence of specific corpora, but this may be extended further, both for proper exploitation of available corpora and for compilation of new ones (e.g. corpora of classical languages involving Romanian culture authors/elements/..., learner corpora both of English as a foreign language or of Romanian as a foreign language; these are only examples all other philological specialties may also benefit from).

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report shows that the degree of accomplishment of this indicator exceeds substantially the criteria set. This is with regard both to the required figures (note that the introduction to number of doctoral supervisors in the field Philology immediately before Table 10 is cited as '9' when in fact it seems to be 12), and also with regard to the degree to which they meet the standards required.

Recommendations: Provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, specifically by support of faculty who may eligible for this indicator in the (near) future.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report shows that the degree of accomplishment of this indicator exceeds substantially the required figures set.

Recommendations: Provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, specifically by support of faculty who may be eligible for this indicator in the (near) future.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: It is not entirely clear, based on Annex 15 IOSUD, which of the courses listed therein apply for this indicator, compared with the courses listed in Table 12. It is assumed that Table 12 contains the complete list of relevant courses, and the performance indicator is thus fulfilled. International relevance as attested by Annex 64 D.FIL and by Annex 9 D.FIL is uneven, with some references limited to the home university (Craiova) even if certainly relevant e.g. as regards being keynote speakers, whereas other references have a more international profile.

Recommendations: Bring to the international level the output of as many participants involved as possible. In this case, it may just mean to divert a part of the research output to international forums and events, i.e. no effort for higher quality may be needed: only diversion of part of the research output to international forums. The high quality is actually evidenced by the data given for indicator A.3.2.1, where it is stated that 'All supervisors of the "Alexandru Piru" Doctoral School have at least 5 indexed publications in Web of Sciences or ERIH-indexed journals with impact factor or other achievements [...]'.
[...]

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

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



Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The self-evaluation report declares that '[...] 2 of the 14 doctoral supervisors exceed 12 doctoral students in the period of doctoral studies or in the periods of legally granted extension [...]'].

Annex IOSUD A.3.1.1. shows that the number of supervisors in charge of over 8 students amounts to 73.33%. Additionally, Unless this indicator has been misunderstood by the undersigned, the figure according to Annex 23D.FIL amounts to 21.42% instead of 14.29%, as declared in the self-evaluation report. This is because, in addition to Profs. Panea and Condei, Prof. Sîrbulescu is ascribed 16 students in the academic year 2017/18, 14 students in the academic year 2016/17, and 16 students in the academic year 2015/16. This amounts to 3 professors (i.e. 21.42%) over the 12-student limit and is, therefore beyond the limits set by the indicator's requirement.

It must be acknowledged that, as the number of supervisors varies over the years considered (from 12 in the academic year 2015/16 to 14 in the academic year 2019/20), the counting procedure may vary. This report abides by the total number of supervisors who exceed the limit (3 out of 14 the year most supervisors are available), but the undersigned agrees that other counts are possible too.

Recommendations: Since 2017/18, the tendency has been clearly to lower the number of supervisors in charge of over 12 students, so the indicator will be considered fulfilled within three years if the policy implemented since 2017/2018 remains and/or is reinforced.

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.

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.



Analysis: The report shows that the degree of accomplishment of this indicator exceeds substantially the required figures set, insofar as not just half the supervisors meet this requirement: all of them do in at least one regard.

Recommendations: Whereas all supervisors attest membership in scientific committees at a national level, and have a record in WorldCat, and all but one at an international level in the period 2015/2020, only 8 have been keynote speakers at major scientific events, only 6 out of 15 supervisors have been scientific reviewers for volumes/collections and, only 6 out of 15 supervisors have been reviewers of international publications (one supervisor differs in both lists), again, only 6 out of 15 supervisors attest membership of scientific committees of scientific events organized abroad, only 4 out of 15 supervisors attest membership in international expert panels, and only 3 supervisors have been co-supervisors of foreign theses.

Other memberships are (slightly) less polarized: membership of professional associations (10 participants: 3 national and 7 international), or participants in international research projects (12 supervisors).

Therefore, the recommendation is to put effort towards the actions where fewest supervisors attest records, e.g. less than half the total number of supervisors, namely:

- i) review of international publications,
- ii) membership of scientific committees of scientific events organized abroad,
- iii) membership in international expert panels, and
- iv) co-supervision of foreign theses.

Figure 32 (Fulfillment of CNATDCU's Standards) is not entirely clear as it does not reflect any data for two supervisors Afana (not recorded in the table) and Condei (recorded in the table but without any attestation). If this is by mistake, then revision of the table is in order; even if it is not, no action is needed as regards fulfilment of the indicator.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report shows that the degree of accomplishment of this indicator exceeds substantially the required figures set, insofar as not just half the supervisors meet this requirement: all of them do.

Recommendations: Provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, specifically by support of work by the faculty who are eligible for this indicator.

The indicator is fulfilled.



Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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.

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report shows that the degree of accomplishment of this indicator exceeds substantially the required percentage set of the alternative, second criterion (1.86% attested versus 1.2% required).

Recommendations: Provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, by attracting sustained interest by candidates and sustained budget support.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report evidences a calendar for this purpose. While the calendar could have provided further detail than it does, it is informative and attests fulfilment of the indicator.

Recommendations: Publication of specific criteria or guidelines for presentation of the candidates' records and projects could help both the candidates prepare successful presentations and the committees be presented properly oriented records to measure and assess. These guidelines could lay emphasis and allocate time intervals to specific contents, e.g.:

- i) background (academic, professional),
- ii) evidence of the project's relevance,
- iii) foreseeable timeframe,
- iv) dissemination plan,
- v) ...

Otherwise, the candidates may dwell too long on less relevant points or fail to give relevant information, and the committee may not make the most of the interview time which, incidentally, could be specified too (at least as a time estimate, e.g. 5 to 10 minutes for presentation, 10 to 15 minutes for discussion...).

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report evidences an extremely low percentage of renouncement/dropping out of doctoral studies (0.14%, far below the figure set for this indicator).

Recommendations: Technically, the figure attested may not necessarily imply actual completion of doctoral studies, insofar as PhD candidates may not submit a thesis and be awarded a degree after year 3 following admission, which is the timeframe Table 18 refers to. While Table 18 addresses the indicator successfully, it would be good to take the answer further and report on the actual number of thesis projects completed (i.e. including submission and defence). The assumption is that the figure will not deviate much (or at all) from the figure attested in Table 18, but actual attestation would count additionally towards the attestation of the quality of the doctoral studies.

The other recommendation is about the reasons for renouncement/dropping out in the 0,14% attested: while the reasons may be extremely specific due to the very low number of cases, it may be worth keeping a record of the causes in case they should arise again and thus be prepared to address them and avoid further renouncement/dropping out for the same reasons.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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.



Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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.

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report evidences a number of relevant courses, one of which is about research methods, as per the indicator's requirement

Recommendations: The report does not refer specifically to statistical data processing, as in the indicator's requirement, even if it may fall under the general description '*mastery of advanced research methods and techniques*' listed under *Professional competences* in this section of the self-evaluation report. If it has been included there, then the rest of this recommendation is to be ignored. If it has not, then the rest of this recommendation is in order: as this requirement is optional and has been addressed alternatively by a course in research methods, this is not a reason to consider the indicator even partially unfulfilled. That said, statistical data processing is increasingly relevant in certain areas of philological research, specifically in corpus linguistics, where percentage data are no longer a reliable standard, even if this is still often the type of data given in quantitative research. Statistical validation of corpus data is needed to guarantee access to the possibility to publish results in high-profile journals specialized in the field. It is therefore highly recommended to add a course in basic statistics for language corpus research.

An additional point well worth adding to the list of *Professional competences* is dissemination policies, to assess younger researchers identify the most successful publication forums and strategies to ensure their output gains the highest possible international relevance.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report evidences the subject *Ethics and Academic Integrity*, as per the indicator's requirement.

Recommendations: To ensure the course is maintained and, if possible, supplemented with additional formative actions in this field.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: Like in B.1.2.2, this indicator is fulfilled as, as specified in note 5, awareness of what the learning outcomes are meets the indicator's requirement. Still, the first part of the indicator, where reference is made to creating mechanisms '[...] to ensure that the training programme based on advanced academic studies, in relation to the evaluated field, aims at "learning outcomes", specifying the knowledge, skills and responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire by studying each subject or through research activities' is not evidenced by the reference to knowledge and skills within a course's description.

Recommendations: It is recommended to take measures to ensure the learning outcomes stay in line with what the target knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy require, e.g. by:

- i) regular check and ensuing revision, if needed,
- ii) regular update as regards not the outcomes themselves, but other aspects too, like methodological issues, research projections, ...

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report evidences counselling by a range of modes, sources and regular meetings, as per the indicator's requirement

Recommendations: To ensure counselling is maintained and (in the unlikely case this is not done), by:

- i) implementing and publicizing specific contents of meetings according to expected needs through average candidates' progress,
- ii) providing a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings, and
- iii) involving postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peers.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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



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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report shows that the ratio doctoral students/guidance participants is far below the figure set for this indicator (2.33:1 attested versus 3:1 required).

Recommendations: Provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, and supply means towards a more even distribution of the effort: consider 3 participants are involved in over 20 committees, whereas 26 participants are involved in fewer than 5 committees.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: Fulfilment of this indicator is assessed based on 5 papers (listed below) selected at random according to the following criterion: the first paper in English listed within the name of each author, counted at intervals of 10 starting from paper no. 10 (i.e. papers nos. 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 of Annex 27 D.FIL). If the paper thus selected is not in English, then the count proceeds to the very first paper in English after the one that met the random selection criterion:

AL-ZUABIDI Adnan Mohaisen Ali: Corpus-Based Explorations of English Language Varieties, in New Perspectives in Literature, Language, and Arts, Marta Albu, Antonie Mihail (eds.), Craiova: Universitaria, 2019, pp. 35-46. ISBN: 978-606-14-1554-0.

The paper aims '[...] to prove that corpus linguistics methods and techniques can be imported and exploited gainfully for sociolinguistic research purposes'. This is not an

original or a necessary aim after about 3 decades of widespread corpus research. It could have been proven in a specific domain, mode, register, ... or based on specific data, but the paper is rather a bibliographical review of the concepts sociolinguistics and corpus research, and an unnecessary one considering the date of publication and the concepts discussed. The paper had a potentially relevant goal that is not accomplished either by an original approach or data discussion: instead, it is just a bibliographical review that is far from updated or original and is, in this regard, not a valuable contribution.

FARTOOSI Ali Mohammed Hasan. Transition and transgression of identity in Chuck Palahniuk's *Survivor*, in *Sino-US English Teaching*, January 2018, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1-7.

The paper aims '[to] carry out an analysis on evidential aspects in the selected novel and will further interpret the episodes of transition and transgressions that inform this novel'. While, at 5 pages, the paper is far from being the deep analysis it claims to be, it does discuss the concepts under study, the author's approach to the work, and specific aspects of the novel, with evidence supporting specific claims. The paper's value lies in discussing actualized instances of specific concepts in a given novel and is, in this regard, a valuable contribution.

LUPȘOIU I. Victoria-Ioana. The Power Metaphor in the Targoviste School Prose, în *East-West Dialogue, Individual and Society through Ages, Proceedings of the First International Interdisciplinary Conference of the History Specialization, Department of Social and Natural Sciences, Hyperion University of Bucharest, Editura Universul Academic, Editura Universitară, 1-2 iunie, 2018, p. 165.*

The paper aims '[...] to show briefly how political power influenced the literary activity of the most representative writers of Targoviste School Prose [...]'. The paper reviews the background, the purpose, the members and the period of the school under study. It swells longer at specific authors, at specific works, and also at specific issues, and achieves its objectives well. The paper's value lies in evidencing the link between political power and a given literary school and is, in this regard, a very valuable contribution.

PALADE N. Flavian-Nyky. Translation and Interpretation – Key Aspects of the Diplomatic Communication . Co-autor: Sanda Marina Bădulescu. *Language and Literature. European Landmarks of Identity.* 2016. Editura Universității din Pitești. ISSN 1843-1577. 33-42.

The paper aims '[...] to present the economic, political and social effects of imperialism and colonialism in the novel called *Nostromo* [...]'. The paper reviews the historical context, the very concepts under study (*imperialism* and *colonialism*), the author's approach to those concepts and other interpretations of the same topic, as this is not an original subject topic. Still, the author does evidence specific points to support their analysis and supplies not just an overview of the topic. The paper's value lies in a fairly deep analysis of specific concepts in a novel and how they are presented and is, in this regard, a valuable contribution.

SIMA D. Remina. The Form and Ideology of Women's Fiction. *Europa:Centru și imagine, cooperare culturală și transfrontalieră.* 2014. Editura: Gutenberg, Arad. 53-60. ISSN 1841-1401.

The paper aims '[...] to illustrate the public and private spheres'. After a bibliographical review of what is public and what is private in a number of respects and, specifically, what it was in the early American Republic, the paper focuses on how both are depicted in the works by K. Chopin and C. Perkins Gilman. This leads to an analysis of the historical context and of specific novels, so the original aim becomes diluted to the analysis of specific literary creation and its message. The paper's value lies in bringing to light specific examples of a given contrast and is, in this regard, a valuable contribution.

Recommendations: Provide the means to foster quality research, e.g. by specific training in frontline research avenues in statistics, in new technologies (in this particular case, to avoid interpretations of well-known resources as new ones, as in the first paper reviewed)

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The report shows that the ratio doctoral students/international participation exceeds by far the figure set for this indicator (3.13 attested versus 1 required). Figure 52 also yields a ratio of 3 between doctoral students versus intellectual products. The report adds a number of other data to attest fulfilment of this indicator. Of these, the most relevant are:

- i) Figure 47 and Figure 48, where the ratio between participation in international conferences vs national conferences is heavily biased towards the latter, which is sharp contrast with Figure 50 and Figure 53, where the bias is the opposite (?), and
- ii) Figure 49, where the number of intellectual products approaches 589, except that no specification of national versus international is made. This means this figure cannot be assessed properly as regards this indicator, nor is it in actual fact very telling when it comes to assessing quality, as far as the undersigned believes.
- iii) Figure 54, where participation at the host university is strongly encouraged/supported. This is positive, in that the human resources support their home university and return a part of the investment made. It may however also be negative, in that the output does not gain (inter)national relevance.

Recommendations: Provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, and supply means towards a stronger participation in international events and towards quality research, as measured by the number of publications in high profile indexes.

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.

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: A ratio higher than allowed by the indicator is reported to have been revised in accordance with the new ARACIS standards. The indicator is therefore partially fulfilled and will resolve within the 3-yr period considered, if the theses underway do not exceed their 3-yr. duration. If a time extension is allowed, then the indicator may not be fulfilled

Recommendations: Secure completion of the theses underway that render this indicator unfulfilled.

The indicator is partially 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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: Annex 63D.FIL attests that only once has the threshold 0.3 been reached, that it has never been exceeded and that the figures are typically far beyond 0.2.

Recommendations: Enlarge the list of institutions from which to invite specialists by high quality networking. Diversify the range of institutions from which specialists are invited.

The indicator is fulfilled.



Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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.

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The annexes cited supply further evidence to the one given in former points, so both the recommendation for each applies here again.

Recommendations: Special emphasis is laid on the need for advanced research training and supply of means for this purpose, specially as regards subsections d) and e).

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: Annexes 22C IOSUD 2019 and 2021 list a number of students' suggestions, which bear witness to the availability of mechanisms to obtain feedback from students. The results obtained reveal a high degree of satisfaction, with very occasional points rated as non-satisfactory, so much so that they may not be substantial. They should, however, be looked into to ensure precisely that they are not relevant or this rating comes from unsufficiently motivated responses to the questionnaires' points in question.

Recommendations: Address the points reported by students in Annex 22C IOSUD 2019 as non-satisfactory (3 items), and see about the suggestions made by students reported in annexes 22C IOSUD 2019 and 2021.

To ensure that there is an alternative channel to online questionnaires to obtain student feedback, preferably a permanently open one.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.



Analysis: The indicator is not about the availability of the information listed in points (a) through (i), but about the publication online of such documents. The self-evaluation report attests links with the relevant information in all points except in point e) (*content of study programmes*), which is supported by (sets of) annexes for which online availability cannot be attested. This is a procedural point rather than one about fulfilment of the indicator, as it is assumed that the (sets of) annexes can/must have been made available online.

Recommendations: Make the access to information as easy as possible (which cannot in all cases be assessed here insofar as access to such information for this report has been partly via shared files).

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.

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The self-evaluation report attests a number of relevant databases, actually most of them the main ones in the field.

Recommendations: Try and expand the list of available databases to new ones and also to other relevant resources.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: It would be good to have the procedure under which students can gain access and use the software in question, e.g.

- i) Does it involve any cost?
- ii) Can they use it as many times as they want?
- iii) Is the procedure administratively long?
- iv) Can it be arranged online?
- v) ...

Recommendations: Make the access to the software as easy as possible (e.g. online access via use of a login and password, unless that is not the case already).

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The self-evaluation report supplies a description of a number of centres and annexes with lists of ascriptions. It does not detail the internal order procedures for access.

Recommendations: If any such procedures are available, then the recommendation is just to make them publicly available online and otherwise. If they are not, then the recommendation is to set a number of criteria to operationalize access to laboratories, and other centres.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion C.3. Internationalization

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: The percentage of doctoral students completing a training course abroad or other mobility forms exceeds the figure set by the indicator (55.07% versus 30%).

Recommendations: At an institutional level, to maintain and widen the network of Erasmus partners for outbound students (currently 10 for students according to Figure 62, and 16 for supervisors according to Figure 64). At a school level, to find out and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in these programmes decide so.

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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: A specific strategy and a number of successful actions therein are described as support to international participation in doctoral studies/co-supervisions.

Recommendations: To design and implement a formal programme to raise funds and therefore give financial support to within a formal framework to as many supervisors and students as possible based on specific criteria.

To maintain and widen the network of participating institutions within each country and to other countries beyond what is shown in Figures 67, 70 and 71.

The indicator is 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: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, figures and/or charts, supported by the necessary annexes available online.

Analysis: A number of actions are presented and they address the indicator successfully, but appear to be occasional events or events organised according to initiatives that are not backed by a specific official programme.

Recommendations: To design and implement a formal programme to diversify activities and bring them into a permanent programme in addition to the workshops hosted, e.g. by way of permanent annual events or scientific meetings.

To maintain and widen the network of participating institutions within each country and to other countries beyond what is shown in Figures 72 and 73.

The indicator is fulfilled.



IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <p>Successful efforts toward internationalization at a number of levels, actually as a cross-cutting property of the doctoral studies.</p> <p>Awareness of the relevance/need for quality research.</p> <p>Potential for successful teaming up with Computing and Social Sciences.</p> <p>Good infrastructure.</p> <p>Care for students.</p> <p>Consistent information availability.</p> <p>High quality supervisors.</p>	<p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <p>Need for quality research regardless of quantity.</p> <p>Need for specialized training.</p> <p>Need for diversification as regards international partners.</p>
<p><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <p>Design and implementation of specific training programmes capitalizing available contacts and developing new ones towards a number of actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) invitation to thesis assessment. ii) thesis co-supervision, iii) research output co-authorship, iv) event-hosting. <p>Capitalize on the new modes developed as a result of the teaching and research procedures during the pandemic period.</p> <p>Increasing awareness of the potential of linguistic, literary and cultural studies as successful research partners for applied research.</p>	<p><u>Threats:</u></p> <p>To maintain a marked tendency to publication in national forums (journals, conferences) and disseminate at home events, even if they are international in scope.</p> <p>Not to supply the necessary training for upgrade of research skills, e.g. as specialized courses and as well as for postdoctoral career-making, e.g. as regards fund-raising resources and international networking</p>

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (*, C)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1		A.1.1.1.	Fulfilled	Implement periodicity/regularity.
2		A.1.1.2.	Fulfilled	N/A
3		A.1.2.1.	Fulfilled	N/A
4		A.1.2.2.	Fulfilled	Specify period of time and conditions for resubmissions.
5		A.1.3.1.	Fulfilled	Design research projects eligible within inter/national calls. Strengthen research avenues already on that track.
6	*	A.1.3.2.	Partially fulfilled	Encourage research projects in the Humanities to team up with Computing and with Social Sciences.
7	*	A.1.3.3.	Partially fulfilled	Supply evidence of expenditure made. Diversify actions beyond conference and proceeding publications.
8	C	A.2.1.1.	Fulfilled	Develop software improvement and training
9	C	A.3.1.1.	Fulfilled	Support faculty eligible.
10	*	A.3.1.2.	Fulfilled	Support faculty eligible.
11		A.3.1.3.	Fulfilled	Foster internationalization.
12	*	A.3.1.4.	Partially fulfilled	Maintain and/or reinforce the policy to lower the number of supervisors in charge of over 12 students.
13	C	A.3.2.1.	Fulfilled	Supply the means to increase participation in: i) review of international publications ii) membership of scientific committees of scientific events organized abroad, iii) membership in international expert panels, and iv) co-supervision of foreign theses.
14	*	A.3.2.2.	Fulfilled	Support faculty eligible.
15	*	B.1.1.1.	Fulfilled	Attract sustained budget support.
16	*	B.1.2.1.		Make criteria/guidelines publicly available, with emphasis on the value of: i) Background (academic, professional), ii) Evidence of the project's relevance, iii) Foreseeable timeframe, and iv) Dissemination plan.
17		B.1.2.2.	Fulfilled	Specify number of theses completed. Identify and address reasons for dropouts and for time extensions.
18		B.2.1.1.	Fulfilled	Foster training in research methods, esp. in statistics for corpus linguistics. Train candidates in the design of postdoctoral careers, with emphasis on dissemination.
19		B.2.1.2.	Fulfilled	Supply additional formative actions.
20		B.2.1.3.	Fulfilled	Regularly revise/upgrade/update learning outcomes and their ancillary aspects (methods, projections, ...).
21		B.2.1.4.	Fulfilled	Implement/publicize contents of meetings.

				Enable a channel for fast submission of questions and answers. Involve former doctoral students in the meetings for their feedback.
22	C	B.2.1.5.	Fulfilled	Work towards a more even distribution of the effort in committee participation.
23	C	B.3.1.1.	Fulfilled	Foster quality research by specific training actions so it leads naturally to output publishable by major journals.
24	*	B.3.1.2.	Fulfilled	Foster stronger participation at international events and towards quality research, besides national channels.
25	*	B.3.2.1.	Partially fulfilled	Secure completion within three years of the theses underway that do not comply with the ARACIS standards.
26	*	B.3.2.2.	Fulfilled	Widen the list of institutions to invite specialists from.
27		C.1.1.1.	Fulfilled	Foster advanced research training and supply means for this purpose.
28	*	C.1.1.2.	Fulfilled	Identify the reasons for the very few points marked as non-satisfactory and address them as far as possible. Consider the feasibility of implement the students' suggestions. Enable a permanent channel for student feedback aside from questionnaires.
29	C	C.2.1.1.	Fulfilled	Guarantee online access to information
30		C.2.2.1.	Fulfilled	Widen the list of databases as far as possible and encourage its use.
31		C.2.2.2.	Fulfilled	Enable online access to the software.
32		C.2.2.3.	Fulfilled	Set a list of criteria to operationalize access to laboratories and centres. Make the criteria publicly available.
33	*	C.3.1.1.	Fulfilled	Widen the network of Erasmus partners Identify and address the reasons why some students decide not to take part in these programmes
34		C.3.1.2.	Fulfilled	Design and implement a permanent, formal programme to diversify activities. Widen the network of participating institutions both within each country and to other countries.
35		C.3.1.3.	Fulfilled	Design and implement a permanent, formal programme to diversify activities, besides workshops hosted, e.g. regular events/scientific meetings. Widen the network of participating institutions within each country and to other countries.

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: Based on the analyses listed above, the undersigned concludes that the conditions for consideration of fulfilment of most and major indicators are met.

General recommendations:

- Maintain the effort made this far.
- Support the faculty who contributed to fulfilment of indicators.
- Focus on training and internationalization.
- Focus on research quality and output, not quantity.
- Seek contacts for international cooperation re Phd theses.
- Team up with Computing and Social Sciences for research.

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.*

Further to the ARACIS calendar, two additional meetings were held, as follows:

- i) Tue. 13/07/21, 9:30-11:30 (Rom. time): Philology domain committee, and
- ii) Thu. 15/07/21, 17:00-18:00 (Rom. time): Fundamental domain committee.