

The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education



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

Higher Education Institution:	National University of Theatre and Film I.L. Caragiale Bucharest (UNATC)
Doctoral School:	Doctoral School, IOSUD-UNATC
Doctoral Domain:	Cinematography and Media
The objective of the external evaluation:	Maintaining accreditation of the doctoral study domain (MAC)

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

No.	Last Name and First Name	Team role	Signature
1.	Conf. Univ. Dr. Habil. Claudiu Turcuş	Expert evaluator	
2.	Prof. Univ. Dr. Habil. Leo Rafolt	International Expert	
3.	Andrei Bărcăuan	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

- ✓ *the context in which the external evaluation report was drafted (the type of evaluation, the period covered by the evaluation, membership of the external quality experts' panel, etc.);*
- ✓ *description of the higher education institution / Romanian Academy (establishment, evolution, mission, governance, structure, study programs/domains, external quality evaluation procedures applied);*
- ✓ *general description of the doctoral study domain (why it was established - in the case of a provisional authorization to operate; evolution and/or changes since the last external quality evaluation procedure - in the case of procedures intended for accreditation or maintaining accreditation, as applicable).*

The Internal Evaluation Report (IER) identifies the evaluated program as full-time doctoral studies, four years, 240 ECTS, submitted for maintaining accreditation in 2026. The IER states that the domain was externally evaluated by ARACIS in 2021 and that the present procedure concerns the continuation of accreditation in the doctoral study domain Cinematography and Media.

UNATC is presented as a specialized public higher education institution organized around the Faculties of Theatre and Film and an IOSUD structure with one Doctoral School covering the domains Theatre and Performing Arts and Cinematography and Media. The evaluated domain combines theoretical, historical and analytical film/media research with practice-based research, including technologically mediated components supported by CINETic and by the institutional research infrastructure.

The IER is complemented by the additional documents submitted during the evaluation visit. These materials substantially clarify the documentary basis of the evaluation by adding lists of doctoral students and supervisors, research plans, CEAC and Doctoral School reports, evidence concerning research, publications, doctoral outputs, mobility, institutional procedures, resources and quality-assurance activities.

II. Methods used

- ✓ *Analyzed documents (internal evaluation report and its annexes; additional documents requested before and during the on-site visit, if any; other documents or data);*
- ✓ *On-site visit (general list of locations visited and categories of people with whom debates have been organized);*
- ✓ *Other relevant methods or aspects.*

The IER and complementary documentation supports the assessment of stakeholder involvement, doctoral-student representation, training and supervision, internationalization, research activity, publication visibility, public information, student services and quality-assurance processes. It also provides a broader institutional context for developments in 2025, including the revision of internal procedures, the emphasis on learning outcomes, the expansion of digital instruments and the consolidation of research and artistic-research activities.

For indicators where the IER contains general descriptions, the committee used the additional documents as corroborating evidence. The evaluation considered documents and evidence relevant for: consultation and feedback mechanisms; doctoral-study contracts and student rights/obligations; mobility and international cooperation; quality-assurance procedures; data collection and analysis; research outputs and doctoral dissemination; library and digital resources; and the follow-up of previous ARACIS recommendations.

The site-visit context and the complementary materials provided by UNATC support a more comprehensive reading of the doctoral domain than the IER alone. The documents were reviewed by indicator, triangulation between the IER and complementary evidence, internal consistency check between the indicator-level statements, the SWOT analysis, the sections on challenges and development directions,

and the evidence submitted during the visit. The assessment also considers the wording of the ARACIS performance indicators reproduced in the official template and the specific requirements implied by those indicators for doctoral studies in an artistic field.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)*
- ✓ *Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled*
- ✓ *Aspects that constitute best practice examples*
- ✓ *Recommendations*

The IER describes IOSUD-UNATC as having organizational components and procedures for admission, doctoral training, research/artistic creation, progress monitoring, thesis defense, archiving and reporting. The complementary documentation confirms that the institutional quality-assurance framework was active in 2025, including CEAC reporting, updated internal regulations and procedures, and operational documents relevant to doctoral studies.

The management and organizational framework show that the Doctoral School operates within the IOSUD structure and that institutional procedures are periodically reviewed. For greater clarity, the documentation can be further systematized by linking each procedure to the responsible body, adoption/revision date and implementation evidence.

The integration of doctoral studies into a single Doctoral School with two artistic domains, together with the availability of CEAC and Doctoral School reporting, provides a relatively coherent institutional framework for managing doctoral education in a specialized vocational university.

Recommendations: Continue organizing procedures applicable to IOSUD, CSUD and the Doctoral School in a consolidated matrix that shows responsible structures, revision history, decision flows and public-access links.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)*
- ✓ *Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled*
- ✓ *Aspects that constitute best practice examples*
- ✓ *Recommendations*

The complementary CEAC documentation shows the presence of student and employer representatives in quality-assurance structures and describes institutional processes through which feedback and stakeholder perspectives are considered.

The submitted documentation indicates that stakeholder engagement is part of the institutional governance and quality-assurance framework. The evidence is sufficient to confirm the existence of consultative mechanisms, while the institution would benefit from presenting them in a more integrated manner for the doctoral domain.

Although the 2025 CEAC report mentions consultations and meetings with stakeholders, the submitted documentation does not include minutes, records, or other verifiable evidence to substantiate that such activities actually took place. In addition, during the discussions with stakeholders and the external evaluation commission, it was indicated that no structured surveys had been conducted and that such consultation meetings had not taken place. In this context, the criterion is assessed as partially fulfilled.

Recommendations: Maintain dated minutes, consultation summaries, student-doctoral representation records and examples of feedback-to-decision processes, especially for regulations and procedures directly affecting doctoral studies in Cinematography and Media. The institution should formalize and document stakeholder consultation activities through dated minutes, survey records, and clear evidence of the feedback-to-decision process, in order to ensure greater transparency and traceability.

Panel assessment: partially 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)*

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

- ✓ *Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled*
- ✓ *Aspects that constitute best practice examples*
- ✓ *Recommendations*

The IER and complementary materials describe classrooms, seminar rooms, research and artistic-creation spaces, specialized publications, databases, technical/logistical facilities and institutional resources available to students and doctoral students. CINETic, library resources, digital access and research infrastructure are relevant for the doctoral domain.

The evidence supports the existence of an adequate material base for doctoral education and research/artistic research. The additional documentation also provides institutional context regarding space management, library access, databases and research facilities. The use of these resources by doctoral students could be made more visible through examples and usage data.

Recommendations: Prepare a concise doctoral-domain infrastructure annex covering rooms, studios, laboratories, editing/post-production facilities, archives/databases, access rules, accessibility adaptations and examples of doctoral projects using these resources.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)*
- ✓ *Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled*
- ✓ *Aspects that constitute best practice examples*

The materials indicate that UNATC manages and maintains the assets used for education, research and artistic activity. The documentation is especially useful in showing the practical pressures generated by programs development and the measures adopted to respond to them.

Recommendations: Continue documenting maintenance plans, equipment renewal, safety/access protocols and the scheduling of specialized facilities for doctoral students and doctoral research projects.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples / Recommendations

The IER states that the domain benefits doctoral supervisors and teaching staff with relevant academic, artistic and professional competences. The complementary file includes the nominal list of doctoral students by supervisor, the Doctoral School report, information on habilitations in Cinematography and Media in 2025, and doctoral research themes by year of study.

The additional documents substantially clarify the human-resources situation of the doctoral domain and confirm the functional match between supervisors, research themes and the profile of Cinematography and Media. They also show recent activity, which contributes to the sustainability of the domain.

Recommendations: Keep an annually updated table of supervisors and doctoral teaching staff, including habilitation status, students supervised, courses, workloads, expertise areas, recent research/artistic outputs and succession planning.

Panel assessment: fulfilled.

Indicator
I.P.A.3.1.2

The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER refers to staff development through training, research/artistic projects, European-funded projects, conferences, workshops, Erasmus+ mobilities and artistic/scientific research activities. The complementary CEAC and DCDI reports add evidence of training, project participation, research collaborations and institutional development during 2025.

The professional-development framework is active and connected to the institution's research, artistic-research and digital-transformation priorities. The evidence supports compliance, while the next step is to present staff-development information in a more systematic annual format for the doctoral domain.

As best practice example, DigitalEyes UNATC and the research-development activities coordinated through DCDI illustrate how staff development, digital competences and artistic-research capacity can be linked in a specialized theatre and film university.

Recommendations: Continue documenting annual staff-development plans, participation lists, training topics, Erasmus+/workshop data and the relation between staff development, supervision quality and future habilitation capacity.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that recruitment and appointment procedures comply with legal and institutional provisions and are communicated through official channels. The complementary CEAC report records competitions and staffing changes in 2025 and refers to relevant methodologies and procedures.

The submitted evidence indicates that recruitment procedures are formally regulated and applied. The documentation also shows the institution's awareness of staffing pressures and the need to maintain adequate human resources in both faculties and in the doctoral domain. Correlation between staffing data, recruitment procedures and institutional development priorities is useful for monitoring sustainability in a small, specialized university.

Recommendations: Attach recent recruitment examples, committee composition, selection criteria and results in future evaluation files, and continue linking recruitment planning to the long-term sustainability of doctoral supervision.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER identifies digital tools for admission, teaching management, student records and communication, including Dropbox, Google Drive, Google Classroom, Edu2Bit, institutional e-mail access to databases, an IT Office and the development of a replacement platform through DigitalEyes UNATC.

This indicator is supported by concrete examples and by the broader institutional digitalization context described in the complementary documents.

DigitalEyes UNATC can become a strong integrated platform if it connects doctoral progress monitoring, research outputs, mobility data, quality-assurance data and digital access to resources.

Recommendations: Clarify the doctoral digital architecture, including access rights, GDPR/data-security measures, progress tracking, research-output databases, thesis-publication workflows and the implementation calendar for the new platform (which is missing for the moment).

Panel assessment: fulfilled.

DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy

Criterion B.1. Content and relevance of study programmes

Standard S.B.1.1. Content of study program/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.
--------------------------	---

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that the doctoral program is organized over four years and 240 ECTS and includes advanced university training and individual doctoral research. The Doctoral School Report and the research plan confirm the existence of doctoral courses, research projects, supervision structures and research themes for doctoral students in Cinematography and Media.

The program structure is relatively coherent with doctoral education in an artistic field. The complementary documentation adds practical evidence concerning courses, projects defended by first-year doctoral students, and the continuity between advanced training, individual research and thesis development.

The combination of theoretical film/media research, practice-based inquiry and technologically mediated topics is well aligned with the specific profile of the field.

Recommendations: In future files, present the 240 ECTS allocation, PPSUA courses, doctoral milestones and assessment calendar in a single curriculum annex, explicitly linking courses to research and/or artistic-research outcomes. Also, the course in *Research Methodologies* and *Academic writing* must be mandatory. As a curricular philosophy, courses that deliver thematic content should be replaced by courses that train and develop research skills.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that expected learning outcomes are correlated with occupational requirements, standards and/or ESCO, and with advanced competences in research, critical analysis, artistic creation, theoretical reflection and knowledge transfer. The CEAC report also notes the institutional revision of learning-outcome formats and RNCIS updates. For the doctoral domain, the link between learning outcomes, doctoral activities, assessment and career paths is present at the level of institutional orientation but would benefit from a more explicit mapping table. The criterion is assessed as partially fulfilled.

Recommendations: Prepare an ESCO/occupational mapping table for the doctoral domain, connecting learning outcomes, doctoral courses, supervision activities, assessment methods, research/artistic outputs and possible academic, cultural and creative-industry pathways.

Panel assessment: partially 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER describes student-centered learning through flexible doctoral pathways, critical reflection, and collaboration. The complementary documentation adds research plans, doctoral projects, course lists and evidence of individual research trajectories in Cinematography and Media.

The doctoral program's design is consistent with student-centered learning, particularly through individual supervision, doctoral research projects and the possibility of combining theoretical, historical, technological and artistic/practice-based research. The annual presentation of doctoral research projects and the diversity of research themes illustrate this model adapted to film and media doctoral education.

Recommendations: Refining the documentary base of supervision agreements, individual research plans, feedback mechanisms, and examples of how doctoral-student choices shape their learning and research trajectories.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

UNATC provides physical, virtual and blended mobility opportunities through Erasmus+ and other cooperation frameworks. The complementary documents mention international conferences, doctoral participation in events, cooperation projects and mobility-related institutional priorities. However, the domain would benefit from presenting the data in a consolidated five-year table.

Doctoral participation in conferences such as *Eastern Screen Studies* and *NECS*, as well as institutional international conferences organized in 2025, supports the academic visibility of doctoral research.

Recommendations: Maintain a five-year mobility and internationalization table including outgoing/incoming mobilities, conference participation, residencies, international projects and funding sources. Cotutelle initiatives should become a priority, for the moment this kind of (inter)national collaboration is listed neither in IER nor in the complimentary documents.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

Both IER and complimentary documents state that the doctoral program offers fair opportunities, supports flexible pathways and recognizes the diversity of doctoral students' needs. The submitted documentation supports the existence of a fair-opportunity framework. The institution has mechanisms related to student support, access to resources and representation. Further documentation could make accommodation and individual support pathways more visible. The combination of student representation, support services, library/digital access and flexibility in doctoral research paths is appropriate for an artistic doctoral domain.

Recommendations: Continue documenting accommodation, accessibility measures, support for vulnerable students and doctoral-student feedback on equal access to facilities, mobility and research resources.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that doctoral students have access to learning-support resources and services, including documentation resources, guidance, facilities and institutional support. The complementary file adds detailed evidence on library services, electronic databases, OPAC access, user support, bibliographic services, digital resources and student services.

The evidence confirms that UNATC provides resources and services adequate for doctoral learning and research. The library documentation is particularly relevant, as it identifies specialized databases, online resources, usage data and user-support services. The continuation of subscriptions to specialized databases and the introduction of bibliographic support services are useful practices for doctoral research support.

Recommendations: Map doctoral-specific use of support services, including library/database access, research guidance, accessibility measures, counselling, and satisfaction or feedback data.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

Learning outcomes are described at program and discipline level. The CEAC report notes the 2025 institutional shift toward explicit learning outcomes, expressed as knowledge, skills/abilities, responsibility and autonomy, and the adoption of a new format for study plans and syllabi. The documentation shows that UNATC has started to adapt its program documentation to the new ARACIS emphasis on learning

outcomes. For the doctoral domain, the process is relevant and in progress; it should be consolidated through a program-level learning-outcomes matrix. The institution-wide revision of study-plan and syllabus templates creates a useful framework for clarifying doctoral learning outcomes.

Recommendations: Continue revising syllabi and study plans so that doctoral learning outcomes are explicit, measurable and aligned with assessment, research/artistic outputs, ethics, methodology and dissemination.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

State of facts and documentary basis: The IER states that achievement of learning outcomes is checked through ongoing evaluations and the final public defense of the doctoral thesis. The Doctoral School Report confirms the organization of doctoral courses, research-project presentations and public thesis defenses in 2025.

The evaluation architecture is consistent with doctoral studies and includes monitoring, research-project assessment and final public defense. The complementary documentation confirms that these stages are operational.

Recommendations: Continue attaching assessment criteria and rubrics for PPSUA, doctoral reports, artistic/research outputs and final defense, including criteria specific to practice-based research.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that admission calendars, selection criteria, specific tests, required documents and registration stages are managed by the competent administrative structures and published on the official UNATC admission website. It also notes a 2025 support phone line and program-specific WhatsApp

counselling. The complementary CEAC documentation adds broader institutional data on admissions and candidate flows, supporting the conclusion that admission procedures are applied.

The support phone line and program-specific counselling can improve accessibility when they complement official written communication and archived procedures.

Recommendations: Continue attaching doctoral-domain admission statistics, criteria, anonymized evaluation grids, appeal data and evidence that informal communication channels support rather than replace official procedures.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

Admission respects fairness and equal opportunities and that support measures exist for vulnerable candidates and candidates with special educational needs or disabilities. The complementary documentation refers to accessibility and support measures within UNATC regulations and admission practices.

The explicit inclusion of vulnerable candidates and candidates with special educational needs/disabilities in admission-related provisions is a relevant equity measure. Although the admission regulations and procedures were reviewed, the submitted documentation does not explicitly mention concrete support measures for vulnerable candidates or candidates with special educational needs. The inclusion of such measures in the admission framework, through clear provisions on accessible registration, adapted procedures where appropriate, and designated support arrangements, would further strengthen anti-discrimination standards and promote a more inclusive admission process.

Recommendations: Specify accessible registration, adapted examinations/interviews, support for candidates in vulnerable situations, responsible contact points and anonymized examples of implementation where available. The doctoral admission documentation should explicitly include concrete support measures for vulnerable candidates and candidates with special educational needs, in order to enhance accessibility, reinforce anti-discrimination practices, and raise the institution's inclusiveness standards.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)

- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that the domain applies institutional and legal regulations concerning doctoral students' professional activity and references the continuous/summative evaluation methodology, the Student Rights and Obligations Code and R.A.P.S. The complementary documents add evidence on doctoral course activity, research projects, thesis defenses and institutional support structures.

The connection between individual research projects and supervision structures is appropriate for doctoral education in a professional-artistic field but should be expanded in order to serve an advanced research program.

Recommendations: Continue documenting progress monitoring, recognition and equivalence procedures, and measures supporting doctoral students who combine doctoral work with professional artistic or media-sector activity.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

IER mentions international cooperation, Erasmus+ mobility and academic/research collaboration. The complementary reports provide evidence of doctoral participation in international conferences, international events organized by UNATC, and other research collaborations. The 2025 international conferences organized around archives, cinema, collective healing and women in film, as well as doctoral participation in international academic events, represent relevant internationalization practices.

Recommendations: Consolidate internationalization evidence in a five-year table with doctoral-student mobility, staff mobility, cotutelle prospects, conference participation, international projects and funding mechanisms.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

IER states that scientific investigation and artistic research support the achievement of learning outcomes. The complementary documents include doctoral research themes, Doctoral School activities, DCDI research projects, conference participation, and publication/output lists involving doctoral students, researchers and teaching staff.

Recommendations: Continue mapping research/artistic-research activities, supervision plans and doctoral milestones, including the role of practice-based outputs in doctoral progression.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that scientific and/or artistic research results are relatively visible. The complementary DCDI report (a structure which is not part of the Doctoral School) and publication/output lists provide evidence of publications, conferences, artistic research results, projects, grants and dissemination activities. However, the list of publications of the supervisors and doctoral students is poorly compiled, and the amount of original research in the field of audio-visual studies published internationally, despite some existing zones of excellence, is relatively small.

Recommendations: In future reports, classify outputs by type, quality level, authorship, doctoral-domain relevance, national/international visibility and links to doctoral supervision or student participation. Improving original research with international output.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that quality assurance is implemented through planned actions and institutional procedures. The complementary CEAC Report 2025 documents the institutional quality-assurance context, CEAC membership, updated regulations and procedures, analysis of educational effectiveness, management of quality and recommendations. The CEAC report provides a descriptive institutional framework for quality improvement and for aligning internal documents with updated ARACIS standards.

Recommendations: Improving a clear QA impact chain: data collection, analysis, decision, implementation, follow-up and evidence of improvement at doctoral-domain level.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that doctoral students, supervisors, teaching staff, administrative staff and other stakeholders are involved in quality-assurance processes. The CEAC Report 2025 confirms the presence of student, employers, teaching and administrative representatives in quality-assurance structures.

The complementary evidence supports the conclusion that stakeholder perspectives are partially included in QA processes. For doctoral studies, the mechanism would be more visible if each consultation were linked to decisions or procedural adjustments.

Although the IER and the CEAC Report 2025 mention the presence of stakeholder representatives within the quality-assurance structure, including students, employers and graduates, the submitted documentation does not include minutes, official records, or implementation plans that would substantiate the actual conduct of consultation meetings or the follow-up of recommendations. During the meetings with stakeholders, it was also clearly stated that they had not been consulted or surveyed regarding the implementation of procedures. In this context, the mere inclusion of stakeholders in the composition of a committee is not sufficient to demonstrate full compliance with the indicator, concrete documentary evidence is still required. The criterion is assessed as partially fulfilled.

Recommendations:

- Maintain a stakeholder participation register for doctoral QA, with minutes, feedback summaries, actions taken and follow-up status.

- Documentation through minutes, official records, and implementation plans should be ensured, and consultation meetings should be extended to include a broader range of stakeholder representatives beyond committee membership, with structured discussions on the implementation of procedures and recommendations.

Panel assessment: partially 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

UNATC Ethics Commission operates under a regulation approved by the University Senate and performs actions compliant with the law. The complementary CEAC documentation refers to ethics, deontology and the regulatory framework relevant to the evaluation of students and academic conduct. The integration of academic ethics and integrity into the doctoral training program is a relevant preventive measure for doctoral education.

Recommendations: Continue publishing or making accessible annual ethics summaries, doctoral ethics-training evidence and procedures concerning originality checks, research ethics and artistic-research ethics. It is also mandatory to introduce the institution of the ombudsman, and elements specific to the ethical visa in audiovisual studies.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)

- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that procedures for quality assurance are systematically applied and periodically revised. The CEAC Report 2025 documents updated regulations and procedures, the adaptation of curricula to learning outcomes and the review of program information in relation to quality standards. The transition toward explicit learning outcomes and updated templates is a constructive response to the revised ARACIS framework.

Recommendations: Continue attaching periodic program-review evidence, curriculum-change examples, responsible persons and implementation timelines for doctoral-domain procedures.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

Members of the academic community and stakeholders are involved in procedure implementation. The complementary CEAC documentation indicates stakeholder participation in quality-assurance structures and institutional consultation processes. The multi-stakeholder composition of CEAC is a useful mechanism for incorporating diverse perspectives into procedure implementation.

Although the complementary CEAC documentation refers to stakeholder participation in quality-assurance structures and institutional consultation processes, the submitted evidence does not include minutes, official records, or other documentary proof of such activities. The presence of stakeholders in CEAC composition does not, by itself, capture the full meaning of this quality indicator, as there is no documented evidence showing how procedures were implemented with stakeholder input. Furthermore, during the meetings held as part of the external evaluation visit, stakeholders stated that they had not been surveyed in this regard. The criterion is assessed as partially fulfilled.

Recommendations: Keep consultation records, feedback summaries and action-tracking tables for doctoral procedures, including changes derived from student and stakeholder input. The institution should maintain documented consultation records, minutes, feedback summaries, and action-tracking tables for doctoral procedures, and that it organize more structured consultation sessions with both internal and external stakeholders regarding procedure implementation.

Panel assessment: partially 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER mentions that the domain analyses students' semester-based evaluations of teaching staff. The CEAC Report 2025 includes references to evaluation procedures and institutional analysis of educational processes, including student-related feedback mechanisms.

Although the IER and the CEAC Report 2025 mention that a mechanism for students' biannual evaluation of teaching staff exists, the submitted documentation does not include the anonymized synthetic report of results required by Law 199/2023. In addition, no minutes, CEAC records, or other documentary evidence were provided to show that the results were analyzed, that appropriate recommendations were made, or that a remedial plan was established and monitored. There is also no report indicating how the implementation of such measures was followed and what outcomes were obtained. The criterion is assessed as partially fulfilled.

Recommendations: This process should be improved and expanded. Provide anonymized aggregate results for doctoral courses/supervision, response rates, follow-up measures, communication to students and how evaluations inform staff development. The institution should ensure the preparation and publication of anonymized synthetic reports of student evaluations, together with CEAC minutes and follow-up documentation showing the analysis of results, the formulation of recommendations, the implementation of remedial measures, and the monitoring of their effectiveness.

Panel assessment: partially 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

CEAC-U collects and analyses quality-assurance data concerning educational activities, student progress, learning outcomes, research activity and beneficiary feedback. The complementary CEAC, Doctoral School, DCDI and library reports contain multiple datasets and descriptive evidence relevant to the doctoral domain. The institution collects and uses relevant data across several structures. However, the evidence remains distributed across separate reports, which makes it harder to follow a single doctoral-domain QA data cycle. A consolidated database or dashboard would improve traceability and comparability over time.

In addition, the submitted documentation does not include minutes, records, or other documentary evidence from CEAC meetings showing that such data were systematically analyzed. Nor are there procedures or working instructions clearly setting out how data are to be collected and analyzed. The criterion is assessed as partially fulfilled.

Recommendations: Establish a doctoral QA database/dashboard with indicators on admission, progress, supervision, mobility, publications/artistic outputs, satisfaction, completion, employment/alumni paths and resource use, specifying data owners and update cycles. The institution should establish a consolidated doctoral quality-assurance database or dashboard, accompanied by clear procedures and working instructions for data collection and analysis, and should ensure that CEAC minutes document the systematic review of these data over time.

Panel assessment: partially 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The IER states that public-interest documents are available on the institutional website, that public-information requests can be sent to a dedicated address, and that defended doctoral theses are public on the institutional website.

The indicator is supported by concrete channels and by the public availability of doctoral-thesis information. The institution also recognizes the need to organize public documents more clearly by categories, which is a useful development direction.

Recommendations:

- The institution should strengthen the transparency and accessibility of public information by expanding the range of documents available on its website, ensuring that all relevant regulations, methodologies, reports, and student-related information are regularly updated and systematically archived. Quality assurance documentation, including CEAC annual reports, should be published and maintained in an easily accessible and well-structured section of the website and updated yearly.

- The institution should redesign and restructure its website to ensure a clearer, more user-friendly, and logically organized presentation of information. Relevant documents, regulations, methodologies, reports, and governance decisions should be systematically categorized, regularly updated, and archived in dedicated sections to facilitate easy access for students, academic staff, prospective candidates, and external stakeholders. The website should provide intuitive navigation and comprehensive coverage of institutional information, enabling users to locate relevant documents and data efficiently and without unnecessary difficulty.

Panel assessment: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The documents show that decision-making transparency is ensured through procedures, official institutional channels and communication structures. The complementary CEAC report also recommends a clearer organization of public documents and decision-related information on the institutional website. At the same time, formal decision-making transparency would be strengthened by easier access to governance decisions, consultation notices and summaries relevant to doctoral studies. The institution's intention to organize public documents by categories is a useful step toward improved decision transparency.

Recommendations: Publish or make accessible relevant decisions, minutes/summaries and consultation notices concerning doctoral studies, while respecting confidentiality and personal-data protection. The institution should establish and maintain a comprehensive, easily accessible, and regularly updated online archive of governance documents. This archive should include CSUD decisions, as well as relevant Senate and Administrative Council decisions, minutes or summaries of meetings, consultation notices, and other documents related to doctoral studies, while ensuring compliance with confidentiality and personal data protection requirements.

Panel assessment: 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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The doctoral domain underwent external ARACIS evaluation in 2021, refers to the ARACIS Council decision of 30.09.2021, and presents the current IER for maintaining accreditation. The complementary documents submitted for the current procedure further support the institution's participation in external evaluation. The IER summarizes previous recommendations and actions undertaken, while the complementary evidence adds documentation relevant to the current evaluation and to the follow-up of institutional development measures. The explicit inclusion of previous ARACIS recommendations in the IER supports accountability and continuity between evaluation cycles.

Recommendations: Continue maintaining a follow-up table for the 2021 recommendations, with status, evidence, deadlines, responsible people and indicators of completion.

Panel assessment: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths: - Specialized doctoral domain in Cinematography and Media; - Institutional continuity in doctoral education; - Decent connection between research, artistic creation and practice-based inquiry; - Access to CINETic, library resources and specialized film/media infrastructure; - Public doctoral thesis procedures; active doctoral courses and research projects; - DCCI-supported research and artistic-research activity, and international conference participation.	INTERNAL FACTORS 	Weaknesses: - Development areas relate mainly to documentation integration and traceability: the evidence is available across several reports and annexes, but it should be consolidated in future files through clearer links between procedures, data, decisions and follow-up. - Useful improvements include integrated QA datasets, explicit ESCO/learning-outcome mapping, consolidated stakeholder-feedback records, and clearer public access to governance information relevant to doctoral studies.
SWOT analysis		
Opportunities: - The development of doctoral research through CINETic and DCCI projects - The expansion of artistic and practice-based research, cotutelle doctorates, international artistic/research residencies. - Stronger recognition of artistic outputs as doctoral research. - DigitalEyes platform as a possible tool for integrated doctoral management and QA data.	 EXTERNAL FACTORS	Threats: - Constrained public funding for culture and artistic research - Retirement-related pressure on human resources - Increasing administrative burdens for supervisors, limited doctoral funding for international dissemination, and competitive international environments for research funding and staff recruitment.

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 management system, which operate based on methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.	F	Maintain a procedure matrix with revision dates, responsible bodies and evidence links.
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.	PF	Keep consultation minutes, representation records and feedback-to-decision evidence. The institution should formalize and document stakeholder consultation activities through dated minutes, survey records, and clear evidence of the feedback-to-decision process, in order to ensure greater transparency and traceability.
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	Maintain a doctoral-domain infrastructure annex with access and accessibility data.
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	Continue documenting maintenance plans, equipment renewal and facility-access protocols.
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	Update annually the supervisor/staff table and succession-risk analysis.
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	Document staff-development participation and links to supervision quality.
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	Attach recent recruitment examples and connect hiring plans to doctoral sustainability.
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	Clarify the doctoral digital architecture and DigitalEyes implementation calendar.
DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy			

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
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	Provide a single curriculum annex with 240 ECTS allocation and doctoral milestones.
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).	PF	Finalize ESCO/occupational mapping for doctoral learning outcomes and career paths.
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	Document individual learning/research plans, supervision and feedback mechanisms.
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	Maintain five-year mobility and internationalization evidence, including virtual formats.
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	Document accommodation accessibility and equal-access feedback from doctoral students.
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	Map doctoral use of library, databases, counselling and support services.
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	Continue making learning outcomes explicit and measurable at program and course level.
16.	I.P.B.5.1.2 Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	Attach criteria/rubrics for PPSUA, reports, outputs and thesis defense.
17.	I.P.B.7.1.1 The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	Attach doctoral admission statistics, criteria, grids and appeal data.
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	Specify and document support measures for vulnerable/disability candidates. The doctoral admission documentation should explicitly include concrete support measures for vulnerable candidates and candidates with special educational needs, in order to enhance

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			accessibility, reinforce anti-discrimination practices, and raise the institution's inclusiveness standards.
19.	I.P.B.7.2.1 The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	Document progress monitoring, interruptions, equivalences and professional-activity support.
20.	I.P.B.8.1.1 The organizational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.	F	Consolidate mobility, cotutelle, residency and international project data.
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	Map research/artistic-research activities to learn outcomes and doctoral milestones.
22.	I.P.B.9.2.1 The results of scientific research are visible at national and international level in that scientific domain, and capitalized upon in an adequate manner.	F	Classify outputs by type, quality, visibility and doctoral-domain relevance.
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	Present the QA impact chain: data, analysis, decision, implementation, follow-up.
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.	PF	Maintain stakeholder participation registers and action-tracking evidence. The institution should formalize and document stakeholder consultation activities through dated minutes, survey records, and clear evidence of the feedback-to-decision process, in order to ensure greater transparency and traceability.
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	Continue documenting ethics training, originality checks and ethics-commission activity.
26.	I.P.C.3.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	Attach periodic program-review evidence and curriculum-change examples.
27.	I.P.C.3.1.2 Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	PF	Keep feedback summaries and consultation records for doctoral procedures. The institution should maintain documented consultation records, minutes, feedback summaries, and action-tracking tables for doctoral procedures, and that it organizes more structured consultation sessions with

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			both internal and external stakeholders regarding procedure implementation.
28.	I.P.C.4.1.1 The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	PF	Provide aggregate doctoral evaluation results, response rates and follow-up measures. The institution should ensure the preparation and publication of anonymized synthetic reports of student evaluations, together with CEAC minutes and follow-up documentation showing the analysis of results, the formulation of recommendations, the implementation of remedial measures, and the monitoring of their effectiveness.
29.	I.P.C.5.1.1 The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	PF	Create a consolidated doctoral QA database/dashboard with data owners and update cycles. The institution should establish a consolidated doctoral quality-assurance database or dashboard, accompanied by clear procedures and working instructions for data collection and analysis, and should ensure that CEAC minutes document the systematic review of these data over time.
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	Keep doctoral webpage complete, current, searchable and linked to QA documents. The institution should strengthen the transparency and accessibility of public information by expanding the range of documents available on its website, ensuring that all relevant regulations, methodologies, reports, and student-related information are regularly updated and systematically archived. In particular, quality assurance documentation, including CEAC annual reports should be published and maintained in an easily accessible and well-structured section of the website and updated yearly. The institution should redesign and restructure its website to ensure a clearer, more user-friendly, and logically organized presentation of information. Relevant documents, regulations, methodologies, reports, and governance decisions should be systematically categorized, regularly

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			updated, and archived in dedicated sections to facilitate easy access for students, academic staff, prospective candidates, and external stakeholders. The website should provide intuitive navigation and comprehensive coverage of institutional information, enabling users to locate relevant documents and data efficiently and without unnecessary difficulty.
31.	I.P.C.6.1.2 The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	Improve access to governance decisions, consultation notices and relevant summaries. The institution should establish and maintain a comprehensive, easily accessible, and regularly updated online archive of governance documents. This archive should include CSUD decisions, as well as relevant Senate and Administrative Council decisions, minutes or summaries of meetings, consultation notices, and other documents related to doctoral studies, while ensuring compliance with confidentiality and personal data protection requirements.
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	Maintain a follow-up matrix for 2021 ARACIS recommendations and current evidence.

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfillment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity	7	1	0
Domain B. Educational efficacy	13	1	0
Domain C. Quality management	6	4	0
Total	26	6	0

Other, general recommendations that were not given within the analysis of a specific performance indicator can be presented here.

Sum up the number of analysed performance indicators, and specify how many were assessed as fulfilled, partially fulfilled, and unfulfilled, if any.

General recommendations:

- 1) consolidate the IER and annexes into a single evidence-based evaluation file;
- 2) maintain stable links to all regulations, reports and procedures;
- 3) create a doctoral-domain QA dashboard for admission, progress, supervision, mobility, research/artistic outputs and satisfaction;
- 4) keep stakeholder consultation and feedback-to-decision evidence;
- 5) continue monitoring human resources sustainability and habilitation capacity;
- 6) finalize learning-outcome and ESCO/occupational mapping at doctoral level;
- 7) clarify assessment criteria for artistic/practice-based research outputs;
- 8) consolidate internationalization data and targets;
- 9) document accessibility and support measures for students and candidates;
- 10) keep a follow-up matrix for previous ARACIS recommendations.

Summary of indicators, after reviewing the IER and the complementary documents submitted during the evaluation: 32 indicators analyzed; 26 fulfilled; 6 partially fulfilled; 0 unfulfilled. The partially fulfilled indicators concern mainly the need to consolidate mapping, data integration and formal decision-transparency evidence, not the absence of the relevant major institutional mechanisms.

VI. Conclusions

A number of important aspects noted during the evaluation are reiterated here, and general conclusions are made about the quality of education delivered within the evaluated doctoral study domain.

Propose and substantiate a decision.

The doctoral domain *Cinematography and Media* operates within a specialized arts university with a relevant institutional profile, a recognized doctoral tradition, active supervision structures, access to artistic/research infrastructure and a coherent orientation toward theoretical, historical, media-related and practice-based research. The IER, read together with the complementary documentation, shows an operational doctoral ecosystem that includes doctoral courses, research projects, public thesis defenses, conference participation, publication activity, research-development projects, quality-assurance reporting and student-support resources.

The evaluation also identifies several areas where documentation can be made more integrated and easier to verify: the explicit mapping of learning outcomes to doctoral activities and occupational/ESCO references, a consolidated doctoral QA database, more systematic stakeholder feedback records, and clearer public access to decision-making documents. These are development recommendations aimed at improving traceability and transparency within an already relatively functional institutional framework.

Proposed decision, based on the IER, the complementary documents submitted during the visit and the analysis above: maintaining accreditation (MAC). No unfulfilled indicator is proposed. The recommendations included in the report should be treated as measures for consolidating evidence, improving public documentation and strengthening the doctoral-domain quality-assurance cycle.

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

- a) **Maintaining accreditation (MAC)**

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



VII. Annexes

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

Documents used for this revised report: Internal Evaluation Report for maintaining accreditation of the doctoral study domain Cinematography and Media, UNATC Bucharest, 2026; complementary evidence submitted during the evaluation.

The complementary file includes, among other documents, the list of doctoral students and supervisors for 2025-2026, the research plan of the Doctoral School, the CEAC Report 2025, the Doctoral School Report 2025, DCDI research documentation, publication/output lists, library and resource information, and documents relevant for procedures, quality assurance, research visibility and student support. All the documents were uploaded in electronic versions on ARACIS evaluation platform.