

The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education



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

Higher Education Institution/Education Provider Organization:	George Enescu National University of Arts of Iași (UNAGE Iași)
Doctoral School:	Doctoral School of Theatre of IOSUD
Doctoral Domain:	Theatre and Performing Arts
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.	Alexandru BOUREANU	Expert evaluator	
2.	Emilia MORARU	International Expert	
3.	Alexandru-Florin RĂDULEA	PhD Student Evaluator	



I. Introduction

The external evaluation report was drafted in the context of the external quality evaluation procedure for the doctoral study domain **Theatre and Performing Arts**, organised within the **Doctoral School of Theatre** of **IOSUD – George Enescu National University of Arts of Iași (UNAGE Iași)**. According to the visit timetable, the objective of the procedure is the **maintenance of accreditation**, and the evaluation visit is scheduled for **27–28 April 2026**. The ARACIS external evaluation panel includes **Alexandru Boureanu**, academic expert, **Emilia Moraru**, international evaluator and **Alexandru-Florin Rădulea**, doctoral student evaluator, while **Călin Ciobotari** is indicated as the institutional contact person.

The period covered by the internal evaluation documentation is clearly identified as **2021–2025**, with the Internal Evaluation Report dated **January 2026**. The documentation therefore provides an adequate chronological framework for assessing the evolution of the doctoral field since the previous external evaluation.

The higher education institution is presented in a coherent and historically grounded manner. UNAGE Iași is described as the institutional successor of the School of Fine Arts founded in **1860**, with a development trajectory that included the Academy of Fine Arts, the Institute of Arts, the “George Enescu” Conservatory, and, after 1990, the reintegration of the field of Theatre within the “George Enescu” Academy of Arts. The institution is correctly characterised as a public university with a distinctive profile in Romania, bringing together the three major artistic fields: **Music, Theatre and Visual Arts**.

The description of IOSUD–UNAGE Iași is sufficiently documented. The report mentions the ministerial orders through which the doctoral schools in Music, Theatre and Performing Arts, and Visual Arts were established. It also indicates that, as of 1 October 2025, IOSUD–UNAGE Iași comprised **25 doctoral supervisors** and **141 doctoral candidates**, which provides relevant institutional context for the scale and structure of doctoral education at the university.

The governance structures are also presented in an adequate manner. The documentation identifies the Rector of UNAGE Iași, the Director of CSUD, the composition of CSUD, the Director of the Doctoral School of Theatre, and the membership of the Doctoral School Council. The report therefore gives a sufficiently clear image of the institutional and decision-making framework supporting the doctoral domain.

The general description of the Doctoral School of Theatre is relevant and well connected to the history of the domain. The report states that the first steps towards doctoral education in Theatre were initiated in 2000, the first doctoral supervisors were validated thereafter, and the first admission session took place in the academic year **2002–2003**. It also notes that, following the Bologna-related transformations, the domain developed both the **scientific doctorate** and the **professional doctorate**, a distinction that remains operational.

The mission of the Doctoral School is clearly formulated around three dimensions: an educational mission, a creative/artistic research mission, and a complementary educational mission linked to socio-cultural development. This formulation is appropriate for a doctoral domain in the arts, where advanced research must integrate theoretical, methodological, creative and professional dimensions.

The doctoral field **Theatre and Performing Arts** is described as having functioned continuously since **2007**, providing a framework for artistic research, theoretical research, critical analysis and interdisciplinary dialogue. The report identifies several significant developments during the 2021–2025 period: the first international cotutelle doctorate, increased international mobility, the affiliation of two new professors, the growth of state-funded doctoral places, the development of the professional doctorate, the annual organization of an international doctoral conference, the development of the DOCTART platform, an increase in defended theses, and the enhancement of research infrastructure.

Evaluation:

The Introduction section is substantially compliant with the expected structure. It provides the necessary institutional, historical, legal and academic context for the evaluation. It also explains the evolution of the doctoral domain since the previous external evaluation and identifies the main developments recorded during the evaluated period. The section is clear, relevant and adequately documented.

However, for the final version of the external evaluation report, the Introduction could be strengthened by adding a more explicit evaluative paragraph regarding the correspondence between the institutional mission, the specific profile of doctoral education in Theatre and Performing Arts, and the current strategic priorities of IOSUD–UNAGE Iași. It would also be useful to distinguish more visibly between information concerning the university, IOSUD, the Doctoral School, and the doctoral field under evaluation.

Conclusion:

The information provided in the Introduction demonstrates that the doctoral field Theatre and Performing Arts is institutionally well integrated within IOSUD–UNAGE Iași, has a clearly defined academic and artistic profile, and has undergone relevant developments since the previous external evaluation. The section adequately supports the purpose of the evaluation procedure for maintaining accreditation.

II. Methods used

The evaluation methodology was based primarily on the analysis of the **Internal Evaluation Report** and its annexes, covering the period **2021–2025**. The documentation examined included institutional regulations, strategic and operational documents, data on doctoral supervisors and doctoral students, annual activity reports, evidence concerning research activity, internationalization, partnerships, doctoral events, financial/project documentation, and the

progress report on the implementation of the recommendations formulated during the previous external evaluation.

The preparation of the internal evaluation documentation involved the Director of the Doctoral School, doctoral supervisors, representatives of IOSUD and CSUD, administrative staff, and doctoral student representatives. This indicates that the self-evaluation process was participatory and included both academic and institutional perspectives.

The on-site visit, scheduled for **27–28 April 2026**, includes meetings with the management of the organisational component, the team that drafted the Internal Evaluation Report, doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, employers, representatives of research centres and laboratories, the Ethics Committee, and quality assurance structures. The visit also includes the examination of the material and research infrastructure relevant to doctoral training in Theatre and Performing Arts.

Evaluation:

The methods used are appropriate and sufficiently diversified. The combination of document analysis, institutional dialogue, stakeholder consultation and on-site verification provides a reliable basis for assessing the quality of the doctoral domain. The inclusion of doctoral students, employers and research infrastructure representatives is particularly relevant, as it allows the panel to verify both formal compliance and the practical functioning of the doctoral field. For greater methodological clarity, the final report could specify the additional documents requested during the visit, if any, and mention whether samples of doctoral files, theses, minutes, student feedback forms and evidence of mobility were examined.

Conclusion:

The evaluation methodology is coherent, relevant and adequate for the objective of **maintaining accreditation** of the doctoral domain **Theatre and Performing Arts**.

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 has organisational components in its structure, which function based on adequate competences, responsibilities, processes, and implementation procedures, and ensure an effective management system.

Indicator I.P.A.1.1.1	For delivering the study programme/domain, the HEI has adequate organisational components and an adequate management system, which operate based on
--------------------------	---



methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.

Presentation of the state of facts

UNAGE Iași, through IOSUD and the Doctoral School of Theatre, has a stable and clearly defined organisational structure for the doctoral domain **Theatre and Performing Arts**. The relevant structures include the Senate, the Administrative Council, the Rector, CSUD, the Director of CSUD, IOSUD–UNAGE Iași, the Doctoral School of Theatre, the Council of the Doctoral School, the CSUD Secretariat, the Ethics Committee and the quality assurance structures. The activity of the Doctoral School is regulated by the Law on Higher Education no. 199/2023, the Framework Regulation on Doctoral Studies, the IOSUD Regulation, the Doctoral School Regulation, the Strategic Plan and the Research Plan.

Analysis

The institutional framework is coherent and adequate for the organisation and delivery of doctoral studies. The existence of specific regulations, methodologies and operational procedures for admission, doctoral supervision, annual evaluation, academic integrity and thesis defence confirms that the doctoral domain functions within a regulated and transparent management system. The organisational responsibilities are clearly distributed between IOSUD, CSUD and the Doctoral School.

Aspects of best practice

A positive aspect is the clear articulation between IOSUD, the Doctoral School and the Faculty of Theatre, which allows the doctoral domain to benefit from both institutional governance and artistic-academic expertise.

Recommendation

N/A

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The internal evaluation process involved doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, graduates, administrative structures, the CSUD Secretariat, the financial department, the university library and IT services. Doctoral candidates were consulted through their representatives, questionnaires and direct discussions, while doctoral supervisors contributed to the analysis of standards, data validation and the completion of the self-evaluation documentation.

Analysis

The documentation confirms a participatory approach in the preparation and revision of regulations and procedures. The involvement of doctoral students, supervisors, graduates and administrative structures demonstrates that stakeholder opinions are considered in institutional decision-making processes. This is particularly relevant for a doctoral domain in the arts, where research, artistic creation and professional practice require permanent dialogue with internal and external beneficiaries.

* The faculty, department, subsidiary, extension - hereinafter “organisational components”

Aspects of best practice

The participation of a doctoral student representative in the preparation of the Internal Evaluation Report is a relevant example of stakeholder engagement.

Recommendation

Formalise an annual consultation register for doctoral regulations and procedures, including the main proposals received and the decisions taken.

Clarify and detail the methodology for electing PhD student representatives to the Doctoral School Council to ensure transparency; consider establishing a fixed 2-year mandate for these roles to ensure continuity.

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The Doctoral School of Theatre has access to educational, research, administrative and artistic spaces appropriate to the doctoral domain. These include seminar rooms, methodological meeting spaces, laboratories for theatrical and choreographic doctoral research, doctoral consultation offices, performance and studio spaces, as well as common facilities of the Faculty of Theatre. The spaces are equipped with computers, video projectors, audio systems, internet access and other technical resources necessary for doctoral research and artistic practice.

Analysis

The material resources are adequate for the specific needs of the doctoral domain **Theatre and Performing Arts**. The existence of specialised laboratories and artistic research spaces is particularly important for the professional doctorate and for practice-based research. The material infrastructure supports both theoretical research and artistic experimentation.

Aspects of best practice

The development of DOCTART and of research laboratories dedicated to artistic research represents a strong element of institutional development.

Recommendation

Improve digital accessibility by **displaying QR/info codes for high-speed internet access** in dedicated PhD study and research rooms.

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The management of movable and immovable assets used by IOSUD and the Doctoral School is coordinated through the Administrative Directorate, the Technical and Heritage Service, the persons responsible for spaces and laboratories, and the CSUD Secretariat. The documentation also mentions future actions such as an annual maintenance calendar, a digital platform for reporting technical issues, and improved accessibility.

Analysis

The available information indicates that the material resources are managed in a functional and sustainable manner. The existence of administrative structures responsible for maintenance and the intention to introduce systematic monitoring mechanisms show institutional concern for the quality of the study, research and work environment.

Aspects of best practice

The proposed digital reporting mechanism for technical problems may become a useful tool for improving responsiveness and transparency.

Recommendation

N/A

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.
--------------------------	---

Presentation of the state of facts

The Doctoral School of Theatre has six affiliated doctoral supervisors, five of whom are tenured faculty members of UNAGE Iași. The doctoral supervisors cover relevant research areas in Theatre and Performing Arts, including theatre studies, performance studies, theatre history, animation theatre, applied theatrical research and artistic research. The doctoral domain has also recorded the affiliation of two new professors during the evaluated period.

Analysis

The human resources are adequate for the organisation and delivery of doctoral studies. The teaching and supervisory staff have the necessary academic qualifications, professional experience and artistic expertise to support doctoral research in both scientific and professional doctoral tracks. The range of competences is appropriate to the interdisciplinary nature of the domain.

Aspects of best practice

The combination of academic research, artistic practice and professional visibility among doctoral supervisors is a strong point of the Doctoral School.

Recommendation

Continue attracting doctoral supervisors with international experience and expertise in emerging areas of performing arts research.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Presentation of the state of facts

The documentation indicates the involvement of teaching staff in research projects, conferences, artistic events, doctoral supervision, commissions and institutional development activities. The annual activity reports show sustained academic and artistic engagement of the doctoral supervisors and affiliated staff.

Analysis

The institution provides a favourable framework for the professional and personal development of teaching staff. Participation in conferences, artistic projects, doctoral commissions, research networks and institutional initiatives contributes to the continuous professional development of the academic community.

Aspects of best practice

The strong connection between professional artistic practice and doctoral supervision enriches the training environment offered to doctoral students.

Recommendation

Strengthening and structuring professional development programs focused on doctoral supervision competencies, research leadership, participation in international projects, and the application of innovative artistic research methodologies, with the aim of preparing future doctoral supervisors.

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

UNAGE Iași applies recruitment procedures in accordance with the legal framework, including the Law on Higher Education no. 199/2023, relevant governmental regulations and the institutional methodology for teaching and research positions. Vacant positions are published on the university website, on the national platform for higher education positions, in the Official Gazette where applicable, and in public institutional spaces. The announcements include information on the position, requirements, documentation, competition calendar, evaluation committee and appeal procedure.

Analysis

The recruitment procedures are transparent, legally grounded and adequately documented. The use of public announcements, clear selection criteria and formal validation procedures ensures the credibility and fairness of recruitment processes.

Aspects of best practice

The publication of competition information through several official channels strengthens transparency and access to information.

Recommendation

Publish all relevant recruitment information in bilingual format, Romanian and English, especially for positions connected to doctoral and international academic activity.

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.
---------------------------------	---

Presentation of the state of facts

IOSUD–UNAGE Iași and the Doctoral School of Theatre use IT tools in administrative and academic processes. The documentation mentions the Integrated Educational Register, used for doctoral student records and academic documents, and the SDT/DOCTART platform, developed through the FDI project CNFIS-FDI-2021-0286 – DOCTART, designed as an information and resource platform for the doctoral schools of UNAGE Iași.

Analysis

The digital tools used by IOSUD and the Doctoral School contribute to administrative simplification, better access to information and improved services for doctoral students, supervisors and administrative staff. The DOCTART platform is particularly relevant for doctoral education in the arts, as it supports visibility, communication and access to resources.

Aspects of best practice

The DOCTART platform is a relevant example of digital development adapted to the needs of doctoral education in artistic fields.

Recommendation

Expanding the DOCTART platform into an integrated digital system that enhances doctoral education management, including doctoral student records, research outputs, mobility, publications, progress tracking, and improved access to resources, supporting transparency and administrative efficiency.

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.
---------------------------------	---

* 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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The doctoral programme in **Theatre and Performing Arts** is structured around advanced doctoral training, individual scientific or artistic research, intermediate evaluation stages and the final public defence of the doctoral thesis. The curriculum is organised in relation to learning outcomes and aims to support both the completion of the doctoral thesis and the professional integration or consolidation of doctoral candidates in artistic, academic, administrative or leadership structures.

Analysis

The curriculum is relevant to the specific nature of the doctoral domain. It combines theoretical research, artistic research, methodological training, ethics and integrity, and practice-based doctoral activities. This structure is appropriate for both the scientific doctorate and the professional doctorate.

Best practice examples

The coexistence of the scientific doctorate and the professional doctorate allow the programme to respond to the specific profile of research in the performing arts.

Recommendation

Development of a flexible and modular doctoral curriculum tailored to the doctoral student's profile and research field with modular recognition of acquired competencies and achieved outcomes.

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).

Presentation of the state of facts

The expected learning outcomes are formulated in relation to knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy. They include advanced knowledge in Theatre and Performing Arts, research methodology, artistic documentation, communication skills, digital competences, ethical conduct, career management and the capacity to initiate collaborations.

Analysis

The learning outcomes are generally aligned with the qualification level and with the professional profiles associated with the doctoral field. The programme addresses both academic research competences and the competences required in the artistic and cultural labour market.

Best practice examples

The distinction between the learning outcomes of the scientific doctorate and those of the professional doctorate is relevant and useful.

Recommendation

Correlate the learning outcomes more explicitly with ESCO descriptors and with the main professional occupations targeted by graduates.

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.
---------------------------------	---

Presentation of the state of facts

The doctoral programme includes individual research plans, work with the doctoral supervisor and guidance committee, participation in workshops, conferences, masterclasses and artistic or research projects. Doctoral candidates are also encouraged to take part in the academic and institutional life of the Doctoral School.

Analysis

The educational process is adapted to the individual research path of each doctoral candidate. The relationship with the doctoral supervisor and the guidance committee supports personalised academic and artistic development.

Best practice examples

The integration of doctoral students in conferences, workshops and artistic research projects is a strong student-centred practice.

Recommendation

N/A

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.
----------------------------------	--

Presentation of the state of facts

The Doctoral School provides opportunities for international mobility through Erasmus+ partnerships, FDI-funded projects, grants and direct institutional support. The internationalisation annex lists partnerships with institutions such as IAD Louvain, University Rennes 2, RESAD Madrid, Hochschule für Musik und Theater Hamburg, University of Gdansk and Université Bordeaux Montaigne.

Analysis

The mobility opportunities are relevant and have increased during the evaluated period. The existence of both student and staff mobilities confirms that internationalisation supports learning and research.

Best practice examples

The participation of doctoral students in international conferences, festivals, workshops and Erasmus+ mobilities represents a valuable educational opportunity.

Recommendation

Development of motivation and support mechanisms to encourage doctoral students' participation in international academic mobility, through systematic information provision, personalized counselling, and recognition of mobility as a valued component of the doctoral pathway.

Implement recurrent consultations with doctoral students regarding their specific research interests (e.g., playwriting/dramaturgy) to tailor future Erasmus+ partnerships and mobility opportunities.

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

Presentation of the state of facts

The doctoral programme provides individualised academic guidance and offers doctoral candidates the possibility to adapt their training and research activities to their doctoral topic, academic profile and professional development needs. The documentation also indicates consultation of doctoral students and their participation in institutional processes.

Analysis

The organisation of doctoral training allows fair opportunities for doctoral candidates, taking into account the diversity of research topics, artistic practices and professional trajectories. The guidance system contributes to equal access to academic support.

Best practice examples

The involvement of doctoral students in consultation processes and institutional representation supports fairness and participatory governance.

Recommendation

N/A

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

Doctoral candidates have access to academic, administrative, library, IT, research and artistic resources. The development of the DOCTART platform and the enhancement of research infrastructure are mentioned among the relevant developments of the 2021–2025 period.

Analysis

The available resources are adequate for the doctoral field and support both theoretical and practice-based research. Access to specialised spaces, digital tools, documentation resources and artistic-research contexts is important for the specificity of Theatre and Performing Arts.

Best practice examples

The DOCTART platform represents a relevant support tool for doctoral research and visibility.

Recommendation

Expanding access to international databases and specialized resources in the performing arts, as well as strengthening support for research dissemination and academic visibility.

Strengthen the communication and awareness strategy regarding psychological and career counseling services and consider organizing group therapy/socialization sessions to prevent academic isolation, partnering with the student representatives.

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.
--------------------------	--

Presentation of the state of facts

The learning outcomes are described in terms of knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy. They include advanced disciplinary knowledge, research and artistic-research competences, communication, ethics, digital skills, collaboration and career-development competences.

Analysis

The learning outcomes are adequately defined and relevant to the doctoral cycle. They provide a clear framework for both doctoral supervisors and doctoral candidates regarding the expected academic, research and professional achievements.

Best practice examples

The formulation of learning outcomes for both scientific and professional doctoral tracks is a positive element.

Recommendation

Make the correspondence between learning outcomes, disciplines, research stages and evaluation methods more explicit in the curriculum documents.

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.
--------------------------	---

Presentation of the state of facts

The achievement of learning outcomes is verified through evaluations of the disciplines included in the advanced training programme, annual research reports, guidance committee assessments, pre-defence procedures, originality checks and the public defence of the doctoral thesis. For the professional doctorate, artistic outputs are also assessed.

Analysis

The evaluation mechanisms are appropriate for doctoral studies and cover both the research process and the final doctoral product. The inclusion of artistic outputs in the evaluation of the professional doctorate is consistent with the specificity of the domain.

Best practice examples

The use of pre-defence, anti-plagiarism verification and evaluation of artistic research products strengthens academic integrity and quality assurance.

Recommendation

N/A

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

Admission to the doctoral programme is carried out in accordance with the legal framework, the IOSUD regulations, the annually approved doctoral admission methodology and the Doctoral School regulations. The process is described as public, transparent and non-discriminatory.

Analysis

The admission procedures are adequate and provide the necessary framework for fair access to doctoral studies. The existence of annually approved methodologies contributes to transparency and predictability.

Best practice examples

The annual public regulation of admission procedures is an important transparency mechanism.

Recommendation

N/A

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.
--------------------------	---

Presentation of the state of facts

The documentation states that admission is organised in accordance with the principles of equity, equal opportunities and non-discrimination, including access for vulnerable groups and candidates with special educational needs or disabilities.

Analysis

The admission framework complies with the principles of fairness and equal opportunities. The documentation confirms institutional concern for inclusive access to doctoral studies.

Best practice examples

The explicit reference to non-discrimination and equal opportunities is a positive element.

Recommendation

N/A

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The doctoral academic journey is regulated through the individual research plan, the guidance committee, annual research reporting, intermediate evaluations, pre-defence and final public defence. The annual reports also show that doctoral candidates take part in conferences, workshops and research or artistic activities.

Analysis

The Doctoral School applies regulations concerning the doctoral students' professional activity and supports their academic progression. The combination of formal supervision and participation in academic events contributes to a coherent doctoral path.

Best practice examples

The active integration of doctoral students into conferences and artistic-research activities strengthens their academic development.

Recommendation

Implementation of a doctoral progress monitoring system based on clear indicators, supporting continuous tracking through existing evaluation and reporting mechanisms.

Develop policies and formalize a comprehensive Institutional Doctoral Strategy to combat the dropout rate (currently sitting including personalized monitoring and early intervention for students losing interest in their research topics).

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The Doctoral School carries out international cooperation through Erasmus+ partnerships, international mobility, participation in conferences and artistic events, and collaborations with universities and cultural institutions. The annex on internationalisation records multiple mobilities of professors and doctoral students during 2021–2025.

Analysis

Internationalisation has visibly developed since the previous evaluation. The number and diversity of partnerships, together with the recorded mobilities, indicate a positive institutional dynamic.

Best practice examples

The increase in international mobility and the development of partnerships with universities and artistic institutions are strong elements of the doctoral domain.

Recommendation

Develop a clearer internationalisation action plan with measurable targets for doctoral mobility.

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

Research and artistic creation are central to the doctoral training process. Doctoral candidates participate in conferences, workshops, debates, artistic projects and research events. The annual reports show sustained activity in doctoral research, including national and international conferences, public debates and workshops.

Analysis

Learning is clearly supported by research and artistic investigation. The doctoral programme provides contexts in which doctoral candidates can test, present and develop their research results.

Best practice examples

The organisation of conferences and workshops dedicated to doctoral research is a relevant best practice.

Recommendation

N/A

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Standard S.B.9.2. Scientific research pertaining to the objectives of the study programme The organisational component carries out scientific research activities aligned with the objectives of the evaluated study programme.	
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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The Doctoral School has developed research and artistic activities with national and international visibility. The annual reports mention conferences, workshops, public debates, book launches, international participation and FDI-funded projects, including DOCTART.

Analysis

The research results are visible and adequately capitalised upon through conferences, publications, artistic events, partnerships and doctoral projects. The domain shows a coherent connection between its research objectives and its educational mission.

Best practice examples

The annual organisation of doctoral conferences and the development of DOCTART contribute to the visibility of doctoral research.

Recommendation

Increasing international visibility through publications in indexed journals, participation in academic networks, and the development of open-access platforms.
 Encourage a "market-driven" research model where cultural institutions and theater companies commission the Doctoral School for specific specialized studies (e.g., audience analysis, cultural impact).

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 organisational component consistently carries out actions and applies procedures, proving their impact on improving the quality of education at the level of the study programme

Presentation of the state of facts

Quality assurance at the level of the Doctoral School of Theatre is carried out in accordance with the IOSUD–UNAGE quality management system, the UNAGE Quality Code, CEAC regulations, IOSUD and SDT regulations, and the Code of Ethics and Academic Integrity. The Internal Evaluation Report states that SDT consistently applies quality assurance procedures, with effects on the improvement of doctoral training, doctoral research, relations with doctoral students, stakeholder feedback, infrastructure development and document management.

Analysis

The documentation and the visit confirms that quality assurance is not treated only as a formal requirement, but as a recurring institutional practice. Questionnaires addressed to doctoral students, teaching staff and graduates, annual evaluations of doctoral students and supervisors, and analysis reports prepared at SDT level provide a functional quality assurance framework.

Best practice examples

The regular use of satisfaction questionnaires and the analysis of their results at the level of the Doctoral School Council are positive practices.

Recommendation

Publish an annual SDT quality report, summarising the main findings, measures adopted and progress achieved.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Standard S.C.1.2. Stakeholder engagement	
The HEI proves that it engages the stakeholders who have relevant activity in applying the procedures.	
Indicator 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.

Presentation of the state of facts

SDT–IOSUD UNAGE Iași systematically integrates the opinions of internal and external stakeholders in the implementation of quality assurance procedures, doctoral activities, course planning, annual evaluation, research activities and development projects. Internal stakeholders include doctoral students, doctoral supervisors, CSUD members, administrative staff and teaching staff, while external stakeholders include graduates, employers, cultural institutions and creative-industry representatives.

Analysis

Stakeholder involvement is visible and relevant for the doctoral field. The consultation of doctoral students, graduates and employers contributes to the adaptation of doctoral training to the needs of the academic, artistic and cultural environment.

Best practice examples

The presence of employers and cultural institutions in the consultation process is particularly relevant for a doctoral domain in Theatre and Performing Arts.

Recommendation

Create a concise annual stakeholder feedback report, indicating the main proposals received and the measures taken.

Complement formal digital surveys with non-formal evaluation methods, such as periodic focus groups, to capture more nuanced and qualitative feedback from doctoral students.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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 organisational 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.
----------------------------------	--

Presentation of the state of facts

The University Ethics Committee operates within the institutional framework approved by the University Senate. The visit calendar includes a dedicated meeting of the external evaluation panel with members of the University Ethics Committee, including its President and members from the academic and student community.

The Internal Evaluation Report also states that ethics and integrity procedures include anti-plagiarism verification of all theses, notification and resolution of non-compliance cases, and periodic training for doctoral students on research ethics.

Analysis

The available evidence indicates that academic ethics structures are functional and integrated into the quality assurance system. Their activity is relevant for doctoral studies, where originality, responsible research conduct and integrity in thesis preparation are essential.

Best practice examples

The inclusion of ethics training and anti-plagiarism verification for all doctoral theses represents a strong quality assurance mechanism.

Recommendation

Redesign and adapt the Ethics and Academic Integrity course to more specifically address the practical and artistic research needs of the doctoral cycle in Theatre and Performing Arts.

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

SDT–IOSUD UNAGE Iași has a procedural framework for initiating study programmes, monitoring doctoral activities, periodically reviewing programmes and regulations, and adapting processes to the needs of doctoral students, teaching staff and the contemporary artistic field. These procedures are defined through IOSUD and SDT regulations, ARACIS-related evaluation procedures, the UNAGE development strategy and CEAC regulations.

Analysis

The procedures are applied systematically and are supported by monitoring mechanisms, including annual evaluation of doctoral students, evaluation and self-evaluation of teaching staff, peer evaluation, and doctoral student evaluation of teaching activities. This confirms the existence of a coherent internal monitoring and review cycle.

Best practice examples

The use of several complementary evaluation instruments — annual doctoral reports, staff self-evaluation, peer evaluation and student feedback — supports a comprehensive quality assurance process.

Recommendation

N/A

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.
--------------------------	---

Presentation of the state of facts

The procedures for initiating and modifying programmes include the analysis of academic and professional needs, consultation of doctoral students, supervisors, graduates and employers, endorsement by SDT, approval by CSUD, and final approval by the UNAGE Senate.

The external evaluation visit also includes meetings with doctoral students, graduates, employers, research centres and quality assurance structures, which supports the verification of stakeholder involvement.

Analysis

The involvement of community members and external stakeholders is adequately documented. Their participation contributes to the relevance of doctoral training and to the adjustment of procedures to the realities of artistic research and the cultural labour market.

Best practice examples

The consultation of employers from major cultural institutions is a relevant practice for assessing the professional relevance of doctoral training.

Recommendation

Systematically record stakeholder consultations in minutes or synthetic reports and link them to concrete improvement measures.

Strengthen the involvement of external stakeholders (cultural institutions, creative industries) in the consultation and review processes of the doctoral curriculum.

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The documentation indicates that doctoral students evaluate teaching activities through anonymous questionnaires completed at the end of each semester. The results are analysed at SDT level, while the SDT Director prepares reports containing directions for action, improvement and resolution.

The Internal Evaluation Report also acknowledges a limitation: doctoral students tend to complete evaluations in a polite and formal manner, often avoiding explicit dissatisfaction, which may reduce the analytical value of the results.

Analysis

The procedure is functional, but the effectiveness of the feedback mechanism depends on increasing the objectivity and critical relevance of student responses. The fact that the institution identifies this limitation is positive and shows reflexive capacity.

Best practice examples

The transparent recognition of the limits of student feedback is a sign of institutional maturity.

Recommendation

N/A

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.
--------------------------	---

Presentation of the state of facts

IOSUD UNAGE and SDT collect and analyse data through institutional databases used for internal quality assurance. These databases include information on doctoral students, teaching staff and supervisors, annual doctoral evaluations, material resources, semester evaluations of teaching staff, research results, mobility, external projects, international collaborations, infrastructure, budget, satisfaction surveys and stakeholder feedback.

Analysis

The data collected are relevant and cover the main areas required for internal quality assurance. The annual reports of the SDT Director further consolidate and interpret these data, supporting institutional monitoring and decision-making.

Best practice examples

The planned development of a centralised IOSUD “Quality Data Hub” and the digital archiving of doctoral files represent promising directions for quality management.

Recommendation

N/A

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.
--------------------------	--

Presentation of the state of facts

The Internal Evaluation Report states that the principles of transparency are applied in accordance with Law no. 544/2001, Law no. 199/2023, UNAGE and IOSUD regulations and ARACIS standards. Public-interest information concerning the evaluated study domain is published on the UNAGE website and on the DOCTART platform.

Analysis

The organisational component ensures access to information of public interest. The use of institutional websites and digital platforms contributes to transparency and improves access for doctoral students, candidates, supervisors, graduates and external stakeholders.

Best practice examples

The DOCTART platform contributes to the visibility of doctoral education and research in the artistic field.

Recommendation

Ensure that key public information is available in both Romanian and English, especially for international candidates and partners.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Presentation of the state of facts

The documentation states that decision-making transparency is ensured through publication, systematic communication to the academic community, stakeholder consultation and documentation of deliberation and approval stages. Major decisions are assumed collectively within SDT or CSUD meetings, recorded in minutes and communicated through institutional channels.

Analysis

The decision-making processes are transparent and supported by institutional procedures. The existence of collective decision-making structures, meeting minutes and communication channels provides a reliable framework for accountability.

Best practice examples

The involvement of doctoral student representatives in SDT and CSUD structures supports transparent and participatory decision-making.

Recommendation

Publish synthetic versions of relevant SDT and CSUD decisions concerning doctoral studies, while respecting data protection rules.

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.

Presentation of the state of facts

The current evaluation procedure concerns the maintenance of accreditation of the doctoral domain **Theatre and Performing Arts**. The evaluation visit is scheduled for **27–28 April 2026**, and the visit calendar includes meetings with management, the team that drafted the Internal Evaluation Report, doctoral supervisors, employers, research centers, the Ethics Committee, quality assurance structures, doctoral students and graduates.

The Internal Evaluation Report also includes a section dedicated to the recommendations and main conclusions resulting from the latest external quality evaluation procedure and to the actions undertaken.

Analysis

The institution complies with the external quality evaluation obligation and has prepared the required documentation for the maintenance of accreditation. The structure of the visit and the documentation submitted indicate institutional readiness and procedural compliance.

Best practice examples


The existence of a progress report regarding the implementation of recommendations from the previous evaluation supports continuity and accountability.


Recommendation

N/A

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The Doctoral School of Theatre within IOSUD–UNAGE Iași has a consolidated academic and artistic identity, supported by approximately 25 years of activity in doctoral education and by a recognised reputation in the field of Theatre and Performing Arts. The internal evaluation report also highlights a solid research infrastructure, including research centres, the research institute, the DOCTART platform, the university publishing house and library resources. ✓ Another important strength is the high level of satisfaction among doctoral students and doctoral supervisors, together with the quality of defended doctoral theses, many of which have been evaluated as very good or excellent and subsequently transformed into relevant publications for the field. ✓ The Doctoral School also benefits from strong local and national visibility, through conferences, conference volumes, public events, media presence and the professional visibility of its academic staff. The annual activity reports confirm the organisation of conferences, workshops, artistic projects and doctoral events with both national and international relevance. ✓ A further strength is the 	<p>INTERNAL FACTORS</p> 	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The most relevant weakness concerns the still moderate level of international visibility. The internal evaluation report mentions only one international cotutelle and an average number of international mobilities, although the situation has improved during the evaluated period. ✓ Another weakness is the small number of affiliated doctoral supervisors, reduced to five following the retirement of a senior professor. This may increase the pressure on existing supervisors and may limit the diversification of research directions. ✓ The administrative workload is also a significant vulnerability. The documentation mentions the overburdening of the CSUD Secretariat, which is served by only one person responsible for several areas, including the Doctoral School of Theatre, the Doctoral School of Music, CSUD, habilitation procedures and anti-plagiarism checks. ✓ The report also identifies the relatively small number of optional courses and a still limited level of interdisciplinarity within the doctoral training programme. <p>Synthetic judgement: The main weaknesses are related to the limited number of doctoral supervisors, administrative overload, moderate internationalisation, insufficient curricular diversification and the need for stronger</p>
--	--	---

<p>clear connection with academic ethics and integrity, supported by quality management procedures, anti-plagiarism verification, ethics training and the absence of major ethically problematic situations reported in the documentation.</p> <p>Synthetic judgement: The main strengths of the doctoral domain are its institutional continuity, recognised academic-artistic profile, solid research infrastructure, quality of doctoral outputs, stakeholder satisfaction, visible public activity and coherent quality assurance culture.</p>		<p>interdisciplinary integration.</p>
<p>SWOT analysis</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ A major opportunity is the implementation of a methodology allowing doctoral students to access individual research grants, which could strengthen both the research and internationalisation components of the Doctoral School. ✓ The possible affiliation of a professor from a foreign university represents another important opportunity, as it could increase international visibility, support cotutelle arrangements and expand the academic network of the doctoral field. ✓ The existing Erasmus+ partnerships and international mobility framework create favourable conditions for developing academic cooperation with institutions from Belgium, France, Spain, Germany, Poland and other countries. The 	 <p>EXTERNAL FACTORS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Threats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ One important threat is the possible worsening of administrative and academic processes due to the overburdening of the secretariat and of affiliated professors. If not addressed, this may affect the efficiency of doctoral administration and the quality of academic support. ✓ Another threat is the risk of formalising quality assurance mechanisms, especially if evaluations, feedback procedures or academic guidance committees become purely bureaucratic rather than genuinely developmental. ✓ The small number of affiliated professors may also generate an excessive number of doctoral students per supervisor, with potential consequences for the quality and individualisation of doctoral supervision. ✓ The documentation also identifies the risk of formalising the

<p>internationalisation annex records several doctoral student mobilities between 2021 and 2025, including Erasmus+ mobilities, conference participation and research visits.</p> <p>✓ The Doctoral School also has opportunities to increase external funding, especially through institutional development projects and partnerships with national and international cultural and research organisations.</p> <p>Synthetic judgement: The main opportunities concern the expansion of international cooperation, increased access to grants, affiliation of foreign academic staff, development of cotutelle arrangements, stronger partnerships and further external funding.</p>		<p>activity of guidance and academic integrity committees, especially in the absence of remuneration or formal workload recognition for committee members.</p> <p>✓ A further external risk concerns the limited availability of doctoral students for long-term mobility, as many are already employed or have family responsibilities, making extended Erasmus+ or research stays difficult to undertake.</p> <p>Synthetic judgement: The main threats are administrative overload, the risk of bureaucratisation, insufficient academic staffing, possible overload of doctoral supervisors, limited mobility availability and the insufficient formal recognition of guidance committee work.</p>
--	--	---

Overall SWOT conclusion

The SWOT analysis confirms that the doctoral domain **Theatre and Performing Arts** has a strong institutional and academic foundation, visible research and artistic activity, and a functional quality assurance culture. At the same time, its future development depends on increasing the number of doctoral supervisors, strengthening internationalisation, reducing administrative overload, diversifying the curriculum and ensuring that quality assurance procedures remain meaningful rather than formal.

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 programme/domain, the HEI has adequate organisational components and an adequate	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	management system, which operate based on methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.		
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formalise an annual consultation register for doctoral regulations and procedures, including the main proposals received and the decisions taken. Clarify and detail the methodology for electing PhD student representatives to the Doctoral School Council to ensure transparency; consider establishing a fixed 2-year mandate for these roles to ensure continuity.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve digital accessibility by displaying QR/info codes for high-speed internet access in dedicated PhD study and research rooms.
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 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.	F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue attracting doctoral supervisors with international experience and expertise in emerging areas of performing arts research.
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthening and structuring professional development programs focused on doctoral supervision competencies, research leadership, participation in international projects, and the application of innovative artistic research methodologies, with the aim of preparing future doctoral supervisors.
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publish all relevant recruitment information in bilingual format, Romanian and English, especially for positions connected to doctoral and international academic activity.

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding the DOCTART platform into an integrated digital system that enhances doctoral education management, including doctoral student records, research outputs, mobility, publications, progress tracking, and improved access to resources, supporting transparency and administrative efficiency.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of a flexible and modular doctoral curriculum tailored to the doctoral student's profile and research field with modular recognition of acquired competencies and achieved outcomes.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correlate the learning outcomes more explicitly with ESCO descriptors and with the main professional occupations targeted by graduates.
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 academic mobility programmes organised in person and/or virtually.	F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of motivation and support mechanisms to encourage doctoral students' participation in international academic mobility, through systematic information provision, personalized counselling, and recognition of mobility as a valued component of the doctoral pathway. Implement recurrent consultations with doctoral students regarding their specific research interests (e.g., playwriting/dramaturgy) to tailor future Erasmus+ partnerships and mobility opportunities.
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	
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	F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding access to international databases and specialized resources in the performing arts, as well as strengthening support

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	learning process, adequate for the individual learning needs, the study domain, the study cycle, and the form of organisation of the study programme.		<p>for research dissemination and academic visibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen the communication and awareness strategy regarding psychological and career counseling services and consider organizing group therapy/socialization sessions to prevent academic isolation, partnering with the student representatives.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make the correspondence between learning outcomes, disciplines, research stages and evaluation methods more explicit in the curriculum documents.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of a doctoral progress monitoring system based on clear indicators, supporting continuous tracking through existing evaluation and reporting mechanisms. Develop policies and formalize a comprehensive Institutional Doctoral Strategy to combat the dropout rate (currently sitting including personalized monitoring and early intervention for students losing interest in their research topics.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a clearer internationalisation action plan with measurable targets for doctoral mobility.
21.	I.P.B.9.1.1 Learning based on scientific investigation and research results support and are capitalised upon in achieving the learning	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	outcomes envisaged through the study programme.		
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing international visibility through publications in indexed journals, participation in academic networks, and the development of open-access platforms. Encourage a "market-driven" research model where cultural institutions and theater companies commission the Doctoral School for specific specialized studies (e.g., audience analysis, cultural impact).
• DOMAIN C. Quality management			
23.	I.P.C.1.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publish an annual SDT quality report, summarising the main findings, measures adopted and progress achieved.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a concise annual stakeholder feedback report, indicating the main proposals received and the measures taken. Complement formal digital surveys with non-formal evaluation methods, such as periodic focus groups, to capture more nuanced and qualitative feedback from doctoral students.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redesign and adapt the Ethics and Academic Integrity course to more specifically address the practical and artistic research needs of the doctoral cycle in Theatre and Performing Arts.
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematically record stakeholder consultations in minutes or synthetic reports and link them to concrete improvement measures. Strengthen the involvement of external stakeholders (cultural institutions, creative industries) in the consultation and review processes of the doctoral curriculum.
28.	I.P.C.4.1.1 The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that key public information is available in both Romanian and English, especially for international candidates and partners.
31.	I.P.C.6.1.2 The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publish synthetic versions of relevant SDT and CSUD decisions concerning doctoral studies, while respecting data protection rules.
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 Fulfillment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity	8	0	0
Domain B. Educational efficacy	14	0	0
Domain C. Quality management	10	0	0
Total	32	0	0

Although all analysed indicators are fulfilled, the evaluation panel considers that several improvement directions should be pursued in order to consolidate the quality of the doctoral domain **Theatre and Performing Arts**:

- The Doctoral School should continue to strengthen its internationalisation strategy, especially by increasing the number of international cotutelle agreements, incoming and outgoing doctoral mobilities, and international research outputs.
- The institution should continue its efforts to attract and affiliate new doctoral supervisors, including international academic staff, in order to diversify research directions and avoid overburdening the existing supervisors.
- The administrative support structure for IOSUD and the Doctoral School should be strengthened, given the complexity of doctoral procedures, reporting obligations, ethics checks, quality assurance activities and external evaluation requirements.
- The curriculum should continue to be updated, with more explicit links between learning outcomes, research competences, artistic research methodologies and ESCO-related professional competences.
- The quality assurance system should further develop integrated digital tools, including a centralised database for doctoral files, research outputs, student feedback, mobility records and implementation of recommendations.
- The Doctoral School should continue to document more systematically the impact of stakeholder consultations, especially those involving doctoral students, graduates, employers and cultural institutions.

7. Formalize the creation of a "Best Practice Guide" authored by student representatives for their peers and establish an extracurricular "Learn to Learn" workshop focused on advanced research data mining and academic information management.
8. Expand and secure permanent funding for the "How I PhD'it" program to facilitate structured dialogue between graduates and current students regarding career paths.
9. Organize systematic information sessions regarding postdoctoral opportunities and funding to ensure research continuity for graduates.
10. Create and maintain a centralized digital archive/repository of recordings, performances, and specific theater research materials accessible to all doctoral students.
11. Support the establishment of an independent/unofficial PhD student communication group (outside the formal administrative structures) to foster community building and peer support.

VI. Conclusions

The external evaluation confirms that the doctoral study domain **Theatre and Performing Arts**, organised within the **Doctoral School of Theatre of IOSUD – George Enescu National University of Arts of Iași**, operates within a coherent institutional, academic and quality assurance framework.

The domain benefits from a strong artistic and academic identity, a consolidated tradition in doctoral education, qualified doctoral supervisors, relevant research and artistic infrastructure, and visible academic, artistic and cultural activity. The documentation analysed shows that the Doctoral School has evolved positively since the previous external quality evaluation and has implemented a significant number of measures aimed at improving doctoral training, research visibility, internationalisation and quality assurance.

The institutional capacity is adequate. The organisational structures, regulations, procedures, management responsibilities and stakeholder involvement mechanisms provide a functional framework for the organisation and delivery of doctoral studies. The material resources, specialised spaces, digital platforms and administrative structures support the specific needs of doctoral education in Theatre and Performing Arts.

The educational efficacy of the doctoral domain is also confirmed. The curriculum is appropriate for the doctoral level and supports the acquisition of advanced research, artistic, methodological and professional competences. Doctoral students benefit from individual supervision, guidance committees, research activities, conferences, workshops, mobility opportunities and artistic research contexts. The programme is particularly relevant through the coexistence of the scientific doctorate and the professional doctorate, both of which respond to the specific nature of the performing arts.

The quality management system is functional. The Doctoral School applies quality assurance procedures, collects and analyses relevant data, involves doctoral students and stakeholders, uses feedback mechanisms, applies academic ethics procedures and participates in external evaluation processes. The existence of annual reports, stakeholder consultations, ethics mechanisms and progress reports demonstrates institutional responsibility and continuity.

The SWOT analysis confirms a generally positive institutional situation. The main strengths are the academic and artistic reputation of the Doctoral School, the quality of doctoral outputs, the relevance of research activities, the public visibility of the doctoral domain and the development of platforms such as DOCTART. At the same time, the evaluation panel notes several areas that require further attention: the need to increase the number of doctoral supervisors, reduce administrative overload, strengthen internationalisation and diversify the curriculum.

Taking into account the analysis of the standards and performance indicators, the documentation reviewed, the institutional context and the quality of the doctoral education provided, the evaluation panel concludes that the doctoral domain **Theatre and Performing Arts** meets the requirements for maintaining accreditation.

Proposed decision

Following the completion of the external evaluation procedure, the evaluation panel proposes:



a) **maintaining accreditation (MAC)**;

for the doctoral study domain Theatre and Performing Arts, organised by IOSUD – George Enescu National University of Arts of Iași / Doctoral School of Theatre.

VII. Annexes