

External evaluation report for the setting up (establishment) 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

This chapter will contain a brief presentation of:

- 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 Panel** etc.);
- details about the doctoral school(s) of which the doctoral domain under review will be part (number of doctoral advisors, number of students, institutional context, short history etc.);
- details about the doctoral study domain under review (institutional context);

This report was produced for an external quality assessment visit in order to establish a new doctoral programme in Music at the University of Oradea within its Arts and Humanities Doctoral School.

The evaluation visit took place on 17-18 November 2022. The expert panel comprised Professor Olguța Lupu (Chairperson); Professor Nelida Nedelcuț; Ms. Daniela Voinescu (student representative); and Professor Patrick Zuk (University of Durham, UK).

¹ When applicable, gendered information will be presented as well.



The Arts and Humanities Doctoral School is one of seven Doctoral Schools at the University of Oradea and was established in 2011.

Its staff comprises eight doctoral supervisors (three in Philology, five in Theology). In the current academic year 2022-23, thirty doctoral students are enrolled on its programmes.

The Music Department currently runs bachelor- and master-level programmes, and is well-placed to expand its provision at doctoral level. Two staff members are accredited for doctoral supervision and two others can be co-opted as associate staff.

II. Methods used

This chapter will cover the methods and tools used in the external evaluation process before and during the evaluation visit, including at least:

- Review of the Internal evaluation report for the doctoral study domain under review and its annexes;
- Review of the documents provided by the IOSUD in physical format during the evaluation visit (if such documents were requested);
- Review of the documents, data and information available on the website of the IOSUD/the Doctoral School(s), in electronic format;
- Visiting the buildings of the institution, including (an indicative and non-exhaustive list, may change according to the context): classrooms; laboratories; the institution's library; the Career Counselling and Guidance Centre; lecture halls for students; student residences; student cafeteria; sports facilities, etc.;
- Meeting/discussions with members of the management of the Doctoral School where the doctoral study domain under review will operate;
- Meeting/discussions with doctoral advisors in the doctoral study domain under review;
- Meeting/discussions with representatives of the various structures of the IOSUD/Doctoral School where the doctoral study domain under review is operating: the Council of the Doctoral School, the University Senate, the Board of Directors, the Evaluation and Quality Assurance Commission, the Quality Assurance Department, the Ethics Commission (including with the student representatives of these structures); the Career Counselling and Guidance Centre; student organizations; secretariats; various departments / administrative offices (Social/Student residences-Cafeterias etc.), etc.;

Evidence was gathered from the following sources:

- i. the Internal Evaluation Report of the doctoral university studies field and its annexes;
- ii. Supplementary documentation requested by the commission and made available by the institution during the evaluation visit;
- iii. Documentation available on the university's website;



- iv. A tour of the premises, which included the lecture halls; specialist music facilities such as performance spaces, lecture theatres, and sound laboratories; the Centre for Artistic Research and Creation (visual arts and music; student halls of residence and the canteen;
- v. Meetings with personnel from the Arts and Humanities Doctoral School of Humanities and Arts, prospective doctoral supervisors in Music, the ethics commission, university research centres, the university senior management, university administration, and the evaluation and quality assurance commission.

III. Analysis of ARACIS's performance indicators

Domain A. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

- general description of domain analysis.

Seven doctoral schools operate at the University of Oradea, between them covering 18 fields of study. The proposed new doctoral programme in Music will be administered by the Arts and Humanities Doctoral School, which currently oversees programmes in Philology and Theology. In the current academic year, 30 students are enrolled on its doctoral programmes.

Criterion A.1. Administrative and managerial institutional structures, and financial resources

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

- general description of the standard's analysis.

The review panel found that the University of Oradea has effective mechanisms in place to run doctoral-level programmes.

Performance indicator A.1.1.1. The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the doctoral school that the doctoral domain is a part of:

- 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 the CSD, and evidence that such elections were conducted;
- c) methodologies for organising and conducting doctoral studies (admission of doctoral students, completion of doctoral studies);



- d) existence of mechanisms for recognising the status of a doctoral advisor and the equivalence of a doctoral degree obtained abroad;
- e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), including proof of the regular frequency of convening their 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 status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
 - analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

The review panel found as follows:

a) The University of Oradea has general regulations in place governing the organization and conduct of university doctoral studies and postdoctoral programs (Annex II.A.1. ROF SUD_HS 14:2021). There are also regulations specific to the Arts and Humanities Doctoral School, introduced between 2017 and 2021 (see Annex II.A.1.1 and Supplementary Annex A.S.1)

b) Procedures are in place to hold elections for the positions of director and council members of the Doctoral School Council, including student members (Annex II.A.2.2). Records of election outcomes are kept (Annex II.A.2.1; Annex II.A.2.5.a). The council membership is listed on the university website (<https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/despre1-7/conducere-csd>).

c) Procedures to admit doctoral students are in place (Annex II.A.4), as well as regulations governing the admission of music students to the new doctoral programme (Annex II.A.4; Annex II.A.5; Annex II.A.6). Further information about institutional admissions procedures are published on the university website: <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/admitere/metodologie-admitere-doctorat-iosud-uo>

There are also institutional-level regulations on the conduct and organisation of doctoral-level programmes (Annex II.A.1.ROF SUD_HS 14_2021_A26.) and on the completion of doctoral-level studies (Annex II.C.8).

d) Procedures exist for recognising the status of a doctoral advisor and the equivalence of a doctoral degree obtained abroad (Annex II.A.7, HS 27.03.2017; Annex II.A.8. – HS 27.03.2017).

e) Evidence exists of functional management structures (the Doctoral School Council), and of the regular frequency of its meetings (Annex II.A.9, HS 11.12.2017; see also: <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/despre/hotarari-csud>).



f) A doctorate university studies contract is evidenced in Annex II.A.10.

g) No internal procedures for the analysis and approval of proposals regarding the training for doctoral study programs based on advanced academic studies were identified.

- **Recommendations: The Arts and Humanities Doctoral School should develop procedures to analyse and approve the content of doctoral training programmes.**

The indicator is fulfilled

Performance indicator A.1.1.2. The doctoral school's Regulations include mandatory criteria, procedures and standards concerning the aspects specified in art. 17, para. (5) of Government Decision no. 681/2011 on the approval of the Code of Doctoral Studies, as further amended and supplemented.

- **description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.**
- **analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.**

In their revised form, the Doctoral School's regulations mostly satisfy government requirements. However, the panel made the following observations:

(i) As noted above, the Arts and Humanities Doctoral School should develop procedures for the periodic review of doctoral training programmes and the approval of new contributions to the curriculum;

(ii) No procedures for resolving conflicts between supervisor and supervisee were identified.

(iii) While procedures are in place to detect and prevent plagiarism and fraud, the wording of the relevant regulations needs to be revised.

(iv) The procedures for revoking a doctoral supervisor's permission to supervise and for admitting new members to the Doctoral School need to be clarified.

Recommendations:

Consideration should be given to the following:



- (i) the development of procedures for periodic review and revision of doctoral training provision;
- (ii) the revision of the rubric on plagiarism to forbid any level of plagiarism (the threshold is currently set at 5%);
- (iii) clarification of the procedures for admitting new members to the Doctoral School and for revoking permission to supervise in the event that a supervisor's work is found to be unsatisfactory.
- (iv) development of conflict resolution procedures.

The indicator is partially fulfilled

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

***general description of the standard's analysis.**

The IOSUD has the necessary resources to offer a viable programme of doctoral studies in music.

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 status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.**
- **analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.**

The university employs the UNIWEB platform to manage student records, including those of doctoral students, and to keep track of their academic progress. (Annex II.A.17). According to discussions with representatives of the university's professional support staff during our visit, the platform is found to be an effective tool and robust data security protocols are in place.

A selection of student records was made available for inspection during our visit.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled

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



- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

Completed theses are routinely checked with anti-plagiarism software, and work-in-progress can also be checked at the request of the doctoral supervisor. Evidence of the purchase and use of the software in question is provided in Appendix II.A.18 and Supplementary Annexes A.S.13 and A.S.15.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion A.2. Research infrastructure

Standard A.2.1. The IOSUD has a modern research infrastructure to support the performance of specific doctoral study activities.

- general description of the standard's analysis.

The university has recently invested in a new state-of-the-art premises for the Music Department, which provides excellent facilities and will undoubtedly enhance the attractiveness of the new programme. The wider research environment is significantly strengthened by the university's Centre for Research and Artistic Creation.

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 status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

An overview of the existing infrastructure is described in the self-evaluation report (pp. 9-10).

The university is to be commended for its investment in a new premises for the Music Department, which opened in October 2022. It has excellent facilities (including rehearsal



and practice spaces, a concert hall, a music library, and recording studios) and offers a very pleasant working environment.

The university library facilities provide access to electronic databases including Web of Science, Scopus, ProQuest, SpringerLink Journals, and the ScienceDirect Freedom Collection.

The Centre for Artistic Research and Creation is highly research-active. A summary of activities for the period 2015-19) is given in Annex II.A.23: details of activities undertaken by Music Department staff are given on pp. 61-117.

The University of Oradea collaborates with cultural institutions in the city, affording excellent opportunities for students on its Music programmes. It also maintains links with other Romanian universities and organises an international performance competition. (Further details are given in Annex II.A.22.)

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion A.3. Quality of human resources

Standard A.3.1. For each domain, there is qualified staff having the experience required for carrying out the doctoral program.

- **general description of the standard's analysis.**

Performance indicator A.3.1.1. Minimum three doctoral thesis advisors work 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 status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.**
- **analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.**

This regulation is comfortably fulfilled. Four staff members work in the doctoral domain and all meet the minimum CNATDCU standards. See Annex II.A.28 and Supplementary Annexes AS5, AS6, and AS7.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled



Performance indicator* A.3.1.2. At least 50% of the doctoral advisors in the doctoral domain under review are tenured professors within the IOSUD and have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

Two of the four doctoral supervisors (Professor Romeo Râmbu and Dr. Mirela Țârc) are tenured professors within IOSUD and are on permanent full-time contracts.

Recommendations: None

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 associate professors / 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 status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

The review team found that all staff members possessed the necessary expertise and qualifications. Module pro formas are provided in Annex II.A.30 and details of the curriculum for the training programme in Annex II.B.1 and Supplementary Annexe A.S.2.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled

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

- general description of the standard's analysis.

All four doctoral supervisors are engaged in research activity that is visible at an international level.



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 visibility within the past 5 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 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 5 years by their membership on the boards of professional associations, membership in organising committees of arts events and international competitions, membership on juries or umpire teams in artistic events or international competitions.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

Two of the doctoral supervisors, Professor Rîmbu and Professor Burcă, have significant profiles as performers. Professor Rîmbu has produced commercial recordings for notable labels including Olympia and Sony, which have been very favourably reviewed abroad. Professor Burcă has served on the juries of international competitions. Dr Țârc has published work in prominent musicological journals and is a member of various professional bodies. Dr Demenescu has also published widely.

The staff's research activities are evidenced in the self-evaluation report (p. 33-36), Annex II.A.26 and II.A.27, and Supplementary Annex A.S.7.

Recommendations: None

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 5 years.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.



Annex II.A.28 furnishes evidence that all four doctoral supervisors significantly exceed 25% of the score required by the CNATDCU minimum standards as a result of the activities carried out in the last 5 years. Further details are given in Supplementary Annex A.S.6.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled.

Domain B. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS.

general description of domain analysis.

A list of current doctoral students is published on the university's website: see <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/organizare/doctoranzi>

The University of Oradea attracts doctoral candidates from other Romanian universities, including the University of Bucharest, the University of Timișoara, and the Technical University of Cluj-Napoca.

The Arts and Humanities Doctoral School of Humanities typically attracts more applicants than can be provided with grant funding from the budget.

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

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

- general description of the standard's analysis.

The University of Oradea uses appropriate procedures to select doctoral candidates for admission to its programmes in order to ensure that they are suitably equipped to undertake study at doctoral level.

Performance indicator* B.1.2.1. Admission in the doctoral study programmes is based on selection criteria including the academic, research and professional performance of the candidates; their interest for scientific or artistic/sports research; publications in the domain, and a proposal of a research subject. Interviewing the candidate is mandatory as part of the admission procedure.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the



- institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

Information concerning selection and admissions procedures is given in Annex II.A.4.

Applicants are assessed on the basis of their academic track record, evidence of research activities (including publications and performances), and the quality of an outline proposal for a programme of original research to be undertaken at doctoral level. They must also undergo a mandatory interview, which affords a further opportunity for the admissions team to judge their suitability for admission.

Recommendations: None
The indicator is fulfilled

Criterion B.2. The content of the doctoral programs

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

- general description of the standard's analysis.

The design of the training for the proposed new doctoral programme in Music conforms to national and internal regulations. Doctoral candidates must complete two phases of training—a preparatory phase in Year 1 and training in research methods in Year 2.

Details of the training programme (module pro formas outlining indicative content, modes of assessment bibliographies) are provided in Supplementary Annexes 2 and 3.

Performance indicator B.2.1.1. The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant for the scientific research training of doctoral students, out of which at least one discipline focuses on the in-depth study of research methodology and/or statistical data processing.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.



The proposed training programme comprises courses on research methods, ethics and academic integrity, music analysis, and interpretation. Doctoral candidates can avail of additional training offer by participating in research events and summer schools.

Details are given in:

<https://www.uoradea.ro/Evenimente+studii+doctorat>

<https://arte.uoradea.ro/ro/despre-noi-facultate/cercetare>

<http://litere.uoradea.ro/cercetare/cercetare>

See also Supplementary Annexes 2 and 3.

Recommendations:

The module pro formas should specify learning outcomes and be aligned more closely with the European Qualifications Framework.

The indicator is fulfilled

Performance indicator B.2.1.2. At least one discipline is dedicated to ethics in scientific research and intellectual property, or there are well-defined topics on these subjects within a discipline taught in the doctoral program.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

The doctoral training programme includes a module on ethics and academic integrity which covers these topics. Details are provided in Supplementary Annexes 2 and 3.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled

Performance indicator B.2.1.3. The IOSUD has the mechanisms in place to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced higher education studies related to the evaluated domain addresses the “learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, and the responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities².

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the

² Or by what the graduate should know, understand and be able to do, according to the provisions of the Methodology for the listing and registration of higher education qualifications in the National Register of Qualifications in Higher Education (RNCIS) approved by the Order of the Minister of National Education no.3475/2017 with subsequent amendments and additions.



- institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

The academic training programme undoubtedly delivers appropriate learning outcomes, although these need to be formulated more specifically in the course documentation.

The programme facilitates the acquisition of subject-specific skills (for example, theories and methods relevant to the study of music) as well as a range of practical skills (e.g. the design and management of independent research projects; understanding of pertinent issues relating to academic integrity and intellectual property).

Supplementary Annex 3 provides details of the content of the training programme.

Recommendations:

Learning outcomes should be articulated more explicitly in the course documentation.

The indicator is fulfilled

DOMAIN C. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

- general description of the analysis of the field.

The review team found that appropriate quality assurance mechanisms are in place.

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

Standard C.1.1. The institutional framework is in place, and policies and procedures are applied for the internal assurance of the relevant quality.

- general description of the standard's analysis.

University of Oradea follows appropriate policies and procedures to assure the quality of its doctoral programmes and these have previously undergone review.

Details of the policies and procedures are given in Annex II.C.1. and Annex II.C.6.

Performance indicator C.1.1.1. The doctoral school to which the doctoral study domain belongs demonstrates that the internal evaluation and quality assurance process of the



study domain is carried out constantly, according to a procedure developed and applied at the level of the IOSUD, including an evaluation of the following mandatory criteria:

- a) the scientific work of doctoral advisors;
 - b) the infrastructure and logistics needed for carrying out the research activity;
 - c) the regulations and procedures based on which doctoral studies are organised;
 - d) the scientific activity of doctoral students;
 - e) the training program based on advanced higher education studies of doctoral students;
 - f) social and academic support services (including for participation in various events, publishing papers, etc.) and counselling services available for the doctoral students.
- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
 - analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

The review panel found as follows:

a) the scientific work of doctoral advisors

The University of Oradea monitors the research activity of doctoral supervisors, who are expected to report on their activity annually. The evaluation procedures follow those specified by the Romanian Ministry of Education. See RA, p.19, and Annex II.8.

b) the infrastructure and logistics needed for carrying out the research activity

Appropriate infrastructure and resources are in place to support postgraduate research. Access to necessary publications and a range of pertinent electronic resources (e.g. Proquest Central) is provided through the university library.

As previously mentioned, the university has recently invested in a new premises for the Music Department, which provides facilities of a high standard (including performance spaces and specialist laboratories).

See RA, pp.29-30.

c) the regulations and procedures based on which doctoral studies are organised

Appropriate regulations and procedures are in place and have been approved by the university Senate.

For details, see: Annex II.A.1, Annex II.A.14, Annex II.A.15, Annex II.C.8, and Annex II.C.9.



d) the scientific activity of doctoral students

In addition to completing a substantial original doctoral-level research project, doctoral candidates in music will be expected to engage in appropriate research activities (including giving presentations on their research at symposia and/or public performances).

See Supplementary Annex A.S.1.

e) the training program based on advanced higher education studies of doctoral students

The Doctoral School offers suitable courses within the training program to doctoral students. For details, see Supplementary Annexes 1 and 2.

f) social and academic support services (including for participation in various events, publishing papers, etc.) and counselling services available for the doctoral students.

The professional development of doctoral candidates on the new Music programme will be supported in a range of ways, including opportunities to participate in academic conferences and public performances, support for publication of academic research and to make recordings of performances, support for travel for research activities and for the purchase of relevant materials such as specialist publications.

Doctoral students in music can avail of university accommodation and catering, as well as medical treatment, access to sports facilities, and the counselling service.

They can also avail of international mobility schemes such as ERASMUS+.

For details, see Annex II.C.7 and Supplementary Annex 3.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled

Performance indicator* C.1.1.2. Mechanisms are implemented during the doctoral study program to enable identification of the doctoral students' 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 status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

The University uses questionnaires to evaluate doctoral student satisfaction over the course of the programme and also after completion. The data is used to monitor quality and to improve aspects that may need attention.

Similar mechanisms will be used for candidates on the new doctoral programme in Music: candidates will be afforded regular opportunities to comment on their satisfaction with the programme and with the quality of the supervision and teaching that they receive.

Evidence is provided in Annex II.C.3, Annex II.C.7, and Supplementary Annexes 16 and 17.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled

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

- general description of the criterion analysis.

The Arts and Humanities Doctoral School provides learning resources in a transparent and accessible manner.

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

- general description of the standard's analysis.

The Arts and Humanities Doctoral School provides the necessary information to current and prospective doctoral candidates in a transparent way, as well as to the general public.

Performance indicator C.2.1.1. Subject to compliance with the data protection regulations in force, the IOSUD publishes the following types of information on the website of the higher education institution:

a) the regulations of the doctoral school;



- b) the admission regulations;
- c) the doctoral study contract;
- d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis;
- e) the content of the training programs 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 in the domain concerned, with basic information (year of enrolment; advisor);
- h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis;
- i) links to the summaries of the doctoral theses to be presented publicly, as well as the day, time and place where they will be presented, at least 20 days before the presentation.
 - description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
 - analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

The review panel found that all the necessary information for doctoral students, for future candidates, and for the general public can be accessed on the institution's website at <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/documente/formulare-utile>.

a) the regulations of the doctoral school

Available at <https://cloud.uoradea.ro/index.php/s/dJFm3EXj8qbaFrPMetodologia>

b) the admission regulations

Available at <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/admitere/metodologie-admitere-doctorat-iosud-uo>

c) the doctoral study contract

Available at <https://cloud.uoradea.ro/index.php/s/kmSFRYqddyXgp53>

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

Available at <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/documente/formulare-utile>

e) the content of the training programs based on advanced academic studies;



Course outlines are available for Philology at <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/domenii-de-doctorat-7/domeniul-filologie/248-plan-de-invatamant> and for Theology at <https://cloud.uoradea.ro/index.php/s/jzN7o38pkAjJazo>

f) the academic and scientific profile, thematic areas/research themes of the doctoral advisors within the domain, as well as their institutional contact data

Details of current doctoral supervisors attached to the Arts and Humanities Doctoral School are provided at <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/conducatori-doctorat2-7/conducator-filologie> and <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/conducatori-doctorat2-7/conducator-teologie>

Details of prospective doctoral supervisors for candidates on the new Music programme are given in Supplementary Annex 10.

g) the list of doctoral students in the domain concerned, with basic information (year of enrolment; advisor)

Lists of current doctoral students is published on the university's website: see <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/organizare/doctoranzi>

h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis

Information about the standards for developing doctoral theses within the Arts and Humanities Doctoral School are provided at <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/domenii-de-doctorat-7/domeniul-filologie/110-standarde-de-elaborare-a-tezei-de-doctorat> and <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/domenii-de-doctorat-7/domeniul-teologie/135-standarde-de-elaborare-a-tezei-de-doctorat>

i) links to the summaries of the doctoral theses to be presented publicly, as well as the day, time and place where they will be presented, at least 20 days before the presentation.

Information is provided at <https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/sustineri-teze/sustineri-teze-doctorat>

Recommendations: None
The indicator is fulfilled



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

- general description of the standard's analysis.

The Arts and Humanities Doctoral School of Humanities and Arts is in a position to provide doctoral students with access to the necessary resources.

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 status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

The university provides doctoral students with access through the Anelis Plus programme free of charge to national and international periodicals and databases (PROQUEST Central, ScienceDirect Freedom Collection, Scopus, Elsevier, SpringerLink Journals, Springer, Web of Science: Core Collection, InCites Journal Citation Reports, Derwent Innovations Index, Clarivate Analytics).

See Appendix II. C.11 and Supplementary Annex A.S.14.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled

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

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

All doctoral candidates have access to anti-plagiarism software to enable them to check their work. In accordance with the Order of the Ministry of Education and Research no. 5229/17.08.2020, The Arts and Humanities Doctoral School uses the platform Sistemantiplagiat.ro, approved by CNATDCU (RefBooks). Reports on work submitted through this system are sent to the doctoral supervisor and the members of the guidance committee, and subsequently discussed with the doctoral student.

See Appendix II. A.18 and Supplementary Annex15.



Recommendations: None

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 a set of internal regulations.

- description of the status quo, findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.
- analysis of the status quo, the findings from the documents provided by the institution under review and from the actual evaluation visit.

Doctoral students in Music will have access to the necessary resources. As detailed above, the Music Department has recently been provided with a custom-built new premises, which has performance spaces, laboratories, and specialist equipment. Further facilities are provided through the university library and the Centre for Research and Artistic Creation.

New software platforms (including Microsoft Teams) have recently been provided to facilitate ease of internal communication.

See Annex II.A.23; Annex II.C.4; and Supplementary Annexes 1 and 4.

Recommendations: None

The indicator is fulfilled



SWOT analysis

<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <p>- the strengths identified throughout the report within the analysis per indicators will be resumed here. Other general strengths that do not fall under a specific indicator may be formulated as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The quality of the teaching staff - The facilities in the new Music Department building - Strong links with other Romanian educational and cultural institutions - The university's partnerships in the region - Support for student research and professional development 	<p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <p>- the weaknesses identified throughout the entire report within the analysis per indicators will be resumed here. Other general weaknesses that do not fall under a specific indicator may be formulated as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fall in financial support for student grants
<p><u>Opportunities:</u></p> <p>possible lines of action for the development of the institution under review will be identified here; examples of opportunities: a favourable economic environment in the proximity of the evaluated institution; the uniqueness of the study programs, and their relevance for the local/national market; the overall attractiveness of the study program etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible opportunities for interdisciplinary projects (e.g. music and medical humanities) - Greater internationalisation of programme and strengthening of links with foreign institutions and cultural agencies 	<p><u>Threats:</u></p> <p>the possible causes of the deficient aspects (the causes of the identified weaknesses) will be identified here, which are actually the threats to the proper functioning of the institution; in addition, external threats may be present as well, such as an inadequate economic environment in the proximity of the evaluated institution; the delivery of study programmes that have low attractiveness both for the candidates and for the labour market etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible deterioration in the economic outlook due to international events - Demographic decline - Possible fall in levels of interest in 'high' musical culture amongst younger generation

Overview of judgments awarded and of the recommendations

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI*, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
1.	PI	<p>A.1.1.1. The existence of specific regulations and their application at the level of the doctoral school that the doctoral domain is a part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 the CSD, and evidence that such elections were conducted; c) methodologies for organising and conducting doctoral studies (admission of doctoral students, completion of doctoral studies); d) existence of mechanisms for recognising the status of a doctoral advisor and the equivalence of a doctoral degree obtained abroad; e) functional management structures (Council of the doctoral school), including proof of the regular frequency of convening their 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. 	Fulfilled	The Arts and Humanities Doctoral School should develop procedures to analyse and approve the content of doctoral training programmes.
2.	PI	<p>A.1.1.2. The doctoral school's Regulations include mandatory criteria, procedures and standards concerning the aspects specified in art. 17, para. (5) of Government Decision no. 681/2011, as further amended and supplemented.</p>	Partially fulfilled	<p>Consideration should be given to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the development of procedures for periodic review and revision of doctoral training provision; (ii) the revision of the rubric on plagiarism to forbid any level of plagiarism (the threshold is currently set at 5%); (iii) clarification of the procedures for admitting new members to the Doctoral School and for revoking permission to supervise in the event that a supervisor's work is found to be unsatisfactory. (iv) development of conflict resolution procedures.
3.	PI	<p>A.1.2.1. The existence and effectiveness of an appropriate IT system to keep track</p>	Fulfilled	None



No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI*, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		of doctoral students and their academic background.		
4.	PI	A.1.2.2. The existence and use of an appropriate software and evidence of its use to verify the percentage of similarity in all doctoral theses.	Fulfilled	None
5.	CPI	A.2.1.1. The venues and the material equipment available to the IOSUD/the doctoral school enable the research activities in the evaluated domain to be carried out, in line with the assumed mission and objectives (computers, specific software, equipment, laboratory equipment, library, access to international databases, etc.). The research infrastructure and the provision of research services are presented to the public through a specific platform. The research infrastructure described above, which was purchased and developed within the past 5 years will be presented distinctly.	Fulfilled	None
6.	CPI	A.3.1.1. Minimum three doctoral thesis advisors work within that doctoral domain, and at least 50% of them (but no less than three) meet the minimum standards of the National Council for Attestation of University Degrees, Diplomas and Certificates (CNATDCU) in force at the time when the evaluation is carried out, which standards are required and mandatory for obtaining the enabling certification.	Fulfilled	None
7.	PI *	A.3.1.2. At least 50% of the doctoral advisors in the doctoral domain under review are tenured professors within the IOSUD and have a full-time employment contract for an indefinite period.	Fulfilled	None
8.	PI	A.3.1.3. The study subjects in the education programme 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 associate professors / CS II, with proved expertise in the field	Fulfilled	None



No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI*, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		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.		
9.	CPI	<p>A.3.2.1. At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in the evaluated domain have at least 5 Web of Science- or ERIH-indexed publications in magazines of impact, or other achievements of relevant significance for that domain, including international-level contributions that indicate progress in scientific research - development - innovation for the evaluated domain. The aforementioned doctoral thesis advisors enjoy international awareness within the past five years, consisting of: membership on scientific boards of international publications and conferences; membership on boards of international professional associations; guests in conferences or expert groups working abroad, or membership on doctoral 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 organising committees of arts events and international competitions, membership on juries or umpire teams in artistic events or international competitions.</p>	Fulfilled	None
10.	PI *	<p>A.3.2.2. At least 50% of the doctoral thesis advisors in a specific doctoral study domain continue to be active in their scientific field, and acquire at least 25% of the score 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	None
11.	PI *	<p>B.1.2.1. Admission in the doctoral study programmes is based on selection criteria including the academic, research and professional performance of the candidates; their interest for scientific or artistic/sports research; publications in</p>	Fulfilled	None

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI*, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		the domain, and a proposal of a research subject. Interviewing the candidate is mandatory as part of the admission procedure.		
12.	PI	B.2.1.1. The training program based on advanced academic studies includes at least 3 disciplines relevant for the scientific research training of doctoral students, out of which at least one discipline focuses on the in-depth study of research methodology and/or statistical data processing.	Fulfilled	The module pro formas should specify learning outcomes and be aligned more closely with the European Qualifications Framework.
13.	PI	B.2.1.2. At least one discipline is dedicated to ethics and intellectual property in scientific research, or there are well-defined topics on these subjects within a discipline taught in the doctoral program.	Fulfilled	None
14.	PI	B.2.1.3. The IOSUD has the mechanisms in place to ensure that the academic training program based on advanced higher education studies related to the evaluated domain addresses the “learning outcomes”, specifying the knowledge, skills, and the responsibility and autonomy that doctoral students should acquire after completing each discipline or through the research activities.	Fulfilled	Learning outcomes should be articulated more explicitly in the course documentation.
15.	PI	C.1.1.1. The doctoral school to which the doctoral study domain belongs demonstrates that the internal evaluation and quality assurance process of the study domain is carried out constantly, according to a procedure developed and applied at the level of the IOSUD, including an evaluation of the following mandatory criteria: a) the scientific work of doctoral advisors; b) the infrastructure and logistics needed for carrying out the research activity; c) the regulations and procedures based on which doctoral studies are organised; d) the scientific activity of doctoral students; e) the training program based on advanced higher education studies of doctoral students; f) social and academic support services (including for participation in various events, publishing papers, etc.) and counselling services available for the	Fulfilled	None

No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI*, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		doctoral students.		
16.	PI *	C.1.1.2. Mechanisms are implemented during the doctoral study program to enable identification of the doctoral students' 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.	Fulfilled	None
17.	CPI	C.2.1.1. Subject to compliance with the data protection regulations in force, the IOSUD publishes the following types of information on the website of the higher education institution: a) the internal regulations of the doctoral school; b) the admission regulations; c) the doctoral study contract; d) the study completion regulation including the procedure for the public presentation of the thesis; e) the content of the training programs 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 in the domain concerned, with basic information (year of enrolment; advisor); h) information on the standards for developing the doctoral thesis; i) links to the summaries of the doctoral theses to be presented publicly, as well as the day, time and place where they will be presented, at least 20 days before the presentation.	Fulfilled	None
18.	PI	C.2.2.1. All doctoral students have free access to one platform providing academic databases relevant to the doctoral studies domain of their thesis.	Fulfilled	None
19.	PI	C.2.2.2. Each doctoral student, upon request, has access to an electronic system for verifying the degree of similarity with other existing scientific or artistic works.	Fulfilled	None
20.	PI	C.2.2.3. All doctoral students have access to the scientific research	Fulfilled	None



No.	Type of indicator (PI, PI*, CPI)	Performance indicator	Judgment	Recommendations
		laboratories or to other facilities depending on the specific domain / domains within the doctoral school, according to a set of internal regulations.		

The recommendations included in the report under the analysis of indicators will be reiterated here. Other, general recommendations that do not fall under a specific indicator may be formulated as well.

VERY IMPORTANT!!! – Each weakness identified must be associated with at least one recommendation for improvement!

Conclusions and general recommendations

Several important issues found during the evaluation are resumed and some general conclusions are drawn on the quality of the education that will be 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 present arguments in favour of his/her own decision).

The University of Oradea is well-placed to inaugurate a new doctoral programme in Music and I strongly support this initiative.

The University is to be warmly commended for its substantial investment in excellent new facilities for the Music Department, and for its recognition of the important contribution that the Department makes to the cultural life of the city and of the region.

Most of the recommendations made above are comparatively minor and can be easily addressed.

As the introduction of the new doctoral programme is likely to result in a significant increase in the workloads of the doctoral supervisors, the situation should be monitored carefully to ensure that the staff members concerned are not overburdened and that they will be able to continue to remain research-active.



I was very impressed by the dedication and enthusiasm of the Music Department staff members whom I met during my visit, and wish to express my appreciation of their hard work to develop the new doctoral programme. I will look forward with interest to hearing how the programme develops and hope to have an opportunity to visit the university again in the future.

Annexes

The following types of documents will be attached:

The detailed schedule of the evaluation visit – MANDATORY.

Any document requested from the IOSUD during the evaluation visit, which is not found in the internal evaluation file received before the visit and which is 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, which are referred to in the report.

The schedule of the evaluation visit is attached below. The chairperson of the panel, Professor Olguta Lupu, will provide details of the supplementary documentation provided during the visit

Professor Patrick Zuk
27.XI.2022



ROMANIAN AGENCY FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education - **ENQA**

Registered in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education - **EQAR**

Programul vizitei de evaluare a domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat MUZICĂ.
a Universității din ORADEA

Interval orar hour	Activitate / <i>Activity</i>	Participanți / <i>Participants</i>	Observații/ Locație <i>Observations/ Location</i>
<i>Joi / Thursday, 17.11.2022</i>			
9:00-9:30	Întâlnire organizatorică a comisiei de experți evaluatori <i>Organizational meeting of the panel evaluators</i>	- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i>	<i>Sala Consiliului de Administrație pavilion J etaj 1</i> <i>Hall of the Administrative Board , pavilion J, floor 1</i>
9:30-10:00	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții conducerii instituției evaluate și ai CSUD <i>Panel evaluators` meeting with representatives of the institution and of the Council for Academic Doctoral Studies (CSUD)</i>	- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai conducerii universității / <i>Representatives of the University's management</i> - Reprezentanți ai CSUD și ai școlii doctorale / <i>Representatives of the CSUD and of the Doctoral School</i> - Persoana de contact / <i>The contact person</i>	<i>Sala Consiliului de Administrație pavilion J etaj 1</i> <i>Hall of the Administrative Board , pavilion J, floor 1</i>



Interval orar hour	Activitate / <i>Activity</i>	Participanți / <i>Participants</i>	Observații/ Locație <i>Observations/ Location</i>
10:00-10:30	<p>Întâlnirea comisiei de experți evaluatori cu responsabilul domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat și cu echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` meeting with the contact person for the doctoral study domain under review and the team who drafted the internal evaluation report</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai instituției evaluate / <i>University's representatives</i> 	<p><i>Sala Consiliului de Administrație pavilion J etaj 1 (sau sala Facultății de Arte M001)</i></p> <p><i>Hall of the Administrative Board , pavilion J, floor 1 (or Hall of the Faculty of Arts, M 001)</i></p>
10:30-11:00	<p>Vizitarea bazei materiale didactice și de cercetare</p> <p><i>Visiting the educational and research infrastructure</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai instituției evaluate / <i>University's representatives</i> 	<p>Vizitarea bazei materiale se realizează separat la nivel instituțional și pe programe de studii.</p> <p>În Campusul Universitar</p>
11:00-11:30	<p>Întâlnirea echipei de evaluare cu personalul didactic aferent domeniului evaluat</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` meeting with the academic staff corresponding to the doctoral study domain</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comisia de evaluare ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i> - Cadre didactice care au calitatea de conducător de doctorat / <i>Doctoral coordinators</i> 	<p>Sala M 001 sau on line doar pentru un membru</p> <p><i>Hall M 001 of the Faculty of Arts or on line meeting</i></p>



Interval orar hour	Activitate / <i>Activity</i>	Participanți / <i>Participants</i>	Observații/ Locație <i>Observations/ Location</i>
11:30 - 12:00	<p>Întâlnirea echipei de evaluare cu membrii Comisiei pentru Evaluarea și Asigurarea Calității (CEAC) / Departamentul de asigurare a calității</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` meeting with the Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC) members / Quality Assurance Department</i></p>	<p>- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i></p> <p>- Reprezentanți ai instituției evaluate / <i>University's representatives</i></p>	<p><i>Sala Consiliului de Administrație pavilion J etaj 1</i></p>
12:00 - 13:00	<p>Întâlnirea echipei de evaluare cu membrii Consiliului școlii doctorale în cadrul căreia va funcționa domeniul evaluat</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` meeting with Doctoral Schools Council (CSD) members</i></p>	<p>- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i></p> <p>- Membrii CSD / <i>CSD's members</i></p>	<p><i>Sala Consiliului de Administrație pavilion J etaj 1</i></p> <p><i>Hall of the Administrative Board , pavilion J, floor 1</i></p>
13:00- 13:30	<p>Întâlnirea echipei de evaluare cu membrii Comisiei de Etică a instituției de învățământ superior</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` meeting with the members of the Ethics Commission</i></p>	<p>- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i></p> <p>- Membrii Comisiei de Etică / <i>Ethics Commission members</i></p>	<p><i>Sala Consiliului de Administrație pavilion J etaj 1</i></p> <p><i>Hall of the Administrative Board , pavilion J, floor 1</i></p>
13:30- 14:30	<p>Pauză de prânz / Lunch break</p>		



Interval orar hour	Activitate / <i>Activity</i>	Participanți / <i>Participants</i>	Observații/ Locație <i>Observations/ Location</i>
14:30-15:00	<p>Întâlnirea echipei de evaluare cu directorii/ responsabilii centrelor/ laboratoarelor de cercetare aferente domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` meeting with the Directors/ persons in charge of the research centers/laboratories within the doctoral study domain</i></p>	<p>- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i></p> <p>-Directorii centrelor / laboratoarelor de cercetare / <i>Directors of research centers/laboratories</i></p>	<p><i>Facultatea de Arte Pavilion M Sala M001</i></p> <p><i>M.001, Arts Faculty pavilion M</i></p>
15:00-15:30	<p>Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experți evaluatori cu responsabilul domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` meeting with the contact person for the doctoral study domain under review</i></p>	<p>- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i></p> <p>- Reprezentanți ai instituției evaluate / <i>University's representatives</i></p>	<p><i>Facultatea de Arte Pavilion M Sala M 001</i></p> <p><i>Hall M 001of the Faculty of Arts</i></p>
15:30-16:00	<p>Întâlnire tehnică a comisiei de evaluare</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` technical meeting</i></p>	<p>- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i></p>	<p><i>Facultatea de Arte Pavilion M Sala M 001</i></p> <p><i>Hall M 001of the Faculty of Arts</i></p>
16:00-18:00	<p>Derularea activităților specifice comisiei de experți evaluatori și efectuarea de consemnări în proiectul raportului de evaluare externă.</p> <p><i>Carrying out the specific activities of the panel evaluators and making entries in the draft of the external evaluation report.</i></p> <p>Dacă se consideră necesare, pot avea loc întâlniri suplimentare, spre exemplu cu / <i>If deemed necessary,</i></p>	<p>- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i></p> <p>- Reprezentanți ai instituției evaluate / <i>University's representatives</i></p>	<p><i>Facultatea de Arte Pavilion M Sala 001</i></p>



Interval orar hour	Activitate / <i>Activity</i>	Participanți / <i>Participants</i>	Observații/ Locație <i>Observations/ Location</i>
	<p><i>additional meetings may be held, for example with:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reprezentanți din Senatul universitar (inclusiv studenți); / <i>representatives from the University Senate (including students);</i> • reprezentanții organizației / organizațiilor studențești; / <i>representatives of the student organization / organizations;</i> • reprezentanți ai Centrului de Consiliere și Orientare în Carieră (CCOC); / <i>representatives of the Career Counseling and Guidance Center (CCOC);</i> • reprezentanți ai bibliotecii instituției de învățământ superior; / <i>representatives of the library of the higher education institution;</i> • reprezentanți ai centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare din domeniul școlii / școlilor doctorale sau din domeniul evaluat; / <i>representatives of research centers / laboratories in the field of the doctoral school / schools or in the evaluated field;</i> • reprezentanți ai direcției cămine-cantine (sau echivalentă) / <i>representatives of the dormitory-canteen department (or equivalent).</i> 		<p>.</p> <p><i>Sala Consiliului de Administrație pavilion J etaj 1 (dimineața) sau/și</i></p> <p>Vineri dimineața de la 10 la 12 în</p> <p>Pavilionul A sala A 002</p>
<p>Vineri / <i>Friday</i>, 18.11.2022</p>			



Interval orar hour	Activitate / <i>Activity</i>	Participanți / <i>Participants</i>	Observații/ Locație <i>Observations/ Location</i>
09:00-10:00	<p>Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experți evaluatori cu responsabilul domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat evaluat</p> <p><i>Panel evaluators` meeting with the contact person for the doctoral study domain under review</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai instituției evaluate / <i>University's representatives</i> 	<p><i>Facultatea de Arte Pavilion M Sala M 001</i> <i>Hall M 001 of the Faculty of Arts pavilion M</i></p>
10:00 - 12:00	<p>Derularea activității comisiei de experți evaluatori (inclusiv continuarea anumitor activități începute/stabilite în ziua precedentă, analiza documentelor suplimentare puse la dispoziție de reprezentanții instituției supuse evaluării, efectuarea de consemnări în proiectul raportului de evaluare externă sau derularea unor întâlniri cu reprezentanți ai instituției supuse evaluării). / <i>Carrying out the work of the panel evaluators (including the continuation of certain activities started / established in the previous day, analysis of additional documents provided by the representatives of the institution under evaluation, making notes in the draft external evaluation report or holding meetings with representatives of the institution under evaluation) .</i></p> <p>Discuții referitoare la elaborarea raportului de evaluare externă al comisiei de experți evaluatori. / <i>Discussions on the preparation of the external evaluation report of the panel evaluators.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS' panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai instituției evaluate / <i>University's representatives</i> 	<p><i>Facultatea de Arte Pavilion M Sala 001</i> <i>Hall M 001 of the Faculty of Arts, pavilion M</i></p>



Interval orar hour	Activitate / <i>Activity</i>	Participanți / <i>Participants</i>	Observații/ Locație <i>Observations/ Location</i>
12:00-13:00	Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții instituției evaluate pentru comunicarea concluziilor procesului de evaluare <i>Panel evaluators` meeting with representatives of the institution under review to discuss on the conclusions of the evaluation process.</i>	- Membrii comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS / <i>ARACIS panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai instituției evaluate / <i>University's representatives</i>	<i>Pavilion A sala A 002</i> <i>Pavilion A, Hall A 002</i>

* Toate activitățile incluse în structura programului vizitei comisiei de evaluare sunt obligatorii, însă ordinea și durata alocată acestora sunt stabilite de către comisie în funcție de specificul evaluării. / * All activities included in the structure of the panel evaluators visit program are mandatory, but the order and duration allocated to them are established by the commission according to the specifics of the evaluation.

Prof. univ. dr.

Coordonator al comisiei de experți evaluatori ARACIS

Prof. univ. dr.

Recteur al Universității din Oradea



ROMANIAN AGENCY FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

*Member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education - **ENQA**
Registered in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education - **EQAR***
