

## **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. Introduction<sup>1</sup>**

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;

---

<sup>1</sup> 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**

*\*general description of domain analysis.*

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

*\*General description of the criterion analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links (unfortunately, not enabled). The information describes the framework and the background of the doctoral school, specifically the university, and its major regulations, structures, resources, organization and procedures.*

*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. Relevant information is presented in the sections below in the form of text with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links.*

**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: The self-assessment report refers in detail to each of the criteria listed in the indicator, supported by annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The report and the annexes evidence the existence of a well-attested, fully comprehensive framework for the doctoral school and of its procedures and regulations. Availability of such information as, e.g. admission to doctoral studies, is of relevance for the higher international visibility of the school (e.g. as regards attracting foreign students) and deserves attention.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to implement easier access in English to documents, like the admission procedure, which may be of relevance for foreign candidates and/or supervisors.*

**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: *The self-assessment report supplies specific data and information supported by annexes available online and links, with reference to requirements set by the indicator. The information includes special cases and how they are addressed (e.g. choice of subjects outside the doctoral school in question, need for additional supervisors, supervisor removal, supervisor replacement...).*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report and the information supplied during online interviews evidence the existence of a well-attested set of criteria, procedures and standards at the doctoral school.*

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.*

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the sections below in the form of text and tables supported by annexes available online and links.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online.*

Analysis: *The report and the annexes evidence the availability of an IT system as per the requirements of the indicator. No evidence of effectiveness is supplied.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to measure the appropriateness and effectiveness of the IT system as regards the users (students), the university administrative staff, and the faculty, if they (need to) access the system. Elicitation of feedback may help improve on the system's capabilities, especially considering it is currently under development.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online and a link.*

Analysis: *The report and the annexes evidence not only the availability of an IT system as per the requirements of the indicator but also of an exhaustively detailed use protocol. Appropriateness is attested by the number of users and by the results obtained, as evidenced in Annex A.1.2.2-4. Plagiarism has been prevented completely in the last five years.*

Recommendations: *N/A*

**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. Relevant information is presented in the sections below in the form of text and tables supported by 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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online, with details of grant-associated PhD contracts.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report evidences two grants to comply with the requirement set by the indicator.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is for the university to supply additional resources for doctoral advisors to be able to submit successful bids, and also to support international research funding.*

*The recommendation is for all doctoral advisors to become actively involved in the submission of additional bids until more successful applications are secured than are attested at present.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by a table and annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The description available in the self-assessment report declares a percentage of 16.67%, so the funded student ratio falls slightly below 20%, as in the requirement set by the indicator. While the indicator cannot be considered fulfilled, the self-assessment report also refers to the future involvement of '[...] economic or social partners to conclude conventions and framework agreements which stipulate the granting of paid scholarships/internships to PhD students from the doctoral field Philology for a period of minimum 6 months'. This means that, even if the indicator cannot be considered fulfilled, the school evidences proactive measures to meet the requirement set by the indicator.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to implement the measures undertaken to raise funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (above 20% doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation) set by the requirements set by the indicator.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to amounts attested by tables. Specific training actions are cross-referenced to section C.3.1.1.

Analysis: The description available in the self-assessment report declares an investment of 9.79%, so the percentage falls slightly below 10%, as in the requirement set by the indicator. While the indicator cannot be considered fulfilled, the self-assessment report evidences percentages that are well above the required threshold in the period 2017-19 and also nearly so in 2020 despite the irregular conditions of that year. This means that, whereas the indicator cannot be considered fulfilled, the school evidences the capacity to meet the requirement set by the indicator even under adverse conditions. Additional information supplied by Prof. Catalin Alexandru during the online meeting with the university representatives of 13:00-14:00, 12/11/21, confirmed the percentage to be 12.24% instead of 9,79%.

Recommendations: N/A

**The indicator is partially fulfilled.**

## **Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure**

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and a link.

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. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and a specific link.

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online and a specific link.

Analysis: The resources available as regards facilities, equipment and online resources are as per the requirements set by this indicator. The research laboratories evidence an extremely active agenda, with organization of training actions, workshops, conferences and publication of research.

Recommendations: The recommendation is for the university to increase the support to the research laboratories as regards library funds.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.



### **Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources**

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in 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.*

**\*General description of the standard analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in 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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by a table and annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The percentage achieved by the doctoral school exceeds the requirements set by the indicator (90,91% attested vs. 50% required by the indicator).*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is for the supervisor who did not meet the CNATDCU requirements to strive towards fulfilment, if the administrative/legal framework allows, considering the supervisor is a pensioner.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online.*

*Analysis: The percentage achieved by the doctoral school exceeds the requirements set by the indicator (90,91% attested vs. 50% required by the indicator).*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is for the supervisor who is not tenured to strive towards tenure, if the administrative/legal framework allows, considering the supervisor is a pensioner.*

**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: The self-assessment report refers to information attested by annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report attests teaching by four tenured professors and one tenured associate professor.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

**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 programs<sup>3</sup> does not exceed 20%.*

Description: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report declares that not any of the eleven supervisors coordinates more than six students.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to keep supervision as evenly distributed among advisors as possible, both for supervision quality and for the advisors' more efficient research record. This is as a result of seven supervisors with four or more students vs. four supervisors with under four students.*

**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. *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in 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: *The self-assessment report refers to information attested by an annex available online. Two subcomponents are used for assessment of the degree of fulfilment of the indicator:*

- i) 5 indexed publications, and*
- ii) international visibility.*

Analysis: *Regardless of how the second subcomponent is measured and which points are fulfilled therein, (research leave, publications, refereeing, event organization, scholarships, project participation, international networking, teaching experience, committee membership...?), the self-assessment report declares fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator as regards the first subcomponent (54.5% vs. 50%). Remarkably, all the supervisors fulfil the subcomponent of publications, and 54.55% of the supervisors fulfil the two subcomponents simultaneously (54.55%).*

---

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





Recommendations: *The recommendation is to divert a substantial amount of the research effort disseminated in national publishers, journals and conferences to international forums, especially in the medium-high impact range.*

*The recommendation is, also, for the advisors who attest fewer criteria, to strive towards a more complete research record and come in line with the performance rest of the rest of advisors.*

***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: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online.*

Analysis: *Annex A.3.2.2. evidences scientific activity as per the requirements set by the indicator. The percentage of scientifically active advisors exceeds by far the requirements set by the indicator (72,72% attested vs. 50% required by the indicator). This means, in practice, that the group is broken into nearly one fourth for whom scientific activity cannot be attested, and three fourths for whom scientific activity is attested.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is for the university to provide the resources to help supervisors remain active. The recommendation is also for lower-ranking advisors to strive towards a higher score.*

***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.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links.*

*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. Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares in Table B.1.1.1 average ratios that comply with the two requirements set by the indicator (0.65 attested for the entire 5-year period vs. 0.2 required by the indicator as regards the number of graduates of other (inter)national higher education institutions set for entrance examination for doctoral studies vs. the number of state budget funded places available, and 1.77 attested for the entire 5-year period vs. 1.2 required by the indicator as regards the number of candidates in the last five years and the number of state budget funded places available). The occurrence of specific years where one of the requirements is not fulfilled (e.g. 2020 for the former requirement) is amply compensated.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

**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. Relevant information is presented in the form of text and a table, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via links.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by specific links. Failing my ability to understand Romanian, the links in question show topics and results of the admission process. The grading criteria are detailed according to the legal framework in force, with specification of relevant articles.*

Analysis: *The admission process is described clearly and the requirements are publicly available from university webpages. Additional information gathered during online interviews underlined use of strict criteria regardless of the positions available, such that candidates may not be admitted even if positions are available.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to disseminate as far as possible (online and otherwise) the information in English too for attraction of potential foreign students.*

**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 admission<sup>4</sup> does not exceed 30%.*

Description: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online.*

Analysis: *Failure to complete doctoral studies, for whichever the reason, does not exceed the requirement set by the indicator (24.30% attested for five cohorts of doctoral students vs. 30% required by the indicator). The worst percentage (30.43% for students enrolled in 2015) is only slightly above the requirement set by the indicator.*

Recommendations: *The recommendations are twofold:*

- i) *concerning identification of reasons for failure:*
  - a. *to keep track of the reasons for which students are expelled and supply the means to address them, and*
  - b. *to keep track of the reasons for which students drop out and supply the means to address them.*
- ii) *concerning management of reasons for failure, to maintain the effort to raise funding and create finance opportunities for support of doctoral students.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

## **Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs**

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and a table, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links.*

**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.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and a table, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and via specific links.*

---

<sup>4</sup> 3 years for the doctoral university studies with the duration stipulated at Article 159, paragraph (3), respectively 4 years for the doctoral university studies with the duration stipulated at Article 174, paragraph (3) of the Law of national education No. 1/2011 with subsequent amendments and additions.

**Performance Indicator B.2.1.1.** *The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant to the scientific research training of doctoral students; at least one of these disciplines is intended to study in-depth the research methodology and/or the statistical data processing.*  
Description: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by an annex available online (Annex A.3.1.3.-2).*

Analysis: *Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the self-assessment report lists six courses relevant to scientific research training vs. three required by the indicator (Discipline Obligatorii), plus four more specific for Philology. Even if only the latter four apply, the evidence attests fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator.*

Recommendations: *Unless this is not legally possible or the contents are already covered by other courses available, the recommendation is to broaden as far as possible the range of courses in research methodology for Philology, for example, with a focus on:*

- i) applied statistics,*
- ii) lexical database (corpus) design and use,*
- iii) research dissemination strategies, and*
- iv) international networking and publication policies.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online (Annexes A.3.1.3.-2 and B.2.1.2). The course is described in detail in Annex B.2.1.2.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report lists one course relevant to research ethics, as in the requirement set by the indicator.*

Recommendations: *N/A*

**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 activities<sup>5</sup>.*

Description: *The self-assessment report describes and refers to information attested by annexes available online and via links, one of which is within the university’s intranet and cannot be accessed (Intranet UniTBv).*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report refers to the structure of the syllabus, and evidences a number of mechanisms towards addressing needs pointed out by PhD supervisors and PhD candidates. The effort to regularly revise the program for best possible alignment with counterpart programmes both within the country and abroad deserves special praise.*

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.



Recommendations: *The recommendation is, admittedly, to remain aware of potential improvements as a result of the contents of other programmes, but to give full priority to the faculty's feedback and initiatives, in view of their qualification and high quality level.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes counselling/guidance in detail and information is attested by an annex available online.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report describes a number of actions within counselling/guidance, all relevant and in accordance with the requirements set by the indicator.*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to ensure that the training actions described remain available and are revised/enlarged on, based on the students' and supervisors' feedback. Potential room for improvement that the school might want to consider may involve:*

- i) to consider the possibility of occasional training events for specific needs according to the students' and supervisors' feedback,*
- ii) to publicize as far as possible the contents covered within counselling/guidance,*
- iii) to involve postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peer,*
- iv) to provide a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings, and*
- v) (more important and unless this is not done already<sup>6</sup>), to enforce guidance regularity, i.e. to ensure that students make use of guidance at least at the beginning and at the end of the academic year (not just upon request, if that is the case), in order to allow feedback, prevent potential dropout, and identify weaknesses/deviations that may become structural, systematic obstacles during their PhD studies.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes information attested by an annex available online.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report declares a ratio that is actually under half as much as in the requirements set by the indicator (1.19:1 attested vs. 3:1 required by the indicator).*

Recommendations: *Despite the remarkable ratio achieved, the recommendation is to find the way to recruit more high-quality supervisors.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

---

<sup>6</sup> The wording 'The counselling committee meets regularly, at commonly agreed upon intervals [...]' does not make it entirely whether there is the undesirable possibility that not any meeting is held, so the recommendation is in case.



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

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, and a table with, reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

*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.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and a table, with reference to information attested in 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 overviewed, supported by a list of references in annexes available online.*

*Analysis: Fulfilment of this indicator is assessed based on five papers selected at random as follows: the first paper with an English title listed in Annex B.3.1.1 is reviewed below, one paper for each supervisor:*

Paper 1. PREDA (BODOC) Alice & ARDELEANU (GOMOESCU) Monica. 2016. The grammaticalization and pragmatization of the Romanian indefinite pro-forms: A corpus-based approach. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 65: 223-256.

The paper is a diachronic study of developments of Romanian indefinite pronouns. It is extremely clear, well-structured, well-balanced and methodologically sound. The choice and use of experimental data and the analysis in terms of grammaticalization and pragmatization processes are reliable and a relevant contribution to a topic that keeps attracting attention (grammaticalization). It takes into consideration all major references in the field (except perhaps B. Joseph's research on the topic) and, all in all, evidences quality research. The conclusions are limited probably because the authors preferred to remain on the safe side and be conservative about the interpretations of their results. This is, again, evidence of academic honesty and maturity.

Paper 2. IACOB, Miruna. 2017. Humor as a survival technique during communism in Romania. *Interlitteraria* 22(2): 332-340.

The paper is a, from my point of view, a review of the influence of context on humour, with focus on communism, postmodernism and their influence on literature. To that end, the paper goes into some authors and their work and offers an overview of the properties of the use or role of humour in that context. The paper is well-written, with sections that are not always clear as regards the main purpose of the paper to that purpose (specifically, too general/too specific) and succeeds to illustrate the points addressed. The references can be updated for a more exhaustive bibliographical research of the analysis of the topic.

Paper 3. ILIESCU, Valentina. 2015. Autobiographical Novel – “I” – Writer – Narrator – Character”. In *Discourse as a form of Multiculturalism in Literature and Communication*, Iulian Boldea (ed.). Arhipelag XXI Press, Târgu-Mureş; 1064-1074.

(Review based on the online translation of full-text Romanian paper).

The paper is a very specific piece of research where the focus is on A. George’s production. As such, the contribution is limited but specialized. The style of the paper, maybe for the automatic translation, does not always allow to keep track of the argumentation easily. The same applies to the English abstract. This may also be as a result of the lack of sections within the paper. Otherwise, the paper does go into the author’s creation, with quotations for illustration of specific points and fulfils its objectives. The analysis uses a low number of references considering the topic. The value and the originality of the paper lie in the specific niche it targets.

Paper 4. BABII, Elena Alexandrina. 2017. Dialogue between the Art of Music and other disciplines. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov*, Series VIII: Performing Arts, vol. 10(59), nr. 2: 7-14.

The paper examines the connection of fine arts among themselves, with a focus on music and literature. Achievement of an aesthetic value lie at the core of the description of the paper and, therefore, a stronger theoretical frame with emphasis on aesthetic analysis could be a relevant source of improvement. This is also partly for the lack of up-to-date references. Even so, the paper shows a clear structure and is well-written, with a clear objective and relevant conclusions in that regard. The paper is a preliminary stepping stone towards deeper analysis and that is also a part of doctoral studies research.

Paper 5. RUS, Violeta. 2017. A multimodal analysis of conventional humorous structures on sensitive topics within rural communities in Romania. *European Journal of Humour Research* 5(1): 19-35.

The paper has a clear objective (‘to identify and analyse sensitive humorous topics in Romanian rural communities’). To that end, it designs, collects and analyzes a corpus of data. Leaving aside the amount of work required by the above (extremely detailed transcription, translation), the paper stands out for its clarity, for its methodological detail and for the presentation of the theoretical framework. The result is a reliable, comprehensive description of topics in the context specified in the opening line of this review. The references could have been completed with titles by the same team. The paper deserved a high-ranking journal.

Recommendations: *The recommendation is, further to the high quality evidenced in the papers, to supply the conditions for high profile research, e.g.:*

- i) *by specific training in:*
  - a. *frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis,*
  - b. *new technologies,*
  - c. *encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.*
- ii) *by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students, and*
- iii) *by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors.*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes the legal framework of application in this regard, and information attested by an annex available online.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report declares a ratio of 1, as in the requirements set by the indicator. It is worth underlining the relevance of what counts as prestigious international events and also the need for publication in high quality forums (journals and conferences).*

Recommendations: *As in the previous indicator, the recommendation is to supply the conditions for high quality research, e.g.:*

- i) by specific training in:
  - a. frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis,*
  - b. new technologies,*
  - c. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.**
- ii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for supervisors and for students, and*
- iii) by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors.*

**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. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to subsequent sections of the report (cf. sections under C).*

**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, supported by an annex available online.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report declares fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator according to Annex B.3.2.1: only two supervisors appear ascribed to a higher education institution other than the one evaluated (Prof. Gheorghe and Prof. Podoaba): both supervise two theses each, the latter in different years too (2013 and 2014).*

Recommendations: *N/A*

**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: *The self-assessment report describes information attested by an annex available online.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report declares a ratio that is not even half as much as the ratio of the requirements set by the indicator (0:1 vs 0:3 required by the indicator).*

Recommendations: *N/A*

***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. Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

*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. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

**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: The self-assessment report describes information attested by an annex available online and a link, with reference to the committee, the method and the specific criteria listed under the title Methodology on the internal evaluation of the Interdisciplinary Doctoral School.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report describes procedures that evidence fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator well beyond the average quality standards as regards quality assurance. The following points deserve special mention:*

- i) assessment of a wide range of criteria, this being of relevance as regards this indicator with reference to criterion a),*
- ii) outstanding PhD student funding and training support, these being of relevance as regards this indicator with reference to criteria d), e) and f), and*
- iii) implementation of recommendations from past evaluation processes.*

*The criteria attest close attention to the requirements set by the indicator.*

*Recommendations: The recommendation is to encourage and supply the means towards an international dimension to points (a), (d) and (e), for greater visibility and relevance, and higher research quality.*

**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, supported by annexes available online and a link.*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report describes utmost care for student feedback, and for quality assessment procedures and instruments. The feedback for the field Philology reveals an extremely high level of satisfaction. The necessary channels are available and guarantee the possibility for increased improvement according to student feedback.*

Recommendations: *N/A*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**\*General description of the criterion analysis.** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

*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. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

**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 and a table, supported by annexes available online and with links, some of which are within the university's intranet and cannot be accessed (e.g. <https://intranet.unitbv.ro/Cercetare/Scoala-Doctorala-Interdisciplinara/Doctorat>).*

Analysis: *The self-assessment report lists specific links for each of the points (a) through (f) required by the indicator. The links evidence both the availability of the information listed in points (a) through (i). An English version of the webpages in question does not seem to be available: availability of this information in at least English is of relevance for higher visibility of the school (e.g. attracting foreign students).*

Recommendations: *The recommendation is to make information as accessible as possible, including access to information in English.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**



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

*\*General description of the standard analysis. Relevant information is presented in the form of text, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

***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, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and a link.*

*Analysis: The annex cited for this indicator evidences availability of online access to a number of relevant databases, including some of the main ones that are available in the field of Philology: Philology actually is the field with the highest number of types of access to databases, according to Annex C.2.2.1-6.*

*Recommendations: The recommendaion is to expand the list of available databases to new ones as they appear, as well as to additional 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, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report declares availability of some of the most advanced and widely acknowledged technical means for fulfilment of this indicator.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

***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.*

*Analysis: The self-assessment report lists and describes facilities with specification of conditions of access to equipment and premises.*

*Recommendations: N/A*

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

### **Criterion C.3. Internationalization**

***\*General description of the criterion analysis.*** *Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

*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. Relevant information is presented in the form of text and tables, with reference to information attested in annexes available online and links.*

***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 and tables, supported by annexes available online and links.

Analysis: The self-assessment report refers to international agreements in various frameworks (Erasmus+ programme, research institutes, companies), to a specific plan for internationalization, to cooperation links whereby PhD mobility can be achieved in the absence of agreements, and to funding opportunities beyond EU programmes. The figures cited in the self-assessment report comply with the percentages of the requirements set by the indicator for the doctoral school and refer both to faculty and students. According to Table 3.1.1-4, while, in the field of Philology, 23.53% of PhD students in training have completed training abroad or other mobility forms, the percentage falls to 14.29% students with defended theses, and the global percentage is 18.42%, slightly below the 20% requirement set by the indicator. The trend is however clearly upwards and the indicator is expected to be fulfilled long before the three-year period considered for partially fulfilled indicators.

Recommendations: The recommendation is to strive towards diversification of international mobility opportunities, both within and outside the Erasmus network.

The recommendation is to identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in these programmes, if any, decide so.

The recommendation is to identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in international conferences and training abroad, if any, decide so.

**The indicator is partially fulfilled.**

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

Description: Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text and a table.

Analysis: The self-assessment report lists a number of foreign guest lecturers, the type of programme whereby they contribute at the university (Erasmus+ vs. other), and available programmes for the purpose as per the requirements set by the indicator.

Recommendations: The recommendation is to implement a permanent seminar of international guest lecturers and researchers, whether online or not, to widen the offer of potential supervisors.

**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.

Analysis: The self-assessment report lists a number of actions aimed at international activity as per the indicator's requirements, with emphasis on the associated funding. Plans for participation in education fairs are mentioned.



Recommendations: *The recommendation is to implement a formal programme of international events to diversify activities and bring them into a permanent programme in addition to events hosted by way of permanent annual events or scientific meetings.*

*The recommendation is also to offer online the necessary information for doctoral studies in English alongside Romanian.*

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

#### IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><b><u>Strengths:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Sustained effort and exceptionally high quality on all fronts: management, teaching, research.</li> <li>ii) Full potential for successful partnership in EU and international research project bids.</li> <li>iii) Full potential for high-quality research and international visibility.</li> <li>iv) Extreme care for students and for quality control.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Weaknesses:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Need for more PhD supervisors.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Opportunities:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) International dissemination of their strengths for capitalization of the extremely high quality achieved, e.g. by way of available contacts and development of new ones towards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. thesis co-supervision and assessment,</li> <li>b. research output co-authorship.</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii) Increasing awareness of the potential of linguistic and cultural studies as successful research partners for applied research.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Threats:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) To retain a tendency towards publication in national forums (journals, conferences) and disseminate at home events.</li> <li>ii) Not to supply the necessary training for upgrade of research skills, e.g. as specialized courses as well as for postdoctoral career-making, e.g. as regards fund-raising resources and international networking.</li> <li>iii) Need for specific student training, e.g. in publication and dissemination strategies.</li> <li>iv) Need for internationalization and networking, esp. towards student training abroad.</li> <li>v) Need for funding support towards point ii) above.</li> </ul>

## V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	PI	<p><b>A.1.1.1.</b> The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the Doctoral School of the respective university doctoral study domain:</p> <p>a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;</p> <p>b) the Methodology for conducting elections for the position of director of the Council of doctoral school (CSD), as well as elections by the students of their representative in CSD and the evidence of their conduct;</p> <p>c) the Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies (for the admission of doctoral students, for the completion of doctoral studies);</p> <p>d) the existence of mechanisms for recognizing the status of a Doctoral advisor and the equivalence of the doctoral degree obtained abroad;</p> <p>e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), giving as well proof of the regularity of meetings;</p> <p>f) the contract for doctoral studies;</p> <p>g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies.</p>	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement easier access in English to documents, like the admission procedure, which may be of relevance for foreign candidates and/or supervisors.
2.	PI	<p><b>A.1.1.2.</b> The doctoral school' Regulation includes mandatory criteria, procedures and standards binding on the aspects specified in Article 17, paragraph (5) of the Government Decision No. 681/2011 on the approval of the Code of Doctoral Studies with subsequent amendments and additions.</p>	Fulfilled	N/A
3.	PI	<p><b>A.1.2.1.</b> The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background.</p>	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to measure the appropriateness and effectiveness of the IT system as regards the users (students), the university administrative staff, and the faculty, if they (need to) access the system. Elicitation of feedback may help improve on the system's capabilities, especially considering it is currently under development.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
4.	PI	<b>A.1.2.2.</b> 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	N/A
5.	IP	<b>A.1.3.1.</b> 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	The recommendation is for the university to supply additional resources for doctoral advisors to be able to submit successful bids, and also to support international research funding. The recommendation is for all doctoral advisors to become actively involved in the submission of additional bids until more successful applications are secured than are attested at present.
6.	PI *	<b>A.1.3.2.</b> 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%.	Partially fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement the measures undertaken to raise funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree (above 20% doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation) set by the requirements set by the indicator.
7.	PI *	<b>A.1.3.3.</b> 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	N/A
8.	CPI	<b>A.2.1.1.</b> 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	Fulfilled	The recommendation is for the university to increase the support to the research laboratories as regards library funds.



No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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		
9.	CPI	<b>A.3.1.1.</b> 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	The recommendation is for the supervisor who did not meet the CNATDCU requirements to strive towards fulfilment, if the administrative/legal framework allows, considering the supervisor is a pensioner.
10.	PI *	<b>A.3.1.2.</b> At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is for the supervisor who is not tenured to strive towards tenure, if the administrative/legal framework allows, considering the supervisor is a pensioner
11.	PI	<b>A.3.1.3.</b> The study subjects in the education program based on advanced higher education studies pertaining to the doctoral domain are taught by teaching staff or researchers who are doctoral thesis advisors / certified doctoral thesis advisors, professors / CS I or lecturer / CS II, with proved expertise in the field of the study subjects they teach, or other specialists in the field who meet the standards established by the institution in relation with the aforementioned teaching and research functions, as provided by the law.	Fulfilled	N/A
12.	PI *	<b>A.3.1.4.</b> The percentage of doctoral thesis advisors who concomitantly coordinate more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12, who are themselves studying in doctoral programs does not exceed 20%.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to keep supervision as evenly distributed among advisors as possible, both for supervision quality and for the advisors' more efficient research record. This is as a result of seven supervisors with four or more students vs. four supervisors with under four students.
13.	CPI	<b>A.3.2.1.</b> 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	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to divert a substantial amount of the research effort disseminated in national publishers, journals and conferences to international

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>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>		<p>forums, especially in the medium-high impact range. The recommendation is, also, for the advisors who attest fewer criteria, to strive towards a more complete research record and come in line with the performance rest of the rest of advisors.</p>
14.	PI *	<p><b>A.3.2.2.</b> At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in a specific doctoral study domain continue to be active in their scientific field, and acquire at least 25% of the score requested by the minimal CNATDCU standards in force at the time of the evaluation, which are required and mandatory for acquiring their enabling certificate, based on their scientific results within the past five years</p>	Fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is for the university to provide the resources to help supervisors remain active. The recommendation is also for lower-ranking advisors to strive towards a higher score.</p>
15.	PI *	<p><b>B.1.1.1.</b> The ratio between the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions, national or foreign, who have enrolled for the doctoral admission contest within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget, put out through contest within the doctoral domain is at least 0.2 or the ratio between the number of candidates within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget put out through contest within the doctoral studies domain is at least 1,2.</p>	Fulfilled	N/A

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
16.	PI *	<b>B.1.2.1.</b> 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	The recommendation is to disseminate as far as possible (online and otherwise) the information in English too for attraction of potential foreign students.
17.	PI	<b>B.1.2.2.</b> The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral students 3, respectively 4, years after admission does not exceed 30%.	Fulfilled	The recommendations are twofold: i) concerning identification of reasons for failure: a. to keep track of the reasons for which students are expelled and supply the means to address them, and b. to keep track of the reasons for which students drop out and supply the means to address them. ii) concerning management of reasons for failure, to maintain the effort to raise funding and create finance opportunities for support of doctoral students.
18.	PI	<b>B.2.1.1.</b> 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	Unless this is not legally possible or the contents are already covered by other courses available, the recommendation is to broaden as far as possible the range of courses in research methodology for Philology, for example, with a focus on: i) applied statistics, ii) lexical database (corpus) design and use, iii) research dissemination strategies, and iv) international networking and publication policies.
19.	PI	<b>B.2.1.2.</b> 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	N/A
20.	PI	<b>B.2.1.3.</b> The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying	Fulfilled	The recommendation is, admittedly, to remain aware of potential improvements as a result of the contents of other programmes, but to give full priority to the

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities.		faculty's feedback and initiatives, in view of their qualification and high quality level.
21.	PI	<b>B.2.1.4.</b> 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	The recommendation is to ensure that the training actions described remain available and are revised/enlarged on, based on the students' and supervisors' feedback. Potential room for improvement that the school might want to consider may involve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) to consider the possibility of occasional training events for specific needs according to the students' and supervisors' feedback,</li> <li>ii) to publicize as far as possible the contents covered within counselling/guidance,</li> <li>iii) to involve postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peer,</li> <li>iv) to provide a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings, and</li> <li>v) (more important and unless this is not done already), to enforce guidance regularity, i.e. to ensure that students make use of guidance at least at the beginning and at the end of the academic year (not just upon request, if that is the case), in order to allow feedback, prevent potential dropout, and identify weaknesses/deviations that may become structural, systematic obstacles during their PhD studies.</li> </ul>
22.	CPI	<b>B.2.1.5.</b> 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	Despite the remarkable ratio achieved, the recommendation is to find the way to recruit more high-quality supervisors.
23.	CPI	<b>B.3.1.1.</b> 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	Fulfilled	The recommendation is, further to the high quality evidenced in the papers, to supply the conditions for high profile research, e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) by specific training in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. new technologies,</li> <li>c. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.</li> <li>ii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students, and</li> <li>iii) by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors.</li> </ul>
24.	PI *	<b>B.3.1.2.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	<p>As in the previous indicator, the recommendation is to supply the conditions for high quality research, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) by specific training in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. frontline research based on qualitative data, e.g. validated by statistical analysis,</li> <li>b. new technologies,</li> <li>c. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for supervisors and for students, and</li> <li>iii) by offering the opportunity for co-supervision with international co-supervisors.</li> </ul>
25.	PI *	<b>B.3.2.1.</b> 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	N/A
26.	PI *	<b>B.3.2.2.</b> 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	N/A
27.	PI	<b>C.1.1.1.</b> The Doctoral school in the respective university study domain shall demonstrate the continuous development of the evaluation	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to encourage and supply the means towards an international dimension to points (a), (d) and (e), for

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>process and its internal quality assurance following a procedure developed and applied at the level of the IOSUD, the following assessed criteria being mandatory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the scientific work of Doctoral advisors;</li> <li>b) the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity;</li> <li>c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized;</li> <li>d) the scientific activity of doctoral students;</li> <li>e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students;</li> <li>f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students.</li> </ul>		<p>greater visibility and relevance, and higher research quality.</p>
28.	PI *	<p><b>C.1.1.2.</b> Mechanisms are implemented during the stage of the doctoral study program to enable feedback from doctoral students allowing to identify their needs, as well as their overall level of satisfaction with the doctoral study program in order to ensure continuous improvement of the academic and administrative processes. Following the analysis of the results, there is evidence that an action plan was drafted and implemented.</p>	Fulfilled	N/A
29.	CPI	<p><b>C.2.1.1.</b> 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"> <li>a) the Doctoral School regulation;</li> <li>b) the admission regulation;</li> <li>c) the doctoral studies contract;</li> <li>d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;</li> <li>e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies;</li> <li>f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data;</li> <li>g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor);</li> <li>h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis;</li> </ul>	Fulfilled	<p>The recommendation is to make information as accessible as possible, including access to information in English.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		i) links to the doctoral theses' summaries to be publicly presented and the date, time, place where they will be presented; this information will be communicated at least twenty days before the presentation.		
30.	PI	<b>C.2.2.1.</b> All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of their thesis.	Fulfilled	The recommendaion is to expand the list of available databases to new ones as they appear, as well as to additional relevant resources.
31.	PI	<b>C.2.2.2.</b> 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	N/A
32.	PI	<b>C.2.2.3.</b> All doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the specific domain/domains within the Doctoral School, according to internal order procedures.	Fulfilled	N/A
33.	PI *	<b>C.3.1.1.</b> 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.	Partially fulfilled	The recommendation is to strive towards diversification of international mobility opportunities, both within and outside the Erasmus network. The recommendation is to identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in these programmes, if any, decide so. The recommendation is to identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in international conferences and training abroad, if any, decide so.
34.	PI	<b>C.3.1.2.</b> 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.	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement a permanent seminar of international guest lecturers and researchers, whether online or not, to widen the offer of potential supervisors.
35.	PI	<b>C.3.1.3.</b> The internationalization of activities carried out during the doctoral studies is supported by IOSUD	Fulfilled	The recommendation is to implement a formal programme of international events to diversify activities and bring them into a

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.).		permanent programme in addition to events hosted by way of permanent annual events or scientific meetings. The recommendation is also to offer online the necessary information for doctoral studies in English alongside Romanian.

*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 indicators are met, except for two partially fulfilled indicators, namely:

- i) A.1.3.2. Measures have been undertaken to raise funding as per the requirements set by the indicator and to the degree set by the requirements set by the indicator. The expectation is for complete fulfilment in three years.
- ii) C.3.1.1. The percentage attested is very close to the percentage required by the indicator, and the trend of the doctoral school is clearly upwards. The expectation is for complete fulfilment long before three years' time.

Even so, the quality level achieved is extremely high, and the recommendations issued above and below for the Philology domain are suggestions rather than recommendations.

### **General recommendations:**

Maintain the effort made this far.

Further support the faculty who contributed to fulfilment of indicators.

Aim at further training abroad, on networking and on internationalization.

Seek contacts for international cooperation re Phd theses (co-supervision, examination panels).

Raise funding for international research and international actions outside the Erasmus Programme.





## VII. Annexes

*The following types of documents shall be attached:*

- *The detailed schedule of the evaluation visit – MANDATORY.*  
No additional meetings were held further to those scheduled in the ARACIS calendar.
- *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.*

Signed in Granada, Spain, 26/11/21

Salvador Valera