The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

External Evaluation Report (EER) for the procedure for obtaining a maintaining accreditation (MAC) of Doctoral Study Domain

Higher Education Institution/Education Provider Organization:	„Dunărea de Jos" University of Galaţi
Doctoral School:	Doctoral School of Economic Sciences
Doctoral Domain:	Economics
The objective of the external evaluation:	Maintaining accreditation (MAC)

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

No.	Last Name and First Name	Team role	Signature
1.	Prof. univ. dr. Dobrin Cosmin	Expert evaluator	
2.	Prof. univ. dr. Şargu Lilia	International Expert	
3.	Drd. Bulboacă Ştefan	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

With a distinguished history beginning in 1948, the "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați (UDJG) is a public institution of higher education. Following external evaluations carried out by ARACIS in 2008, 2013, 2019, and 2024, the university was awarded a "high degree of confidence," reflecting the effectiveness of its academic and quality management systems. In December 2024, UDJG renewed its certification in accordance with the SR EN ISO 9001:2015 standard, covering "Research, Development and Innovation Management; Research, Development and Innovation in the areas defined by the PNCDI IV strategy (Research-UDJG Research Portal)." The university fulfils multiple roles in fostering technical, scientific, cultural, and social progress, generating immediate as well as medium and long-term impact, and supporting the development of Galați municipality and the Southeast region of Romania. In this context, UDJG maintains strong partnerships with the socio-economic environment, offering expertise, consultancy, and technical solutions to current challenges.

The Institute for Doctoral Studies (IOSUD-UDJG), which is responsible for the organisation of doctoral education, operates based on well-defined institutional procedures, transparent governance structures, and a highly qualified academic staff. It oversees five doctoral schools, including the Doctoral School of Economics (SDSE). Within this setting, doctoral programmes in economics, management, and marketing are coordinated by supervisors with international academic recognition, who contribute through significant publications and active participation in research initiatives and institutional partnerships.

The doctoral field of Economics has experienced notable progress during the analysed period, consolidating its position in the academic environment through an increase in the number of supervisors, a broader range of research topics, and the ongoing refinement of doctoral training policies. Its primary objective is to develop highly skilled researchers capable of addressing the demands of today's academic and economic landscape. Key developments since the last external evaluation include the establishment of the Doctoral School of Economics (EDSE) in 2024, the upgrading of research infrastructure (including artificial intelligence and neuromarketing laboratories, as well as access to international databases), and the expansion of international collaborations. These changes have enhanced the field's visibility and boosted scientific output.

Overall, the PhD in Economics can be regarded as a well-established domain, grounded in UDJG's institutional tradition, while being firmly oriented towards innovation, internationalisation, and the continuous improvement of research quality, thereby aligning with the requirements of external evaluation methodologies and European standards in doctoral education.

II. Methods used

The evaluation was based on a **detailed examination of the Internal Evaluation Report** and its annexes, which include data regarding governance structures, human resources, curricula, available infrastructure, research activity, the status of doctoral students, publications of doctoral supervisors, institutional partnerships, and documents related to internal quality assurance procedures. In addition, the following were consulted:

- **IOSUD–UDJG regulations** (regulations, methodologies, operational procedures).
- **Supporting documents uploaded on the institutional platform** (staff allocation plans, lists of publications, evidence of scientific activities, collaboration agreements, strategic plans).
- **Information regarding infrastructure** (STRATEC laboratories, the Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, the Neuromarketing Laboratory, and access to international databases.
- **data on academic mobility**, participation in conferences, research projects, and the activity of supervisory committees.

In addition, documents provided by the institution during the preparation of the report were analysed, including rectoral decisions, annual reports of the doctoral schools, and individual evaluation sheets for **doctoral students**.
On-site visit - The evaluation methodology also included an **institutional visit** to directly verify the data presented in the report. In this context, the following were inspected:

- the **teaching and research facilities** of the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration (lecture rooms, specialised laboratories, the **STRATEC research centre**).
- The **University Library** includes facilities providing access to scientific databases.
- **Administrative spaces are** used for managing doctoral studies.
- **support infrastructure** (campus, student dormitories, social facilities).

During the visit, discussions were held with the main categories of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the doctoral program:

- The **leadership of the Doctoral School of Economic Sciences** (director, members of the Doctoral School Council).
- **Doctoral supervisors** in the field of Economics.
- **Doctoral students** are at various stages of the program.

- **Graduates of the doctoral field in Economics** who have obtained the doctoral title.
- **Administrative staff** responsible for the management of doctoral studies.
- **representatives of quality assurance structures**.

Other methods and relevant aspects In addition to the documentary analysis and the institutional visit, the evaluation process included:

- **Consultation with stakeholders**, through formalised mechanisms: thematic meetings, consultations with the socio-economic environment, and with institutional partners involved in research activities.
- **Analysis of performance indicators**, by verifying the scientific results of doctoral supervisors and doctoral students, based on self-evaluation sheets and annexes regarding publications.
- **Examination of quality assurance procedures**, including the implementation of policies related to ethics, academic integrity, and plagiarism prevention.
- **Correlation of institutional data with on-site observations** to assess the consistency of the information and the actual implementation of the procedures provided in official documents.

III. Judgement on the extent to which the standards and performance indicators are fulfilled

DOMAIN A. Institutional capacity

Criterion A.1. Managerial and administrative structures and processes involving students and other stakeholders

Standard S.A.1.1. Organisational components and institutional processes The HEI proves that it engages the relevant stakeholders in developing methodologies and regulations, as well as implementation procedures.	
Indicator I.P.A.1.1.1	For delivering the study program/domain, the HEI has adequate organizational components and an adequate management system, which operate based on methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The HEI has a **clearly defined organisational structure**, within which academic and administrative bodies operate according to well-defined competencies and responsibilities, supported by consistent internal procedures and management mechanisms. The organisational structure of the "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați is based on institutional normative documents, the University Charter, the Regulations for Organisation and Operation, and the regulations of the University Senate and its committees, which establish the roles, responsibilities, and decision-making processes of all relevant entities.

The governance framework includes the University Senate, the Board of Trustees, the General Directorate, and the administrative departments, all of which operate under procedures that are periodically updated to ensure effective management. These bodies are supported by permanent committees, ethics committees, administrative units, and support services, each operating based on its own internal regulations, which are published and available to the entire academic community.

Regarding **doctoral studies**, **IOSUD–UDJG** benefits from a robust institutional framework, with its own regulations, a dedicated organisational structure, and a Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD) that oversees operational management, develops strategies, approves the establishment or reorganisation of doctoral schools, and manages resource allocation. The functioning of doctoral schools is regulated through methodologies, operational procedures, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms applied uniformly at the institutional level.

In the area of doctoral studies, IOSUD–UDJG benefits from a robust institutional framework, with its own regulations, a dedicated organisational structure, and a Doctoral Studies Council (CSUD) that ensures operational management, develops strategies, approves the creation or reorganisation of doctoral schools, and manages resource allocation. The operation of the doctoral schools is governed by methodologies, operational procedures, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms applied uniformly across the institution.

Doctoral students are integrated into the **decision-making processes** through their representation in governing structures (the **University Senate**, **faculty councils**, and **doctoral school councils**), while their consultation is systematically carried out through surveys, periodic evaluations, thematic meetings, and institutionalised feedback mechanisms. In addition, other stakeholders, **employers, graduates, and socio-economic partners** are involved in processes to revise methodologies and regulations, contributing to the continuous adaptation of institutional policies.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

According to the analysed data, the institution has:

- **A coherent management system**, based on clear normative documents, operational procedures, and control mechanisms and **functional administrative structures**, with clearly defined responsibilities and transparent decision-making flows.
- **Procedures that are periodically updated**, in accordance with national legislation (e.g., IOSUD regulations, procedures regarding admission, evaluation, habilitation, recognition of the doctoral title, and quality monitoring).
- **Systematic consultation of stakeholders**, demonstrating a participatory process in the adoption and revision of methodologies.
- **Institutional transparency** is confirmed by the publication of rules, reports, procedures, and relevant documents on the university's platforms.

All these aspects highlight the operation of a solid and effective management system that complies with national standards for doctoral education. The higher education institution demonstrates that it has appropriate organisational structures that operate in line with internal regulations, methodologies, and regularly updated procedures, thereby ensuring the proper development of the doctoral field in Economics.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Based on the available information, the following examples of good practices can be identified:

- **Integration of doctoral students into governance structures,** fostering representativeness and real involvement in decision-making processes.
- **Institutionalised and recurring consultation procedures**, such as periodic questionnaires, thematic meetings, council sessions, and collaboration with the socio-economic environment.
- **A comprehensive internal evaluation system**, conducted annually and periodically for both doctoral supervisors and doctoral students, reflects a well-established culture of quality.
- **Comprehensive regulations regarding ethics and academic integrity**, including anti-plagiarism strategies and related procedures.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Standard S.A.1.2. Stakeholder engagement The HEI proves that it engages the relevant stakeholders in developing methodologies and regulations, as well as implementation procedures.	
Indicator I.P.A.1.2.1	The opinions of the faculty and department members, of the subsidiary or extension* and of other stakeholders are considered in the process of adopting and revising methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The **Doctoral School of Economic Sciences (SDSE) from** Dunărea de Jos University of Galați (UDJG) demonstrates the systematic involvement of stakeholders in the development and revision of institutional methodologies, regulations, and procedures. According to the documentation, the consultation process is formalised and recurrent, including:

- **Periodic meetings of the SDSE Council and the Doctoral Studies Council (CSUD)**, during which proposals for the modification or updating of regulations specific to the field are discussed: https://ugal.ro/informatii/informatii-publice/hotarari/hotarari-csud
- **Thematic meetings organised with doctoral supervisors and research teams** (workshops, conferences, round tables): https://ugal.ro/anunturi/evenimentele-saptamanii
- **Questionnaires administered to doctoral students** in order to obtain feedback regarding organisational, administrative, and academic aspects: https://evaluare.ugal.ro/index.php/en/evaluarea-conducatorilor-de-doctorat-de-catre-studentii-doctoranzi/chestionar-de-evaluare-a-conducatorilor-de-doctorat-de-catre-studentii-doctoranzi-sd-sfi
- **Consultations with industrial and socio-economic partners** involved in research activities, practice/research internships, or joint supervision arrangements.

All recommendations and observations from stakeholders are centralised and integrated into the updated versions of methodologies, operational procedures, and study plans.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The information in the document confirms that the institution ensures **real and documented participation of stakeholders** in the processes of drafting and revising the regulatory framework.

* The faculty, department, subsidiary, extension - hereinafter "organisational components"

The mechanisms used:
- ✧ Are **formal** (meetings of governing bodies, official consultations).
- ✧ Are **periodic**, having a permanent character within the academic culture of SDSE.
- ✧ Produce **visible effects** by integrating the collected opinions into study plans, course descriptions, evaluation procedures, regulations, and methodologies.

This approach reflects full compliance with the indicator's requirements, as the revision of documents is not carried out unilaterally but results from a participatory process that involves academic staff, doctoral students, and relevant external stakeholders. Moreover, the use of tools such as doctoral student questionnaires, consultations with representatives from the economic sector, and the recording of processes through minutes and internal reports indicates the presence of a well-integrated and mature system of stakeholder engagement.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Based on the analysed data, the following **elements of excellence** can be identified:
- ✧ **Multi-level stakeholder involvement -** The simultaneous consultation of academic staff, doctoral students, doctoral supervisors, and external partners through multiple instruments.
- ✧ **Use of formal and informal feedback mechanisms -** The combination of institutional meetings with questionnaires, workshops, meetings, and thematic analyses.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion A.2. The material resources and optimisation of the use of the material resources

Standard S.A.2.1. Material resources The HEI owns adequate movable and immovable assets to enable it to carry out the study programme/domain.	
Indicator I.P.A.2.1.1	The HEI legally owns venues for the related education, research and administrative processes, as well as for services for students, doctoral students and trainees, thus providing an enabling environment for living and studying, including for disabled persons. Optimal venues are also provided for activities of the staff. Such venues are adequately equipped.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The higher education institution owns a substantial portfolio of educational, administrative, and research facilities, which are legally in its possession and adequately meet the requirements of study programmes and doctoral student activities. Based on the analysed information, the university benefits from modern buildings and infrastructure, including teaching classrooms, specialised laboratories, research centres, and spaces dedicated to academic life, such as student accommodation, a cafeteria and two food outlets, a sports complex with gyms, a stadium, a chapel, a student medical office, and an occupational health unit. Research activities are supported by dedicated spaces, including advanced laboratories such as those within the STRATEC Centre, equipped with contemporary technologies that enable experimental, analytical, and applied research. The university library further enhances academic work by offering access to both physical and digital resources, supporting doctoral study and research processes. All user groups academic staff, students, doctoral candidates, and technical personnel benefit from appropriate and well-equipped working environments. Additionally, measures have been implemented to ensure accessibility for individuals with disabilities through adapted infrastructure and services.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The available data show that the institution largely fulfils the requirements of the indicator. There is a clear alignment between the resources available and the needs of educational and research activities. The facilities are adequate in terms of capacity, variety, and equipment, and their organisation reflects a coherent planning approach that supports both current academic activities and the advancement of doctoral research. Furthermore, the institution provides suitable conditions for staff through offices, meeting spaces, and well-organised administrative resources. There is also evident commitment to the ongoing maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure, which supports the stability and effectiveness of academic processes. Overall, the current situation confirms that **the indicator's requirements are fully met**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The existence of advanced laboratories (e.g., AI and neuromarketing labs) demonstrates strategic investments in modern scientific infrastructure:
- ✧ Extended access to international databases and electronic resources is an essential aspect of competitive doctoral programs.
- ✧ The integration of facilities that support academic life (sports spaces, medical services, and a digital library) contributes to a comprehensive university environment.
- ✧ Guaranteed accessibility for all categories of users, including those with special needs.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Standard S.A.2.2. Management of material resources The organisational components manage the movable and immovable assets used for the evaluated study programme/domain in an optimal, sustainable manner.	
Indicator I.P.A.2.2.1	The movable and immovable assets are properly maintained to ensure optimal conditions for studying, living and research, as well as for work.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The HEI manages its **material resources**, buildings, teaching spaces, laboratories, research centres, and equipment through a dedicated administrative system that includes structures responsible for maintenance, repairs, and modernisation. The documentation shows that the university consistently carries out maintenance work, both through in-house operations and planned investments, to ensure appropriate conditions for study, research, and professional activities.

Formal procedures are implemented to regulate operations related to the maintenance of buildings and equipment, as well as to ensure compliance with safety and occupational health standards. There is an **operational procedure for in-house repair and maintenance work, as well as a procedure** to eliminate and prevent workplace accidents through employee training and accountability, ensuring optimal working conditions and protecting health by monitoring the health status of all UDJG employees. Among the managed facilities are well-equipped classrooms and laboratories, advanced research centres (e.g., STRATEC), libraries, campus infrastructure (student dormitories, cafeteria, sports facilities), and support services for students and staff. Measures for accident prevention and the maintenance of operational standards are documented institutionally.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The HEI **fully meets the requirements of the indicator**. All categories of resources used within the doctoral program are managed through clear procedures validated by the administrative structures. The condition of the spaces and equipment reflects a constant concern for ensuring optimal conditions for work, study, and research. The maintenance process is **regular, systematic, and verifiable**, based on approved and periodically revised procedures, while the investments made in infrastructure confirm a **preventive and sustainable approach to patrimony management**. The existence of modern facilities, such as specialised laboratories and digital spaces, supports the quality of academic activities and demonstrates the efficiency of material resource management.

Moreover, the conditions provided for staff and doctoral students' **ergonomic spaces, well-equipped research laboratories, and support services** indicate full compliance with operational standards. The infrastructure is properly maintained, contributing to the continuity of educational and scientific processes.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Based on the information provided, the following **examples of good practice** can be identified:

✓ **Institutionalised procedures for maintenance and repairs**

There are clear operational procedures for in-house maintenance work, covering the entire university.

✓ **Continuous investments in educational and research infrastructure**

Rehabilitation works, equipment acquisitions, modernisation projects, and the development of specialised laboratories reflect a strategic orientation toward sustainability and performance.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion A.3. Adequate human resources and transparent staff recruiting procedures developed according to the law

Standard S.A.3.1. Human resources The HEI has the required human resources to organise and deliver the evaluated study programme / domain.	
Indicator I.P.A.3.1.1	The human resources of the organisational component are suitable to perform the activities pertaining to the evaluated study programme/domain. The teaching staff has the required qualifications and professional competences to teach the subject matters assigned to them in the job list.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed information indicates that the doctoral programme in Economics is supported by a fully constituted team of doctoral supervisors and academic staff, all holding stable contractual positions within the institution and possessing the qualifications required to effectively carry out their academic duties. Those engaged in doctoral activities have obtained habilitation in accordance with national regulations, meet the CNATDCU standards, and demonstrate recent, visible, and measurable scientific output in international databases, including publications in impact journals indexed in **Web of Science**.

In addition to their professional qualifications, the academic staff have experience in **applied research**, collaborations with the **economic sector**, participation in research projects, and involvement in relevant research centres. The number of doctoral supervisors is **adequate for the number of doctoral students**, without exceeding institutional limits, which allows for **effective and genuine academic supervision**:

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The indicator requires demonstrating the **adequacy of human resources** at the program level in terms of qualifications, academic competencies, and availability to carry out teaching and research activities. Based on the available data, the program **fully meets these requirements**:

- **Adequate qualifications** – All doctoral supervisors and course holders meet the current minimum standards, holding habilitation, validated competencies, and a solid scientific portfolio.
- **Demonstrated scientific competence** – Academic productivity is consistent and measurable, reflected in the number of **Web of Science publications**, bibliometric indicators, and involvement in projects and collaborations.
- **Human resource structure appropriate to the volume of activity** – The number of supervisors relative to doctoral students is balanced, allowing effective monitoring of their progress.
- Consequently, the **human resources are not only numerically sufficient but also qualitatively aligned with the requirements of a modern doctoral cycle**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

- **A team of doctoral supervisors with international visibility** – Their activity in **Q1–Q3 journals** and participation in external scientific committees represent a benchmark of excellence.
- **Involvement in applied research and interinstitutional collaborations** – Connections with the **economic sector** and with research centres enhance the relevance and impact of doctoral training.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Indicator I.P.A.3.1.2	The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The reviewed documents indicate that the university ensures a coherent framework for the professional and personal development of its academic and research staff. The institution promotes engagement in continuing education, international mobility programmes, scientific conferences, and various professional development initiatives. Staff members benefit from access to programmes organised by the Department for Continuing Education, financial support for participation in academic events, and Erasmus mobility opportunities aimed at professional growth. In addition, the university encourages the attainment of habilitation, career advancement within academia, and active involvement in research and innovation projects.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The indicator requires demonstrating that the institution creates **real, accessible, and effective contexts for the professional and personal development of staff**. The analysis of the available data confirms the **full compliance with this criterion**:

- **Diverse and accessible training opportunities** – Institutional programs for professional development and continuing education are well represented and oriented toward strengthening professional competencies.
- **Support for academic career advancement** – The university encourages the attainment of the **habilitation certificate** and supports the procedures required for academic promotion.
- **International mobility opportunities for staff** – Clear **Erasmus+ procedures** are implemented for teaching and training mobility, demonstrating openness to transnational development.
- **Encouragement of involvement in scientific projects** – Access to internal funding for conferences, participation in scientific activities, and involvement in research projects contribute to enhanced academic performance.

Overall, the current situation shows that the institution **not only meets the minimum requirements but also fosters a stimulating environment that strengthens academic careers**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Institutional infrastructure dedicated to continuing education – The DFCTT provides courses accessible to staff, contributing to the development of professional competencies.

- **Financial support for participation in international events –** The existence of specialised mechanisms supporting participation in conferences reflects an institutional culture oriented toward performance.
- **Active policies for the internationalisation of academic careers – Erasmus+ mobilities and access to international collaborations represent a recognised** good practice within the European higher education system.
- **Promotion of habilitation and academic development prior to evaluation processes –** The increasing number of habilitated academic staff demonstrates the effectiveness of institutional support.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Standard S.A.3.2. Recruitment procedures Teaching staff recruitment procedures compliant with the provisions of the law.	
Indicator I.P.A.3.2.1	Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

According to institutional documentation, the university implements a well-defined set of procedures for recruiting academic staff, developed in line with current legislation and approved by the University Senate. The hiring process is conducted through public competitions, with separate methodologies for permanent and fixed-term positions, based on specific criteria established by the faculties and transparently published on the institution's website. These procedures encompass all stages of candidate selection, including the announcement of vacancies, the submission of applications, the evaluation of files in accordance with legal and institutional requirements, the organisation of competition examinations, and the publication of results. All job opportunities are communicated through official channels, and the outcomes are made fully public, ensuring equal access for all candidates. Comparable procedures are in place for the recruitment of auxiliary teaching staff and non-teaching personnel, following the same principles of transparency and non-discrimination.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The indicator requires that the **recruitment process comply with the law and be conducted transparently**. The presented data clearly confirm this:

- **Compliance with national legislation** – All institutional procedures are aligned with the legal framework and have been approved by the university's competent governing bodies.
- **Procedural transparency** – Competition announcements, participation requirements, evaluation criteria, and results are made public, demonstrating equal access and the elimination of any non-transparent practices.
- **Standardised procedures** – The use of clear methodologies, differentiated by types of positions and complemented by faculty-specific criteria, ensures **coherence and predictability** in the selection processes.

Overall, the information confirms that **the indicator is fully respected**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

- **Full publication of procedures and results**, facilitating external verification.
- **Specific criteria established at the faculty level**, adapted to the academic profile of the field.
- **Alignment of recruitment competitions with the institutional strategy**, through compliance with internal regulations and legal standards.

4. Recommendation

- Periodically updating specific criteria to reflect academic developments and emerging standards in the field of Economics.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion A.4. Digitalisation of institutional processes

Standard S.A.4.1. Digital transformation The digital transformation process in the organisational component seeks to achieve administrative simplification and improve the quality of the services provided to the members of its own community, as well as to third parties.	
Indicator I.P.A.4.1.1	The organisational component uses IT tools in its own procedures, to improve access and provide good quality services for the members of its own community and the indirect beneficiaries of education.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed documents show that the institution uses an extensive set of IT tools to manage administrative, academic, and research activities, with the aim of simplifying internal processes and facilitating access to services for the entire university community. The digital platforms used include systems for teaching and communication (**Microsoft Teams**), for managing teaching and administrative activities (the HR platform with modules for curricula, staffing plans, and statistics), for the evaluation of teaching staff by students (**evaluare.ugal.ro**), and for accessing electronic bibliographic resources through the **ARTHRA digital repository** and the international databases available via **AnelisPlus**. Students also benefit from additional digital services such as Wi-Fi access, **Office 365 accounts**, cloud storage through the internal platform **files.ugal.ro**, and secure connectivity through the **EduRoam system**. The university also has **HPC infrastructure for advanced research** and has invested, through **PNRR funds**, in the modernisation of digital laboratories and computing centres.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The indicator requires evidence of the **effective use of digital tools** to improve access to services and enhance the quality of activities. According to the analysed data:

- **Digital tools cover administrative, teaching, and research processes.** Platforms dedicated to resource management, evaluation, academic communication, and scientific documentation are integrated and systematically used.
- **User access is facilitated through centralised services, single sign-on systems, access to cloud services, Wi-Fi, and electronic resources, enabling** a unified and efficient digital experience.
- **Digitalisation is oriented toward quality and continuous modernisation.** Investments in HPC infrastructure, digital laboratories, and academic management systems, along with acquisitions through PNRR, confirm an explicit digital transformation strategy.

Overall, the institution has a coherent digital ecosystem adapted to the needs of the academic community.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

- **Integration of a high-level HPC infrastructure** to support advanced research is an element of excellence that is rarely encountered at the institutional level.
- **Extensive access to international electronic resources** through the **AnelisPlus consortium** and the **ARTHRA repository**.
- **Unified digital platforms** for learning (**Moodle**), educational management (**HR**), communication (**Microsoft Teams**), and evaluation (**evaluare.ugal.ro**).
- **Modernisation through PNRR funding demonstrates the institution's capacity to integrate large-scale digitalisation** projects.

The indicator is: fulfilled

DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy

Criterion B.1. Content and relevance of study programmes

Standard S.B.1.1. Content of study programme/s* The study programme is based on a curriculum designed so that students can acquire the expected learning outcomes.	
Indicator I.P.B.1.1.1	The study programme is developed and structured according to the expected learning outcomes, and organised based on transferable study credits. It includes all learning, teaching, practical training, research and evaluation experiences, which, together, lead to a higher education qualification.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

According to the reviewed documents, the doctoral programme in Economics is organised around a curriculum based on clearly defined learning outcomes, aligned with the requirements of the third cycle of studies. It includes a credit-based study plan that integrates advanced training activities, research work, individual study, periodic evaluations, and the progressive development of the doctoral thesis. Courses such as academic writing, research ethics, the use of scientific sources, and advanced digital skills are aimed at building the competencies necessary for independent research. Beyond theoretical components, doctoral candidates are actively involved in practical research activities, benefiting from access to specialised research centre infrastructure and international bibliographic resources. The documentation also confirms the presence of well-structured evaluation mechanisms, including examinations, annual progress reports, and the presentation of research outcomes before academic committees.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The indicator requires demonstrating that the program:

- **is designed according to the expected learning outcomes and is based on a system of transferable credits**
- **integrates the full range of educational experiences** (teaching, practical training, research, assessment)
- **coherently leads to the achievement of a higher qualification**: The analysis of the document confirms the **full fulfilment of these requirements**:
- **Structuring based on learning outcomes** – The curriculum includes clearly formulated outcomes for both courses and research activities, ensuring the coherence of academic training.
- **Organisation based on the credit system** – The study plan allocates credits to each course and activity, in accordance with the regulations of the third cycle.

* The term "programmes" concerns the external quality evaluation for the study programmes contained in a master/doctoral domain. The term "programme" shall be used hereinafter.

- **Complex learning experiences** – Doctoral students attend courses, workshops, applied research activities, presentations, bibliographic analyses, and progressive assessments that support the development of scientific competencies.
- **Coherence in qualification development** – The curricular plan is designed to ensure progression from fundamental knowledge to advanced competencies, contributing to the completion of the thesis and the attainment of the doctoral qualification.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

- **Alignment of courses with current research needs:** the inclusion of advanced digital skills and academic writing represents modern elements of training.

4. Recommendations

Expansion of the portfolio of interdisciplinary courses that connect **Economics** with emerging fields (e.g., behavioural sciences, technology).

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.2. Alignment of the curriculum with the qualification

Standard S.B.2.1. Alignment with the qualification level and the intended competences In the curriculum design and development process, the organisational component seeks to ensure the qualification level, as well as correlation with the envisaged occupations.	
Indicator I.P.B.2.1.2	The expected learning outcomes are correlated with the competences required by those occupations, according to the occupational standards and/or the European Skills, Competences and Occupations (ESCO).

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysis of the documents from the **Internal Evaluation Report of the DSUD–Economics** shows that the **learning outcomes** are formulated in accordance with the **National Qualifications Framework (level 8)** and the **European Qualifications Framework (EQF)**, by defining learning outcomes in terms of **knowledge, skills, and competences** specific to the doctoral qualification in the field of **Economics**. The **study plan** includes relevant courses to develop advanced competencies in research, analysis, methodology, ethics, and **digital skills**. The **course descriptions** explicitly indicate the targeted competencies, as well as the **responsibility and autonomy acquired by doctoral students**, correlated with the **occupational requirements of the Economics field**, according to **ESCO**.

The alignment with occupations in the field of **Economics** is supported by:

- The **research topics approved within SDSE** and the **involvement of doctoral students in applied projects**, including research centres such as **STRATEC** (neuromarketing laboratory, AI, etc.),
- **collaborations with the business environment** and participation in **relevant scientific conferences**.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The indicator requires demonstrating the **correlation between learning outcomes and the competencies required for occupations specific to the field of Economics**, in accordance with **occupational standards and ESCO**. The analysis shows that the **learning outcomes are well defined** and cover advanced-level competencies such as **critical analysis, original research, methodological design, academic management, ethics and integrity, and digital skills,** all corresponding to **level 8 of the EQF/NQF**. The competencies are **aligned with ESCO occupations**, and the **study plan is appropriate for graduates' occupational profiles**, integrating transversal courses required for professions in the economic field (research, innovation, digitalisation, ethics). The **course descriptions demonstrate the correlation between academic content, assessment methods, and the competencies required for the targeted occupations**. The focus on **applied research** (AI, neuromarketing, predictive models, collaborations with companies) further supports compliance with **ESCO**, which emphasises **knowledge transfer and innovation**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- **The integration of advanced digital skills courses into doctoral training is currently required under the ESCO and EQF standards.**
- **Use of the modern STRATEC infrastructure** (AI Lab, Neuromarketing Lab), which enables the development of applied competencies that are rarely found in other doctoral schools in the country.
- **Clear structuring of competencies** in accordance with **level 8 of the NQF/EQF** and with **ESCO occupations**.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.3. Student-centred learning, teaching and evaluation

Standard S.B.3.1 Principles The organisational component implements the principles of student-centred learning.	
Indicator I.P.B.3.1.1	The organisational component ensures implementation of the student-centred learning in the curriculum and through the teaching strategies used in the learning and teaching activities and experiences.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The documents analysed in the Internal Evaluation Report of DSUD–Economics show that IOSUD–UDJG and SDSE explicitly integrate the principles of student-centred learning through the study plan, which includes courses oriented toward developing doctoral students' professional and transversal competencies, as well as through course descriptions and student-centred **teaching strategies**.

Mechanisms for **guidance and monitoring** are also in place. Each doctoral student has an **Individual Study Program** and a **supervisory and academic integrity committee**. Their activity is monitored annually through the **Doctoral Student Activity Report**. There is also a **consultation schedule, periodic meetings, and minutes of presentation sessions**. Research topics are aligned with **individual interests** and with **current directions in the field of** Economics.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The indicator requires evidence of the **actual integration of student-centred learning principles** in the curriculum and teaching strategies. The analysis shows that the **curriculum is designed to support autonomy and individual development**. The study plan and course descriptions include competencies aimed at training a researcher capable of **critical analysis, reflection, synthesis, and original scientific production**.

The **learning outcomes** are consistent with the **third cycle doctoral studies** and support the doctoral student's capacity to **make autonomous decisions**, in line with a **student-centred curricular model**.

Formative assessment is a continuous process (presentations, applied assignments, feedback) and is combined with **summative assessment** (examinations, research reports, scientific articles), reflecting adaptation to the **pace and needs of each doctoral student**. Supervisory committees, consultation schedules, **joint publications between doctoral students and supervisors**, and **annual monitoring** demonstrate the implementation of a **supportive learning model**.

The **indicator is fully met**. The documents demonstrate that **SDSE adopts a modern student-centred learning model**, both in the structure of the curriculum and in teaching and research practices.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Doctoral activities benefit from innovative research infrastructure, including the Artificial Intelligence Laboratory (focused on predictive modelling and data analysis) and the Neuromarketing Laboratory (equipped with eye-tracking and EEG technologies), which represent distinctive resources within the field of economics. These facilities support active and applied learning approaches that are rarely encountered in other doctoral schools. Moreover, the practice of co-authoring scientific articles between doctoral students and their supervisors reflects the genuine application of mentoring and research-driven learning. In addition, doctoral candidates can select courses from other doctoral schools, offering an advanced level of curriculum personalisation. They also have access to opportunities such as participation in international conferences, Erasmus+ mobility programmes, and academic research placements, all of which contribute to the development of comprehensive professional competencies.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Indicator I.P. B.3.1.2	The organisational component ensures opportunities for students to participate in academic mobility programmes organised in person and/or virtually.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The documents in the report demonstrate that doctoral students in **DSUD–Economics** benefit from numerous **academic mobility opportunities**, delivered in person, virtually, or in a mixed format through **Erasmus+ programs** and other institutional instruments. The university applies **clear and transparent procedures** for Erasmus+ mobility, as outlined on the official Erasmus Office page, including **Erasmus+ K131**, **K171**, and **Erasmus+ traineeships**. The **study plans are designed flexibly**, allowing the recognition of results obtained during mobility periods **without extending the duration of studies**.

The mobility opportunities include:

- ✧ **study mobilities** at partner universities within and outside the EU,
- ✧ **practice or research internships**,
- ✧ **virtual mobilities** (participation in courses, international conferences, and online programs).

Doctoral students participating in mobility programs during **2024–2025** have presented **scientific papers at academic events** (Annexes IPB 3.1.1. in the file). Additionally, **IOSUD–UDJG** has a **dedicated operational**

procedure for mobility that details eligibility, selection, recognition of results, and the implementation of international mobility programs.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The evaluation of the data shows that the **indicator on the provision of mobility opportunities is robustly fulfilled and** designed in accordance with **European standards**. There is a **diversity of academic mobility opportunities**, as well as mechanisms for their **integration into the academic pathway**.

The institution demonstrates compliance with the **ESG principles (Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area)** regarding:

- the **promotion of internationalisation**,
- **academic mobility**,
- **international academic cooperation**,
- and the **recognition of mobility outcomes**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The internal report highlights several **noteworthy practices**:

- **Universal participation in international conferences** for doctoral students who have completed their studies.
- A **high number of scientific papers were presented** at academic events.
- The **integration of virtual and blended mobility formats**, which allows broader access, including for doctoral students with **professional or family constraints**.

There are also **mature institutional procedures** that ensure **rapid academic recognition, counselling, and logistical support**, as evidenced in the annexes of the report, representing an **efficient and transparent mechanism**.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Standard S.B.3.2. Fairness The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students.	
Indicator I.P.B.3.2.1	The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students, in line with their potential and aspirations, taking into account the diversity of learning styles and abilities

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The documents in the report show that **UDJG and SDSE ensure equitable opportunities for all doctoral students**, regardless of their background, learning style, or specific needs.

According to the **UDJG Charter** and the **Regulation of Doctoral University Studies**, all doctoral students benefit from:

- **access to educational resources** (library, international databases, digital platforms),
- **accessible infrastructure** (ramps, elevators, adapted educational support),
- **access to research topics, doctoral supervisors, and supervisory committees** according to their interests and potential,
- **academic counselling, tutoring, and mentoring**,
- opportunities to participate in **conferences, workshops, and mobility programs**, including for those with **special needs**.

The **study plan** includes courses that support equity, such as **Academic Ethics and Integrity** and **Digital Skills**, and access to courses from **other doctoral schools** allows the **personalisation of the learning pathway**.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The reported practices demonstrate that the **indicator is substantially fulfilled**, because:

- **Equity is integrated into the institutional regulations**, and doctoral students have equal access to resources, courses, scientific activities, and infrastructure.
- **Diversity of learning styles is respected** through curricular flexibility, access to digital resources, and the ability to work at an individual pace within the research process.
- **Institutional support is personalised through supervisory committees, counselling**, tutoring, and annual monitoring.
- **Scientific activities are accessible to all doctoral students**, without discrimination based on whether they are publicly funded or fee-paying, or on year of study. All of these demonstrate **compliance with European standards regarding equity and inclusion in doctoral education**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- **Equal access to advanced research infrastructure** (AI Lab, Neuromarketing Lab) for all doctoral students, regardless of the field in which they are active.

- **Extensive participation in scientific events** (conferences, workshops), supported both for doctoral students currently in training and for those in the years preceding completion.
- **Accessibility of campus infrastructure**, including for persons with disabilities, in accordance with the technical annexes.

4. Recommendation:

- **Increasing the visibility of resources and services for students with special educational needs.**

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.4. Accessibility and efficiency of the resources and support services, adequate for learning

Standard S.B.4.1. Access to resources and services The organisational component provides access to adequate resources and support services, according to the needs of the students.	
Indicator I.P.B.4.1.1	The organisational component provides students, including those with special educational needs/disabilities, with access to resources and services designed to support the learning process, adequate for the individual learning needs, the study domain, the study cycle, and the form of organisation of the study programme.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The documents in the report highlight that **UDJG and SDSE ensure extensive and equitable access to educational, technical, and support resources for all doctoral students, including those with special needs**, through the following:

- **Modern lecture halls, seminar rooms, and laboratories:** 534 teaching and research rooms covering **33,080 m²**, adequately equipped for educational and research processes.
- **Specialised research centre – STRATEC**, which provides **Artificial Intelligence and Neuromarketing laboratories**, accessible to all doctoral students, including for applied activities and experiments.
- **Access to informational resources** through the **UDJG Library**, with both physical and online access to international databases (**Web of Science, Scopus, Elsevier, etc.**) and to electronic books through the **AnelisPlus** and **Koha** projects. Students can also access online resources **remotely** through the library portal.

Additionally, a range of **support services** is available:

- **Accommodation in student dormitories** and **canteens, recreational centres, and sports facilities, all accessible for persons with disabilities (ramps, elevators, adapted signage), dedicated medical services, including a student health centre, occupational medicine office, and career counselling and guidance services through CCOC**.

There is also **personalised educational support** through:

- supervisory and academic integrity committees for each doctoral student,
- scheduled consultation hours and individual feedback sessions,
- and an **annual progress report** for every doctoral student.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The resources are appropriate for the **third cycle of studies**:

- **High-performance laboratories, modern infrastructure, and access to international databases** ensure strong support for advanced research.
- **Access is equal and equitable:** all doctoral students, regardless of their context, have access to the same infrastructures, services, and digital resources.
- **Individual needs are respected:** the infrastructure is adapted for students with disabilities, and academic support (supervision, consultation, personalisation) is continuous.
- **Diversity of learning styles is supported** through various ways of accessing resources: **physical, online, hybrid, laboratory-based, and digital**.

This approach is aligned with both **ARACIS requirements** and those of the **European Higher Education Area (ESG)**, which require **equitable access to resources for all doctoral students**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- **State-of-the-art research infrastructure** (AI Lab, Neuromarketing Lab) available to all doctoral students, regardless of their research topic.
- **Online access to international scientific resources**, including **remote access** for students with reduced mobility.
- **Adaptation of university spaces for persons with disabilities**, documented through annexes regarding buildings and accessibility.
- **A structured system of personalised supervision, with specialised** committees and **annual monitoring**.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.5. Learning outcomes

Standard S.B.5.1. Definition and evaluation Learning outcomes are adequately defined and evaluated.	
Indicator I.P.B.5.1.1	Learning outcomes are adequately described, and they support understanding of the students' and teachers' expectations regarding the content of the subject matters in the curriculum.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

Within **DSUD Economics**, the learning outcomes are clearly formulated in:

- The **study plan and the associated courses** explicitly define competencies, knowledge, and skills for each subject.
- The **course descriptions** include objectives, learning outcomes, detailed content, teaching methods, assessment methods, and the levels of responsibility and autonomy associated with each course.

Through the **individual doctoral study program**, expectations regarding progress, research activities, and annual evaluations are clearly established. All these documents are **published transparently on the IOSUD–UDJG website**.

2. Analysis of the state of facts:

The analysis shows that:

- **Learning outcomes are coherently described**, easy to understand, and aligned with the competencies of **level 8 of the NQF/EQF**.
- There is **alignment between the expectations of teaching staff and doctoral students**, due to the clarity of the course descriptions and the annual monitoring process.
- **Assessment methods** (reports, presentations, scientific articles, examinations) are **directly connected to the declared learning outcomes**.
- The analysed documents demonstrate **full compliance with the indicator**: learning outcomes are **clearly defined, communicated, and systematically assessed**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- **Full transparency:** publication of all documents online for doctoral students and supervisors.
- **Direct correlation between research and assessment**, through the requirement to publish in journals and/or participate in conferences.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Indicator I.P.B.5.1.2	Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The documents in the report show that the **verification of learning outcomes in DSUD–Economics is carried out systematically** through the following mechanisms:

- **Continuous assessments within the advanced training program.** Each course in the study plan includes **formative and summative assessment methods**, such as projects, presentations, reports, written assignments, and examinations, according to the course descriptions. All doctoral students receive an **annual evaluation of their scientific activity**, conducted by the doctoral supervisor based on **performance indicators and achieved results** (publications, conference participation, and chapters of theoretical analysis).
- **Periodic evaluations through scientific reports** Doctoral students present **annual progress reports** before the **supervisory and academic integrity committees**, with official minutes recorded. The research evaluation includes the literature review status, methodology, preliminary results, dissemination activities, and plans for **future work**.
- **Final verification of learning outcomes. The defence of the doctoral thesis** is conducted in accordance with the Regulation for the Completion of Doctoral University Studies, as published on the **IOSUD–UDJG website**.

The final evaluation includes: a **similarity report**, **validation of compliance with CNATDCU standards**, **analysis by the supervisory committee** and the **public defence before the doctoral committee**.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The data in the report demonstrate that the **indicator is fully fulfilled** through the following:

- The existence of **continuous assessments** ensures the gradual verification of competencies, in accordance with the declared learning outcomes.

- The **structure of the assessments corresponds to the requirements of the third cycle**, emphasising independent research, innovation, academic writing, and scientific dissemination.
- **Annual reports are formally documented and analysed by specialised committees**, ensuring objectivity and traceability.
- The **final examination (doctoral thesis defence)** fully validates the achievement of the learning outcomes, in accordance with the **minimum standards and IOSUD procedures**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- **Structured and transparent annual evaluations**, with official minutes, individual monitoring, and feedback.
- **Integration of scientific dissemination** (conference participation, WoS/BDI articles) as part of the **progress evaluation**.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.7. Procedures and practices regarding the admission competition, the journey, recognition and equivalence of studies, and result certification

Standard S.B.7.1. Admission The admission procedures and principles ensure access to higher education.	
Indicator I.P.B.7.1.1	The organisational component applies the admission procedures.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed documents show that the **admission procedures for the third cycle (doctoral studies)** are applied correctly and transparently within **IOSUD UDJG and the SDSE Economics Doctoral School**. Admission is regulated by the **Methodology for the Organisation and Conduct of Admission to the Third Cycle**, adopted by **UDJG Senate Decision no. 17/05.02.2025**. Information regarding **fields of study, doctoral schools, doctoral supervisors, the admission calendar, fees, and procedures** is published online. The methodology includes **eligibility criteria, admission stages**, **bibliography**, **assessment of language competencies**, **entrance examinations** and **ranking criteria**. The procedures are **applied uniformly at the IOSUD level** in compliance with the national legal framework and internal regulations (the UDJG Charter and IOSUD regulations).

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The **indicator is fulfilled**, based on the following arguments:

- The procedures are not only established but also **consistently implemented**, being respected at every stage of the admission process (publication, registration, evaluation, ranking).
- **Transparency is ensured** through the online publication of all relevant information, allowing **equal access for candidates**.
- **Competence assessment** is carried out through tests that are aligned with the mission of the doctoral school and the standards of the field of Economics (interview, research proposal, language examination).
- The procedures comply with the **principles of equity and equal opportunity set out in the national methodology and** the **internal regulations of UDJG**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- **Clear structuring of the admission stages**, which minimises errors and maximises predictability for candidates.
- **Assessment of competencies through research proposals**, enabling an appropriate selection aligned with the doctoral profile.
- **Integration of a language proficiency examination**, ensuring compliance with **internationalisation requirements**.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Indicator I.P.B.7.1.2	Admission in higher education study programmes complies with the principles of fairness and equal opportunities, and with the establishing of support measures to ensure access of vulnerable groups at social and educational risk, including candidates with special educational needs and/or disabilities.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The document shows that within **IOSUD–UDJG** and the **Doctoral School of Economic Sciences (SDSE)**, admission procedures are designed and implemented in accordance with the principles of **equity, equal opportunities, and non-discrimination**:

- Admission is conducted in accordance with the **Methodology for the Organisation and Conduct of Admission to the Third Cycle**, approved by the Senate and published online on the official UDJG admission page. The methodology includes explicit provisions regarding **equal access and non-discriminatory treatment** in the selection process.

- All information regarding **admission, examinations, calendar and criteria** is publicly available online
- This ensures **transparency and equal access for all candidates**.
- **UDJG ensures**, through institutional regulations, access for **candidates with disabilities or special educational needs** to adapted infrastructure (ramps, elevators, accessible spaces) and educational support, in accordance with the documents on facilities and infrastructure included in the **IPA annexes** (buildings, dormitories, accessible classrooms).
- The institution's policies guarantee **equitable admission procedures for vulnerable and socially at-risk groups**, in line with the **UDJG Charter** and the **Institutional Regulation for Doctoral University Studies**, which provide for **inclusion, non-discrimination, and the support necessary for continuing studies**.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The **indicator is fulfilled** for the following reasons:

- Admission procedures are **applied uniformly** and comply with the principles of **equity and equal opportunity, as demonstrated by full information transparency**, digital accessibility, and alignment with national legislation.
- There are **clear institutional measures to support vulnerable candidates**, particularly regarding access to educational infrastructure and administrative services.
- **University regulations** (the Charter, IOSUD Regulations, and the Admission Methodology) explicitly integrate the principles of **non-discrimination and equal opportunities**, demonstrating a coherent institutional approach.
- **Accessible infrastructure** confirms the practical implementation of inclusive principles in the admission process, ensuring that candidates with disabilities can participate **without physical barriers**.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- Full transparency: complete and updated publication of admission information online, accessible to all candidates.
- Adapted infrastructure: accessible university spaces, confirmed through documentation regarding the material base.
- Strong regulations on equity: the UDJG Charter and the IOSUD Regulations explicitly include principles of equity, non-discrimination, and support for vulnerable groups.
- Integrated institutional support: administrative services, counselling, and adapted facilities for candidates with special requirements.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Standard S.B.7.2. Academic journey of students The organisational component carries out actions supporting the students' academic journey.	
Indicator I.P.B.7.2.1	The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The documents included in the internal evaluation report indicate that IOSUD–UDJG and the Doctoral School of Economic Sciences (SDSE) strictly implement the regulations governing the professional activity of doctoral students. Doctoral candidates therefore follow the advanced training programme in accordance with the SDSE Curriculum, which is publicly available online. Each doctoral student's activity is conducted based on the Individual Doctoral Study Programme (PISUD) and is regulated through the Doctoral Studies Contract, which defines rights and obligations, the activity timeline, and the conditions for extending or interrupting studies. The IOSUD–UDJG regulations concerning the organisation of doctoral studies are applied consistently, including the Institutional Regulation, thesis methodology, and procedures related to evaluation, ethics, and academic integrity. The professional activity of doctoral students is monitored annually through activity reports prepared by the students and assessed by the supervisory committee, with the process documented through corresponding official minutes.

2. Analysis of the state of facts

The indicator is considered fulfilled because:

- The regulations are applied **uniformly and transparently** at all stages of the academic pathway: admission, advanced training, research activities, annual evaluations, and completion of studies.
- Mandatory documents (Doctoral Studies Contract, PISUD, and annual reports) are implemented for each doctoral student, ensuring **traceability and institutional compliance**.
- The annual evaluation of scientific activity (publications, conferences, thesis progress) confirms the **effective implementation of regulations** regarding professional activity.
- The IOSUD–UDJG procedures ensure a **predictable and well-regulated framework**, in accordance with the national legislation governing doctoral studies.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- ✧ The integration of **supervisory and academic integrity committees** provides continuous support to doctoral students throughout their studies.
- ✧ **Comprehensive contractual documentation** (Doctoral Studies Contract, PISUD), which clarifies expectations and responsibilities from the very beginning.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.8. Internationalisation process

Standard S.B.8.1. Internationalisation Improving the quality of education and research through internationalisation actions.	
Indicator I.P.B.8.1.1	The organisational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

UDJG and the Doctoral School of Economic Sciences have **internationalisation as a strategic priority**, as outlined in the 2025–2029 Strategic Plan. The activities encompass Erasmus+ mobility programmes, participation in international conferences, involvement in research collaborations, cotutelle arrangements, and partnerships with external academic institutions. Doctoral students within the DSUD Economics field have completed mobility periods and taken part in a wide range of international conferences. STRATEC has partnerships with research centres in France and Romania, while doctoral supervisors have Web of Science (WoS) publications with international visibility and serve on global scientific boards (Annex IPB 3.1.2 of the file).

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The activities undertaken indicate that the indicator is met: there are functional mobility opportunities, consistent participation of doctoral students in international scientific events, active research collaborations, and the international visibility of doctoral supervisors. However, the level of mobility remains relatively modest, and the number of international doctoral candidates is still limited.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- ✧ Publications in WoS Q1–Q2 journals.
- ✧ International STRATEC protocols (e.g., CRECC Paris).
- ✧ International scholarships (Eugen Ionesco).
- ✧ Organisation of its own international conferences (e.g., CSSD UDJG).

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.9. Scientific research results

Standard S.B.9.1 Scientific research in the education process Scientific research activities support students in achieving the learning outcomes.	
Indicator I.P.B.9.1.1	Learning based on scientific investigation and research results support and are capitalised upon in achieving the learning outcomes envisaged through the study programme.

1. Presentation of the state of facts

Scientific research is a **central pillar of the doctoral program in Economics (DSUD E)**, integrated into the curriculum through courses dedicated to research methodology, ethics, and digital competencies, as well as through applied research activities. Doctoral students have access to **modern research infrastructure**, including specialised laboratories (AI, Neuromarketing) and international databases (WoS, Scopus, ScienceDirect).

Research activities are guided by **doctoral supervisors with international visibility**, as evidenced by publications in WoS Q1–Q3 journals, relevant Hirsch indices, and involvement in international scientific committees. Doctoral students publish in **BDI- and WoS-indexed journals**, including articles awarded by UEFISCDI, and present papers at international conferences and at the conference of doctoral schools within IOSUD. Partner research centres (e.g., STRATEC) have **active protocols with institutions in Romania and abroad** (CEMEX Iași, CRECC Paris, CSE ENACTED Suceava), facilitating the integration of doctoral students into research networks (Annexes IPB 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 in the file).

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The reviewed documents indicate that, within **DSUD Economics**, there is a strong link between research and the educational process, with the outcomes of scientific work being incorporated into the development of doctoral students' advanced competencies. Research activities are ongoing, systematically monitored, and assessed on an annual basis, while annual reports confirm both the progress of doctoral candidates and the alignment of research with the programme's objectives.

Participation in conferences, publications in journals indexed in Web of Science, and engagement in international partnerships demonstrate that research results are effectively integrated into doctoral training, supporting the achievement of learning outcomes specific to the doctoral cycle.

The integration of doctoral students into research projects, the availability of modern infrastructure, and the collaborations developed through STRATEC further support the high-level fulfilment of this indicator.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

- ✧ Publications in Q1/Q2 journals and constant participation in international conferences.
- ✧ Advanced laboratories (AI, Neuromarketing) are integrated into doctoral research processes.
- ✧ International STRATEC research protocols with institutions such as CRECC Paris.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Standard S.B.9.2. Scientific research pertaining to the objectives of the study program The organizational component carries out scientific research activities aligned with the objectives of the evaluated study program.	
Indicator I.P.B.9.2.1	The results of scientific research are visible at national and international level in that scientific domain, and capitalised upon in an adequate manner.

1. Presentation of the state of facts

The analysed documentation shows that the doctoral school within IOSUD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați actively supports the dissemination and valorisation of scientific research results produced by both doctoral students and supervisors. The self-evaluation report provides evidence of publications in national and international journals, conference proceedings, and collective volumes authored by doctoral candidates and academic staff involved in the programme. The documents also highlight participation in national and international scientific conferences, as well as the involvement of doctoral students in research projects and academic networks. Research outcomes are disseminated through articles indexed in recognised databases, conference presentations, and other academic outputs. Institutional reports and records of doctoral student activities further confirm the contribution of doctoral research to the scientific visibility of the field. These aspects demonstrate the presence of institutional mechanisms that support the dissemination and effective use of research results generated within the doctoral programme.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The analysis of the available evidence confirms that the doctoral programme facilitates the dissemination and scientific visibility of research outcomes at both national and international levels. The existence of publications in scientific journals, conference papers, and participation in academic events reflects the active engagement of doctoral students and supervisors within the scientific community. The involvement of doctoral candidates in research projects and academic networks further enhances the impact and visibility of their research within their respective fields. Overall, the reviewed documentation shows that the results produced within the doctoral programme are effectively disseminated and valorised through recognised scientific channels.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

- ✧ active participation of doctoral students and supervisors in national and international scientific conferences.
- ✧ publication of research results in peer-reviewed journals and conference proceedings.
- ✧ Involvement of doctoral candidates in research projects and academic collaborations.
- ✧ institutional support for the dissemination of research outcomes.

4. Recommendation:

- ✧ further increase the international visibility of research results through publications in high-impact journals.

The indicator is: fulfilled

DOMAIN C. Quality management

Criterion C.1. Quality assurance strategies and procedures, including in the field of academic ethics and conduct, which involve students, employers and other stakeholders and are applied in a consistent, transparent manner

Standard S.C.1.1. Application Adequately implemented strategic directions, actions, and procedures	
Indicator I.P.C.1.1.1	The organizational component consistently carries out actions and applies procedures, proving their impact on improving the quality of education at the level of the study program

1. Presentation of the state of facts

UDJG and IOSUD consistently implement institutional strategies (quality strategy, internationalisation strategy, research–development–innovation strategy, and digitalisation strategy), all of which are approved by the Senate and implemented across faculties and doctoral schools. These strategies are publicly available and periodically reviewed. There is a functional quality management system, certified to **ISO 9001:2015**, with clear operational procedures for planning, monitoring, and evaluating educational activities. The procedures are accessible on institutional platforms.

The Doctoral School of Economic Sciences (SDSE) annually conducts self-evaluation processes, internal reports, analytical meetings, and monitoring of academic and research activities, approved by the CSUD and the Senate, demonstrating the systematic implementation of procedures. Standardised institutional procedures are in place for admission, implementation of the Individual Doctoral Study Program, annual evaluation, doctoral student feedback, and for ethics, academic integrity, and plagiarism prevention. The existence of digital platforms (evaluare.ugal.ro, HR, student.ugal.ro, Moodle, ARTHRA, SmartUMS) ensures traceability and transparency in the implementation of administrative and academic procedures. The impact of implementing these procedures can be observed in increased international visibility, compliance with CNATDCU standards, positive ARACIS evaluations, improved publication quality, greater involvement in research projects, increased participation in conferences, and enhanced support for doctoral students.

2. Analysis of the current situation in relation to the indicator

The data show that procedures are applied **consistently, not merely formally**: admission, annual evaluation, supervision, ethics, mobility, funding, recognition of research activity, and the use of IT resources are all documented and periodically monitored. There are **feedback mechanisms** (evaluation of doctoral supervisors and doctoral student questionnaires) that lead to real adjustments in educational practice and in the organisation of the program. The impact of these procedures is demonstrated through **the quality of publications, the increasing number of projects and partnerships, the organisation of international conferences, a good completion rate of doctoral studies, a high level of infrastructure, and the involvement of doctoral students in scientific activities.**

By integrating institutional strategies into everyday activities, the doctoral school demonstrates **real operational functionality**, not merely the formal existence of regulations.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples:

- A **mature quality management system**, fully digitalised and transparent, with publicly available annual reports.
- **Consistent implementation of ethics procedures**, including the anti-plagiarism strategy, periodic checks, and training on academic integrity.
- **Integrated digital platforms** for administrative and academic processes (Moodle, SmartUMS, evaluare.ugal.ro), which increase efficiency and traceability.
- **Continuous monitoring** through CSUD, CEAC, self-evaluation reports, and validation of procedures by the Senate.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Standard S.C.1.2. Stakeholder involvement.

The higher education institution demonstrates that it involves stakeholders with relevant activity in the implementation of procedures.

Indicator I.P.C.1.2.1.	**The opinions of members of the academic community and of other stakeholders are taken into account in the process of implementing the procedures.**

1. Presentation of the state of facts

The analysed documents indicate that IOSUD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați implements institutional mechanisms through which the opinions of members of the academic community and other stakeholders are collected and taken into account in the implementation and revision of internal procedures. At the institutional level, the opinions of academic staff, students and administrative personnel are collected through consultations within academic governance structures (faculty councils, specialised committees, University Senate) and through periodic evaluation and satisfaction surveys addressed to students and doctoral students via the institutional evaluation platform (https://www.evaluare.ugal.ro).

Within the doctoral school, feedback mechanisms are in place for doctoral students to evaluate their supervisors and the doctoral program. The results are analysed within academic management structures. Doctoral students are also represented in the governance structures of IOSUD and the doctoral school, participating in the analysis of program performance indicators and in the formulation of improvement proposals. The consultation process also includes interactions with employers and representatives of the socio-economic environment, whose opinions are considered when revising study programs and institutional procedures.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The analysis of the documents confirms the existence of institutionalised mechanisms for collecting and analysing the opinions of members of the academic community and other stakeholders. The use of evaluation questionnaires, consultations within academic governance structures and the participation of doctoral students in decision-making bodies demonstrate the active involvement of the university community in the implementation and revision of institutional procedures. Furthermore, the results of evaluations and feedback mechanisms are analysed by the structures responsible for quality management and are used to formulate improvement measures regarding study programmes and academic activities. The periodic consultation with employers and institutional partners helps align the doctoral programme with the requirements of the socio-economic environment and developments in the research field.

Overall, the analysed evidence indicates that stakeholder opinions are systematically collected and considered in the processes of implementing and improving institutional procedures.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The analysis highlights several elements that may be considered examples of good practice:

- ✧ The use of an institutional platform dedicated to student and doctoral student feedback collection.
- ✧ The representation of doctoral students in IOSUD and doctoral school governance structures.
- ✧ The periodic evaluation of doctoral supervisors by doctoral students.
- ✧ The consultation of employers and institutional partners in the revision of study programmes.

Criterion C.2. Functionality of education quality assurance structures, including in the field of academic ethics and conduct, according to the law

Standard S.C.2.2. Operation Quality assurance and academic ethics and conduct organizational structures adequately perform their specific role and functions.	
Indicator I.P.C.2.2.2.	The academic ethics commission operates based on the regulation approved by the University Senate, and performs actions that are compliant with the law, independently from any other structure or person in the higher education institution.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed documents indicate that the “Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați has a functional University Ethics Committee that operates based on regulations approved by the University Senate and made publicly available on the university’s website. These regulations define the committee’s organisational structure, responsibilities, procedures for handling complaints, and mechanisms for addressing breaches of academic ethics and deontology. The committee’s activity is carried out in accordance with national legislation governing academic integrity and university ethics.

The Ethics Committee is responsible for examining complaints regarding potential breaches of ethical standards, formulating opinions and issuing decisions or recommendations in accordance with institutional procedures. Institutional documents emphasise the committee's independent status, which operates autonomously from the university's executive and administrative structures.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The analysis of the available documents confirms the existence of a well-defined regulatory framework governing the organisation and functioning of the University Ethics Committee. The regulation approved by the University Senate outlines the committee’s responsibilities, procedures, and operational principles, ensuring alignment with national legal provisions on academic ethics and integrity. The regulatory framework also highlights the committee’s independence in examining complaints and issuing decisions, without interference from other institutional bodies. By establishing clear procedures for identifying and addressing ethical violations, the institution provides an effective structure for promoting academic integrity and preventing unethical conduct in both teaching and research activities.

Overall, the analysed information confirms that the structure responsible for university ethics operates in accordance with the approved regulations and the applicable legal provisions.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The analysis highlights several elements that may be considered examples of good practice:

- ✧ clearly defined **procedures for analysing complaints and addressing breaches of academic ethics**
- ✧ , and the integration of academic integrity principles into **institutional quality assurance policies**.

4. Recommendations

Although the indicator is fulfilled, several directions for further consolidation may be considered:

- ✧ developing **training and awareness activities regarding academic ethics and integrity** for students and academic staff.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion C.3. Procedures for the initiation, monitoring and periodic review of the study programmes and domains and of the performed activities, involving students, employers and other stakeholders

Standard S.C.3.1. Procedures and implementation of procedures The HEI has procedures for initiating, monitoring, and periodically reviewing the study programmes and domains and the performed activities, and applies them systematically.	
Indicator I.P.C.3.1.1	The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed documents indicate that IOSUD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați implements an institutional quality assurance system that includes procedures and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating doctoral study programs, applied within the Doctoral School of Economic Sciences. The institutional framework is defined by regulations and procedures approved by the University Senate that govern the initiation, monitoring, and periodic evaluation of study programs, as well as specific activities related to doctoral studies. These documents are publicly available on the university website and on institutional quality management platforms. At the level of IOSUD and the doctoral school, mechanisms are in place to monitor the activities of doctoral students and doctoral supervisors. These include periodic academic evaluations, annual activity reports and internal evaluation procedures for study programs.

The institution also uses quality evaluation mechanisms, such as feedback questionnaires for doctoral students and periodic analyses of academic results and research activities.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The analysis of the available documents confirms the existence of a functional institutional system for quality assurance of doctoral programs. Institutional procedures define clear responsibilities for the governance structures of IOSUD and the doctoral school and establish mechanisms for periodic monitoring and evaluation of academic and research activities. The systematic implementation of these procedures, through internal evaluations, activity reports and feedback mechanisms, demonstrates that quality assurance processes are integrated into the management of the doctoral program. The results of internal evaluations and monitoring processes are used to analyse academic performance and to identify improvement measures for the study program.

Overall, the analysed evidence indicates that institutional procedures are consistently applied and help ensure and continuously improve the quality of the doctoral program.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The analysis highlights several elements that may be considered examples of good practice:

- ✧ The implementation of **periodic monitoring mechanisms for doctoral students and doctoral supervisors**.
- ✧ The use of **doctoral students' feedback in the evaluation of the study program**.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Indicator I.P.C.3.1.2	Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed documents indicate that IOSUD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați involves members of the academic community and other stakeholders in implementing institutional quality-assurance procedures for doctoral study programs. At the institutional and doctoral school level, mechanisms are implemented to ensure the participation of academic staff, doctoral students and other categories of personnel in the analysis and implementation of internal procedures. Doctoral student representatives participate in the governance structures of IOSUD and the doctoral school, contributing to discussions and proposals on the organisation and functioning of doctoral programs. The opinions of members of the academic community are collected through institutional feedback mechanisms, such as evaluation questionnaires addressed to doctoral students and consultations within academic governance structures. The results are analysed by the structures responsible for quality management and used to improve academic activities.

The implementation process also includes consultation with external partners and representatives of the socio-economic environment, whose opinions are considered in the development and adaptation of study programs.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The analysis of the documents confirms the existence of institutional mechanisms for involving members of the academic community and other stakeholders in the implementation of quality assurance procedures. The participation of doctoral students in the governance structures of IOSUD and the doctoral school, as well as the use of institutional feedback mechanisms, demonstrates the active involvement of the university community in

analysing and applying institutional procedures. Furthermore, consulting external partners helps align academic and research activities with the needs of the socio-economic environment and developments in the research field.

Overall, the analysed evidence indicates that members of the academic community and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in implementing institutional procedures.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

- ✧ The **representation of doctoral students in the governance structures of IOSUD and the doctoral school**.
- ✧ The use of **institutional feedback mechanisms for evaluating the doctoral program**.
- ✧ Consultation with **external partners and the socio-economic environment** in the development of study programs.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion C.4. Procedures for the periodic evaluation of the quality of the activities of teaching staff, auxiliary teaching staff, and administrative staff

Standard S.C.4.1. Procedures Applying the methodologies and procedures contributes to improving the quality of the staff's activities.	
Indicator I.P.C.4.1.1	The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed documents indicate that "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați implements institutional mechanisms for the periodic evaluation of teaching staff by students, including within doctoral study programs. The evaluation is conducted each semester through standardised questionnaires administered via the institutional evaluation platform (https://www.evaluare.ugal.ro). These questionnaires assess various dimensions of teaching activity, such as the quality of teaching, the clarity of presentation, the relevance of course content, and interaction with students. The evaluation results are collected and analysed at the institutional level and at the levels of faculties and doctoral schools, and are used in the monitoring of the quality of the educational process. The structures responsible for quality management periodically analyse these results and formulate recommendations for improving teaching activities. Teaching staff also have access to the evaluation results, which may be used for self-assessment and professional development purposes.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The analysis of the documents confirms the existence of institutionalised mechanisms for the semester-based evaluation of teaching staff by students. The use of standardised questionnaires administered through institutional platforms ensures the systematic collection of student feedback regarding the quality of teaching activities. The results of these evaluations are analysed by the structures responsible for quality management and used to monitor academic performance and improve the educational process. By integrating these evaluation mechanisms within the institutional quality assurance system, the institution demonstrates that student feedback is considered in the analysis and development of teaching activities. Overall, the analysed evidence indicates that student evaluations of teaching staff are systematically reviewed and used in the quality assurance process.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The analysis highlights several elements that may be considered examples of good practice:

- ✧ The use of an **institutional platform dedicated to the evaluation of teaching staff by students**.
- ✧ The integration of **student evaluation results into institutional quality assurance processes**.
- ✧ The use of **student feedback as a tool for the professional development of teaching staff**.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion C.5. Systematically updated databases on internal quality assurance

Standard S.C.5.1. Databases The HEI uses databases to support internal quality assurance activities.	
Indicator I.P.C.5.1.1	The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed documents indicate that IOSUD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați implements institutional mechanisms for the systematic collection and analysis of data relevant to the internal quality assurance process of doctoral study programs. At the institutional level, procedures and tools are implemented to monitor academic

and research activities, including the periodic collection of data on doctoral students' activity, doctoral supervisors' performance, research outcomes, and program-specific indicators. Data are collected through various institutional instruments, such as annual activity reports, internal evaluations of study programs, feedback questionnaires addressed to doctoral students, and other monitoring mechanisms within the institutional quality management system. The collected information is analysed by the structures responsible for quality management at IOSUD and at the doctoral school level. It is used in the periodic evaluation of study programmes and in the development of improvement measures for academic and research activities.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The analysis of the available documents confirms the existence of institutional mechanisms for the systematic collection and analysis of data relevant to the internal quality assurance process.

Institutional procedures provide for the periodic collection of data regarding academic performance, research activities and educational outcomes, as well as their analysis by the structures responsible for quality management. Through instruments such as activity reports, internal evaluations, and feedback mechanisms, the institution gathers relevant information that enables monitoring of the doctoral program's performance and the identification of opportunities for improvement. The integration of these processes into the institutional quality assurance system demonstrates that the collected data are systematically used to analyse and develop study programs.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The analysis highlights several elements that may be considered examples of good practice:

- ✧ The implementation of an **institutional system for collecting and analysing data regarding academic performance and research activities**.
- ✧ The use of **annual activity reports and internal evaluations** in monitoring study programs.
- ✧ The integration of **doctoral students' feedback in analysing the quality of the educational process**.
- ✧ The use of collected data in the **evaluation and improvement of doctoral programs**.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion C.6. Transparency of information of public interest, including those regarding the study programmes and domains offered, and transparency regarding the related certificates, diplomas and qualifications

Standard S.C.6.1. Transparency The organisational component ensures transparency of information, as required by the law.	
Indicator I.P.C.6.1.1	The organisational component ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The documents indicate that IOSUD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați ensures the publication and public accessibility of information relevant to the organisation and implementation of doctoral study programmes. Key information is available on the institutional websites of the university and its doctoral schools, including regulations on the organisation and conduct of doctoral studies, institutional procedures, details about doctoral supervisors, the structure of study programmes, admission requirements, research activities, and academic outcomes. The university's online platforms provide open access to these resources, enhancing the transparency of both academic and administrative processes. Additionally, information related to evaluation procedures, activity reports, and other relevant documents is made accessible to the academic community and the wider public.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The publication of institutional documents, regulations, and information on the organisation of the doctoral programme contributes to the transparency of academic activities. It facilitates access to relevant information for interested stakeholders. The availability of this information allows potential candidates, doctoral students, teaching staff and other stakeholders to obtain information regarding program organisation, admission conditions, programme structure and academic and research activities.

Overall, the analysed evidence indicates that the institution ensures the publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study program.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The analysis highlights several elements that may be considered examples of good practice:

- ✧ ensuring **public access to information regarding doctoral supervisors and academic activities**.
- ✧ The use of online platforms for disseminating relevant information regarding the **doctoral study program.**

4. Recommendations:

- ✧ extending the availability of information **in English as well** to increase international visibility.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Indicator I.P.C.6.1.2	The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

IOSUD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați implements institutional mechanisms to ensure the transparency of decision-making processes within governance structures and doctoral schools. Decisions relevant to the organisation and functioning of doctoral study programmes are adopted within the university governance structures, such as the University Senate, the Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD) and the doctoral school councils. Relevant decisions and documents (regulations, methodologies, procedures, and governing body decisions) are published on the institutional website, ensuring that the academic community and other stakeholders have access to information about decision-making processes. Doctoral student representatives also participate in decision-making structures, contributing to transparency and the involvement of the academic community in institutional governance.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The analysis of the documents confirms the presence of institutional mechanisms that promote transparency in the decision-making processes related to the doctoral study programme. The publication of decisions adopted by governing bodies, along with institutional regulations and procedures, ensures that the academic community and other stakeholders are informed about matters concerning the programme's organisation and functioning. Moreover, the involvement of doctoral student representatives in decision-making structures represents an additional factor that reinforces transparency and highlights the participatory nature of academic governance.

The institution ensures transparency in decision-making processes by publishing relevant information and involving representatives of the academic community in governance structures.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The analysis highlights several elements that may be considered examples of good practice:

- ✧ The involvement of doctoral student representatives in decision-making bodies.
- ✧ public access to regulations and procedures regarding the organisation of doctoral studies.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion C.8. Participation in external evaluation processes, according to the law

Standard S.C.8.1. Compliance with the external evaluation obligation The HEI undergoes external quality evaluation as required by the law.	
Indicator I.P.C.8.1.1	The organisational component carries out the procedures pertaining to the external quality evaluation process, aiming to organise the evaluated study programme as provided by the law.

1. Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The analysed documents indicate that IOSUD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați undertakes the activities required for the external quality evaluation of doctoral study programmes, in compliance with national regulations and ARACIS standards. The institution prepares and submits the necessary documentation for the evaluation process, including self-evaluation reports, annexes, and supporting materials that reflect the organisation and functioning of the doctoral programme. The external evaluation process is further supported by the involvement of institutional bodies responsible for quality management, such as the Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD), the leadership of doctoral schools, and the university's quality assurance structures.

The institutional documentation also indicates that the university participates in external evaluation processes conducted in accordance with the national legislative framework and higher education quality assurance standards.

2. Analysis of the state of facts in relation to the performance indicator

The analysis of the documents confirms that the institution applies the procedures for the external quality evaluation of doctoral study programs in accordance with the legal framework and evaluation standards. The preparation of the self-evaluation report and the supporting documentation demonstrates the involvement of institutional structures in the preparation and implementation of the external evaluation process.

The institution's participation in external evaluation procedures and its cooperation with evaluation bodies contribute to monitoring and improving the quality of study programs. The institution carries out the procedures necessary for the external quality evaluation process to organise and operate the study program in compliance with legal provisions.

3. Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The analysis highlights several elements that may be considered examples of good practice:

- ✧ The systematic preparation of **self-evaluation reports and documentation related to external evaluations**.
- ✧ The involvement of **institutional quality management structures in preparing external evaluation processes**.
- ✧ institutional cooperation with **national quality assurance bodies**.
- ✧ The use of external evaluation results improves **study programs**.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths:		Weaknesses:
✓ Well-defined institutional framework and procedures for quality assurance ✓ Transparent recruitment and governance processes ✓ Systematic collection and analysis of data supporting quality management ✓ Public access to information regarding doctoral programs and regulations	INTERNAL FACTORS ⇧	✓ Limited international visibility of doctoral programs. ✓ Partial digitalisation of quality monitoring processes. ✓ Uneven participation of students in feedback and evaluation processes.
SWOT analysis		
Opportunities:		**Threats:**
✓ Expansion of international partnerships and joint doctoral programs. ✓ Access to European research and education funding programs. ✓ Development of digital platforms supporting quality management.	⇩ EXTERNAL FACTORS	✓ Increasing international competition for doctoral candidates and researchers. ✓ Possible fluctuations in public funding for higher education and research. ✓ Migration of highly qualified graduates and researchers.

V. Extent to which the standards and performance indicators are fulfilled, and recommendations

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
DOMAIN A. Institutional capacity			
1.	I.P.A.1.1.1 For delivering the study program/domain, the HEI has adequate organizational components and an adequate management system, which operate based on methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.	F	
2.	I.P.A.1.2.1 The opinions of the faculty and department members, of the subsidiary or extension and of other stakeholders are considered in the process of adopting and revising methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures.	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
3.	I.P.A.2.1.1 The HEI legally owns venues for the related education, research and administrative processes, as well as for services for students, doctoral students and trainees, thus providing an enabling environment for living and studying, including for disabled persons. Optimal venues are also provided for activities of the staff. Such venues are adequately equipped.	F	
4.	I.P.A.2.2.1 The movable and immovable assets are properly maintained to ensure optimal conditions for studying, living and research, as well as for work.	F	
5.	I.P.A.3.1.1 The human resources of the organisational component are suitable to perform the activities about the evaluated study programme/domain. The teaching staff has the required qualifications and professional competences to teach the subject matters assigned to them in the job list.	F	
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	Periodically updating specific criteria to reflect academic developments and emerging standards in the field of Economics.
8.	I.P.A.4.1.1 The organisational component uses IT tools in its own procedures, to improve access and provide good quality services for the members of its own community and the indirect beneficiaries of education.	F	-
DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy			
9.	I.P.B.1.1.1 The study programme is developed and structured according to the expected learning outcomes, and organised based on transferable study credits. It includes all learning, teaching, practical training, research and evaluation experiences, which, together, lead to a higher education qualification.	F	Expansion of the portfolio of interdisciplinary courses that connect Economics with emerging fields (e.g., behavioural sciences, technology).
10.	I.P.B.2.1.2 The expected learning outcomes are correlated with the competences required by those occupations, according to the occupational standards and/or the European Skills, Competences and Occupations (ESCO).	F	
11.	I.P.B.3.1.1 The organisational component ensures implementation of the student-centred learning in the curriculum and through the teaching strategies used in the learning and teaching activities and experiences.	F	
12.	I.P.B.3.1.2 The organisational component ensures opportunities for students to participate in	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	academic mobility programmes organised in person and/or virtually.		
13.	I.P.B.3.2.1 The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students, in line with their potential and aspirations, taking into account the diversity of learning styles and abilities.	F	Increasing the visibility of resources and services for students with special educational needs.
14.	I.P.B.4.1.1 The organisational component provides students, including those with special educational needs/disabilities, with access to resources and services designed to support the learning process, adequate for the individual learning needs, the study domain, the study cycle, and the form of organisation of the study programme.	F	-
15.	I.P.B.5.1.1 Learning outcomes are adequately described, and they support understanding of the students' and teachers' expectations regarding the content of the subject matters in the curriculum.	F	
16.	I.P.B.5.1.2 Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	-
17.	I.P.B.7.1.1 The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	
18.	I.P.B.7.1.2 Admission in higher education study programmes complies with the principles of fairness and equal opportunities, and with the establishing of support measures to ensure access of vulnerable groups at social and educational risk, including candidates with special educational needs and/or disabilities.	F	
19.	I.P.B.7.2.1 The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	-
20.	I.P.B.8.1.1 The organisational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.	F	
21.	I.P.B.9.1.1 Learning based on scientific investigation and research results support and are capitalised upon in achieving the learning outcomes envisaged through the study programme.	F	
22.	I.P.B.9.2.1 The results of scientific research are visible at national and international level in that scientific domain, and capitalised upon in an adequate manner.	F	Further increase the international visibility of research results through publications in high-impact journals.
DOMAIN C. Quality management			

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
23.	**I.P.C.1.1.1** The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	
24.	**I.P.C.1.2.1** The opinions of the members of its own community and of other stakeholders are taken into account in the procedure implementation process.	F	
25.	**I.P.C.2.2.2.** The academic ethics commission operates based on the regulation approved by the University Senate, and performs actions that are compliant with the law, independently from any other structure or person in the higher education institution.	F	developing training and awareness activities regarding academic ethics and integrity for students and academic staff.
26.	**I.P.C.3.1.1** The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	-
27.	**I.P.C.3.1.2** Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	F	
28.	**I.P.C.4.1.1** The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	F	-
29.	**I.P.C.5.1.1** The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	F	-
30.	**I.P.C.6.1.1** The organisational component ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.	F	extending the availability of information in English as well to increase international visibility.
31.	**I.P.C.6.1.2** The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	-
32.	**I.P.C.8.1.1** The organisational component carries out the procedures pertaining to the external quality evaluation process, aiming to organise the evaluated study programme as provided by the law.	F	-

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfilment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity	8		
Domain B. Educational efficacy	14		
Domain C. Quality management	10		
Total	32		

VI. Conclusions

The evaluation highlights several directions for further development, particularly strengthening international visibility, further digitalisation of quality management processes, and increased stakeholder participation in evaluation and feedback mechanisms.
Overall, the analysed evidence indicates that the study program operates in accordance with the legal provisions and quality assurance standards applicable in higher education.

Propose and substantiate a decision.

Following the completion of the accreditation/maintaining accreditation procedure, the decision of the evaluation panel shall be one of the following:*

a) ~~accreditation*~~ ~~(AC)~~/maintaining accreditation (MAC).
b) ~~conditional maintaining of the provisional authorisation to operate*~~ ~~(CMPA)~~/~~conditional maintaining of accreditation~~ ~~(CMAC)~~.
c) ~~non-accreditation*~~ ~~(NAC)~~/~~withdrawal of the accreditation~~ ~~(WAC)~~.

VII. Annexes

Enclose the schedule of the on-site visit, the list of documents reviewed, and any other documents relevant to the evaluation procedure that are referred to in the EER and cannot be accessed through links.

* When the external quality evaluation for accreditation is performed with undergoing the procedure for obtaining a provisional authorisation to operate.