

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

The present report was created on the basis of the periodic evaluation visit of the Doctoral field - Philology, at the University of Oradea.

According to the agenda, the evaluation visit took place between 15-20 November 2021, being included in the institutional evaluation visit of IOSUD.

The evaluation commission appointed by ARACIS had the following composition:

- Prof. univ. dr. Boldea Iulian (Universitatea de Medicină, Farmacie, Științe și Tehnologie „George Emil Palade” din Târgu Mureș)
- Prof.univ.dr. Schuppener Georg (University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava)
- Toderașcu Paula Andreea (Universitatea „Transilvania” din Brașov)

The specific activities of the evaluation visit of the doctoral field were scheduled between 15-17 November - as online meetings with the members of the evaluation commission and meetings with the evaluation commission and the representatives of the university, faculty, doctoral school management, doctoral field coordinator, doctoral students, graduated doctoral students in the field, employers etc. On 18/19 November, the coordinator of the evaluation team, took part in a on-site visit at the university in question. During the visit, he had “face to face” meetings with all of the members and personnel.

II. Methods used

In preparation for the evaluation, ARACIS and the university in question provided the necessary documentation. The general documents about the university and esp. the internal evaluation report and the relevant annexes were stored in a cloud. These documents were analyzed in more detail in advance. In this analysis were included especially the provided internal evaluation report of the doctoral study domain under review and its annexes. Questions and problems were identified, which were then addressed during the evaluation.

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



During the on-site visit the the coordinator of the evaluation team had the opportunity to visit the buildings included in the institution's property, comprising the classrooms, laboratories, the institution's library, the research centers and other locations relevant for the doctoral study domain.

During the online visit the following were held to receive further and additional details on the internal evaluation report and to discuss open questions:

- 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 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 Doctoral School.

The online visit was realized by Zoom sessions, a simultaneous interpreting was provided.

All the necessary information needed for a deeper and comprehensive evaluation has been provided by the university in question. All questions asked in the meetings have been sufficiently answered. The results of the evaluation of these information build the basis for the following analysis.

III. Analysis of ARACIS's performance indicators

Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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



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

All the necessary documents have been provided, it is clearly shown that the criteria are fulfilled.

Recommendations: none

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.

All the necessary documents have been provided, it is clearly shown that the criteria are fulfilled.

Recommendations: none

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

*general description of the standard analysis.

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

An appropriate IT system is at work, the effectiveness has been clearly demonstrated.

Recommendations: none

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.

It was credibly shown that such a software program is available and in use on regular basis.

Recommendations: Already at the beginning of the doctoral studies, these programs should be pointed out more intensively.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

*general description of the standard analysis.

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



It is not credibly demonstrated that there was any relevant grant in relation to the advisors of the doctoral students. The grant mentioned in the internal evaluation report dates back to 2007/2008 and is insofar not in the period under investigation.

Recommendations: The efforts to receive research grants, institutional and human resources development grant should be clearly intensified.

The indicator is not 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%.*

It is convincingly shown in the internal evaluation report that there were more than 20% doctoral students which received a funding besides governmental funding.

Recommendations: none

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

The presented documents give some relevant hints on the fulfillment of this indicator.

Recommendations: none

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

It is credibly demonstrated and in the online meetings comprehensively discussed that the equipment and the facilities provided are suitable for the current research.

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



Recommendations: none

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

By the documents provided it is shown that the conditions of the minimum standards of CNATDCU are fulfilled.

Recommendations: none

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.*

The documents and annexes do not sufficiently provide clear information that this indicator is really fulfilled. In the meetings and the discussions it becomes clear that 3 of 4 supervisors are retired now. Although it is intended to improve this situation by employment of younger advisors, there are no concrete plans and steps to realize this. The advisors are mainly focussed on literary studies so that the linguistic part of philology is not adequately covered.

Recommendations: It is strongly recommended to integrate more young researchers in the advisor team. Further, linguistics is not adequately represented in the group of doctoral advisors.

The indicator is partially 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.*

The internal evaluation report provides only rough and vague information in respect to this criterion. The competences in the disciplines are not really shown since the CVs do not demonstrate the specific competences. In the meetings and discussions some credible hints were given that the conditions are fulfilled.

Recommendations: The presentation of competencies should be improved.

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%.*

From the IER it can be concluded that this indicator is fulfilled. Since the number of doctoral students decreased in the last years there are no problems with an significant overload of the advisors.

Recommendations: none

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

The provided documents (IER +annexes) fail to demonstrate that 50% of the advisors have at least 5 WoS or ERIH-indexed publications or equivalent international rated results or attendances in conferences and/or editorial boards. The information in respect to Prof.univ.dr. Florin Cioban is sufficient, but the information respect to Prof.univ.dr. Ioan Simut is not sufficient. Further, it can be seen that the impact and the engagements are mostly directed to national level, and there is not a sufficient international component. On the other advisors no adequate details are provided.

Recommendations: The international visibility and impact of the doctoral thesis advisors should be improved by increasing the number of memberships in editorial boards of international journals. The attendance at international conferences should be intensified. Further, the participation in international conference organisation boards/international professional associations should be intensified, too. Finally, it is strongly recommended for all advisors to publish in international peer-reviewed journals.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Performance Indicator *A.3.2.2. *At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in a specific doctoral study domain continue to be active in their scientific field, and acquire at least 25% of the score*

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.



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.

Full and detailed information about this performance indicator is provided. It is shown that the criteria are fulfilled. But at all there is a great difference between the retired advisors and the not retired one.

Recommendations: In order to ensure the achievement of the necessary score in the future, it is strongly recommended to recruit younger researchers as advisors as soon as possible.

The indicator is fulfilled.

Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

The documents show clearly that the number of admitted candidates is much higher than the number of doctoral grants allocated by the Ministry of Education. Insofar the indicator is fulfilled. But the details of the admission demonstrate that most of the candidates are from the UO itself.

Recommendations: It is recommended to develop activities to generate more applications from master graduates from other universities and to attract also international candidates for an enrollment in the doctoral study domain.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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



Detailed information is provided in respect to the criteria of the admission process. The criteria fit the need formulated in this indicator.

Recommendations: none

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%.

The percentage of the drop out rate of doctoral students is calculated in the provided documents in detail. The rate does not exceed the threshold of 30%.

Recommendations: none

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

The IER and the provided annexes show credibly that the indicator is fulfilled.

Recommendations: The training program is primarily focused on literary studies, linguistics is clearly underrepresented in the curriculum. Since linguistics belongs to the philology program, too, the program should be enriched by courses dedicated to research methods in linguistics.

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.

As it is explained in the IER and the related annex and as it was discussed in the meetings, this indicator is fulfilled at all.

Recommendations: none

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.

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.

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



The formal conditions for this indicator are guaranteed at the university in question. This is shown by the provided documents and by the results of the meetings. But in the contents of skills and knowledge there are some shortcomings, since measures to improve employability are underdeveloped.

Recommendations: The support in respect to skills beyond research should be optimized. Information about career prospects should be intensified. Language skills could be improved. The support to gain grants has to be optimized. The aim to promote excellence and to transfer knowledge to the Romanian (and international) society and the scientific community should be supported by effective and adequate measures preparing the doctoral students to publish and communicate their research results to national and international target groups.

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.*

As it was documented in the meetings this indicator is fulfilled. The internal evaluation report provides further details on this. However, the documentation of this guidance is not sufficient.

Recommendations: It should be documented and made more visible how the doctoral students benefit from the counseling.

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.*

The internal evaluation report provides only rough information about this issue. In the documents there are currently 13 doctoral students mentioned, according the discussions and the information provided in the meetings, the number of doctoral students decreased. So the criterion is just met.

Recommendations: Since the current ratio does not fit the needs well, it is strongly recommended to optimize this ratio by employment of new young staff/advisors.

The indicator is fulfilled.

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

Performance Indicator B.3.1.1. *For the evaluated domain, the evaluation commission will be provided with at least one paper or some other relevant contribution per doctoral student who has obtained a doctor's title within the past 5 years. From this list, the members of the evaluation commission shall*



randomly select 5 such papers / relevant contributions per doctoral study domain for review. At least 3 selected papers must contain significant original contributions in the respective domain.

The documents, esp. the IER, do not sufficiently provide publications of all graduates of the last 5 years. Insofar there are doubts whether in two cases publications really exist. It was not possible to assess the quality in these cases. In the other cases under investigation, it can be seen that the necessary original contribution is contained.

Recommendations: A relevant number of articles are published in local anthologies or journals. It is strongly recommended to raise the national and international visibility and the impact of the research by publications in renown national and international peer-reviewed journals. The attendance at international conferences may also lead to international publications.

The indicator is partially 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.

The documents lack sufficient information about prestigious international events the doctoral students attended. Most of the events mentioned are only of local relevance and do not have a clear international level. An international participation is not credibly demonstrated. A Session of scientific communications, Section of teaching staff and doctoral students of the Doctoral School of Philology Oradea, as mentioned in the documents frequently cannot be seen as a prestigious event with in international impact. Also in the discussions there were no further hints on frequent and relevant participation in international events. Taking these facts into account, the ratio is clearly below 1.

Recommendations: Participation in international conferences, whether in-country or abroad, should be more strongly encouraged as a matter of urgency. Provision should be made for each doctoral student to attend at least one international conference or its equivalent per year.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

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

*general description of the standard analysis.

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

The internal evaluation report documents some cases where the indicator was not fulfilled. This was the case for the doctoral thesis advisor Prof. univ dr. Paul Magheru in 2019 and 2020, and for the doctoral thesis advisor Prof. univ dr. Ioan Simuț in 2016.

Recommendations: More attention is necessary to win other specialists from other HEI for these tasks. Overloads of specialists from outside the IOSUD have to be avoided strictly in future.

The indicator is not 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.

In the report, the period under review is changed in this section, which leads to misleading information. It is clear from the previously provided data (cf. B3.2.1.) that prof.univ.dr. Boldea Lulian participated in 10 (of 23) commissions, which clearly exceeds the rate. The participation of 9 commissions stated here also clearly exceeds the limit. Further, the participation of Prof univ dr. Manolaghe Gheorghe in 9 (of 23) cases is not as in the document – misleadingly – stated a ratio of 0.25, but of 0.30 which only narrowly fits the necessary threshold.

Recommendations: Overloads are to be avoided in the future. The distribution of tasks among a greater variety of researchers is strongly advised.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

Although the information in the internal evaluation report is vague, unclear and in details insufficient, since there are a lot of possible details mentioned, but not really demonstrated and documented, the results of the meetings and the discussions held at the online visit of the university show that the indicator is fulfilled in general.

Recommendations: *The routines and results of the development procedure should be better documented.*

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.

The mentioned satisfaction report for 2020 was not provided for the domain of Philology. The information in the provided Questionnaire on the level of satisfaction in the IER and the table presented in the related annex is not identical in detail. So, it is not credibly demonstrated if and how the reporting procedures are performed concretely. Further, in the IER some plans are formulated for the future which cannot seriously be assessed.

Recommendations: The routines to implement the feedback mechanisms should be intensified.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

The IER presents some relevant details about the web-publication of these information. But in most cases the information given is insufficient. It is not sufficiently clear, how the information in categories a), b), e), f), g) is available in the internet. The contents are only provided in the form of annexes to the evaluator.

Recommendations: The information published on the website should be improved and completed.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.



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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

The internal evaluation report provides some basic information about the fulfillment of this indicator. In the meetings held during the online visit it became clear that the necessary access to the databases is provided to the doctoral student on request.

Recommendations: none

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.*

The documents provided and the results of the meetings during the online evaluation give full evidence of the fulfilment of this indicator. But it was mentioned that the information about this opportunity could be given earlier for the doctoral students.

Recommendations: The doctoral students should be informed about the access to the electronic anti-plagiarism-system as soon as possible after their enrollment in the doctoral school.

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.*

On the basis of the results of the meetings and the information provided in the internal evaluation report, it can be concluded that this indicator is fulfilled.

Recommendations: none

The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion C.3. Internationalization

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

Performance Indicator *C.3.1.1. *IOSUD, for every evaluated domain, has concluded mobility agreements with universities abroad, with research institutes, with companies working in the field of study, aimed at the mobility of doctoral students and academic staff (e.g., ERASMUS agreements for the doctoral studies). At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences. IOSUD drafts and applies policies and measures aiming at increasing the number of doctoral students participating at mobility periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.*



The international mobility is clearly insufficient. In the documents only one doctoral student and one partner university abroad is mentioned in relation to international mobilities. There are indeed some international contacts, but there is no adequate mobility.

Recommendations: Students should be encouraged to carry out stays abroad, to make better use of mobility opportunities. The still existing international partnerships should be better communicated to the doctoral students. Further, the international relations and opportunities for stays (incl. grants) abroad should be broadened, esp. in respect to philology. The transparency about international mobility programs should be increased. Clear routines should be implemented for crediting international courses. By the attendance at international conferences international contacts and networks should be established so that the doctoral students would have the necessary contacts for international mobility.

The indicator is not 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.*

On the basis of the information provided in the IER and as a result of the meetings held during the online visit of the university it is clear that there are no adequate international activities to perform this indicator. The mentioned contacts are only on national, but not on international level. There is insufficient information about integration or invitation of a relevant number of leading international experts for lectures and/or courses or project.

Recommendations: It is necessary to strengthen the international contacts to guarantee this indicator in the future. Additionally, the attendance of the doctoral students at international online lectures is recommended.

The indicator is not 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.).*

The documents provided give some details about attendance at educational fairs in the last years. But there is no concrete information, how at these fairs are directed to possible doctoral students. Other measures than these attendances are deficient.

Recommendations: The measures for internationalization are totally focused on educational fairs, they should be diversified. They should especially reflect the multi-cultural and multi-ethnic traditions of the region and point out these facts e.g. on international educational fairs. The internationalization should be also strengthened by the participation in international projects. Further, it is recommended that also the supervisors take part in the mobility activities so that they could contact possible international candidates for the doctoral studies personally.

The indicator is partially fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

<u>Strengths:</u>	<u>Weaknesses:</u>
--------------------------	---------------------------

<p>- the strengths identified throughout the report will be resumed as part of the indicators' analysis. Other general strengths that do not fall within a particular indicator may be formulated.</p> <p>The doctoral domain in question has a good level in literary studies. The team is well experienced. Doctoral and graduate student satisfaction is high. The graduates have good career prospects.</p>	<p>- the weaknesses identified throughout the report will be resumed as part of the indicators' analysis. Other general weaknesses that do not fall within a particular indicator may be formulated.</p> <p>The national and international visibility of the institution is deficient. Linguistics is only insufficiently taken into account. The structure of the supervisor team (75% retired) is more than problematic.</p>
<p><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <p>- possible lines of action for the development of the institution under review shall be identified;</p> <p>By strengthening the international contacts the doctoral domain could win a more renown profile. This would also contribute to further development in terms of quality and content.</p>	<p><u>Threats:</u></p> <p>- the possible causes of the deficient aspects (the causes of the identified weaknesses), which are practically the threats to the proper functioning of the institution, shall be identified;</p> <p>If no far-reaching changes are made to the personnel structure, in the long term the existence of the doctoral domain is in question.</p>

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	PI	<p>A.1.1.1. The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the Doctoral School of the respective university doctoral study domain:</p> <p>a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;</p> <p>b) the Methodology for conducting elections for the position of director of the Council of doctoral school (CSD), as well as elections by the students of their representative in CSD and the evidence of their conduct;</p> <p>c) the Methodologies for organizing and conducting doctoral studies (for the 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</p>	fulfilled	none

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		obtained abroad; e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), giving as well proof of the regularity of meetings; f) the contract for doctoral studies; g) internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies.		
2.	PI	A.1.1.2. The doctoral school' Regulation includes mandatory criteria, procedures and standards binding on the aspects specified in Article 17, paragraph (5) of the Government Decision No. 681/2011 on the approval of the Code of Doctoral Studies with subsequent amendments and additions.	fulfilled	none
3.	PI	A.1.2.1. The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track of doctoral students and their academic background.	fulfilled	none
4.	PI	A.1.2.2. The existence and use of an appropriate software program and evidence of its use to verify the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses.	fulfilled	Already at the beginning of the doctoral studies, these programs should be pointed out more intensively.
5.	IP	A.1.3.1. Existence of at least one research or institutional / human resources development grant under implementation at the time of submission of the internal evaluation file, per doctoral study domain under evaluation, or existence of at least 2 research or institutional development / human resources grant for the doctoral study domain, obtained by doctoral thesis advisors operating in the evaluated domain within the past 5 years. The grants address relevant themes for the respective domain and, as a rule, are engaging doctoral students.	not fulfilled	The efforts to receive research grants, institutional and human resources development grant should be clearly intensified.
6.	PI *	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 /	fulfilled	none

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		human resources development grants is not less than 20%.		
7.	PI *	A.1.3.3. At least 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants obtained by the university through institutional contracts and of tuition fees collected from the doctoral students enrolled in the paid tuition system is used to reimburse professional training expenses of doctoral students (attending conferences, summer schools, training, programs abroad, publication of specialty papers or other specific forms of dissemination etc.).	fulfilled	none
8.	CPI	A.2.1.1. The venues and the material equipment available to the doctoral school enable the research activities in the evaluated domain to be carried out, in line with the assumed mission and objectives (computers, specific software, equipment, laboratory equipment, library, access to international databases etc.). The research infrastructure and the provision of research services are presented to the public through a specific platform. The research infrastructure described above, which was purchased and developed within the past 5 years will be presented distinctly	fulfilled	none
9.	CPI	A.3.1.1. Minimum three doctoral thesis advisors within that doctoral domain, and at least 50% of them (but no less than three) meet the minimum standards of the National Council for Attestation of University Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (CNATDCU) in force at the time when the evaluation is carried out, which standards are required and mandatory for obtaining the enabling certification.	fulfilled	none
10.	PI *	A.3.1.2. At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.	partially fulfilled	It is strongly recommended to integrate more young researchers in the advisor team. Further, linguistics is not adequately represented in the group of doctoral advisors.
11.	PI	A.3.1.3. The study subjects in the education program based on advanced higher education studies pertaining to the doctoral domain are	fulfilled	The presentation of competencies should be improved.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		<p>taught by teaching staff or researchers who are doctoral thesis advisors / certified doctoral thesis advisors, professors / CS I or lecturer / CS II, with proved expertise in the field of the study subjects they teach, or other specialists in the field who meet the standards established by the institution in relation with the aforementioned teaching and research functions, as provided by the law.</p>		
12.	PI *	<p>A.3.1.4. The percentage of doctoral thesis advisors who concomitantly coordinate more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12, who are themselves studying in doctoral programs does not exceed 20%.</p>	fulfilled	none
13.	CPI	<p>A.3.2.1. At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in the evaluated domain have at least 5 Web of Science- or ERIH-indexed publications in magazines of impact, or other achievements of relevant significance for that domain, including international-level contributions that indicate progress in scientific research - development - innovation for the evaluated domain. The aforementioned doctoral thesis advisors enjoy international awareness within the past five years, consisting of: membership on scientific boards of international publications and conferences; membership on boards of international professional associations; guests in conferences or expert groups working abroad, or membership on doctoral defense commissions at universities abroad or co-leading with universities abroad. For Arts and Sports and Physical Education Sciences, doctoral thesis advisors shall prove their international visibility within the past five years by their membership on the boards of professional associations, membership in organizing committees of arts events and international competitions, membership on juries or umpire teams in artistic events or international competitions.</p>	partially fulfilled	<p>The international visibility and impact of the doctoral thesis advisors should be improved by increasing the number of memberships in editorial boards of international journals. The attendance at international conferences should be intensified. Further, the participation in international conference organisation boards/international professional associations should be intensified, too. Finally, it is strongly recommended for all advisors to publish in international peer-reviewed journals.</p>
14.	PI *	<p>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</p>	fulfilled	<p>In order to ensure the achievement of the necessary score in the future, it is strongly recommended to recruit younger researchers as advisors as</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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		soon as possible.
15.	PI *	B.1.1.1. The ratio between the number of graduates of masters' programs of other higher education institutions, national or foreign, who have enrolled for the doctoral admission contest within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget, put out through contest within the doctoral domain is at least 0.2 or the ratio between the number of candidates within the past five years and the number of seats funded by the state budget put out through contest within the doctoral studies domain is at least 1,2.	fulfilled	It is recommended to develop activities to generate more applications from master graduates from other universities and to attract also international candidates for an enrollment in the doctoral study domain.
16.	PI *	B.1.2.1. Admission to doctoral study programs is based on selection criteria including: previous academic, research and professional performance, their interest for scientific or arts/sports research, publications in the domain and a proposal for a research subject. Interviewing the candidate is compulsory, as part of the admission procedure.	fulfilled	none
17.	PI	B.1.2.2. The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral students 3, respectively 4, years after admission does not exceed 30%.	fulfilled	none
18.	PI	B.2.1.1. The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant to the scientific research training of doctoral students; at least one of these disciplines is intended to study in-depth the research methodology and/or the statistical data processing.	fulfilled	The training program is primarily focused on literary studies, linguistics is clearly underrepresented in the curriculum. Since linguistics belongs to the philology program, too, the program should be enriched by courses dedicated to research methods in linguistics.
19.	PI	B.2.1.2. At least one discipline is dedicated to Ethics and Intellectual Property in scientific research or there are well-defined topics on these subjects within a discipline taught in the doctoral program.	fulfilled	none

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
20.	PI	B.2.1.3. The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities.	fulfilled	The support in respect to skills beyond research should be optimized. Information about career prospects should be intensified. Language skills could be improved. The support to gain grants has to be optimized. The aim to promote excellence and to transfer knowledge to the Romanian (and international) society and the scientific community should be supported by effective and adequate measures preparing the doctoral students to publish and communicate their research results to national and international target groups.
21.	PI	B.2.1.4. All along the duration of the doctoral training, doctoral students in the domain receive counselling/guidance from functional guidance commissions, which is reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting.	fulfilled	It should be documented and made more visible how the doctoral students benefit from the counseling.
22.	CPI	B.2.1.5. For a doctoral study domain, the ratio between the number of doctoral students and the number of teaching staff/researchers providing doctoral guidance must not exceed 3:1.	fulfilled	Since the current ratio does not fit the needs well, it is strongly recommended to optimize this ratio by employment of new young staff/advisors.
23.	CPI	B.3.1.1. For the evaluated domain, the evaluation commission will be provided with at least one paper or some other relevant contribution per doctoral student who has obtained a doctor’s title within the past 5 years. From this list, the members of the evaluation commission shall randomly select 5 such papers / relevant contributions per doctoral study domain for review. At least 3 selected papers must contain significant original contributions in the respective domain	fulfilled	A relevant number of articles are published in local anthologies or journals. It is recommended to raise the national and international visibility and the impact of the research by publications in renown national and international peer-reviewed journals.
24.	PI *	B.3.1.2. The ratio between the number of presentations of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years), including posters, exhibitions made at prestigious international events (organized in the country or abroad) and the number of doctoral	partially fulfilled	Participation in international conferences, whether in-country or abroad, should be more strongly encouraged as a matter of urgency. Provision should be made for each doctoral student to attend at least one international conference or its

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		students who have completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years) is at least 1.		equivalent per year.
25.	PI *	B.3.2.1. The number of doctoral theses allocated to one specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the evaluated IOSUD should not exceed two (2) in a year for the theses coordinated by the same doctoral thesis advisor.	not fulfilled	More attention is necessary to win other specialists from other HEI for these tasks. Overloads of specialists from outside the IOSUD have to be avoided strictly in future.
26.	PI *	B.3.2.2. The ratio between the doctoral theses allocated to one scientific specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the institution where the defense on the doctoral thesis is organized, and the number of doctoral theses presented in the same doctoral study domain in the doctoral school should not exceed 0.3, considering the past five years. Only those doctoral study domains in which minimum ten doctoral theses have been presented within the past five years should be analyzed.	partially fulfilled	Overloads are to be avoided in the future. The distribution of tasks among a greater variety of researchers is strongly advised.
27.	PI	C.1.1.1. The Doctoral school in the respective university study domain shall demonstrate the continuous development of the evaluation process and its internal quality assurance following a procedure developed and applied at the level of the IOSUD, the following assessed criteria being mandatory: a) the scientific work of Doctoral advisors; b) the infrastructure and logistics necessary to carry out the research activity; c) the procedures and subsequent rules based on which doctoral studies are organized; d) the scientific activity of doctoral students; e) the training program based on advanced academic studies of doctoral students; f) social and academic services (including for participation at different events, publishing papers etc.) and counselling made available to doctoral students.	fulfilled	The routines and results of the development procedure should be better documented.
28.	PI *	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	partially fulfilled	The routines to implement the feedback mechanisms should be intensified.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		overall level of satisfaction with the doctoral study program in order to ensure continuous improvement of the academic and administrative processes. Following the analysis of the results, there is evidence that an action plan was drafted and implemented.		
29.	CPI	<p>C.2.1.1. The IOSUD publishes on the website of the organizing institution, in compliance with the general regulations on data protection, information such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the Doctoral School regulation; b) the admission regulation; c) the doctoral studies contract; d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis; e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies; f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data; g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor); h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis; i) links to the doctoral theses' summaries to be publicly presented and the date, time, place where they will be presented; this information will be communicated at least twenty days before the presentation. 	partially fulfilled	The information published on the website should be improved and completed.
30.	PI	C.2.2.1. All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of their thesis.	fulfilled	none
31.	PI	C.2.2.2. Each doctoral student shall have access, upon request, to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works.	fulfilled	The doctoral students should be informed about the access to the electronic anti-plagiarism-system as soon as possible after their enrollment in the doctoral school.
32.	PI	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,	fulfilled	none

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		according to internal order procedures.		
33.	PI *	C.3.1.1. IOSUD, for every evaluated domain, has concluded mobility agreements with universities abroad, with research institutes, with companies working in the field of study, aimed at the mobility of doctoral students and academic staff (e.g., ERASMUS agreements for the doctoral studies). At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences. IOSUD drafts and applies policies and measures aiming at increasing the number of doctoral students participating at mobility periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.	not fulfilled	Students should be encouraged to carry out stays abroad, to make better use of mobility opportunities. The still existing international partnerships should be better communicated to the doctoral students. Further, the international relations and opportunities for stays (incl. grants) abroad should be broadened, esp. in respect to philology. The transparency about international mobility programs should be increased. Clear routines should be implemented for crediting international courses. By the attendance at international conferences international contacts and networks should be established so that the doctoral students would have the necessary contacts for international mobility.
34.	PI	C.3.1.2. In the evaluated doctoral study domain, support is granted, including financial support, to the organization of doctoral studies in international co-tutelage or invitation of leading experts to deliver courses/lectures for doctoral students.	not fulfilled	It is necessary to strengthen the international contacts to guarantee this indicator in the future. Additionally, the attendance of the doctoral students at international online lectures is recommended.
35.	PI	C.3.1.3. The internationalization of activities carried out during the doctoral studies is supported by IOSUD through concrete measures (e.g., by participating in educational fairs to attract international doctoral students; by including international experts in guidance committees or doctoral committees etc.).	partially fulfilled	The measures for internationalization are totally focused on educational fairs, they should be diversified. They should especially reflect the multi-cultural and multi-ethnic traditions of the region and point out these facts e.g. on international educational fairs. The internationalization should be also strengthened by the participation in international projects. Further, it is recommended that also the supervisors take part in the mobility activities so that they could contact possible international candidates for the doctoral studies personally.

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

*In my assessment, the doctoral domain generally meets the evaluation criteria. Basic prerequisites for solid education and training of doctoral students are in place. The most of the organizational and content-related conditions are **fulfilled** - with exceptions. These cases, where the requirements are not met, are as follows: A.1.,3.1., B.3.2.1., C.3.1.1., C.3.1.2. The indicators A3.1.2., A.3.2.1., B.3.1.2., B.3.2.2., C.1.1.2., C.2.1.1., C.3.1.3. are only partially fulfilled. It is necessary to improve all the relevant issues in these cases within the nearer future. In most cases this would be possible with a manageable effort when the recommendations mentioned above would be taken into account.*

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.*

Trnava, Nov. 26th 2021

*Prof. Dr. Dr. Georg Schuppener
International evaluator*