

The External Evaluation Report of a Doctoral Study Domain

Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Methods used
- III. Analysis of performance indicators
- IV. SWOT Analysis
- V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations
- VI. Conclusions and general recommendations
- VII. Annexes

I. Introduction¹

In this chapter, the following shall be summarized:

- the context in which this external evaluation report was drafted (**the type of evaluation, the period of the evaluation visit, the composition of the Experts Committee** etc.);
- details about the doctoral school(s) of which the doctoral domain under review is part (number of doctoral advisors, number of students, institutional context, short history etc.);
- details about the doctoral study domain under review (number of students, institutional context, short history etc.).

Data about the evaluated programme:

- The higher education institution:
Bucharest University of Economic Studies (ASE)
- The doctoral school that manages the evaluated doctoral studies field:
MANAGEMENT
- The field of the academic doctoral studies organized by the Doctoral School:
MANAGEMENT
- Type of evaluation:
periodical evaluation

The composition of the Expert Committee:

1	Prof.univ.dr. ABRUDAN Maria Madel Coordinator	Universitatea din Oradea University of Oradea
2	Prof.univ.dr. BRDULAK Jakub International expert	Universitatea de Economie din Varşovia, Polonia SGH WARSAW SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, Poland
3	MĂLĂNCUŞ Cezara	Universitatea de Vest din Timișoara

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



PhD student	West University of Timișoara
-------------	------------------------------

Students of the doctoral school MANAGEMENT:

- 2015-2016: 32
- 2016-2017: 29
- 2017-2018: 27
- 2018-2019: 30
- 2019-2020: 30
- TOTAL: 148

Currently, the 10 doctoral programmes are managed by the 11 doctoral schools. The doctoral school MANAGEMENT is one of these. The doctoral school was accredited in 1997 when ASE was accredited as Institution organising doctoral studies (IOD).

II. Methods used

The below methods and tools were used in the external evaluation process before and during the visit:

- The analysis of the internal evaluation report of the IOSUD 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 (<http://doctorat.ase.ro/english-2>), in electronic format;
- On-line meetings with IOSUD/Doctoral Schools in which the doctoral study domain under review is operating:
 - The Council of the University Doctoral Studies (CSUD) The Council of the Doctoral School(s) (CSD) , 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);
 - Doctoral advisers, doctoral students, graduates, employers of graduates, representatives of Research Centres
- Application of questionnaires to doctoral students or academic staff affiliated to the IOSUD (run by MĂLĂNCUȘ Cezara).

III. Analysis of ARACIS's performance indicators

Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*



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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

The activity at the level of doctoral programmes is performed in compliance with the *Institutional regulation for organising and conducting doctoral studies*, approved by the ASE Senate before the beginning of the academic year and is published on the institutional website. The regulations for particular years are available at the website of ASE <http://senat.ase.ro/hotarari> (only in Romanian). Regulations for academic years from 2015-2016 until 2020-21 were attached to the self assessment report.

The methodology for conducting elections was attached to the report (in Romanian). There is no information if it is publicly available (for example for students).

Methodologies for the organisation and conduct of admission contests to doctoral studies were attached to the self assessment report. Documents referring to the current admission are publicly available. Students have access to the university website to information about minimal criteria for the defense of PhD theses and to the guide for the writing of the PhD thesis.

At IOSUD level there is a Council for Doctoral Studies. At the level of each doctoral school there are Councils of Doctoral School. The structure is aligned with the Romanian regulations.

The Council of the Doctoral School - SDMAN is held regularly at least three times a year, upon demand of the doctoral school director or of at least one third of the members, as well as whenever this is



required in order to solve current problems. Proofs of regular meetings were attached to the report. During the visit, the information was confirmed.

Admitted candidates are enrolled at the beginning of the academic year and sign with ASE a Learning Agreement, which includes the rights and obligations of the parties, signed on the 1st October of each academic year. The attached contract (agreement) to the self assessment report is only in Romanian.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

The Regulation of the Doctoral School of Management - Annex SDMAN-01 includes criteria, procedures and standards compulsory for the aspects mentioned in art.17, para. 5 of GD no. 681/ 2011.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

ASE has an informational system facilitating the data collection, processing and analysis, and of the information relevant for the assessment and the institutional quality assurance. Digitalised processes: students' admission, distribution of dorm seats, institution's book-keeping, management of scientific research, student record, school records, transcript of records fulfillment, intracommunity scholarships and mobilities

No complaints from students.



Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

ASE has implemented ever since 2015 the Antiplagiarism Control operational procedure, by which the method of usage of the antiplagiarism system is defined in compliance with the technical specifications of the Sistemantiplagiat.ro Platform. The procedure was attached to the self assessment report (in Romanian). During the visit, the usage of the system was confirmed.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

The annex SDMAN-08 presents grants achieved by the institution. The number of grants is above the required level.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Performance Indicator *A.1.3.2. *The percentage of doctoral students active at the time of the evaluation, who for at least six months receive additional funding sources besides government funding,*



through scholarships awarded by individual persons or by legal entities, or who are financially supported through research or institutional / human resources development grants is not less than 20%.

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

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

According to research conducted by Romanian evaluators, the situations presented in the evaluation file of the PhD field Management and following the discussions with the director of SDMAN it results that, during the evaluation period, 18.38% of doctoral students (compared to the current number of doctoral students) benefited from other sources other than government funding. We also mention the fact that we found that there are a number of 31 different funding allocations for doctoral students, which represents 22.79% of the total. For the calculation basis - doctoral students with funding from the budget existing at the time of evaluation - the percentage is 43.8% (25/57).

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

The report and annexes do not present detailed information in this criterium. The SDMAN declares covering conference participation at the level below 10% of expenses. According to Annex SDMAN-11c updated and presented at the visit, the expenses with access to international scientific and research literature, those allocated with human resources involved in doctoral student training programs and those with human resources involved in the scientific coordination of doctoral students - in proportion of 40% of total income.

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended to focus on further stimulating the participation of PhD students in the field of Management at conferences, summer schools, courses, internships abroad, publishing specialized articles or other specific forms of dissemination funded by doctoral grants.

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



The indicator is fulfilled.

Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

The PhD students of the Doctoral School of Management are provided, for research activity, with the IOSUD-ASE infrastructure. The infrastructure (rooms, technical equipment) is adequate, students have also access to software applications that equip them for conducting research.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion A.3. Quality of Human Resources

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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



Within SDMAN there are 26 PhD supervisors who are affiliated with the Doctoral School of Management. PhD supervisors, at the moment of preparing the internal evaluation report, coordinate on average simultaneously 4 doctoral students during their doctoral studies (3 years plus extensions). The ratio of the PhD supervisors in SDMAN simultaneously coordinating more than 8 students, but no more than 12 during their doctoral studies is of 0%. The adequate data was attached to the self assessment report.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

Among 208 teaching staff involved in teaching at ASE (Annex CSUD-64), 17 teaching staff do not represent ASE. It means that more than 50% of teaching staff is employed by ASE.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

All 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.

Reliable data was attached to the report.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled.



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

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

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

The ratio is 0% - There is none of the doctoral thesis advisors who concomitantly coordinate more than 8 doctoral students, but no more than 12.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

There are 95% of PhD supervisors having at least 5 publications indexed in Web of Science or ERIH. 85% of PhD supervisors affiliated with the field of doctoral Management benefit from international visibility.

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



Reliable data was attached to the report.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

The indicator is 100% 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.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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



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

The ratio 1,2 is above the required level in the academic years 2019-2020 and 2018-2019. It was also in the year 2015-2016.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

IOSUD has a policy of admission to doctoral university studies with clearly defined criteria, one of the tests of the admission contest being of interview type, the specialized exam. Among the important evaluation criteria in the admission stage are: C1 - the scientific results of the candidate in the chosen field and C2 - the quality of the doctoral research project. The practical aspects related to the actual conduct of the admission, the stages taken, including the specifics during the pandemic were discussed extensively in discussions with the director of SDMAN, supporting compliance with the criteria analyzed.

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended to continuous publication of relevant admission information on the SDMAN website in Romanian and in English

The indicator is fulfilled

Performance Indicator B.1.2.2. The expelling rate, including renouncement / dropping out of doctoral students 3, respectively 4, years after admission⁴ does not exceed 30%.

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



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

The dropout rate never reached 30%. The highest was in 2015-2016 at the level of 16%.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion B.2. The content of doctoral programs

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

The training programme based on advanced academic studies includes 22 disciplines relevant for the preparation in scientific research of the PhD students in ASE.

Within the field of the Doctoral School of Management, the advanced PhD prep plan includes 4 disciplines: (1) Ethics and academic integrity, (2) Implementation of quantitative and qualitative methods in scientific research, (3) Management and innovation for competitive advantage, (4) Formation and development of research skills.

Reliable data was attached to the report.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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



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

The above mentioned discipline 'Ethics and academic integrity' is dedicated to Ethics and Intellectual Property in scientific research.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Performance Indicator B.2.1.3. *The IOSUD has mechanisms to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced university studies addresses „the learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities⁵.*

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

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

The specific professional and transversal skills are emphasised in the skills grids and the discipline sheets included in the annual curricula of the Doctoral School of Management.

The report contains detailed information this indicator. Reliable data was attached.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

Doctoral students receive counseling/guidance from functional guidance commissions, which is reflected in written guidance and feedback or regular meeting. The guidance commissions cover doctoral supervisors and scientific coordinators.

Reliable data about guidance commissions was attached to the report

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



Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

The ratio between doctoral students and the number of teaching staff/researchers providing doctoral guidance is 2.31

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

For the PhD field Management, the situation regarding the scientific contribution of PhD students is presented in detail in Annex SDMAN-31 - which contains the summary of relevant articles published by PhD students who defended their doctoral thesis and obtained the scientific title of doctor confirmed CNATCDU in the last 5 years, as well as their relevant extenso contributions (83 contributions mentioned).

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled



Performance Indicator *B.3.1.2. *The ratio between the number of presentations of doctoral students who completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years), including posters, exhibitions made at prestigious international events (organized in the country or abroad) and the number of doctoral students who have completed their doctoral studies within the evaluated period (past 5 years) is at least 1.*

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

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

The ratio between the number of participations in prestigious international events and the number of doctoral students is 2,22.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

In 4 situations, the number of doctoral theses allocated to an external reviewer was exceeded by 2 for students coordinated by the same doctoral supervisor in a university year. 48 external scientific reviewers participated in defenses. Exceeding the level, according to the expert's opinion, is acceptable.

Recommendations:

1. It is recommended to not exceed two (2) doctoral theses allocated to an external reviewer.

The indicator is fulfilled

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



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

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 is less than 0,3.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Domain C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

**general description of domain analysis.*

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

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

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

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

IOSUD-ASE developed and applies regularly an internal assessment and monitoring procedure of doctoral schools, especially:

- 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.

Reliable data was attached.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

There are implemented mechanisms during the stage of the doctoral study program to enable feedback from doctoral students allowing them 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.

Reliable data is attached to the report.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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

(a) the Doctoral School regulation;

(b) the admission regulation;

(c) the doctoral studies contract;

(d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;



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

All above data is presente on the website <http://doctorat.ase.ro/> and <http://doctorat.ase.ro/management> . Detailed data is provided in Romanian.

Recommendations:

1. It is suggested to make the data available on the website in English if the program is also dedicated to non-Romanian speaking candidates.

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.*

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

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

Students have free access to platforms providing databases relevant to the doctoral studies like: Jstor Business Collection I & IV, Thomson Reuters Eikon, Bloomberg Finance, CEEOL, Audit Analytics, ZP Corporate, as well as other electronic resources and scientific journals, resources accessed via the Anelis Plus Association as part of the project Electronic National Access to Scientific Literature for the Support of Reasearch and Education in Romania - Anelis Plus 2020: Elsevier ScienceDirect Freedom Collection, ProQuest Central, Emerald Management Xtra, Clarivate Analytics (Thomson ISI), Scopus, CAB Ebooks, DeGruyter Ebooks, Elsevier ebooks Freedom CollectionN.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled



Performance Indicator C.2.2.2. *Each doctoral student shall have access, upon request, to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works.*

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

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

All the ASE students, including the PhD students of the Doctoral School Management have access to acces to checking the level of similarity of their scientific works: <http://dmci.ase.ro/index.php/antiplagiat> (in Romanian)

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Performance Indicator C.2.2.3. *All doctoral students have access to scientific research laboratories or other facilities depending on the specific domain/domains within the Doctoral School, according to internal order procedures.*

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

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

Students have permanent access to the rooms and labs of the Faculty of Management, as well as to those of its departments.

Reliable data was attached.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion C.3. Internationalization

**general description of the criterion analysis.*

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

**general description of the standard analysis.*

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



periods abroad, up to at least 20%, which is the target at the level of the European Higher Education Area.

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

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

Out of the 72 PhD students of the Doctoral School of Management who defended their theses within the assessed period 54 participated with papers at international conferences abroad reaching a ratio of 75%. It represents 40% of the mobilities made by all the PhD students.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

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

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

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

International experts have been invited to give lectures/courses for the students of SDMAN. At the IOSUD level, there were 97 meetings presented in the attachment.

Recommendations:

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

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

The IOSUD collects data about internationalization of activities. The data about fairs is collected. There is also monitoring joint international supervision.

Recommendations:

The indicator is fulfilled

IV. SWOT Analysis

<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Broad and high skilled staff involved in the doctoral studies - Highly skilled and motivated the management board of the studies <p>* the strengths identified throughout the report will be resumed as part of the indicators' analysis. Other general strenghts that do not fall within a particular indicator may be formulated.</p>	<p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No significant weaknesses were identified <p>*the weaknesses identified throughout the report will be resumed as part of the indicators' analysis. Other general weaknesses that do not fall within a particular indicator may be formulated.</p>
<p><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increasing globalization attracting foreign candidates to the doctoral studies <p>*possible lines of action for the development of the institution under review shall be identified;</p> <p>*examples of opportunities: a favorable economic environment in the proximity of the assessed institution, the uniqueness of the study programs and their relevance to the local/national market, the overall attractiveness of the study programs etc.</p>	<p><u>Threats:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The demanding external administration burdening causing dedication to much effort on activities non-directly impacted the quality of the program - Lowering engagement of PhD students causing by their external activities, for example, limited participation in the international scholars because of lack availability caused by work. <p>*the possible causes of the deficient aspects (= the causes of the identified weaknesses), which are practically the threats to the proper functioning of the institution, shall be identified;</p> <p>*besides, there may be external threats, such as: the inopportune economic environment in the proximity of the assessed institution, the conduct of low attractiveness study programs for both candidates and the labor market etc.</p>

V. Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (*, C)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	A.1.3.3	At least 10% of the total amount of doctoral grants obtained by the university through institutional contracts and of tuition fees collected from the doctoral students enrolled in the paid tuition	fulfilled	It is recommended to focus on further stimulating the participation of PhD students in the field of Management at conferences, summer schools, courses, internships abroad,

		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.).		publishing specialized articles or other specific forms of dissemination funded by doctoral grants.
2	B.1.2.1.	Admission to doctoral study programs is based on selection criteria including: previous academic, research and professional performance, their interest for scientific or arts/sports research, publications in the domain and a proposal for a research subject. Interviewing the candidate is compulsory, as part of the admission procedure.	fulfilled	It is recommended to continuous publication of relevant admission information on the SDMAN website in Romanian and in English
3	B.3.2.1.	The number of doctoral theses allocated to one specialist coming from a higher education institution, other than the evaluated IOSUD should not exceed two (2) in a year for the theses coordinated by the same doctoral thesis advisor.	fulfilled	It is recommended to not exceed two (2) doctoral theses allocated to an external reviewer.
4	C.2.1.1.	The IOSUD publishes on the website of the organizing institution, in compliance with the general regulations on data protection	fulfilled	It is suggested to make the data on the website available in English if the program is also dedicated to non-Romanian speaking candidates.

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).

It is a very good doctoral program with significant strengths based on highly skilled and engaged staff and management. There were identified no significant weaknesses.



The main opportunity of the program is to further internationalization and attracting more foreign candidates. It might be a significant activity of the whole Romanian business interest – the program is a good proof of high-quality education delivered in Romania and graduates of this program might naturally become Romanian global economical ambassadors.

There were 2 significant threats identified.

1. The evaluation process shows the demanding burden which does not provide value-added of the direct delivery of the program. For example, the number of annexes prepared by the university needed a lot of effort and time. Quality assurance should support the main activity of the study program – meeting the goals and objectives in the learning-teaching process. It would be recommended to analyze the efficiency of quality assurance processes. Raising the bureaucratic burden will decrease the resources for the delivery of the program.
2. The engagement of PhD students is not as high as it could be. It leads to not full participation of students in the opportunities offered by the study program, for example in international scholars. One of the answers to this threat might be introducing Recognition of Prior Learning and micro-credentials to the study program.

VII. Annexes

- Detailed program of the evaluation visit
- Documents updated on the date of the visit - folder
- Questionnaire applied to doctoral students, interpretation