

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

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

**General description of the criterion analysis:** Relevant information is referred in later subsections to the information attested in annexes available online.

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

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

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

*(a) the internal regulations of the Doctoral School;*

*(b) the Methodology for conducting elections for the position of director of the Council of doctoral school (CSD), as well as elections by the students of their representative in CSD and the evidence of their conduct;*



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

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

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

f) the contract for doctoral studies;

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

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online and to a link.

**Analysis:** Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the self-assessment report succinctly refers to information available as annexes. Of the subcriteria in question, the self-assessment report breaks into two points ((b) and (c)) the information on elections for the position of director of the Council of the doctoral school, probably by mistake, and maybe inducing to misinterpretation in the subsequent subcriteria.

Regarding subcriterion (c), it is quite questionable that Annex A.1.1.1.d.1. actually makes available information on the admission *methodology*, even if the methodology at issue is certainly available in Annex 1.1.1.1.d.2 and also in Annex IOSUD 17. The link <https://www.uav.ro/academic/%C5%9Fcoal%C4%83-doctoral%C4%83-interdisciplinar%C4%83-uav-arad/admitere-studii-doctorale> is dead and is not valid as a source of information in this regard.

Regarding subcriterion (e), as far as the regularity of the meetings is concerned, the information in Annex A.1.1.1.f. attests three meetings (October and November 2019, and March 2020). Three meetings, on apparently not evenly distributed periods of time, do not evidence regularity or periodicity as requested in point (e). Regularity or periodicity may be described in Annex A.1.1.1.a., in Romanian.

Subcriterion (f) is supported by Annexes A.1.1.1.g.1. and A.1.1.1.g.2. (forms that do not evidence *actual* contract signing). However, as this report does not question the legitimacy and accuracy of the self-assessment report, the above remarks on this and other specific subcriteria are not considered an obstacle to a positive assessment.

**Recommendations:** Additionally to the annexes cited in the self-assessment report, the recommendation is to implement easier access to the admission methodology online and otherwise. More regular meetings (or the possibility for them) are recommended to be scheduled (to be cancelled, if no decision-making or reporting is needed, but at least the possibility must be available).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, details of the two major points of this indicator are given in the annexes referenced, with specification of the articles concerning each point.

**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 domain analysis:** Relevant information is referred in later subsections to the information attested in annexes available online.

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

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report refers to annexes available online and to a link. The link (UAV Arad - Sums - Core.uav.ro - Intranet) requests a login and a password that has not been made available and, therefore, these resources remain within the university's intranet. Otherwise, and subject to my failure to understand Romanian, Annexes A.1.2.1.a through A.1.2.1.d only list names. This does not evidence the availability and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system as per the requirements made explicit in the indicator. This does not mean that such a system does not exist, only that the information available in the annexes cited does not evidence so.

The email dated 23/09/21 requesting evidence of '[...] the availability and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system as per the conditions made explicit in the performance indicator' was responded with an email dated 24/09/21 as follows: 'The IT system requires a login and password because of the data protection rules. Therefore, we cannot provide access to people outside the university. However, it is functional and students have access to a lot of information such as syllabus, readers, study contract, taxes (they can pay their taxes online), online exams, they can evaluate their professors, the library/hostel/canteen conditions etc. We attach some printscreens with evidence from the platform and upon your request we can start a zoom session where we can access an account and show you how it works.' The response supplied screenshots as sufficient evidence of the existence of an IT system to track students and their background.

**Recommendations:** N/A

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

**Performance Indicator A.1.2.2.** *The existence and use of an appropriate software program and evidence of its use to verify the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses.*

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online and to a link.

**Analysis:** The annexes cited (A.1.2.2.a through A.1.2.2.e) list students, and Annex A.1.2.2.f. is evidence of the results of antiplagiarism scan of an unidentified student. The self-assessment report also refers to the antiplagiarism software's website (Sistemantiplagiat.ro) with instructions.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to offer students the possibility to learn how to optimize their research during the doctoral and postdoctoral periods avoiding (self-)plagiarism, by specific training.

**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 domain analysis:** Relevant information is referred in later subsections to the information attested in annexes available online.



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

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online and to a link.

**Analysis:** The university link (<https://www.uav.ro/universitate/documente/proiecte-f-d-i>) lists a number of projects for 2019 and 2020, with descriptions in Romanian. The annexes cited (A.1.3.1.a through A.1.3.1.g) refer to the same type of contents. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, not any of these sources evidence fulfilment of the indicator either as research/institutional development/HR grants, even if staff costs are listed.

The email dated 23/09/21 requesting evidence of fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator was responded with an email dated 24/09/21 and attachment of '[...] a document signed by the rector and the IOSUD director with projects and amount of money for each as proof for the existence of such grants.' Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, one of the projects listed (CNFS-FDI-2016-0046) is within the field of Philology.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is for the institution to supply the means for doctoral advisors to be able to submit successful grant applications, and for the doctoral advisors to devote as much attention as possible to submit 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:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** As in the previous performance indicator, reference is made to Annexes A.1.3.2.a through A.1.3.2.d. Again, and subject to my failure to understand Romanian, not any of these annexes evidence fulfilment of the performance indicator, especially that the fulfilment reaches a given required percentage. The email dated 23/09/21 requesting evidence of fulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator was responded with an email dated 24/09/21 and attachment of a table showing '[...] the number of grants for philology and other domains of the IOSUD.' In Romanian and English, the document lists 14 candidates and 5 PhD candidate scholarships, so the percentage is well above the requirement set by the indicator (35.71% vs. 20 requested in the indicator).

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to find ways to raise funds for a higher number of students, so they do not necessarily have to do their doctoral studies part-time while at the same time working. While a desirable 100% of funded students is extremely difficult to attain and the percentage attested (35,71%) deserves praise, the institution is encouraged to try and improve on the percentage for the benefit of the quality of the research done by the doctoral students.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**



**Performance Indicator \*A.1.3.3.<sup>2</sup>** *At least 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants obtained by the university through institutional contracts and of tuition fees collected from the doctoral students enrolled in the paid tuition system is used to reimburse professional training expenses of doctoral students (attending conferences, summer schools, training, programs abroad, publication of specialty papers or other specific forms of dissemination etc.).*

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Reference is made to Annexes A.1.3.3.a and A.1.3.3.b. Both evidence publications that are described as funded by the university both as regards printing and students' conference participation. While the former is, the latter is not evidenced by the two annexes. Neither is it in relation to the 10% amount set in the requirements of the indicator, especially as no budget or accounting is supplied.

The email dated 17/09/21 requesting evidence that '[a]t 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 [...]' was responded with an email dated 21/09/21 supplying evidence of '[...] the payment estimate for the publication of the PhD students' conference proceedings 2021 and the contract with the publishing house, the invoice for the conference proceedings, invoices for the payment for plagiarism check for several years (this gives PhD candidates the possibility to check their thesis and other publications for free) and invoices paid to Anelis Plus (giving students the opportunity to access the database for free at the university or at home from a mobile device'.

While this response is certainly evidence of investment of funding to the end requested in the requirements set by the indicator, it does not attest that this investment amounts to '[a]t 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 [...]', or such a percentage cannot be gathered thereof.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to use the percentage set by the indicator to training expenses and, if this is done, to supply the relevant evidence. The recommendation is also to diversify the training actions to bring more varied benefits and extend them to participants who do not take part in conferences and their publications, for whichever the reason. Training courses and mobility actions and purchase/upgrading/updating of software specific for research in Philology (lexical databases) are strongly recommended.

***The indicator is not fulfilled.***

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

**General description of the criterion analysis:** Relevant information is referred in later subsections to the information attested in the annexes available online.

---

<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.



*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 referred in later subsections to the information attested in the annexes available online.

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

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Reference is made to annexes for attestation of fulfilment of the requirements of this indicator:

- i) Annexes A.2.1.1.a through A.2.1.1.l for equipment (hardware and software): Printed and electronic journal suscription and publications, database suscription and facilities are evidenced, even if details of whether they are from the past 5 years are not always available.
- ii) Annex A.2.1.1.e for laboratories for specific courses: A number of premises are listed as available to host specific courses.
- iii) Annexes C3.1.1.a. through C.3.1.1.d for agreements with foreign universities: A number of Erasmus and Erasmus + agreements are evidenced as available.
- iv) Annex C.3.1.3.e for financed projects. A number of projects are listed. Of these, and subject to my failure to understand Romanian, few may be considered to be within the field of Philology. Considering the performance indicator's wording, this is however no obstacle to assess the indicator as 'fulfilled'.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to maintain the effort towards access to specialized information, to supply specific training courses and to supply the means towards publicly financed research projects in the field of Philology.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

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

**General description of the criterion analysis:** Relevant information is referred in later subsections to the 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 referred in later subsections to the 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:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Reference is made to Annexes A.3.1.1.a through A.3.1.1.j, for attestation of fulfilment of the requirements of this indicator. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the documents evidence this indicator as fulfilled for the three advisors available.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to urgently enrol new advisors and, once this has been achieved, to ensure the means to their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

***Performance Indicator \*A.3.1.2. At least 50% of all doctoral advisors have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period with the IOSUD.***

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to an annex available online.

**Analysis:** Reference is made to Annex A.3.1.2. for attestation of fulfilment of the requirements of this indicator. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the document evidences this indicator as fulfilled for the three advisors available.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to urgently enrol new advisors and, once this has been achieved, to ensure the means for their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

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

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Reference is made to Annexes A.3.1.3.a through Annexes A3.1.3.i for attestation of fulfilment of the requirements of this indicator. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the documents evidence this indicator as fulfilled.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to enrol new staff members and, once this has been achieved, to ensure the means for their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator. The recommendation is also to bring to the international level the output of as many faculty as possible, e.g. by submitting at least part of the research output to international forums and events with high quality indices.

***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%.***

---

<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





**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Reference is made to Annexes A.3.1.4.a and A.3.1.4.b for attestation of fulfilment of the requirements of this indicator. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the documents evidence this indicator as not fulfilled:

- i) Against the contents of the self-assessment report, only 2 supervisors are listed in the Annexes, one of whom, Prof. Mihăilescu, supervises 12 candidates: this means the ratio of PhD supervisors who coordinate more than 8 students at the same time enrolled for doctoral studies amounts to 50%.
- ii) Even if the count were according to the self-assessment report's claim of 3 supervisors, and again according to Annexes A.3.1.4.a and A.3.1.4.b, the ratio of PhD supervisors who coordinate more than 8 students at the same time enrolled for doctoral studies would amount to 33%.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to urgently enrol supervisors so the ratio can be lowered significantly in the next three years and, once this has been achieved, to ensure the means to maintaining ratios within the requirements set in this indicator.

The supervisors are encouraged to distribute the supervision among themselves more evenly for the benefit of the students but also of the supervisors themselves, in that the supervisor who is currently overloaded may divert part of the effort to further research, to internationalization or to other research actions.

***The indicator is partially fulfilled.***

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

**General description of domain analysis:** Relevant information is referred in later subsections to the 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:** Relevant data are referred to an annex available online.

---

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.



**Analysis:** Reference is made to Annex A.3.2.1 for attestation of fulfilment of the requirements of this indicator. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the documents evidence this indicator as fulfilled for 3 faculty staff as regards publications. International awareness, as measured in the requirements set by the indicator, is presented only for Prof. Vălcan, as he appears as a member of several scientific committees and a member of examining committees abroad. Most of the rest of the indices for international awareness are not evidenced, even if Prof. Mihăilescu appears as a visiting professor abroad, and some of her publications and of Prof. Neamțu's publications are of conference papers that may have resulted from invited plenaries or similar.

As the indicator sets as requirements both publications and international relevance, and not having evidence of such except for one of the supervisors, i.e. 33%, the indicator is considered as partially fulfilled.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to urgently request and supply the means towards their faculty's international activity in the regards set by the indicator, or similar. The supervisors who do not meet the requirements set by the indicator are also encouraged to diversity their output and network with international universities for attestation of the requirements set within the three year period allowed in the conditions established by ARACIS for indicators that are partially fulfilled.

The actions that apparently need further effort, i.e. where fewest supervisors attest records are:

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

***The indicator is partially fulfilled.***

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

**Description:** Relevant data are referred to annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Reference is made to Annexes A.3.2.2.a through Annexes A.3.2.2.d for attestation of fulfilment of the requirements of this indicator. Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, the documents evidence this indicator as fulfilled for 2 out of the 3 supervisors listed.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to enrol new supervisors and, once this has been achieved, to ensure the means for their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator. The supervisors who do not meet the requirements set by the indicator are encouraged to strive towards meeting them, and the institution is recommended to supply the means to find ways to support and stimulate the staff to remain active in their scientific fields.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***



## **Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

**General description of domain analysis:** Relevant information is presented in the form of text, always with reference to the information attested in annexes available online.

### **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, always with reference to the information attested in annexes available online.

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

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

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** Since the academic year, 2018/19, the degree of accomplishment of this indicator has been considerably higher than the ratio set by the requirements of the indicator of the alternative, second criterion for fulfilment (1.5% is the lowest attested versus 1.2% required).

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, by attracting sustained interest by candidates and sustained budget support.

#### ***The indicator is fulfilled.***

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

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

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by email attachments.



**Analysis:** Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, Annex IOSUD-17 describes admission procedures. Additionally, the email dated 24/09/21 requesting evidence of this indicator was responded with an email dated 24/09/21 where admission work is evidenced for a number of students.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to supply as much public information as possible concerning specific criteria or guidelines for presentation of the candidates' records and projects, so candidates can prepare successful presentations and the committees be presented properly oriented records to measure and assess. For interviews, the guidelines could allocate time intervals to contents such as:

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

***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:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** The report evidences a low percentage of renouncement/dropping out of doctoral studies (10%, i.e. far below the figure set by this indicator). Notably, the text of the self-assessment report describes and abides by a different text than there is in this annex. Thus, the self-assessment report reads:

*Doctoral students` dropout rate 2 years after being admitted does not exceed 30%.*

The email dated 24/09/21 requesting evidence of this indicator was responded with an email dated 24/09/21 where figures refer again to dropout rates 2 years after being admitted. Therefore, this report uses the self-assessment report's wording and requirements, in case the institution was mistakenly supplied a different version for the self-assessment report. The oral interviews, including the one with students, did not suggest the conditions may change substantially in the third or fourth year, or not so to the extent that the dropout percentage would rise dramatically

**Recommendations:** Except for the proviso noted under the former point *Analysis*, the figure attested does not require specific recommendations. Still, the 3-year period and the conditions under which doctoral research and ensuing dissemination take place do not seem to be in accordance with each other, and better results in quality research output can be achieved only if time extensions are allowed both in theory and in practice. While it cannot be denied that they are allowed in theory, in practice they require renewed payment for each year beyond the 3 years allowed in principle. This is a strong coercion on the students' capacity to request a time extension. The recommendation is to allow time extension beyond 3 years' doctoral studies at a substantially lower or, better, at no cost on the part of students.

The second recommendation is to identify the reasons why 10% students dropout as early as 2 years after admission, and address them by provision of the means that may turn out to be a common reason for abandonment.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

---

<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.



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

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

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

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

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online and a link to the university's website.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report refers to annexes available online and to a link. The link (<https://core.uav.ro/raport-fise-discipline>) requests a login and a password that have not been made available and therefore these resources remain within the university's intranet. Still, the annexes supply information that evidence a number of relevant courses, one of which (HdIDIO02) is a discipline in the field of research methodology. An additional course (HdIDIO03) is relevant as far as methodology is concerned too.

**Recommendations:** Statistical data processing is an essential part of present-day language research, whether it is for descriptive or for applied linguistics. Statistical data processing is necessary in more and more areas of philological research, and certainly where quantitative data are used. The recommendation is to supply training courses accordingly, i.e. courses in basic statistics and applied, advanced statistics.

The oral interviews evidenced a need for training in research dissemination strategies, networking and publication policies with emphasis on internationalization. This must be encouraged and used by both faculty and doctoral students for optimization of their publications' impact and contribution to improvements on the institution's quality level and international relevance.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** The annex supplies information that evidences a number of relevant courses, one of which (HdIDIO01) is a discipline in the field of research ethics.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to ensure that the course is maintained and, if possible, supplemented with additional formative actions in this field.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***



**Performance Indicator B.2.1.3.** *The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities<sup>5</sup>.*

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online and a link to the university’s website.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report refers to annexes available online and to a link. The link (<https://core.uav.ro/raport-fise-discipline>) requests a login and a password that have not been made available and therefore these resources remain within the university’s intranet. Still, Annexes B.2.1.3.a through B.2.1.3.f supply evidence of specification of mechanisms towards addressing learning outcomes with specification of ‘[...] the knowledge, skills and responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire by studying each subject or through research activities’ within a course’s description.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to ensure that the learning outcomes are revised and updated as necessary to stay in line with the target knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy required by each course and their overall training.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

**Performance Indicator B.2.1.4.** *All along the duration of the doctoral training, doctoral students in the domain receive counselling/guidance from functional guidance commissions, which is reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting.*

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online and a link.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report refers to annexes available online and to a link. The link (<https://core.uav.ro/platform>) is dead and its data are unavailable. Annexes B.2.1.4.a and B.2.1.4.b evidence guidance.

**Recommendations:** The recommendations are, at least:

- i) To disseminate the range of contents that can be covered within counselling/guidance.
- ii) To involve postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peers.
- iii) To provide a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings.
- iv) More important, to enforce regularity, i.e. to ensure that students make use of guidance at least at the beginning and at the end of the academic year, in order to allow feedback on the institution’s performance, prevent potential dropout, and to identify weaknesses/deviations that may become structural, systematic obstacles during the duration of the PhD studies.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

---

<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.



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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, Annex B.2.1.5. states that the ratio is as per the requirements set by the indicator. Still, Prof. Vălcan appears associated with 4 students. While Prof. Vălcan is one of the 3 supervisors attested for this report, the ratio does not deviate substantially from the ratio set by the indicator and can be certainly compensated in the near future.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, by levelling the ratio to 3:1 in all cases.

***The indicator is partially fulfilled.***

### **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, always with reference to the information attested in annexes available online.

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

**General description of the standard analysis:** Relevant information is presented in the form of text, always with reference to the 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 analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Fulfilment of this indicator is assessed based on 5 papers (listed below in chronological order of publication) selected according to the following criteria:

- i) papers in English are assessed,
- ii) papers with an English abstract are assessed, based on their translations into English by use of an online translator.

Paper 1. Marcu-Oniga, R. (2015). Categoria gramaticală a intensității în gramaticile actuale ale limbii române. *Journal of Humanistic and Social Studies*, 1: 135-153.

(Review based on English abstract and online translation from Romanian into English).

The paper is a most relevant analysis of the mono/bicategoriality of word-classes involved in the expression of intensity/degree in Romanian. The hypothesis of monocategoriality is reviewed and, while it could have been analysed further, the fact remains the paper's description is well-grounded, supported by a wealth of examples and coherent with the data.

The paper's contribution could have been more substantial, if taken at least one step forward with respect to traditional descriptions, but it certainly is original and relevant.

Paper 1. Spunei, E. et al. (2015). Computer diagnosis of output light signals. *Analele Universității Eftimie Murgu Reșița*, 12 (2): 336-344.

(Review based on full-text English paper).

The paper can be viewed as a highly technical application within computational semiotics, typically beyond the reach of students in the Humanities. While not a strictly linguistic development, it goes into communication and response times, and both are technically aspects of language research, whether natural language or artificial language. This paper sets in the latter framework.

The semiotic side of the paper is outweighed by the technical side, and the paper is, in this respect, of limited value for the field Philology. While technically it is advanced research, it does not entail a linguistic analysis nor does it evidence the influence of linguistic (semiotic) data on language processing.

Paper 1. Achim, D. (2016). Lectura naratarului în Hanu-Ancuței de Mihail Sadoveanu. *Limba Română*, 1-2 (236): 161-172.

(Review based on English abstract and online translation from Romanian into English).

The paper uses a novel (*Hanu-Ancuței*, by M. Sadoveanu) to underline the need for the analysis of discursive resources in proper understanding of its literary value.

The value and the originality of the paper lie more in the analysis of the literary work references than in the underlining of the need for the incorporation of discourse resources, insofar as the latter have been part and parcel of proper literary analysis for a long time now.

Paper 1. Ando, A. (2016). Pamfil Șeicaru's literary protrait. *Journal of Humanistic and Social Studies*. 7(1): 29-34.

(Review based on full-text English paper).

The paper examines several works on Pamfil Șeicaru and the picture that emerges thereof. As in other papers under review in this section, the value and the originality of the paper lie more in the analysis of the subject topic (namely, Pamfil Șeicaru) than in the critical analysis of the works under study. The design of the study corpus is worth special mention in that it covers a range of authors, even if the resulting body of data (14 works) and the ensuing analysis lend themselves to further analysis than is presented in the paper.

Paper 1. Petrescu, A. (2016). Categoria aspectului în gramaticile și studiile precomparatiste. *Philologica Banatica*, 2: 48-59.

(Review based on English abstract and online translation from Romanian into English).

The paper overviews the grammatical category aspect based on a sound analysis of bibliographical references on the topic.

The paper's contribution lies in the original contrast between how aspect is not just expressed, but has been described in the grammatical tradition. It raises awareness of potential inconsistencies and is, thus, a step towards critical review of not always well-founded, standing assumptions in grammatical description.



**Recommendations:** The recommendations are to supply the conditions for high quality research, e.g.:

- i) by specific training in:
  - a. frontline research based on qualitative data validated by statistical analysis,
  - b. new technologies,
  - c. encouraged publication in medium-high impact journals.
- ii) by allowing time extension beyond 3 years' doctoral studies at a substantially lower or, better, at no cost on the part of students,
- iii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students,
- iv) by encouraging 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:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

**Analysis:** The indicator's wording is for a ratio of 1 between presentations by doctoral students who have completed their studies and doctoral students who have graduated. The following students attest one or more such presentations:

- i) D. Achim (Annex B.3.2.1.a)
- ii) A. Ando (Annex B.3.2.1.f)
- iii) M.D. Corina (Annex B.3.2.1.c)
- iv) C. Corla (Annex B.3.2.1.d.)
- v) D.L. Drăgan (Annex B.3.2.1.e)
- vi) N.L. Dumitrache (Annex B.3.2.1.f)

Two students do not attest such presentations:

- i) R. Marcu-Onniga
- ii) A. Petrescu

As students i) through vi) in some cases attest more than one such presentation, their output compensates for the lack of such presentations in the latter i) and ii) and, in this sense, the indicator is fulfilled. It must however be noted that this is not the standard, as this type of ratio in rankings is intended to ensure that students produce at least one such presentation each. The latter is not the case: a more precise wording in the indicator would have resulted in partial fulfilment for the output attested for this indicator. This double analysis justifies both the recommendation and the final assessment.

**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 validated by statistical analysis,
  - b. new technologies.



- ii) by allowing time extension beyond 3 years' doctoral studies at a substantially lower or, better, at no cost on the part of students,
- iii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students,
- iv) by encouraging 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 criterion analysis:** Relevant information is presented in the form of text, always with reference to the information attested in the annexes available online.

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by an annex available online.

**Analysis:** The self-assessment report explains the circumstances resulting in unfulfilment of the requirements set by the indicator and according to Annex B.3.2.1. While the reasons (financial and legal) are understandable (especially the latter, legal reasons whereby the regulations have changed), the fact remains that the indicator is, at best, only partially fulfilled, even if for reasons that may have been beyond the institution's reach.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future by attracting more doctoral students and supervisors.

***The indicator is partially fulfilled.***

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

**Description:** No data are presented.

**Analysis:** The indicator does not apply: the PhD theses registered for the last 5 years are below 10.

**Recommendations:** As in the previous indicator, the recommendation is to provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future e.g. by:

- i) attracting more doctoral students and supervisors (by the actions recommended in indicators above),
- ii) enlarging the list of institutions from which to invite specialists (by high quality networking),
- iii) diversifying the range of institutions from which specialists are invited (by high quality networking).

N/A



## **Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT**

**General description of domain analysis:** Relevant information is presented in the form of text, always with reference to the information attested in the annexes available online.

### **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, always with reference to the information attested in annexes available online.

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

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

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

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

**Analysis:** The annexes cited supply further evidence of the points listed in the indicator:

- i) (a) is evidenced by Annexes C1.1.1.a.1. through C.1.1.1.a.3, and C1.1.1.b.
- ii) Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, (b) and (c) are evidenced in Annexes C1.1.1.c.1 through C.1.1.1.c.7.
- iii) (d) and (e) can be considered to be evidenced by Annexes C.1.1.1.d through and C.1.1.1.f.

The text of the self-assessment report does not include point (f) above. This report uses the self-assessment report's version, in case the institution was mistakenly supplied a different version.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to try and give an international dimension to points (a), (d) and (e), in order to achieve greater visibility and relevance, and also to attain an ever increasingly higher quality standard. Future self-assessment reports should explicitly refer to subcriterion (f) above too.

***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.

**Analysis:** Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, some of the annexes cited for this indicator can be considered to enable the necessary channels for student feedback leading to increased improvement of the processes they are involved in. Others are more direct evidence of the resources used, which again can be viewed as evidence of improvement at the request of students' needs.

One of the main points in the self-assessment report's description of this indicator is the work of the QEE commission. While the oral interview involving this type of commission was informative and clear, additional evidence would have been necessary in written to attest their work procedures, their activity and, if possible, their success and their difficulties, in addition to the description available in the opening sections of the self-assessment report too (cf. 1.3.).

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to institutionalize and operate through as many modes as possible (oral, in written, online) questionnaires and channels to enable student feedback so it can be quantified and used towards an analysis of the QEE commission's success.

For the QEE commission, to implement a proactive agenda and act not only at the request of student feedback, but also at their own initiative, e.g. collecting evidence of needs and potential improvement areas regardless of student's elicited feedback.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

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

**General description of the criterion analysis.** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

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

**General description of the standard analysis.** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

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

- (a) the Doctoral School regulation;*
- (b) the admission regulation;*
- (c) the doctoral studies contract;*
- (d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;*
- (e) the content of training program based on advanced academic studies;*
- (f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the Doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data;*



(g) the list of doctoral students within the domain with necessary information (year of registration; advisor);

(h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis;

(i) links to the doctoral theses' summaries to be publicly presented and the date, time, place where they will be presented; this information will be communicated at least twenty days before the presentation.

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text and a table, supported by annexes available online and with links.

**Analysis:** The annexes cited for this indicator may be informative of the requirements set by the indicator. Still, the indicator is not just about the availability of the information listed in points (a) through (i), but about the *online publication* of such information. In this regard, the link supplied allows to find the information requested, at least in the English version of the website, including information for subcriterion (c), for which no specific link is given in the table issued by the self-assessment report.

Please note that fulfilment of this indicator was researched not using the links supplied in the abovementioned table of links for the subcriteria, and this in order to ensure access is possible without guidance. Later inspection of the list of specific links given in the abovementioned table revealed that not all them are active links (e.g. <https://www.uav.ro/academic/%C5%9Fcoal%C4%83-doctoral%C4%83-interdisciplinar%C4%83-uav-arad> and <https://www.uav.ro/academic/%C5%9Fcoal%C4%83-doctoral%C4%83-interdisciplinar%C4%83-uav-arad/finalizare-studii-doctorale> are dead).

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to make information as accessible as possible, e.g. being more user-friendly (please note that the difficulties that prompt this comment may be only for access to information in English). The recommendation is to ensure that links remain active and lead to up-to-date information too.

***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 data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

**Analysis:** The annexes cited for this indicator list and give detail of a number of relevant databases, actually most of them the main ones that are available in the field of Philology.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation 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, supported by annexes available online.



**Analysis:** The link Sistemantiplagiat.ro attests availability of technical means for fulfilment of this indicator. The oral interviews supplied additional data on access to the software in question (e.g. it can be accessed anytime and as many times as requested, it does not involve any cost, the procedure is administratively not long and can be arranged online, ...).

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to *keep* access to the software as easy as possible.

**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, supported by annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Annex C.2.2.3.b. lists facilities with specification of equipment and other relevant details as regards this indicator. The internal order procedures for access is, however, not available in the annexes in question.

**Recommendations:** If there are specific procedures, the recommendation is to make them publicly available online and otherwise. If there are not, the recommendation is to set a number of criteria to operationalize access to laboratories, and such similar centres.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

**General description of the criterion analysis:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

*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 data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

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

**Analysis:** Annexes C.3.1.1.a. through C.3.1.1.d attest mobility agreements, and can be viewed as the result of a policy aiming at increased mobility. However, the third requirement of the indicator, namely 'At least 35% of the doctoral students have completed a training course abroad or other mobility forms such as attending international scientific conferences' cannot be attested in any way or from the actual Erasmus agreements. The wording of the indicator also refers to '[...] attending international scientific conferences'. The spirit of the indicator clearly refers to international conferences abroad, but this is not specified.



Based on the wording of the indicator, it has to be admitted that the requirements are met, even if the actual case is not so, at least as regards international conferences *abroad*.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to strive towards diversification of the Erasmus network.

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

Most important, the last recommendation here is to identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in international conferences and training abroad decide so.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***

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

**Description:** Relevant data are analysed as presented in the form of text, supported by annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Annexes C.3.1.2.a through C.3.1.2.d attest Erasmus agreements, as in indicator A.2.1.1. This is relevant, but does not evidence successful actions in support of actual international participation in co-supervision. Annex C.3.1.2.e attests one invited lecture. Two links attest international cooperation.

**Recommendations:** The recommendation is to design and implement a formal programme to fund doctoral studies within a framework.

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

The last recommendation is to build a bigger network of partner institutions beyond what is evidenced by Annexes C.3.1.2.a through C.3.1.2.d, both within and beyond the Erasmus framework.

***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, supported by annexes available online.

**Analysis:** Subject to my failure to understand Romanian, Annexes C.3.1.3.a through C.3.1.3.d attest international activity as per the indicator's requirements. This is relevant but limited in number and requires additional effort to cater for future needs, if the programme is intended to develop and grow as it should. This is especially the case for one of the first doctoral schools in the university, as is the case for Philology.

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

As in the previous indicator, the recommendation is also to build a bigger network of partner institutions, both within and beyond the Erasmus framework.

***The indicator is fulfilled.***



#### IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><b><u>Strengths:</u></b></p> <p>Initial efforts toward internationalization at a number of levels.</p> <p>Potential for successful teaming up with Computing and Social Sciences.</p> <p>Good infrastructure.</p> <p>Care for students and care for quality control.</p> <p>Consistent information availability.</p>	<p><b><u>Weaknesses:</u></b></p> <p>Need for quality research regardless of quantity.</p> <p>Need for specialized training.</p> <p>Need for internationalization to ensure quality research.</p> <p>Need for most supervisors' bigger international relevance: publications in high-quality forums, participation in international committees, international co-supervision, etc.</p> <p>Need for international networking and diversification of international activity.</p>
<p><b><u>Opportunities:</u></b></p> <p>Design and implementation of specific training programmes capitalizing available contacts and developing new ones towards a number of actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) invitation to thesis assessment.</li> <li>ii) thesis co-supervision,</li> <li>iii) research output co-authorship.</li> </ul> <p>Capitalize on the new online modes of participation developed as a result of the teaching and research procedures during the pandemic period.</p> <p>Increasing awareness of the potential of linguistic, literary and cultural studies as successful research partners for applied research.</p>	<p><b><u>Threats:</u></b></p> <p>To rely on a marked tendency towards publication in national forums (journals, conferences) and disseminate at home events, even if they are international in scope.</p> <p>Not to supply the necessary training for upgrade of research skills, e.g. as specialized courses as well as for postdoctoral career-making, e.g. as regards fund-raising resources and international networking.</p> <p>Not to allow time extensions without payment, which results in poorer research quality. This results, in turn, in poorer visibility and relevance.</p>



## 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	<p>To implement easier access to the admission methodology online and otherwise.</p> <p>To schedule more regular meetings (or the possibility for them).</p>
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	
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	
4.	PI	<p><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.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>To offer students the possibility to learn how to optimize their research during the doctoral and postdoctoral periods avoiding (self-)plagiarism by specific training.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
5.	IP	<p><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.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>For the institution, to supply the means for doctoral advisors to be able to submit successful grant applications.</p> <p>For the doctoral advisors, to devote as much attention as possible to submit bids until more successful applications are secured than are attested at present.</p>
6.	PI *	<p><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%.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>To find ways to raise funds for a higher number of students, so they do not necessarily have to do their doctoral studies part-time.</p>
7.	PI *	<p><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.).</p>	Not fulfilled	<p>To use the percentage set by the indicator to training expenses and, if this is done, to supply the relevant evidence.</p> <p>To diversify the training actions to bring more varied benefits and extend them to participants who do not take part in conferences and their publications.</p>
8.	CPI	<p><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 and the provision of research services are presented to the public through a specific platform. The research infrastructure described above, which was purchased and</p>	Fulfilled	<p>To maintain the effort towards access to specialized information.</p> <p>To supply specific training courses.</p> <p>To supply the means towards publicly financed research projects in the field of Philology.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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	To enrol new advisors.  Once this has been achieved, to ensure the means to their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator.
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	To enrol new advisors.  Once this has been achieved, to ensure the means to their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator.
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	To enrol new advisors.  Once this has been achieved, to ensure the means to their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator.  To bring to the international level the output of as many faculty as possible, e.g. by submitting at least part of the research output to international forums and events with high quality indices.
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%.	Partially fulfilled	To enrol new advisors.  Once this has been achieved, to ensure the means to their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator.  To distribute the supervision among supervisors more evenly for the benefit of the students but also of the supervisors themselves, in that the supervisor who is currently overloaded may divert part of the effort to further research, to internationalization or to other research actions.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
13.	CPI	<p><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 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>To request and supply the means towards their faculty's international activity in the regards set by the indicator, or similar.</p> <p>For the supervisors who do not meet the requirements set by the indicator, to diversity their output and network with international universities for attestation of the requirements set by the indicator.</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>To enrol new supervisors.</p> <p>Once this has been achieved, to ensure the means for their fulfilment of the requirements set in this indicator.</p> <p>For the supervisors who do not meet the requirements set by the indicator, to strive towards meeting them.</p> <p>For the institution, to supply the means to find ways to support and stimulate the staff to remain active in their scientific fields.</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</p>	Fulfilled	<p>To provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, by attracting sustained interest by candidates and sustained budget support.</p>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.		
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	To supply as much public information as possible concerning specific criteria or guidelines for presentation of the candidates' records and projects, so candidates can prepare successful presentations and the committees be presented properly oriented records to assess.
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	To allow time extension beyond 3 years' doctoral studies at a substantially lower or, better, at no cost on the part of 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	To supply training courses, i.e. to implement courses in basic statistics and applied, advanced statistics.  To supply training courses in research dissemination strategies, networking and publication policies with emphasis on internationalization.
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	To ensure that the course is maintained and, if possible, supplemented with additional formative actions in this field.
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 the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities.	Fulfilled	To ensure that the learning outcomes are revised and updated as necessary to stay in line with the target knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy required by each course and their overall training.
21.	PI	<b>B.2.1.4.</b> All along the duration of the doctoral training, doctoral students in the domain	Fulfilled	

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		receive counselling/guidance from functional guidance commissions, which is reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting.		<p>To disseminate the range of contents that can be covered within counselling/guidance.</p> <p>To involve postgraduates so students can receive feedback from their peers.</p> <p>To provide a channel for fast submission of questions (FAQs) and answers that may not require actual meetings.</p> <p>To enforce regularity, i.e. to ensure that students make use of guidance at least at the beginning and at the end of the academic year.</p>
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.	Partially fulfilled	To provide the means to secure fulfilment of this requirement in the future, by levelling the ratio to 3:1 in all cases.
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 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	<p>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 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 allowing time extension beyond 3 years' doctoral studies at a substantially lower or, better, at no cost on the part of students,</li> <li>iii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students,</li> <li>iv) by encouraging 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	Fulfilled	<p>To supply the conditions for high quality research, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v) by specific training in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. frontline research based on qualitative data validated by statistical analysis,</li> <li>b. new technologies,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years) is at least 1.		vi) by allowing time extension beyond 3 years' doctoral studies at a substantially lower or, better, at no cost on the part of students, vii) by encouraging mobility and research leave abroad, both for faculty and for students, viii) by encouraging co-supervision with international co-supervisors.
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.	Partially fulfilled	To provide the means to secure fulfillment of this requirement in the future by attracting more doctoral students and supervisors.
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.	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 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	To try and give an international dimension to points (a), (d) and (e), in order to achieve greater visibility and relevance, and also to attain an ever increasingly higher quality standard.

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
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	<p>To institutionalize and operate through as many modes as possible, questionnaires and channels to enable student feedback so it can be quantified and used towards an analysis of the QEE commission's success.</p> <p>For the QEE commission, to implement a proactive agenda and act not only at the request of student feedback, but also at their own initiative.</p>
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> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Fulfilled	<p>To make information as accessible as possible.</p> <p>To ensure that links remain active and lead to up-to-date information too.</p>
30.	PI	<p><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.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>To expand the list of available databases to new ones as they appear, as well as to additional relevant resources.</p>
31.	PI	<p><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.</p>	Fulfilled	<p>To keep access to the software as easy as possible.</p>



No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI *, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
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	<p>If there are specific procedures, to make them publicly available online and otherwise.</p> <p>If there are not, to set a number of criteria to operationalize access to laboratories, and such similar centres.</p>
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.	Fulfilled	<p>To make a bigger effort towards diversification of the network of Erasmus partners.</p> <p>To identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in these programmes decide so.</p> <p>To identify and address the reasons why the students who do not take part in international conferences and training abroad decide so.</p>
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	<p>To design and implement a formal programme to fund doctoral studies within a formal framework.</p> <p>To design and implement a permanent seminar of international guest lecturers and researchers, whether online or not, to widen the offer of supervisors.</p> <p>To build a bigger network of partner institutions beyond what is evidenced by Annexes C.3.1.2.a through C.3.1.2.d, both within and beyond the Erasmus framework.</p>
35.	PI	<b>C.3.1.3.</b> 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.).	Fulfilled	<p>To design and implement a formal programme of international events to diversify activities and bring them into a permanent programme in addition to the events hosted occasionally.</p> <p>To build a bigger network of partner institutions, both within and beyond the Erasmus framework.</p>



*The recommendations contained in the report shall be resumed in the indicators' analysis. Other general recommendations may be made that do not fit within a particular indicator.*

*VERY IMPORTANT!!! – Each identified weakness must be correlated with at least one recommendation to improve the situation!*

## **VI. Conclusions and general recommendations**

*Several important issues raised during the evaluation are resumed and some general conclusions are drawn on the quality of the education provided within the doctoral study domain under review; the Experts' Panel also presents general assessments about the institution. Other general recommendation may also be presented, which cannot be related to a specific indicator and have not been presented at point V.*

*A decision is proposed, together with the reasons for granting it (if the Experts' Panel members do not reach a consensus, each of them can propose and argue his/her own decision).*

**Conclusions:** Based on the analyses listed above, the undersigned concludes that the conditions for consideration of fulfilment of most indicators are met, but also that some of the main indicators are either partially or not fulfilled.

**General recommendations:**

- Maintain the effort made this far.
- Further support the faculty who contributed to fulfilment of indicators.
- Focus on training and internationalization.
- Focus on research quality and prioritize publication quality over quantity.
- Seek contacts for international cooperation re Phd theses (co-supervision, examination panels).
- Team up with Computing and Social Sciences for research.
- Raise funding for international research and international actions outside the Erasmus Programme.
- Immediately allow time extension beyond 3 years' doctoral studies at a substantially lower or, better, at no cost on the part of students.
- Design and implement a permanent seminar of training courses both for faculty and candidates.
- Encourage and foster action by ethic and quality committees at their own initiative, and with a regular agenda too, not just as reaction to complaints (i.e. proactive, not just reactive action).

**Recommendations for supervisors and candidates:**

- Disseminate at fewer conferences, and divert the effort towards papers in medium/high impact journals.
- Disseminate less as home publications, and divert the effort towards more international interaction (not necessarily publications: e.g. international project bids).
- Undertake regular research leave abroad.



Strengthen the international networking effort for improved output qualitatively (more publication opportunities, more international relevance via other means than publications, more expertise involved) and quantitatively (more examiners, more supervisors, more research topics).

## VII. Annexes

*The following types of documents shall be attached:*

- *The detailed schedule of the evaluation visit – MANDATORY.*
- *The survey questionnaire applied to doctoral students or academic staff in the doctoral study domain under review, the results - optional (e.g., in graphic form) and their interpretation - if applicable.*
- *Scanned documents – any document requested from the IOSUD during the evaluation visit and received, which is not found in the internal evaluation file received before the visit and referred to in the report.*
- *Pictures – if relevant issues are raised regarding the condition of the student residences, cafeterias, premises for teaching and learning activities, library etc.*
- *Screenshots/Print screens of the Doctoral School/IOSUD website proving specific claims in the report, accompanied by the date when they were accessed and saved.*
- *Any other documents relevant to the evaluation process referred to in the report.*

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

- i) Mon. 13/09/21, 16:00-17:00 (Rom. time): Online meeting with the contact person for the doctoral study domain under review and the team who drafted the internal evaluation report
- ii) Mon. 13/09/21, 17:00-18:00 (Rom. time): Online meeting with the academic staff corresponding to the doctoral study domain.
- iii) Mon. 13/09/21, 17:00-18:00 (Rom. time): Online meeting with PhD students.

Signed in Granada, Spain, 27/09/21