



HOTĂRÂRE

privind validarea rezultatelor procedurilor de evaluare externă a calității educației

Având în vedere prevederile generale și specifice aferente proceselor sau procedurilor privind:

- **evaluarea externă a calității și validarea rezultatelor cuprinse în Rapoartele de evaluare externă:** art. 223-226, art. 229-230 și art. 249 alin. (1) lit. f), g) și h) din Legea nr. 199/2023 a învățământului superior nr. 199/2023, cu modificările și completările ulterioare, denumită în continuare Legea, precum și în Metodologia de evaluare externă a calității educației în învățământul superior, aprobată prin Hotărârea Guvernului nr. 962/2024, cu modificările și completările ulterioare, denumită în continuare Metodologia;
- **autorizarea de funcționare provizorie pentru programele de studii universitare din ciclul I de licență:** art. 235 alin. (1) lit. a) și lit. b) pct. (ii), alin. (2)-(5) și art. 236 alin. (1)-(2) din Lege; art. 27, art. 29 și art. 32-33, coroborate cu art. 59, art. 62 și art. 63 din Metodologie;
- **autorizarea pentru domeniile de studii universitare din ciclul II de masterat:** art. 235 alin. (1) lit. a) și lit. b) pct. (iii), alin. (2)-(5) și art. 236 alin. (1)-(2) din Lege; art. 27-29 și art. 34-35, coroborate cu art. 59, art. 62 și art. 63 din Metodologie;
- **autorizarea pentru domeniile de studii universitare din ciclul III de doctorat:** art. 235 alin. (1) lit. b) pct. (iv), alin. (2)-(5) și art. 236 alin. (1) și (3) din Lege; art. 27-29 și art. 37-38, coroborate cu art. 59, art. 62 și art. 63 din Metodologie;
- **acreditarea pentru programele de studii universitare din ciclul I de licență:** art. 239 alin. (1) lit. b) și alin. (6)-(7), art. 240 alin. (1) din Lege; art. 39-40 și art. 42, coroborate cu art. 60, art. 62 și art. 63 din Metodologie;
- **acreditarea pentru domeniile de studii universitare din ciclul II de masterat:** art. 239 alin. (3) și alin. (6)-(7), art. 240 alin. (1) din Lege; art. 39-40 și art. 43-44, coroborate cu art. 60, art. 62 și art. 63 din Metodologie;
- **acreditarea pentru domeniile de studii universitare din ciclul III de doctorat:** art. 239 alin. (4) și alin. (6)-(7), art. 240 alin. (2) din Lege; art. 39-40 și art. 46-47, coroborate cu art. 60, art. 62 și art. 63 din Metodologie;
- **analiza și validarea în vederea verificării respectării Metodologiei, de către comisiile de experți evaluatori în cadrul rapoartelor de evaluare externă:** art. 235 alin. (4), pentru autorizare, respectiv art. 239 alin. (6) lit. d), pentru acreditare și menținerea acreditării, din Lege, precum și art. 62-63 din Metodologie.

Luând în considerare:

a. Ghidul aplicabil programelor de studii universitare de licență, aprobat prin Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 42/06.02.2025, cu modificările și completările ulterioare;



b. Ghidul aplicabil domeniilor de studii universitare de masterat, aprobat prin Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 83/03.04.2025;

c. Ghidul aplicabil domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat, aprobat prin Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 84/03.04.2025;

Întrucât Consiliul ARACIS validează, prin vot deschis și pe baza verificării respectării Metodologiei, propunerile formulate de către comisiile de experți evaluatori și poate solicita refacerea Rapoartelor de evaluare externă atunci când constată că Metodologia nu a fost respectată ori respectivele rapoarte nu cuprind suficiente date și dovezi pentru adoptarea deciziei,

Ținând seama de considerentele Consiliului aferente validării rezultatelor individualizate în procesele verbale de ședință, al căror format a fost aprobat prin Hotărârea Consiliului nr. 170/H/03.07.2025,

În temeiul art. 258 alin. (1) din Lege și al art. 62 alin. (1) și (2) din Metodologie, precum și al art. 7 alin. (1) și alin. (3) lit. b) și h), art. 11 alin. (1) și al art. 23 alin. (5) din Regulamentul de organizare și funcționare al ARACIS, aprobat prin Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 188/H/27.06.2024 și completat prin Hotărârea nr. 116/H/02.04.2026,

Consiliul Agenției Române de Asigurare a Calității în Învățământul Superior HOTĂRĂȘTE:

Art. 1. (1) Se validează rezultatele procedurilor de evaluare externă a calității educației pentru programele de studii universitare de licență, domeniile de studii universitare de masterat și domeniile de studii universitare de doctorat, după caz, cuprinse în anexele 1-16, care fac parte integrantă din prezenta hotărâre.

(2) Pentru fiecare dintre programele sau domeniile de studii universitare, anexa corespunzătoare indică, conform art. 230 alin. (2) și alin. (3) lit. b), c) și d), art. 231 lit. a) și b), art. 232 lit. c), d) și e), art. 235 alin. (1) lit. b), punctele ii-iv, alin. (3)-(5), art. 239 alin. (1) lit. b), alin. (3), (4), (6) lit. a)-d) din Lege, procesul sau procedura de evaluare parcursă, rezultatele din Raportul de evaluare externă care se validează, precum și considerentele analizei de validitate și concluzia motivată a Consiliului.

(3) Rezultatele prevăzute la alin. (1) se comunică Ministerului Educației și Cercetării și instituțiilor solicitante și se publică pe site-ul ARACIS.

Art. 2. Analiza de validitate se exercită în limitele art. 235 alin. (4), respectiv ale art. 239 alin. (6) lit. d) din Lege și ale art. 62 raportat la art. 63 din Metodologie.

Art. 3. Rapoartele de evaluare externă, inclusiv numele experților, se publică integral pe site-ul ARACIS, în condițiile art. 229 alin. (2) din Lege și ale art. 62 alin. (3) din Metodologie.



Art. 4. Prezenta hotărâre intră în vigoare la data de 27.08.2026.

Art. 5. Prezenta hotărâre va fi dusă la îndeplinire de Direcția Asigurarea Calității și de Compartimentul Tehnologia Informației.

Prof. univ. dr. ing. Cristian-Vasile DOICIN
Președinte

Daniela Cristina GHIȚULICĂ
Director general

Carmen MIRIAN
Director Direcția Asigurarea Calității

Cristina-Vasilica ICOCIU
Director Direcția Juridică, Cooperare, Comunicare și Formare
Consilier juridic

NR. 260/H/27.08.2026



AGENȚIA ROMÂNĂ DE ASIGURARE A CALITĂȚII ÎN ÎNVĂȚĂMÂNTUL SUPERIOR

Membră în Asociația Europeană pentru Asigurarea Calității în Învățământul Superior - ENQA

Înscrișă în Registrul European pentru Asigurarea Calității în Învățământul Superior - EQAR

ANEXA NR. 10

la Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 260/H/27.08.2026

Anexa 10.1

DATE DE IDENTIFICARE		
Instituția de învățământ superior/organizația furnizoare de educație	Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași	
Școala(ile) doctorală(e)	Biologie	
Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD)	Biologie	
Procedura/procesul de evaluare externă a calității educației	Menținerea acreditării	
DECIZIA		
Descrierea pe scurt a procesului de luare a deciziei		
Raportul de evaluare externă (REE) a fost analizat în ședința Comisiei permanente de specialitate Științe Exacte și Științe ale Naturii (CPS_C1) din 17.08.2026, propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV nr.4370/17.08.2026. Propunerea de decizie a fost analizată de către Departamentul de evaluare Studii Universitare (DESU), opinia DESU fiind consemnată în PV nr.4487/27.08.2026.		
Gradul de îndeplinire a standardelor și indicatorilor de performanță și motivarea deciziei		
Domeniul	Standarde Î / N	Indicatori de performanță Î / PÎ / N
A	Î: S.A.1.1, S.A.1.2., S.A.2.1., S.A.2.2., S.A.3.1., S.A.3.2., S.A.4.1. N: 0	Î: I.P.A.1.1.1, I.P.A.1.2.1, I.P.A.2.1.1, I.P.A.2.2.1, I.P.A.3.1.1, I.P.A.3.1.2, I.P.A.3.2.1, I.P.A.4.1.1 PÎ: 0 N: 0
B	Î: S.B.1.1., S.B.2.1., S.B.3.1., S.B.3.2., S.B.4.1., S.B.5.1., S.B.7.1., S.B.7.2., S.B.8.1., S.B.9.1., S.B.9.2. N: 0	Î: I.P.B.1.1.1., I.P.B.2.1.2, I.P.B.3.1.1, I.P.B.3.1.2, I.P.B.3.2.1, I.P.B.4.1.1., I.P.B.5.1.1, I.P.B.5.1.2, I.P.B.7.1.1, I.P.B.7.1.2, I.P.B.7.2.1, I.P.B.8.1.1, I.P.B.9.1.1, I.P.B.9.2.1 PÎ: 0 N: 0
C	Î: S.C.1.1, S.C.1.2, S.C.2.2., S.C.3.1, S.C.4.1., S.C.5.1., S.C.6.1., S.C.8.1 N: 0	Î: I.P.C.1.1.1, I.P.C.1.2.1, I.P.C.3.1.1, I.P.C.3.1.2, I.P.C.4.1.1., I.P.C.5.1.1, I.P.C.6.1.1, I.P.C.6.1.2, I.P.C.8.1.1 PÎ: I.P.C.2.2.2 N: 0
Motivarea deciziei		
Consiliul ARACIS în ședința din 27.08.2026 analizează și validează propunerea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității, constatând că din: 32 indicatori: 31 sunt îndepliniți, 1 parțial îndeplinit și 0 neîndeplinit 26 standarde: 26 sunt îndeplinite, 0 neîndeplinite, și, astfel, prin aplicarea art. 63 din Metodologie decide că standardele sunt ÎNDEPLINITE.		
Decizia	Menținerea acreditării	



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

Higher Education Institution/Education Provider Organization:	Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași (UAIC)
Doctoral School:	Doctoral School of Biology (SD-BIO)
Doctoral Domain:	Biology
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.	ZĂRNESCU OTILIA	Expert evaluator	
2.	DUCA MARIA	International Expert	
3.	MALAIRĂU VICTOR	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

- This report was drafted following the external quality evaluation procedure for maintaining the accreditation of the Doctoral Study Domain (DSUD) Biology, organised within the Doctoral School of Biology (SD-BIO), part of the Doctoral Studies Organising Institution of the „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași (IOSUD-UAIC). The evaluation reviewed the Internal Evaluation Report (IER) submitted by IOSUD-UAIC, together with its annexes, and assessed the extent to which the domain meets the standards and performance indicators applicable to the procedure for maintaining accreditation, as set out in Annex 1 to the ARACIS Guide for DSUD evaluation.
- The „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași was established in 1860 and currently comprises 15 faculties and 14 doctoral schools, with over 25,000 students and partnerships with about 650 universities worldwide. The university holds a High Degree of Confidence following the latest institutional evaluation (2022) and Maintaining Accreditation for the large majority of its degree programmes and doctoral domains, including its IOSUD status (Order 5.838/2021). Doctoral studies are organised under the Institutional Regulation on Doctoral Studies (last revised September 2025) and the Doctoral Domain operates under the Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of SD-BIO (approved by Senate decision, November 2025).
- The Doctoral School of Biology, in its current form, was re-established in 2017 following the reorganisation of the former Doctoral School of Chemistry, Life and Earth Sciences, and currently delivers a single doctoral domain, Biology (scientific doctorate type), covering specialisations such as molecular biology, genetics, biochemistry, biotechnology, microbiology, botany, zoology, plant and animal physiology, comparative anatomy and bioarchaeology. The domain was last externally evaluated by ARACIS in 2021 (decision of 25.11.2021), obtaining the qualification Maintaining Accreditation, and an intermediate (follow-up) evaluation in 2024 confirmed substantial progress on the recommendations formulated at that time.

II. Methods used

- Documents reviewed: the Internal Evaluation Report (IER) submitted by IOSUD-UAIC/SD-BIO for the procedure of maintaining accreditation of the Biology DSUD, together with its annexes (staff schedule, curriculum plan 2026–2030, course description, doctoral student research-funding annex), the institutional and SD-BIO specific regulations referenced therein, the previous ARACIS external evaluation report (2021) and the intermediate progress evaluation report (2024).
- On-site visit: discussions were organised, in accordance with the Guide, with the management of IOSUD-UAIC and of the Faculty of Biology, with the Director and Council of SD-BIO, with PhD supervisors, current doctoral students and graduates, as well as with the staff responsible for quality assurance (CEAC-SD/CMC) and administrative/technical support; the research laboratories, library and computer rooms used by the doctoral domain were also visited.

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)

SD-BIO operates within IOSUD-UAIC on the basis of the Institutional Regulation on Doctoral Studies (Senate, 18.09.2025) and its own Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of SD-BIO (Senate decision no. 8, 27.11.2025), both periodically reviewed. The regulations cover admission of new PhD supervisors, the design and content of the advanced university studies programme (PPUA), supervisor-change and conflict-mediation procedures, conditions for interrupting the programme, prevention of research fraud (including plagiarism), access to research resources, and attendance requirements, and they are complemented by specific procedures (e.g. recognition of foreign doctorates, recognition of the right to supervise doctorates).

The SD-BIO is coordinated by the Director and Doctoral School Council (DSC), responsible for doctoral education and research activities. The Doctoral School Council is composed of: Prof. PhD Habil. Luminița BEJENARU, Prof. PhD Habil. Marius STEFAN, Assoc. Prof. PhD Habil. Mircea Dan MITROIU, Prof. PhD Monica HÂNCIANU (Gr. T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Iași), Prof. PhD Carmenica Doina JIȚĂREANU (Ion Ionescu de la Brad University of Life Sciences, Iași), doctoral students Elena-Iren HÂNCU and Loredana-Elena MANTEA. The strategic objectives of the Biology doctoral study field are integrated into the development plans of IOSUD-UAIC, the Faculty of Biology and SD-BIO. Admission procedures, doctoral contracts, habilitation and affiliation procedures, recognition of qualifications, and academic ethics mechanisms are clearly regulated. Institutional regulations, methodologies, procedures, and decisions are publicly available through the University website, ensuring transparency and accessibility.

✓ 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.

The documentation shows a coherent management system, renewed in line with Law no. 199/2023 and the 2024 Framework Regulation on Doctoral Studies, with elections for the CSUD (2024) and the SD-BIO Council (2022) having been completed under dedicated methodologies. The regulatory framework is consistently applied to the day-to-day running of the domain (admission, PPUA, supervision, defence).

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Annual review of the admission methodology and of the institutional doctoral regulation, ensuring continuous alignment with legislative changes.

The doctoral advisory committees benefit from the active participation of two external members, ensuring valuable academic expertise and strengthening inter-institutional collaboration.

✓ **Recommendations**

None.

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

Institutional regulations and procedures (including the SD-BIO Regulation) are drafted through a documented circuit: the initiator submits the draft for content approval to the head of the relevant structure, the Quality Management Office (CMC) reviews the form in line with the documented-information procedure, and the Rector, the Administration Council and the Senate approve the final version. The SD-BIO Regulation was elaborated through consultation of all SD-BIO members, and the University Code of Student Rights and Obligations was drafted together with student representatives.

✓ **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**

This circuit ensures that academic staff, the doctoral-school leadership and the wider community have a structured opportunity to contribute to and validate regulatory documents before adoption, consistent with the standard's requirement for stakeholder involvement. The Internal Evaluation Report and the discussions held during the evaluation visit confirm that UAIC and the SD-BIO actively involve stakeholders (academic staff, doctoral students, and other relevant stakeholders) in the development, review, and improvement of internal regulations and procedures. The involvement of academic staff and doctoral students in decision-making structures reflects a participatory governance model, while strategic planning supports the sustainable development and increased visibility of the doctoral field. However, the institutional framework would benefit from a more explicit description and formalisation of clearly defined mechanisms for stakeholder consultation, including their roles in the analysis, review, and approval processes of institutional documents, in order to further ensure their consistency, compliance, and quality.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

N/A

✓ **Recommendations**

Continuing to monitor the effectiveness of stakeholder consultation mechanisms and integrating feedback into institutional decision-making processes.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

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 domain uses eight specialised research laboratories (biochemistry/molecular biology, molecular genetics, microbiology, fungal research, invertebrate diversity and phylogenetics, neurobiology/ neuropsychopharmacology, comparative anatomy/ bioarchaeology, plant physiology), comprising 27 laboratory rooms and 9 auxiliary rooms, equipped with specialised instruments (a CEQ 8000 DNA sequencer, HPLC/FPLC systems, a confocal and several other optical microscopes, two electron microscopes, fermenters, climate/growth chambers, and behavioural-testing equipment for animal models). Students also have access to the Faculty of Biology library (60,500 volumes, 70 reading seats), two computer rooms (34 workstations), the amphitheatre (196 seats) and a 50-seat lecture room, and to national/international scientific databases through the ANELIS PLUS consortium.

✓ **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**

The infrastructure available is adequate and diversified for the specialisations covered by the domain (molecular biology, genetics, biochemistry, biotechnology, microbiology, botany, zoology, physiology, bioarchaeology) and supports both coursework and independent doctoral research; it is also made available, in part, to other domains/faculties, fostering interdisciplinary collaboration as intended by SD-BIO's strategic objectives.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

Research groups linked to SD-BIO actively promote shared use of their infrastructure through the ERRIS/ERRTIS national research-infrastructure registry and offer paid research services (DNA extraction, sequencing, gene-expression analysis) that further valorise the existing equipment.

Development of a diversified research infrastructure covering multiple areas of Biology, combined with interdisciplinary access for doctoral students to laboratories and research centers across the university.

✓ **Recommendations**

Continuing to planned renewal/extension of laboratory equipment, in line with the modernisation already initiated.

Maintenance and use of valuable scientific collections as resources for research and doctoral training activities.

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

The maintenance of laboratories, lecture/seminar rooms, equipment, furniture and scientific collections is carried out through ongoing institutional procedures covering budget planning, identification of funding sources (including research grants), public-procurement processes, and current repairs/modernisation works.

- ✓ 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

The arrangements in place are adequate to keep the spaces and equipment used by the domain in good working order, supporting optimal conditions for study, research and work. The available material assets, including research equipment, teaching facilities, and scientific collections, are properly managed and maintained, providing adequate conditions for doctoral students and academic staff to conduct educational, research, and professional activities. The measures implemented demonstrate an effective approach to resource management, ensuring the continuity and functionality of the infrastructure required for the successful implementation of the doctoral programme.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

N/A

- ✓ Recommendations

None

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

Eleven PhD supervisors are active in the Biology domain (eight professors, two associate professors and one senior researcher grade I), all of whom meet the CNATDCU minimal habilitation standards for Biology, ten being full-time IOSUD-UAIC staff and one an emeritus professor on a fixed-term contract. Three additional supervisors have habilitated and affiliated to SD-BIO during the evaluated period (Assoc. Prof. L.A. Oprică, 2023/2024; Assoc. Prof. V. Surugiu and Assoc. Prof. L. Fusu, 2024/2025). PPUA disciplines are taught exclusively by these qualified supervisors and by a senior researcher, on the basis of the annual staff schedule. The evaluation panel verified, against the institutional Regulation on Doctoral Studies (approved by the Senate on 30.05.2024, with a further revision approved on 18.09.2025) publicly available on the SD-BIO website, that the supervision workload of the domain's eleven supervisors is fully compatible with the regulatory ceiling (from the 2026–2027 academic year, a maximum of 8 simultaneous doctoral students per supervisor, exceptionally up to 12 with Senate approval and for no more than 20% of a school's supervisors). The expertise of the teaching and research staff is demonstrated through academic CVs, Web of Science-indexed scientific publications, participation in scientific committees of

international journals and conferences, membership in international professional associations, and involvement in expert groups and international scientific events. According to the available evidence, all doctoral supervisors are scientifically active and meet the applicable CNATDCU minimum criteria at the time of evaluation, demonstrating significant scientific performance and international recognition.

- ✓ **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**

The number, qualification and ongoing scientific activity of the supervisors (each obtaining well above the minimum 25% performance threshold relative to the CNATDCU habilitation standards over the last five years, with several supervisors far exceeding 100%) demonstrate that human resources are adequate and that teaching staff possess the competences required for the disciplines they teach. The fulfilment of CNATDCU minimum standards by all doctoral supervisors represents an important indicator of the quality of human resources and of their capacity to ensure doctoral supervision at high academic standards. Furthermore, the participation of academic staff in professional development and continuous training activities, including digital competencies and emerging educational technologies, demonstrates the institution's commitment to adapting to current requirements in higher education and research. The affiliation of new doctoral supervisors during the evaluated period reflects the institution's commitment to strengthening and continuously developing its academic human resources.

- ✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**
Maintaining an active and competitive body of doctoral supervisors with national and international scientific recognition.
Attracting and affiliating new doctoral supervisors during the evaluation period.
- ✓ **Recommendations**
None.

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

Professional and personal development of staff is supported through the university's Centre for Personal Development and Professional Training, training sessions on Moodle/Teams, participation in the FDI project „University for All: Inclusion and Success”, and access to certification platforms for data-analysis and AI-related skills.

- ✓ **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**

These mechanisms provide a reasonable, although still relatively informal, framework for continuous professional development; the institution shows clear intent to expand digital-skills training in particular. The analysis of the available evidence shows that UAIC and SD-BIO provide an adequate framework for the professional and personal development of academic and research staff. The existence of a dedicated institutional structure for continuous training demonstrates the university's commitment to improving staff competencies and adapting to current requirements in education and research. Training activities contribute to the modernization of teaching and research practices. Participation in scientific events, professional networks, and collaborative initiatives enhances academic visibility and supports the development of research partnerships.

- ✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**
Encouragement of staff participation in international scientific networks, editorial boards and professional associations as a parallel form of professional development.

✓ Recommendations

Developing an annual training plan specifically for SD-BIO staff, so that professional development activities can be monitored and reported in a more systematic manner. It is recommended to strengthen cooperation with European universities through formal agreements that facilitate doctoral internships and joint academic activities.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER) Recruitment of teaching staff follows the institutional Competition Methodology for Filling Didactic Positions, publicly available, and the acceptance of new PhD supervisors within SD-BIO follows the standards set out in Annex 1a to the SD-BIO Regulation. The <i>Methodology</i> for the recruitment of academic positions establishes the framework for organizing recruitment procedures, ensuring legality, transparency, and open competition. At the level of the SD-BIO, the recruitment and affiliation of doctoral supervisors are regulated by the Regulation on the Organization and Functioning of SD-BIO, with specific criteria and standards established. The relevant procedures and documents are publicly available through institutional platforms, ensuring transparency and equal access to information.
✓	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 The procedures comply with the legal framework and are applied transparently, as evidenced by the consistent documentation of recent habilitations and affiliations to SD-BIO. The analysis of the available evidence shows that recruitment procedures at UAIC and SD- BIO are formally regulated, transparent, and aligned with legal requirements. The existence of institutional methodologies ensures a consistent and objective recruitment process based on clear evaluation criteria. At SD-BIO level, the specific requirements for accepting new doctoral supervisors support the maintenance of a qualified and scientifically competitive academic body in the field of Biology. The public availability of recruitment procedures contributes to transparency and confidence in the selection process.
✓	Aspects that constitute best practice examples N/A
✓	Recommendations None

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)**
IOSUD-UAIC operates the eSIMS information system for student records and academic progress, and is implementing, through the PNRR-funded „eUAIC” project (2022–2025), an integrated Portal and School Management application intended to simplify administrative processes for students and staff; Moodle and Microsoft Teams are used for teaching and communication, and a Quality Management platform is being implemented for self-evaluation files.
- ✓ **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**
The organisational component makes consistent use of IT tools to support academic and administrative processes, with concrete and funded plans for further digitalisation. The analysis of the available evidence demonstrates that UAIC has developed an advanced digital transformation framework contributing to more efficient institutional processes and improved academic and administrative services.
The eSims system provides centralized and structured academic data management, increasing transparency and efficiency. Its continuous development by specialized university structures reflects a sustainable and adaptive approach to digitalization.
- ✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**
The implementation of the eUAIC project represents an important step towards integrating academic and administrative processes into a unified digital ecosystem, supporting a modern, flexible, and efficient educational environment.
- ✓ **Recommendations**
Complete and roll out the Quality Management platform currently under implementation, to further streamline the preparation of self-evaluation files.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)**
The doctoral programme is structured into the Advanced University Studies Programme (PPUA, first semester, 30 ECTS, covering research-results valorisation strategies, research methods and techniques, and ethics/academic integrity) and the Scientific Research Programme (PCS, remaining semesters, 210 ECTS), evaluated through four cumulative research reports, the last being the pre-defence of the thesis, for a total of 240 ECTS over the four-year programme. Discipline sheets define learning outcomes aligned with teaching/assessment activities.

* 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.

- ✓ 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

The programme is properly developed around transferable study credits and includes the full range of learning, research and assessment experiences expected of a Level 8 (EQF/CNC) qualification; the low withdrawal rate recorded over 2021–2025 (about 3%) further supports the adequacy of the programme design. The programme ensures the integration of advanced training, research activities, scientific communication, and periodic assessment, providing effective monitoring of doctoral students' progress.

However, the Study Plan should be revised and completed in accordance with the applicable regulatory requirements for all eight semesters of study. It should clearly justify the allocation of the full 240 ECTS credits across the training and research components and all study activities.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

N/A

- ✓ Recommendations

Publication on the SD-BIO website of the doctoral curriculum, clearly structured for the entire 4-year study period, highlighting the distribution of the 240 ECTS credits allocated to the doctoral programme among advanced training activities, individual research, practical activities, and scientific dissemination.

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

Learning outcomes are explicitly mapped, in the IER, to Level 8 of the National Qualifications Framework (knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy) and to the relevant ESCO occupational category (2 – Professionals; 21 – Science and Engineering Professionals; 213 – Life Science Professionals).

The doctoral study programme in the field of Biology within the SD-BIO aims to develop advanced research competences applicable in life sciences and related interdisciplinary fields, being structured around three main dimensions: (1) *Advanced and frontier knowledge in Biology*, including the ability to generate and interpret new knowledge through original research and the application of modern investigation methods; (2) *Research skills and competences*, including the design and implementation of scientific projects, critical analysis of scientific literature and research data, and dissemination of results through scientific publications; (3) *Autonomy and academic responsibility*, including compliance with research ethics principles, independent scientific decision-making, interdisciplinary collaboration, and communication of research outcomes to the scientific community and society.

- ✓ 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

The analysis of the available documentation indicates that the intended learning outcomes are coherently aligned with the qualification level and the competences

required for doctoral graduates. However, the course descriptions included in the curriculum do not consistently specify the intended learning outcomes, and the bibliographic references require updating to reflect recent scientific developments.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

Integration of interdisciplinary perspectives in defining and developing doctoral competences.

✓ **Recommendations**

Inclusion, in all course syllabi within the doctoral programme curriculum, of the intended learning outcomes, aligned with the learning outcomes corresponding to NQF Level 8, EQF descriptors, and relevant occupational profiles from the ESCO classification.

Update the bibliography included in the course descriptions to reflect recent scientific literature and current developments in the field of Biology.

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

The SD-BIO Regulation (Art. 7) places the doctoral student at the centre of their own formation, with the freedom to structure research activities under the supervisor's mentorship; interdisciplinary collaboration is encouraged (e.g. with Medicine, Environmental Science, History), and progress is monitored through periodic reports assessed by the Guidance and Academic Integrity Committee.

The academic relationship between the doctoral supervisor and the student is based on mentoring and scientific collaboration, in accordance with the provisions of the national higher education legislation, promoting autonomy, responsibility, and active involvement in the research process. The progress of doctoral students is monitored through a structured system of periodic scientific reports included in the individual research plan. The evaluation process is continuously supported by the doctoral supervisor and the Guidance and Academic Integrity Committee. The programme also promotes interdisciplinary approaches by encouraging collaboration between Biology and complementary fields, such as Medicine and Environmental Sciences, in order to address complex scientific and societal challenges.

✓ **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**

The arrangements in place reflect genuine student-centred learning, combining individualised research planning with structured periodic evaluation and mentorship. The system of periodic research reports ensures continuous monitoring of individual progress and provides opportunities for feedback and adjustment of research directions. The interdisciplinary dimension of the programme increases the relevance and impact of doctoral training by integrating knowledge from complementary fields and addressing current research challenges.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

Promotion of interdisciplinary research approaches.

✓ **Recommendations**

None

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER) Fifteen documented academic mobilities of doctoral students took place in 2021–2025 (mostly Erasmus+ study/research mobilities and project-based research stays in France, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Spain and the Netherlands), and the newly approved Institutional Methodology for the European Doctorate (2026) is designed to further stimulate international mobility of doctoral students. The mobility activities were carried out in universities and research institutions from several European countries, including Italy, France, Poland, Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, and the Czech Republic. The mobility opportunities included doctoral research internships, Erasmus+ mobilities (including Erasmus+ Placement), participation in international research projects, Blended Intensive Programmes (BIP), summer schools, and research grants for early-career researchers.
✓	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 The frequency and diversity of mobilities recorded over the evaluated period demonstrate that the organisational component provides real opportunities for both physical and, where relevant, virtual academic mobility. The significant involvement in Erasmus+ mobility schemes reflects the effective use of European institutional mechanisms supporting academic exchange, while the diversification of mobility formats (BIP, research internships, summer schools, and international projects) demonstrates openness towards flexible and interdisciplinary forms of academic cooperation. Participation in mobility programmes contributes to the development of advanced research competences in international environments; access to high-performance research infrastructures and specialised facilities; strengthening international scientific collaboration networks; improving linguistic and intercultural competences; integrating doctoral students into European research communities.
✓	Aspects that constitute best practice examples Adoption of the European Doctorate methodology as an institutional mechanism specifically designed to increase doctoral mobility going forward.
✓	Recommendations Increase the number of longer-term mobility opportunities and participation in international mobility and knowledge-exchange programmes should be increased to support the development of research skills and international experience.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER) Equal opportunities are supported through a set of institutional measures, including awarding doctoral scholarships financed by the Ministry of Education, as well as additional scholarships from the university's own funds; ensuring non-discriminatory access to research resources and academic infrastructure; facilitating physical access

to study and research facilities through adapted infrastructure for persons with disabilities (e.g., ramps and elevators available in Building B of UAIC, where SD-BIO activities are carried out); providing access to Erasmus+ academic mobility programmes based on transparent and unitary institutional selection criteria. Doctoral students are also informed and encouraged to participate in projects and initiatives promoting social inclusion, educational equity, complementary skills development, and academic entrepreneurship.

- ✓ 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

The measures in place provide fair opportunities for students with different needs and aspirations, addressing both physical accessibility and financial support.

The scholarship system contributes to reducing socio-economic barriers and supports the continuity of doctoral studies, while the combination of national and institutional funding mechanisms provides additional financial stability for doctoral students. The accessibility of physical infrastructure represents an important element of inclusion, enabling participation in academic activities for students with different functional needs. The transparent selection procedures for Erasmus+ mobility opportunities ensure fair access to international academic experiences relevant to doctoral training. Overall, SD-BIO promotes an inclusive academic environment where diversity in learning approaches, abilities, and professional development pathways is recognised and supported.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

N/A

- ✓ Recommendations

None

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

The University Code of Student Rights and Obligations (Art. 11) guarantees adapted access to all university spaces and sign-language interpretation for students with disabilities; the university provides electronic access to major scientific databases (ANELIS PLUS consortium), a Learning Centre, a Learn & Connect Centre, and a Student and Alumni Support Service offering academic, career and psychological counselling; several student dormitories are equipped with ramps, lifts/platforms and adapted rooms.

- ✓ 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

A comprehensive set of resources and support services is available, appropriately differentiated for students with special educational needs, and aligned with the specific requirements of doctoral-level study and research.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

Dedicated adapted accommodation and automated lift platforms in several dormitories.

✓ **Recommendations**

None

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

Learning outcomes are described in the discipline sheets of the PPUA programme (e.g. for the 2026–2027 academic year) in alignment with course objectives, content and assessment methods, and the 2026–2030 curriculum plan specifies the distribution of 240 ECTS (30 from PPUA, 210 from PCS).

✓ **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**

Although the educational and research activities effectively contribute to the development of doctoral students' competences, the absence of explicitly defined learning outcomes in the course descriptions indicates the need to further align the curriculum documentation with the current requirements for learning outcomes-based programme design. The formalisation of learning outcomes is essential to ensure consistency between programme objectives, course content, teaching and learning activities, and assessment methods, while providing a common understanding of the expected achievements for both doctoral students and academic staff.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

N/A

✓ **Recommendations**

Define and include learning outcomes in all course descriptions, ensuring their alignment with the program objectives, course content, and assessment methods of the doctoral study program.

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

Achievement of learning outcomes is verified through: (i) ongoing and final examinations for PPUA disciplines, following institutional examination regulations; and (ii) four cumulative research reports during PCS, the last of which constitutes the pre-defence of the thesis, followed by the public defence in front of a doctoral committee that includes external/international referees. The evaluation panel confirmed, against the institutional Regulation on Doctoral Studies, that the procedure additionally requires a similarity

(plagiarism-detection) check before submission, mandatory public availability of the thesis for 90 calendar days on the national UEFISCDI platform prior to defence, and a defence committee of at least five members (president, supervisor(s), and at least three referees, at least two of whom must be external to IOSUD-UAIC) before CNATDCU confirmation of the doctoral title.

- ✓ 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

The combination of disciplinary examinations and staged, cumulative research reports culminating in a publicly verifiable, externally refereed defence provides a robust and externally auditable verification mechanism for learning outcomes throughout the doctoral programme.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Inclusion of international experts in defence committees as an additional quality-assurance mechanism for the verification of learning outcomes (10 such committees in 2021–2025), combined with the mandatory 90-day public availability and similarity check prior to defence. The final evaluation confirms the achievement of the overall learning outcomes through the assessment of the doctoral thesis and the candidate's scientific contribution. This integrated assessment approach contributes to transparency, consistency, and quality assurance in the doctoral training process.

- ✓ Recommendations

None

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

Admission is organised yearly under a regulation revised annually, comprising an oral component (research-project presentation, 50%, and interview, 20%) and a written component (self-assessment of scientific activity, 30%); admission statistics for 2021–2025 show consistent application of the procedure, with growing competition for budgeted places in the last two sessions.

- ✓ 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

The admission procedure is applied consistently year after year and is transparently documented, including detailed criteria for evaluating research proposals and prior scientific activity. The available evidence demonstrates that the admission procedures applied by the Doctoral School of Biology are clearly defined, transparent, and aligned with the requirements of doctoral-level education, ensuring a selection process based on academic merit and research potential. The structure of the admission examination reflects a strong research-oriented approach, with the highest weight assigned to the research project, which represents the central element in assessing the candidate's capacity to conduct advanced scientific activities. The combination of research project evaluation, interview, and scientific portfolio provides a comprehensive assessment of candidates' knowledge, previous achievements, motivation, and potential for doctoral research. The annual updating and publication of admission methodologies ensure

transparency, predictability, and continuous alignment with institutional and national requirements.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

N/A

✓ **Recommendations**

Further develop an integrated digital admission and evaluation system to improve efficiency, transparency, and process traceability.

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

The admission regulation (Art. 10–11) sets out equal-opportunity measures for candidates with disabilities, allocates budgeted places for disadvantaged groups (e.g. Roma candidates) and for Romanians abroad, and simplifies the administrative process for candidates (reduced documentation, digital submission/registration).

✓ **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**

Admission to the doctoral programme complies with the principles of fairness and equal opportunity and includes concrete support measures for vulnerable and at-risk groups, including candidates with special educational needs and/or disabilities. The analysis highlights the following aspects: the existence of a clear regulatory framework ensuring non-discrimination in the admission process; transparent publication of admission methodologies, procedures, and selection criteria; implementation of standardized evaluation procedures based on objective criteria, reducing the risk of arbitrary differential treatment. The admission process ensures a fair evaluation of candidates based on academic and research potential. However, the specific operational measures dedicated to supporting vulnerable candidates are generally addressed within the broader institutional inclusion framework and are less explicitly detailed in the admission regulations for doctoral studies.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

N/A

✓ **Recommendations**

None

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

SD-BIO applies the institutional regulations on doctoral students' professional activity, including individualised study contracts, guidance by the supervisor and by the Guidance and Academic Integrity Committee, administrative support for mobilities and reporting, and financial support through ministry and university scholarships as well as research-project funding. The progress of doctoral students is periodically evaluated according to

national standards and institutional procedures, ensuring the achievement of intermediate objectives and the successful completion of the doctoral thesis.

- ✓ 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

The organisational component implements the relevant regulations consistently, supporting doctoral students' academic journey from enrolment to thesis completion. Doctoral School of Biology has implemented a coherent and structured framework for managing doctoral students' professional activities, in accordance with legal requirements and current academic standards. The implemented system ensures: the integration of doctoral activities into the institutional regulatory framework; the existence of a functional academic mentoring mechanism supporting the scientific development of doctoral students; multidimensional support, including academic, administrative, and financial assistance, contributing to the continuity and performance of doctoral studies; systematic monitoring and evaluation of doctoral progress, ensuring quality assurance throughout the training process. The applied model supports the progressive transition from guided training to independent research activity, in line with European standards for doctoral education.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The university offers scholarships for doctoral students from its own funds, which motivates their activity.

- ✓ Recommendations

Development of an integrated digital system for monitoring doctoral pathways, to support the real-time tracking of scientific progress.

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

Internationalisation actions documented for 2021–2025 include: ten committees (thesis defence/guidance) involving international experts from universities in the USA, Republic of Moldova, Hungary, France and Tunisia; fifteen recorded outgoing student mobilities; twelve lectures/courses delivered by invited international experts; and the new Institutional Methodology for the European Doctorate (2026) aimed at stimulating international mobility and cross-border supervision.

- ✓ 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

SD-BIO carries out a sustained and diversified set of international-cooperation actions that support both mobility of community members and collaboration in academic and research activities, consistent with the domain's strategic objective of strengthening interdisciplinary and international links. The involvement of international experts in doctoral supervision and evaluation structures represents an important quality assurance mechanism, contributing to increased objectivity, academic openness, and alignment with international research standards. Their participation ensures external scientific perspectives in the evaluation of doctoral research and supports the development of internationally competitive doctoral outcomes. The mobility activities

carried out by doctoral students contribute directly to the development of advanced research competences, exposure to high-performance research infrastructures, improvement of intercultural and communication skills, and integration into international scientific networks. The use of Erasmus+ programmes and bilateral agreements provides an institutional framework that facilitates sustainable academic exchanges.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

Systematic inclusion of international experts in both guidance and defence committees, and a dedicated institutional methodology (European Doctorate, 2026) designed to further deepen internationalisation.

✓ **Recommendations**

Continue to expand the network of international partner institutions and consider setting indicative annual targets for outgoing and incoming mobility. In line with the UAIC International Cooperation Strategy, efforts should also be made to attract a higher number of international students.

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

Doctoral students were involved as team members in 18 funded research projects during 2021–2025 (national PN-III/PN-IV grants, UEFISCDI projects, a Swiss SNSF-funded project, and internal/university grants), and the resulting research underpins the PCS reports and the doctoral theses. These projects cover a wide range of research fields, including: molecular biology; biochemistry; ecology; bioarcheology; biosecurity; biodiversity conservation; biomedical sciences. Doctoral students participate as active members of research teams, contributing to: collection, processing, and analysis of scientific data, preparation of scientific articles and conference communications, development and application of experimental methodologies, implementation of interdisciplinary research activities. The evidence provided by research project documentation, scientific outputs, doctoral progress reports, and publications confirms the systematic integration of scientific research into the doctoral training process.

✓ **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**

Investigation-based learning is clearly integrated into the doctoral programme, with research findings directly supporting the achievement of the learning outcomes envisaged by the programme (cumulative research reports and the thesis itself).

The involvement of doctoral students in real research environments contributes significantly to achieving the expected learning outcomes at doctoral level, including autonomy, originality, critical thinking, and the capacity to generate new knowledge.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

Active involvement of doctoral students, from an early stage, as named team members in competitively funded national and international research projects.

✓ **Recommendations**

None

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

Over 2021–2025, students and supervisors of the domain produced 144 articles in Web of Science-indexed journals (with impact factor) and 67 articles in BDI-indexed journals, together with 154 communications at national and 129 at international scientific events; financing for doctoral research comes from a diversified mix of sources (budget allocation, ministry and university scholarships, and several competitive research grants), and the share of funds explicitly earmarked for doctoral students' research and mobility increased to about 55% of total available funding in the most recent academic year, with a target of at least 20% of the per-student budget allocation set for 2026. The evaluation panel verified that this 20% target corresponds to the minimum threshold set in Art. 42(6) of the institutional Regulation on Doctoral Studies, which requires IOSUD-UAIC to allocate at least 20% of doctoral-grant funding to doctoral students' research activities, including national and international mobility.

✓ 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

The volume and indexing of scientific output demonstrate good national and international visibility of the research carried out within the domain, and is adequately capitalised upon through publication and conference dissemination; the trend in dedicated doctoral-research funding shows responsiveness to the recommendation made at the previous external evaluation and consistency with the binding institutional minimum.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Diversification of funding sources for doctoral research (national grants, international project participation, internal university grants) beyond the basic doctoral grant. High level of scientific production in Web of Science indexed journals, demonstrating the quality and international relevance of doctoral research.

✓ Recommendations

Continue to increase, as planned for 2026, the share of the per-student budget allocation earmarked specifically for doctoral students' research activities and mobility, consolidating compliance with the institutional 20% minimum.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)**
Internal quality assurance for the doctoral programme is coordinated by the Commission for Evaluation and Quality Assurance at SD-BIO level (CEAC-SD), operating under the institutional Regulation on the Organisation and Functioning of the Quality Evaluation and Assurance Commission and the Procedure on internal evaluation and monitoring of doctoral schools; SD-BIO produces an annual internal evaluation report, publicly available, covering supervisor performance, doctoral-student outcomes and overall programme quality.
- ✓ **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**
The organisational component applies its quality-assurance procedures consistently, and the annual internal evaluation reports document, year on year, the impact of these procedures on programme quality.
Quality assurance activities at the doctoral school level focus on monitoring doctoral study programmes, teaching and research activities, doctoral students' support measures and the continuous improvement of educational processes. During the evaluation visit, the panel found that the institutional quality assurance mechanisms are operational and effectively implemented. At the same time, the Quality Manual provides a comprehensive framework for the implementation of quality assurance procedures across the institution. However, unlike the situation reflected in the 2024 activity report, the current composition of the quality assurance structure at the doctoral school level no longer includes a doctoral student representative.
- ✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**
The institution has developed and implemented a comprehensive Quality Manual, providing a coherent institutional framework for the implementation and continuous improvement of quality assurance procedures.
- ✓ **Recommendations**
It is recommended to include a doctoral student representative in the quality assurance structure at the doctoral school level, in accordance with the principles of student participation in institutional quality assurance and decision-making processes.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)**
The institutional Quality Manual and the related procedures (elaboration of documented information; initiation, approval, dissemination and archiving of documented information; Code of University Ethics and Conduct) define a structured circuit through which the opinions of academic staff, students and other stakeholders are taken into account when procedures are implemented.
The doctoral school periodically consults doctoral students, graduates, employers and other relevant stakeholders regarding the development of doctoral study programmes, research activities, curriculum development and cooperation with external partners. Stakeholders' opinions are collected through meetings, student evaluation questionnaires, collaboration agreements and direct consultations. Feedback is considered in the continuous improvement of doctoral education and research activities.

- ✓ **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**
The same consultative mechanism used for drafting documents is also applied to their implementation, ensuring the involvement of the relevant community members. During the evaluation visit, doctoral students, graduates and employers confirmed that they are periodically consulted regarding the development of the doctoral study programmes and the improvement of research activities. However, the evaluation panel found that documentary evidence supporting these consultation meetings (such as minutes of meetings or attendance lists) was not systematically available. Nevertheless, the interviews confirmed that consultation with stakeholders represents an established practice within the doctoral school.
- ✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**
The doctoral school maintains active collaboration agreements with employers and research institutions, facilitating doctoral students' involvement in joint research activities and applied projects.
- ✓ **Recommendations**
It is recommended to systematically document future consultation meetings by preparing meeting minutes, attendance lists or other supporting documents.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)**
The UAIC Ethics Committee operates on the basis of its own Regulation approved by the University Senate acting independently from any other university structure, and prepares annual activity reports and adopts decisions regarding cases falling within its competence. The University has also established structures responsible for research ethics and bioethics, which examine requests for ethical approval of research involving human participants, biological material or other activities requiring ethical assessment. The Ethics Committee prepares annual activity reports and adopts decisions regarding cases falling within its competence.
- ✓ **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**
The evaluation panel found that the Ethics Committee performs its activities independently within the institutional framework. However, several shortcomings were identified regarding the public availability and updating of ethics-related documents. The Regulation available on the university website dates from 2021 and has not yet been updated in accordance with the current legal framework. In addition, the composition of the Research Ethics Subcommittee is not published, the institutional organisation regarding the coexistence of the Research Ethics Subcommittee and the faculty bioethics committees requires further clarification, and the decisions adopted by the

Ethics Committee for 2025 and 2026 were not available on the website at the time of the evaluation visit. It was also noted that the decisions published for 2024 do not ensure anonymisation of complainants' personal data.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

N/A

✓ Recommendations

Update the Regulation of the Ethics Committee in accordance with the current legal framework and the University Charter.

Publish the current composition of the Research Ethics Subcommittee and clarify its relationship with the faculty bioethics committees.

Publish the Ethics Committee decisions adopted in 2025 and 2026, ensuring full compliance with personal data protection requirements.

Ensure the complete anonymisation of the Ethics Committee decisions published on the university website.

Improve the visibility of the Ethics Committee section on the university website and publish all mandatory information in accordance with the applicable legislation.

It is recommended to clarify the position and role of the Bioethics Commission within the university's ethics framework and to define its functional relationship with the Research Ethics Subcommittee, including their respective responsibilities and mechanisms for collaboration.

The indicator is: partially 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)

SD-BIO applies the Regulation on the Initiation, Approval, Monitoring and Periodic Evaluation of the Doctoral Study Programme, supported by a dedicated Committee for the Elaboration/Revision of the Curriculum Plan, and the institutional Procedure for the Evaluation and Internal Monitoring of Doctoral Schools is consistently applied at IOSUD-UAIC level. These procedures are implemented within the doctoral school in accordance with the institutional regulatory framework. The curriculum and course syllabi are periodically reviewed, while quality assurance activities are reflected in the reports prepared at the institutional level. The doctoral school regularly reviews the organisation of doctoral studies, the curriculum and the procedures applicable to doctoral education.

✓ 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

Procedures are systematically applied to the initiation, monitoring and periodic revision of the Biology doctoral programme, with documented impact on quality assurance (e.g. the periodic curriculum revisions and the annual internal evaluation reports).

The evaluation panel found that the procedures for monitoring and periodically reviewing the doctoral study programme are consistently implemented. During the evaluation visit, ongoing revisions of the curriculum and course syllabi were noted, including the integration of learning outcomes throughout the curriculum.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

N/A

- ✓ Recommendations
- None

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER) SD-BIO applies an internal procedure for the analysis and approval of proposals concerning the doctoral programme's topics and of research themes proposed by supervisors, and the IER documents periodic consultation of community members and, for some procedures, of external stakeholders. Stakeholders participate in consultations regarding doctoral education, research activities, curriculum development and cooperation with external institutions. Employers contribute to research projects, doctoral supervision activities and practical collaboration through partnership agreements.
✓	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 Community members, including supervisors and doctoral students, are involved in implementing the relevant procedures, contributing to the transparency and relevance of the programme. The evaluation panel confirmed, through meetings with employers, academic staff and doctoral students, that stakeholders are actively involved in the development of the doctoral school and maintain continuous collaboration with the institution. Employers confirmed their participation in research partnerships and doctoral activities and provided feedback regarding the competences expected from graduates.
✓	Aspects that constitute best practice examples Active involvement of doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, and management structures in quality assurance processes.
✓	Recommendations None

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER) Teaching staff are evaluated by doctoral students in accordance with the institutional methodology for student evaluation of teaching activities. The evaluation is carried out periodically using a questionnaire completed by doctoral students, and the results are communicated to the teaching staff upon request. The evaluation process currently addresses the overall teaching activity rather than the performance of individual courses or teaching staff members.

- ✓ 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

The organisational component analyses the results of student evaluations of teaching staff in a structured and recurrent manner, in line with institutional procedures.

The evaluation panel found that the doctoral school applies the institutional procedure for student evaluation of teaching activities. However, the evaluation questionnaire assesses the teaching process as a whole and does not allow the separate evaluation of each discipline or each teaching staff member involved in doctoral education. Consequently, individual performance cannot be analysed and statistical results cannot be generated.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

N/A
- ✓ Recommendations

Revise the evaluation procedure so that doctoral students evaluate each course and each teaching staff member individually and publish aggregated (anonymised) results of the student-evaluation process.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER) The institutional Directorate for Digital Communications and IT manages a set of interconnected applications (eSIMS, BURSE, STUDENTS, RNO, GS, among others) used to collect and analyse data relevant to quality assurance, and a dedicated Quality Management platform for self-evaluation files is currently being implemented. The institution systematically collects and analyses data regarding the evaluation of teaching activities by doctoral students, the academic progress of doctoral students, research activities and scientific output, graduate employability, employer feedback, academic mobility, educational resources and research infrastructure. The collected data are used by the institutional quality assurance structures to prepare quality assurance reports and to support the continuous improvement of doctoral education.
✓	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 Data relevant to internal quality assurance is systematically collected and analysed through institutional systems, supporting the doctoral programme's monitoring needs. The evaluation panel found that the university has functional institutional databases and information systems supporting quality assurance activities. Relevant academic and administrative data are systematically collected and analysed through institutional procedures and are used to support evidence-based decision-making and the continuous improvement of doctoral education and research activities.
✓	Aspects that constitute best practice examples Online access to academic and administrative information for students and staff.
✓	Recommendations None.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER) Information of public interest concerning the doctoral programme (supervisor competences, defended theses and reports, curriculum plans, regulations, admission information, activity reports) is published on the SD-BIO and Faculty of Biology websites, complemented by university-wide publication of official documents, legislation, regulations and activity/evaluation reports.
✓	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 The evaluation panel found that the institution ensures public access to most information relevant to doctoral studies. However, several documents of interest for doctoral students were not easily accessible or were missing from the dedicated webpages at the time of the evaluation visit, including the study contract, which was available only within the ARACIS evaluation documentation.
✓	Aspects that constitute best practice examples Publication of diverse information resources supporting doctoral students' orientation and access to institutional procedures.
✓	Recommendations It is recommended to publish the study contract and other documents of interest for doctoral students in the dedicated doctoral school section of the faculty and university website. Regular updating of academic and administrative documents related to doctoral activities.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER) The University Charter, Senate and Council regulations, strategic and operational plans, and minutes of relevant decision-making bodies (where applicable) are publicly available, and SD-BIO publishes its own regulatory and procedural documents online. Relevant information regarding the organisation and functioning of the doctoral school is available through the official university website and the doctoral school webpage. Institutional decisions and regulations are communicated through the university website and other institutional communication channels.
✓	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 Decision-making processes relevant to the doctoral domain are conducted transparently and the underlying documents are accessible to the academic community and the public. However, the evaluation panel found that, although the institution generally ensures transparent decision-making, certain documents of public interest were not publicly

available at the time of the evaluation visit, including documents related to the Ethics Committee, as detailed under Indicator I.P.C.2.2.2.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

Publication of doctoral-related information through dedicated SD-BIO communication channels.

✓ **Recommendations**

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

SD-BIO prepared and submitted its Internal Evaluation Report for the present maintaining-accreditation procedure following the institutional timeline (November 2025–February 2026), in continuation of the previous 2021 external evaluation (Maintaining Accreditation) and the 2024 intermediate (follow-up) evaluation, both of which were duly completed.

The institution and the doctoral school implement the procedures required for external quality assurance in accordance with the applicable legislation and the methodologies established by ARACIS.

✓ **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**

The organisational component consistently carries out the procedures required for participating in external quality-evaluation processes, as provided by the law.

The evaluation panel found that the doctoral school actively participates in the external quality assurance process and has prepared the documentation required for the external evaluation in accordance with the applicable ARACIS methodology. The academic staff and the management of the doctoral school are actively involved in implementing the external evaluation procedures and in addressing the observations formulated during previous evaluations.

✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples**

Existence of a dedicated administrative structure for quality assurance, with clearly defined responsibilities.

✓ **Recommendations**

None

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

✓ Strengths:		Weaknesses:
✓ Highly qualified PhD-supervisor body with strong national and international scientific	INTERNAL FACTORS ⬆	✓ Continued reliance on public funding , only partially offset by an increasing share of

recognition (11 supervisors, all exceeding CNATDCU minimal habilitation standards, several well above 100%), with strong international visibility through Web of Science publications. ✓ Excellent and diversified research infrastructure (8 specialised laboratories, modern instrumentation, research centres, high-performance computing facilities, valuable biological collections, library and digital-database access), covering all specialisations of the domain. ✓ Well-structured doctoral training, combining advanced courses, individual research, regular progress monitoring, and effective academic supervision. ✓ Strong involvement of doctoral students in national and international research projects, resulting in scientific publications and conference participation. ✓ Consistent doctoral output: 28 theses defended in 2021–2025 and a low (~3%) withdrawal rate. ✓ Sustained internationalisation: international experts in 10 guidance/defence committees, 15 outgoing student mobilities, 12	competitive grants. ✓ Limited disciplinary diversification, with very low staff turnover in some research directions (e.g., plant physiology relying largely on one emeritus supervisor). ✓ Uneven internationalisation of research outputs among doctoral supervisors, and relatively limited participation of doctoral students in long-term international research mobility programmes, given the institution's existing potential. ✓ Still relatively informal tracking of staff professional-development activities. ✓ Lack of an integrated, real-time monitoring platform for quality assurance indicators, including the absence of a publicly accessible dashboard presenting key doctoral quality indicators. ✓ Incomplete documentation and traceability of the implementation process for recommendations resulting from previous external evaluations, even though these recommendations have been implemented.
--	---

lectures by invited foreign experts, and a new European Doctorate methodology (2026). ✓ Diversified funding for doctoral research, with an increasing share specifically allocated to students' research and mobility. ✓ A functional and periodically reviewed quality-assurance system, at both institutional and domain-specific level (CEAC-SD, annual internal evaluation reports), supporting the continuous improvement of the doctoral programme.		
SWOT analysis		
Opportunities: ✓ Increasing access to European and national non-reimbursable funding, supporting the continuous modernisation of research infrastructure and doctoral research/training. ✓ Growing demand for interdisciplinary expertise in life sciences, health and environmental research. ✓ Enhancing international visibility and cooperation, through high-quality scientific publications, expanding international partnerships, strengthening European doctoral networks, promoting joint doctoral programmes and	↕ EXTERNAL FACTORS	Threats: ✓ Demographic decline reducing the pool of eligible master's graduates. ✓ Intensifying competition from other doctoral schools, both national and international, for the most promising candidates, coupled with the migration of early-career researchers toward better-funded international centres (brain drain). ✓ Possible fluctuations in public funding for doctoral studies and research, and dependence on competitive projects to sustain research activities and mobility.

international agreements, and extending virtual and blended mobility opportunities at doctoral level. ✓ The new European Doctorate methodology and PNRR-funded digitalisation projects (eUAIC), opening further opportunities for internationalisation and administrative simplification. ✓ Achieving full digitalisation of academic management and quality assurance processes, through integrated doctoral monitoring platforms and advanced real-time feedback mechanisms for doctoral students and graduates. ✓ Strengthening innovation ecosystems and technology transfer.		✓ Frequent legislative changes affecting the stability of doctoral-study regulations. ✓ High administrative workload for teaching staff and doctoral supervisors, with a risk of fragmentation of research activities. ✓ External pressure to increase performance indicators without corresponding growth in available resources.
--	--	--

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	None.

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
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	Continuing to monitor the effectiveness of stakeholder consultation mechanisms and integrating feedback into institutional decision-making processes
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	Continuing to planned renewal/extension of laboratory equipment, in line with the modernisation already initiated. Maintenance and use of valuable scientific collections as resources for research and doctoral training activities.
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	None.
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	None.
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	Developing an annual training plan specifically for SD-BIO staff, so that professional development activities can be monitored and reported in a more systematic manner. It is recommended to strengthen cooperation with European universities through formal agreements that facilitate doctoral internships and joint academic activities.
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	None.
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	Complete and roll out the Quality Management platform currently under implementation, to further streamline the preparation of self-evaluation files.
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	F	Publication on the SD-BIO website of the doctoral curriculum, clearly structured for the entire 4-year study period, highlighting the distribution of the 240 ECTS credits allocated to the doctoral programme among advanced

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	experiences, which, together, lead to a higher education qualification.		training activities, individual research, practical activities, and scientific dissemination.
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	Inclusion, in all course syllabi within the doctoral programme curriculum, of the intended learning outcomes, aligned with the learning outcomes corresponding to NQF Level 8, EQF descriptors, and relevant occupational profiles from the ESCO classification. Update the bibliography included in the course descriptions to reflect recent scientific literature and current developments in the field of Biology.
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	None.
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	Increase the number of longer-term mobility opportunities and participation in international mobility and knowledge-exchange programmes should be increased to support the development of research skills and international experience.
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	None.
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	Complete and roll out the Quality Management platform currently under implementation, to further streamline the preparation of self-evaluation files.
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	Define and include learning outcomes in all course descriptions, ensuring their alignment with the program objectives, course content, and assessment methods of the doctoral study program.
16.	I.P.B.5.1.2 Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	None.
17.	I.P.B.7.1.1 The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	Further develop an integrated digital admission and evaluation system to improve efficiency, transparency, and process traceability.

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
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	None.
19.	I.P.B.7.2.1 The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	Development of an integrated digital system for monitoring doctoral pathways, to support the real-time tracking of scientific progress.
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	Continue to expand the network of international partner institutions and consider setting indicative annual targets for outgoing and incoming mobility. In line with the UAIC International Cooperation Strategy, efforts should also be made to attract a higher number of international students.
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	None.
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	Continue to increase, as planned for 2026, the share of the per-student budget allocation earmarked specifically for doctoral students' research activities and mobility, consolidating compliance with the institutional 20% minimum.
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	It is recommended to include a doctoral student representative in the quality assurance structure at the doctoral school level, in accordance with the principles of student participation in institutional quality assurance and decision-making processes.
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	It is recommended to systematically document future consultation meetings by preparing meeting minutes, attendance lists or other supporting documents.
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	PF	Update the Regulation of the Ethics Committee in accordance with the current legal framework and the University Charter.

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	from any other structure or person in the higher education institution.		Publish the current composition of the Research Ethics Subcommittee and clarify its relationship with the faculty bioethics committees. Publish the Ethics Committee decisions adopted in 2025 and 2026, ensuring full compliance with personal data protection requirements. Ensure the complete anonymisation of the Ethics Committee decisions published on the university website. Improve the visibility of the Ethics Committee section on the university website and publish all mandatory information in accordance with the applicable legislation. It is recommended to clarify the position and role of the Bioethics Commission within the university's ethics framework and to define its functional relationship with the Research Ethics Subcommittee, including their respective responsibilities and mechanisms for collaboration.
26.	I.P.C.3.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	None.
27.	I.P.C.3.1.2 Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	F	
28.	I.P.C.4.1.1 The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	F	Revise the evaluation procedure so that doctoral students evaluate each course and each teaching staff member individually and publish aggregated (anonymised) results of the student-evaluation process.
29.	I.P.C.5.1.1 The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	F	None.
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	It is recommended to publish the study contract and other documents of interest for doctoral students in the dedicated doctoral school section of the faculty and university website. Regular updating of academic and administrative documents related to doctoral activities.
31.	I.P.C.6.1.2 The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
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	None.

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfillment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity	8		
Domain B. Educational efficacy	14		
Domain C. Quality management	9	1	
Total	31	1	

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.

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.

The evaluation panel finds that the Doctoral Study Domain Biology, organised within SD-BIO/IOSUD-UAIC, has a robust institutional framework, an adequately qualified and internationally visible body of PhD supervisors, a well-equipped research infrastructure, and a doctoral programme that is appropriately structured around transferable credits and centred on the doctoral student, with consistent verification of learning outcomes through staged research reports and public thesis defence. The domain has implemented the recommendations formulated at the previous external evaluation (2021) and confirmed in the 2024 intermediate evaluation, notably by increasing the share of dedicated research/mobility funding for doctoral students, by habilitating and affiliating new PhD supervisors, by increasing international mobility and the involvement of international experts in committees, and by sustaining a high level of scientific productivity.

Of the 32 performance indicators applicable to the procedure for maintaining accreditation, 31 were assessed as fulfilled; one was assessed as partially fulfilled, and none unfulfilled. Consequently, none of the conditions for a finding of non-fulfilment of the standards, as set out in Art. 63 para. (3) of the Methodology, are met. Decision proposed: Maintaining Accreditation (MAC) of the Doctoral Study Domain Biology within SD-BIO/IOSUD-UAIC.

Propose and substantiate a decision.

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

Maintaining accreditation (MAC);



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.

Schedule of the on-site visit. List of documents reviewed (Internal Evaluation Report and annexes: staff schedule 2025–2026, curriculum plan 2026–2030, proposed discipline sheets 2026–2027, doctoral-research funding annex; institutional and SD-BIO regulations referenced in the IER; previous ARACIS external evaluation report (2021) and intermediate progress evaluation report (2024).



Calendarul vizitei de evaluare externă a calității
domeniului de studii universitare de doctorat/ The timetable for the evaluation of the external quality evaluation visit
for the doctoral university study domain

Instituția de învățământ superior/Organizația furnizoare de educație/ Higher Education Institution / Education Provider Organization: **Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași**

Școala doctorală/ Doctoral School: **Școala Doctorală de Biologie / Doctoral School of Biology**

Domeniul de doctorat/ Doctoral Domain: **BIOLOGIE / BIOLOGY**

Obiectivul evaluării externe/ The objective of the external evaluation: (*autorizare de funcționare provizorie/acreditare/menținerea acreditării domeniului de doctorat*): **Menținerea acreditării domeniului de doctorat**

Perioada vizitei de evaluare/ The evaluation period: **6 – 7 iulie 2026**

Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/Evaluation panel:

Reprezentantul ÎÎS/OFE:

Nr./No.	Numele și prenumele/ Last Name and First Name	Calitatea/Team role
2.	ZĂRNESCU OTILIA	<i>Membru - Cadru didactic RNE</i>
3.	DUCA MARIA	<i>Membru - Evaluator internațional RNE-I</i>
4.	MALAIRĂU VICTOR	<i>Membru - Student doctorand RNE-S</i>

Nr./No.	Numele și prenumele/ Last Name and First Name	Calitatea/Team role
1.	BEJENARU LUMINIA	<i>Persoană de contact/Contact person</i>

Intervalul orar/ <i>Hour</i>	Activități de evaluare/ <i>Evaluation activities</i>	Participanți/ <i>Participants</i>	Locație/ <i>Location</i> /Listă participanți/ <i>List of Participants</i>
Luni/ <i>Monday</i> , 6.07.2026			
9:00 - 9:30	Discuții tehnice în cadrul comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității/ <i>Technical discussions within the expert committee for external quality evaluation</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași
9:30 -10:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu reprezentanții conducerii componentei organizatorice/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the representatives of the management of the organisational component</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai conducerii componentei organizatorice aferente domeniului de studii de doctorat evaluat/ <i>Representatives of the management of the organisational component</i> - Persoana de contact/ <i>Contact person</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - Decan - Director SD-BIO
10:20-10:30	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
10:30-11:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți evaluatori în evaluarea externă a calității cu echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă (REI)/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the team that has drafted the internal evaluation report</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Echipa care a realizat REI/ <i>Team that has drafted the IER</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - Director SD-BIO - membru CSD, SD-BIO - membru SD-BIO - secretar SD-BIO
11:20-11:30	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
11:30-12:30	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu personalul didactic implicat în activitățile din cadrul DSUD/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the teaching staff involved in the activities within the DSUD</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Cadre didactice conducători de doctorat/ <i>Teaching staff who are PhD supervisors</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - membru SD-BIO - membru SD-BIO - membru SD-BIO - membru SD-BIO

Intervalul orar/ <i>Hour</i>	Activități de evaluare/ <i>Evaluation activities</i>	Participanți/ <i>Participants</i>	Locație/ <i>Location</i> /Listă participanți/ <i>List of Participants</i>
			- CS I dr. Alin Stelian Ciobîcă – membru SD-BIO
12:30-13:30	Pauză de prânz/ <i>Lunch</i>		
13:30-14:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare / <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the staff in charge with the research centres/laboratories</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare/ <i>Staff in charge with research centres/laboratories</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași LLista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - reprezentat grup <i>BioActive</i> - responsabil grup <i>Genetică Moleculară și Evolutivă</i> - responsabil grup <i>Ecotoxicologie si comportament animal</i> - reprezentant grup <i>CERNESIM</i> - responsabil grup <i>Bioarheologie</i> - reprezentant grup <i>Diversitatea nevertebratelor si Filogenetică</i>
14:20-14:30	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
14:30-15:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ <i>Representatives of quality assurance organisational structures</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - Director SD BIO (coordonator comisie CEAC-SD BIO) - (membru comisie CEAC-SD BIO) - (membru comisie CEAC-SD BIO)

Intervalul orar/ <i>Hour</i>	Activități de evaluare/ <i>Evaluation activities</i>	Participanți/ <i>Participants</i>	Locație/ <i>Location</i> /Listă participanți/ <i>List of Participants</i>
15:20-15:30	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
15:30-17:30	Vizitarea bazei materiale/ <i>Visiting the material resources</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai instituției sau Academiei Române, după caz/ <i>Representatives of the HEI or the Romanian Academy, as applicable</i>	
17:30-18:30	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu angajatori ai absolvenților DSUD/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with employers¹ of the DSUD alumni</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Angajatori/ <i>Employers</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> Amfiteatru B2, /Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - Șef laborator Institutul Regional de Oncologie Iași, <i>online</i> - Coordonator Centru Avansat de Cercetare-Dezvoltare în Medicina Experimentală , UMF Iași, <i>online</i> - reprezentant Laborator PRAXIS - secretar Consiliu Științific, Institutul de Arheologie Iași, <i>online</i> . - Director Centrul de Cercetari Biologice "Stejarul" Piatra Neamt / INCDSB, <i>online</i> - membru Consiliu Științific, Institutul Național de Cercetare-Dezvoltare „Delta Dunării”, Tulcea, <i>online</i> - Director Departament, Universitatea „Lucian Blaga” Sibiu, <i>online</i>
Marți/ <i>Tuesday</i> , 7.07.2026			
9:00 - 9:30	Întâlnirea tehnică a comisiei de experți evaluatori (Activitate în colaborare pentru clarificarea aspectelor prezentate în REI)/ <i>Technical meeting of the expert evaluation panel</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași

¹ Avoid inviting employers who are also staff of the HEI or members of the Romanian Academy, as applicable.

Intervalul orar/ <i>Hour</i>	Activități de evaluare/ <i>Evaluation activities</i>	Participanți/ <i>Participants</i>	Locație/ <i>Location</i> /Listă participanți/ <i>List of Participants</i>
	<i>(Collaborative activity for clarifying the aspects presented in the Internal Evaluation Report - IER)</i>		
9:30 -10:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ <i>Representatives of quality assurance organisational structures</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - membru comisie CEAC facultate - membru comisie CEAC facultate
10:20-10:30	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
10:30-11:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu membri ai Comisiei de etică universitară/ <i>Meeting of the experts panel with members of the University Ethics Committee</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Membri ai Comisiei de etică universitară/ <i>Members of the University Ethics Committee</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - președinte CEU - secretar CEU
11:20-11:30	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
11:30-12:30	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu studenți ² doctoranzi din cadrul DSUD/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with doctoral students of the DSUD</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Studenți doctoranzi/ <i>Doctoral students</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> Amfiteatru B2, /Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting:</i> - student drd. anul I - student drd. anul I - student drd. anul I - student drd. anul I - student drd. anul I - student drd. anul II

² Nu este obligatorie în cazul autorizării domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat/ It is not mandatory in the case of authorization of doctoral university study domain.

Intervalul orar/ <i>Hour</i>	Activități de evaluare/ <i>Evaluation activities</i>	Participanți/ <i>Participants</i>	Locație/ <i>Location</i> /Listă participanți/ <i>List of Participants</i>
			- student drd. anul II - student drd. anul II - student drd. anul II - student drd. anul IV - student drd. anul V
12:30-13:30	Pauză de prânz/ <i>Lunch</i>		
13:30-14:00	Întâlnire tehnică a comisiei de experți evaluatori/ <i>Technical meeting of the expert evaluation panel</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași
14:00-14:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu absolvenți ^{3,4} ai DSUD/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with alumni⁵ of the DSUD</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Absolvenți ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ <i>Graduates</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> Amfiteatru B2, /Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași
14:50-15:00	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
15:00-15:30	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu reprezentanți ai conducerii componentei organizatorice/persoana de contact/reprezentanți ai	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași

³ Se va evita invitarea absolvenților care sunt angajați ai ÎIS sau ai OFE, după caz.

⁴ Nu este obligatorie în cazul autorizării domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat

⁵ Avoid inviting alumni who are also staff of the HEI or members of the Romanian Academy, as applicable.

Intervalul orar/ <i>Hour</i>	Activități de evaluare/ <i>Evaluation activities</i>	Participanți/ <i>Participants</i>	Locație/ <i>Location</i> /Listă participanți/ <i>List of Participants</i>
	CEAC/reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității ⁶ / <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the organisational component / contact person / representatives of the CEAC / representatives of quality assurance organisational structures</i>	- Reprezentanți ai conducerii / reprezentanți ai CEAC / reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ <i>Representatives of the management / representatives of the CEAC / representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures</i> - Persoana de contact/ <i>Contact person</i>	Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting</i> : - Prorector UAIC pentru resurse umane, managementul calității și activități culturale - reprezentant CEAC UAIC - reprezentant CEAC UAIC
15:30-16:00	Finalizarea activităților de evaluare/ <i>Completion of evaluation activities</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași
16:00-17:00	Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții conducerii ÎS sau a OFE, după caz și ai conducerii componentei organizatorice pentru comunicarea concluziilor procesului de evaluare/ <i>Meeting of the members of the expert evaluators' panel with representatives of the management of the HEI or the EP, as applicable, and management of the organisational component, to communicate the conclusions of the evaluation process</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Reprezentanți ai conducerii și ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ <i>Representatives of the management</i> - Persoana de contact/ <i>Contact person</i>	Sala/Locația/ <i>Room/Location</i> B468/Facultatea de Biologie, UAIC, et. I, Bd. Carol I, 20A, Iași Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ <i>List of participants attending the meeting</i> : - Decan - Director SD-BIO - membru CSUD

⁶ Clarificarea unor aspecte rezultate din activitățile și discuțiile desfășurate pe parcursul efectuării vizitei, dacă se impune