



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 de doctorat, precum și pentru programul pregătitor de limba română pentru cetățenii străini, după caz, cuprinse în anexele nr. 1-13 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 17.09.2026.

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. 286/H/17.09.2026



ANEXA NR. 4

Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 286/H/17.09.2026

Anexa 4.1

DATE DE IDENTIFICARE		
Instituția de învățământ superior/organizația furnizoare de educație	Universitatea „Dunărea de Jos” din Galați	
Școala(ile) doctorală(e)	Științe Biomedicale	
Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD)	Medicină	
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 medicale (CPS_C12) din 10.09.2026 propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV nr. 4602/ 10.09.2026. REE revizuit a fost analizat în ședința CPS_C12 din 14.09.2026, propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV nr. 4620/14.09.2026. Propunerea de decizie a fost analizată de către Departamentul de evaluare Studii Universitare (DESU), opinia DESU fiind consemnată în PV nr. 4655/17.09.2026.		
Gradul de îndeplinire a standardelor și indicatorilor de performanță și motivarea deciziei (se indică cifrele care stau la baza luării deciziei Consiliului ARACIS)		
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: -	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:- N: -
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: -	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.5.1.2, I.P.B.7.1.1, I.P.B.7.1.2, I.P.B.7.2.1, I.P.B.9.1.1, I.P.B.9.2.1 PÎ: I.P.B.5.1.1, I.P.B.8.1.1, N: -
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: -	Î: I.P.C.1.2.1, I.P.C.2.2.2, 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.1.1.1, N: -
Motivarea deciziei		
Consiliul ARACIS în ședința din 17.09.2026 analizează și validează propunerea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității, constatând că din: • 32 indicatori: 29 sunt îndepliniți, 3 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	

The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education



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

Higher Education Institution/Education Provider Organization:	"Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați
Doctoral School:	Biomedical Sciences
Doctoral Domain:	Medicine
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.	Professor Ovidiu FIRA-MLADINESCU	Expert evaluator	
2.	Professor Roxana Octavia CĂRARE	International Expert	
3.	Student Dana Paula PUGHIUC	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

- ✓ the context in which the external evaluation report was drafted (the type of evaluation, the period covered by the evaluation, membership of the external quality experts' panel, etc.);

This report was drafted following the external quality evaluation process initiated by ARACIS to maintain the accreditation of the doctoral study field of Medicine within the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences at "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați.

The on-site visit, which took place from April 28 to 30, 2026, was attended by the following ARACIS experts—part of the team approved via Council Decision (HC) 13/H/15.01.2026 (as amended by 53/H/05.02.2026 and 137/H/22.04.2026) and accepted as such by the requesting institution:

1. Prof. Ovidiu FIRA-MLADINESCU, PhD – RNE expert evaluator,
2. Prof. Roxana Octavia CĂRARE, PhD – international expert,
3. Dana Paula PUGHIUC – PhD student evaluator.

- ✓ description of the higher education institution / Romanian Academy (establishment, evolution, mission, governance, structure, study programmes/domains, external quality evaluation procedures applied);

"Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați (UDJG) is a public higher education institution established in 1948; it has evolved from academic structures with a predominantly technical and pedagogical profile into a comprehensive university comprising 15 faculties and offering a diverse range of study programs at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels. Currently, UDJG has approximately 14,000 students, and doctoral studies are conducted across 19 fields under the supervision of 171 doctoral supervisors.

UDJG's mission is to generate, certify, and transfer knowledge to society through undergraduate and postgraduate education, scientific research, innovation, and technology transfer, thereby contributing to the professional and personal development of students and doctoral candidates and meeting the needs of the socio-economic environment. The institution's activities are grounded in the principles of academic freedom, university autonomy, and academic integrity, and are supported by an institutional quality management system.

University governance is ensured by the Senate, the Administrative Council, and the corresponding academic and administrative structures, in accordance with the University Charter and institutional regulations. Five multidisciplinary doctoral schools operate within the IOSUD-UDJG framework, including the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences, which hosts doctoral studies in the field of Medicine.

UDJG has undergone external institutional evaluations by ARACIS in 2008, 2013, 2019, and 2024, receiving the "High Degree of Confidence" rating on each occasion. The Medicine field within the IOSUD also underwent periodic external evaluation, with the most recent assessment taking place in 2021 and confirming the maintenance of accreditation.

- ✓ general description of the doctoral study domain (why it was established - in the case of a provisional authorisation to operate; evolution and/or changes since the last external quality evaluation procedure - in the case of procedures intended for accreditation or maintaining accreditation, as applicable).

The doctoral study field of Medicine (DSUD-Medicine) is organized within the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences (SDSBM) of "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați and falls under the jurisdiction of CNATDCU

Commission 20 – Medicine. Established in 2019, the SDSBM currently organizes doctoral studies in the fields of Medicine and Pharmacy. The School is governed by a council, and each field is coordinated by an academic staff member with relevant expertise and experience.

The DSUD-Medicine program aims to provide advanced training for highly qualified personnel capable of conducting original scientific research and developing innovative solutions with medical applications. Doctoral training integrates advanced coursework and scientific research, leveraging the university's research infrastructure and access to international scientific databases. Forty-one doctoral supervisors—comprising 29 full-time faculty members and 12 associates—operate within this field, and 204 doctoral students were enrolled between 2020 and 2025.

Since the last external evaluation, the field has seen a strengthening of its human resources and research capacity. Specifically, 18 faculty members have obtained the right to supervise doctorates (habilitation), and 7 doctoral students have earned their doctoral degrees. Doctoral students utilize the infrastructure of the two research centers within the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy and participate in research activities; the results of this work are disseminated through publications and scientific presentations, including in Web of Science-indexed journals. Overall, developments since the last external evaluation highlight the strengthening of human resources and research capacity at DSUD-Medicine.

II. Methods used

- ✓ Analysed documents (internal evaluation report and its annexes; additional documents requested before and during the on-site visit, if any; other documents or data);

As part of the external quality assessment procedure for the bachelor's degree program, the commission conducted a detailed analysis of the Internal Evaluation Report (IER) prepared by the institution, along with the accompanying annexes. Additionally, the institution was requested to upload—and subsequently did upload—to the ARACIS online platform updated and amended documents, as well as new ones, in response to findings made by the commission during both the preliminary stage and the on-site visit.

- ✓ On-site visit (general list of visited locations and categories of persons with whom debates have been organised);

During the external evaluation visit, the main structures and spaces relevant to the conduct of doctoral studies in the field of Medicine were inspected, including research centers and laboratories, as well as the research infrastructure and facilities supporting medical and scientific activities. Visits were made to research laboratories and spaces in fields such as dermatology, cardiorespiratory studies, histology, surgery and medical imaging, biochemistry, and public health, alongside facilities for toxicology, medical analysis, radiology, microbiology, immunology, nutrition, genetics, dermatology, and pediatrics.

Meetings and discussion sessions were organized with key stakeholders involved in the organization and conduct of doctoral studies: university and IOSUD/Doctoral School leadership; the team responsible for drafting the internal evaluation report; heads of research centers and laboratories; academic staff and doctoral supervisors; representatives of the socio-economic sector and employers; alumni and current doctoral students; and representatives of bodies responsible for quality assurance and university ethics (CEAC and the Ethics Commission).

The discussions addressed aspects regarding the organization and operation of the field, the admission and doctoral training process, research activities, available resources and infrastructure, quality assurance mechanisms, ethics and academic integrity, as well as the experiences and perspectives of the various groups involved in the doctoral program.

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 current situation. “Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați (UDJG) possesses an organizational structure and a management system for the institution and its doctoral studies that are formalized through the University Charter, as well as regulations, methodologies, and procedures approved by the Senate. The IOSUD (Institution Organizing Doctoral Studies) is organized and operates through the CSUD (Council for Doctoral Studies) and doctoral schools, with clearly defined duties and responsibilities. Regulatory documents and information relevant to doctoral students—including details on admission, the conduct of studies, and completion requirements—are publicly available, including in English. Mechanisms are in place for the periodic internal monitoring and evaluation of the activities of doctoral schools, doctoral supervisors, and doctoral students, alongside feedback mechanisms involving these stakeholders. Regulations and procedures are subject to periodic review.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed indicate that UDJG possesses appropriate organizational components for managing doctoral fields and a coherent procedural framework aligned with legislative requirements. The decision-making powers of the IOSUD structures and doctoral schools are clearly defined, and processes regarding admission, doctoral training, evaluation, supervisor affiliation, and study completion are formalized. Student representation in governance structures and the existence of feedback mechanisms support their participation in institutional processes. The systematic publication of relevant documents and information contributes to managerial transparency. Overall, the evidence analyzed supports full compliance with the indicator.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation. Within the DSUD-Medicine, stakeholder involvement in the adoption and revision of methodologies, regulations, and procedures takes place through institutionalized

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

consultation mechanisms. The management structures of the IOSUD and the Doctoral School, doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, and—where applicable—partners from the medical services sector are involved. Consultation is carried out through meetings of the CSUD and SDSBM, thematic meetings with doctoral supervisors and research teams, questionnaires addressed to doctoral students, and consultations with partners involved in research activities, internships, or joint supervision arrangements.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed highlight the existence of institutionalized consultation and feedback mechanisms that enable the participation of various stakeholder categories in decision-making and regulatory review processes. The involvement of doctoral students through feedback mechanisms, as well as the consultation of doctoral supervisors and partners from the medical field, supports the participatory nature of the process.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations.

- Strengthen the traceability of the consultation process by explicitly documenting the observations and proposals made by stakeholders, the manner in which they were analyzed, and the decisions adopted—including by highlighting the resulting changes in the revised methodologies, regulations, and procedures.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Standard S.A.2.1. Material resources

The HEI owns adequate movable and immovable assets to enable it to carry out the study programme/domain.

Indicator I.P.A.2.1.1	The HEI legally owns venues for the related education, research and administrative processes, as well as for services for students, doctoral students and trainees, thus providing an enabling environment for living and studying, including for disabled persons. Optimal venues are also provided for activities of the staff. Such venues are adequately equipped.
---------------------------------	--

Presentation of the current situation. UDJG possesses adequate facilities for conducting teaching and research activities, including teaching spaces, laboratories, research centers, a library, and amenities for students and staff. The Doctoral School of Medicine (DSUD-Medicine) has its own teaching and research spaces and enjoys access to the university's research center infrastructure and the clinical facilities of partner hospitals, under collaboration agreements. Doctoral students are provided with access to research infrastructure, bibliographic resources, and international databases, including remote access. Facilities for persons with disabilities are also provided.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed highlight the existence of infrastructure suited to the specific needs of the field of Medicine, enabling the teaching, experimental, and clinical activities outlined in the doctoral programs. Doctoral students' access to laboratories and research centers, as well as to the clinical infrastructure of partner hospitals, is a key factor in conducting applied doctoral research. Access to scientific literature and international databases supports literature reviews and research activities. Student life facilities and accessibility measures complement the conditions necessary for an environment conducive to study and research. Overall, the material resources and the arrangements for accessing them meet the requirements of the doctoral field of Medicine.

Examples of good practice. Notable examples include the integration of university research infrastructure with the clinical infrastructure of partner hospitals and the provision of doctoral student access to bibliographic resources and international databases, including remote access.

Recommendations: None.

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 current situation. UDJG manages, maintains, and modernizes its movable and immovable assets through administrative and specialized structures, in accordance with institutional procedures. Repair, maintenance, and modernization works are carried out periodically, while equipment and other movable assets are inventoried, maintained, and replaced as needed. Measures regarding occupational health and safety and accident prevention are also in place.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed and the committee's findings indicate that UDJG possesses functional mechanisms for the maintenance and management of its material resources, ensuring appropriate conditions for teaching, research, and work activities. At the same time, regarding the field of Medicine, there is a need for more extensive and diversified development of research infrastructure, going beyond the acquisition of specific pieces of equipment. Relevant in this regard are the need to develop an animal facility (bio-base) and to strengthen infrastructure for morphopathology and biochemistry. While these aspects represent areas for the further development of material resources, the management and maintenance mechanisms are, overall, adequate.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendation.

- Develop and implement a phased plan to diversify and expand the research infrastructure of the DSUD-Medicine (Doctoral School), prioritizing the animal facility, morphopathology, and biochemistry, aligned with doctoral research directions and the field's development needs.

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 current situation. DSUD-Medicine has 41 doctoral supervisors, of which 29 are full-time and 12 are associate. The disciplines in the advanced training program are supported by teaching staff with expertise corresponding to the field taught. The human resource involved in the doctoral activity is, overall, sufficient for the program to be carried out.

Analysis of the current situation. Although according to the analyzed documents, all doctoral supervisors meet the minimum standards in force and present a scientific activity with Web of Science indexed publications and international visibility, some aspects regarding the sustainability and future compliance of the human resource should be mentioned. Thus, 21 of the 41 doctoral supervisors have a Hirsch index lower than 10, insufficient compared to the new CNATDCU minimum standards for habilitation, applicable starting with the 2026–2027 academic year. Also, the high share of associate directors (12 out of 41) and the fact that they carry out their main activity in other university centers require careful monitoring of compliance with the legal conditions regarding doctoral coordination.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendation.

- Elaboration of a plan for the development and consolidation of human resources, in order to ensure the sustainability of DSUD-Medicine by reporting to the new CNATDCU standards.
- Continuously verifying and monitoring the status of affiliated doctoral supervisors and strictly adhering to the legal provision stating that a doctoral supervisor may not simultaneously supervise doctoral students at more than one IOSUD, with the exception of joint supervisions (cotutelle).

The indicator is: fulfilled .

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

Presentation of the current situation. UDJG provides the institutional framework for the professional and personal development of teaching, research, and administrative staff through continuous training, participation in conferences and scientific events, international mobility, and support for academic career advancement. Mechanisms are in place to facilitate staff participation in Erasmus+ mobility programs—including for teaching and training purposes—as well as involvement in research and innovation projects.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed highlight the existence of diverse, institutionalized professional development opportunities relevant to academic and research activities. Support for continuous training, international mobility, and academic career progression contributes to strengthening the competencies of staff involved in the field of Medicine.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation. UDJG regulates the recruitment of teaching and research staff through methodologies approved by the Senate, in accordance with legal provisions. Positions are filled through a competitive selection process based on general and specific criteria, and information regarding the organization and results of these competitions is published on the university's website. The established procedures adhere to the principles of transparency, competitiveness, and non-discrimination.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed highlight the existence of a transparent procedural framework for the recruitment of teaching staff. However, with regard to the doctoral field of Medicine, the commission found an expansion of the area of recruitment/co-optation of tenured teaching staff in the field of Dental Medicine, by considering the two fields as sufficiently close for habilitation and doctoral coordination in Medicine. Although there is a thematic proximity between the two fields, they represent distinct doctoral fields, with specific requirements and standards. Consequently, to ensure the relevance and compliance of human resources, membership in the field of Medicine must be substantiated by relevant scientific skills and results in this field, not exclusively by disciplinary proximity.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations.

- Review the recruitment/engagement practices of doctoral supervisors, so as to explicitly document the relevance of skills and scientific activity for the field of Medicine.

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 current situation. UDJG utilizes a diverse digital infrastructure to support educational, administrative, and research processes, including platforms for teaching activities, human resources management, and academic performance assessment, as well as student management information systems, cloud services, and single sign-on authentication. Access to bibliographic resources and international databases is provided through the university's digital infrastructure.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed highlight a good level of digitalization regarding institutional processes and the existence of a well-developed IT infrastructure that facilitates access to educational and administrative services as well as research resources. However, discussions with students and alumni revealed a need for further digitalization of certain administrative and scientific processes to enhance their efficiency, accessibility, and traceability.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendation.

- Expand and integrate the digitalization of administrative and scientific processes, prioritizing activities specific to doctoral studies.

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 current situation. The advanced training program of the DSUD-Medicine (Doctoral School of Medicine) is structured in alignment with expected learning outcomes and utilizes the transferable credit system. The training plan and course syllabi specify the targeted competencies, skills, responsibilities, and levels of autonomy. The structure includes courses relevant to the transversal training of doctoral students, such as academic writing and research project management, English for biomedical sciences, scientific research ethics, and advanced digital skills. Course syllabi are reviewed and approved at the doctoral school level.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed highlight a coherent structure for the training program, geared towards developing the competencies required for doctoral-level research. Aligning courses with expected learning outcomes and using transferable credits reinforces the program's structured nature and its focus on competency development. Essential transversal competencies for doctoral work are addressed, including scientific communication, research management, research integrity

* 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.

and ethics, and the use of digital tools. The program content is appropriate for qualification level 8 and the field of Medicine, fostering the doctoral student's autonomy and sense of responsibility in research activities.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation. The evaluated institution states that the expected learning outcomes are formulated in accordance with the National Qualifications Framework, the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) – qualification level 8 – and the competencies corresponding to the targeted occupations. These are incorporated into the curriculum and course syllabi through the definition of competencies, objectives, course content, and assessment methods.

Analysis of the current situation. Document analysis reveals that the courses within the doctoral training program aim to develop competencies and skills appropriate for qualification level 8 and the specific nature of research activities in the field of Medicine. The competencies and objectives outlined in the course syllabi are sufficiently clear and relevant to doctoral training, aligning with the qualification profile and its associated professional and research activities. Furthermore, the course content and assessment methods are appropriate for the targeted competencies. Consequently, the competencies developed through the program are found to align with the doctoral qualification level and to be relevant to the corresponding occupations.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation. DSUD-Medicine implements student-centered learning principles through a curriculum structure focused on developing professional and transversal competencies, as well as through mechanisms for individualizing and monitoring the doctoral pathway. An individual doctoral study program is developed for each doctoral student, and the advanced training program offers the option to select courses provided by other doctoral schools within the university. Doctoral students' activities are credited via ECTS and monitored through an annual activity report. Throughout their studies, doctoral students receive guidance and counseling from guidance and academic integrity committees; the work of these committees is documented through meeting minutes and the outcomes of scientific activities.

Analysis of the current situation. The analyzed documents and information highlight the implementation of concrete mechanisms supporting student-centered learning through the individualization of the training pathway, course selection options, progress monitoring, and the provision of guidance throughout the doctoral studies. The work of the guidance committees is supported by evidence regarding the evaluation of scientific reports, the presentation of thesis stages, and publications produced in collaboration with committee members. The ratio of 204 doctoral students to 138 faculty members involved in guidance indicates favorable conditions for an individualized supervision process. The teaching strategies and assessment methods described in the submitted documents foster active participation and the development of the doctoral student's autonomy. However, although the institutional framework allows access to courses and resources from various academic fields, opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration in doctoral training and research activities could be further developed.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations.

- Strengthening interdisciplinary collaboration within the doctoral program by developing training and research activities that foster interaction between doctoral students and supervisors from complementary scientific fields—including through interdisciplinary research projects, joint scientific activities, and the utilization of infrastructure and expertise available across the university's various academic and research units.

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 current situation. UDJG offers doctoral students international academic mobility opportunities through the Erasmus+ program, based on agreements concluded by the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy with partner universities and on institutional procedures regarding the organization, recognition, and validation of mobility periods. The institution notes the possibility of undertaking mobility activities in person, virtually, or in a hybrid format, as well as the existence of an institutional framework for documentation and research stays abroad. According to the data presented, 16 mobility periods were undertaken by doctoral students from the DSUD-Medicine program between 2020 and 2025.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents analyzed highlight the existence of an institutional framework and international partnerships that create genuine opportunities for the academic mobility of doctoral students. The 16 mobility periods reported for DSUD-Medicine serve as direct evidence that these opportunities are being utilized. Furthermore, the procedures regarding the recognition and validation of outcomes achieved during mobility, as well as the provisions concerning documentation/research stays abroad, support the functionality of the mechanism. It should be noted that doctoral students' participation in international scientific conferences—while relevant to the internationalization of training and scientific activity—does not in itself constitute academic mobility and should not be equated with it in the self-assessment procedures for this indicator.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation. UDJG declares that it ensures equitable opportunities for doctoral students by applying principles of inclusion and non-discrimination and by providing equal access to educational and research resources. To allow for the individualization of the doctoral path, provisions are made for flexibility in selecting the research topic and doctoral supervisor, access to diverse educational and scientific resources, participation in scientific activities, and support mechanisms—including guidance and academic integrity committees, counseling, and mentoring.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents and information analyzed highlight the existence of an institutional framework that ensures non-discriminatory access for doctoral students to training activities, educational resources, and research infrastructure, while enabling the individualization of the doctoral path based on their research topics, interests, and aspirations. The ability to choose the research topic and supervisor, combined with guidance throughout the studies, creates the conditions for tailoring the training to the individual profile and potential of the doctoral student. Diverse training resources and methods are available, including scientific activities and digital resources. However, certain elements cited in the self-evaluation report—such as the course on ethics and academic integrity, the absence of dropouts, or periodic program evaluation procedures—relate to other quality dimensions and do not, in themselves, constitute direct evidence regarding equity or adaptation to diverse learning styles and abilities.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation. UDJG provides doctoral students in the DSUD-Medicine program with access to resources and support services tailored to the specific nature of doctoral studies. These include educational and research infrastructure, library and electronic resources, access to international scientific databases and educational platforms, as well as counseling, mentoring, and guidance services. Doctoral students have access to the training activities outlined in the curriculum and may also choose additional courses offered by the doctoral school or other doctoral schools. Measures are in place to ensure infrastructure accessibility for persons with disabilities, alongside forms of individualized support provided through guidance and academic integrity committees.

Analysis of the current situation. The documents and information analyzed highlight the existence of a diverse range of infrastructure and support services appropriate for the level and specific nature of doctoral training in Medicine. Access to bibliographic resources and international databases, research infrastructure, and the ability to tailor the training pathway facilitate learning and research activities. Guidance mechanisms also offer support adapted to the individual needs of doctoral students. Infrastructure accessibility measures and provisions for differentiated educational support address the requirements for the inclusion of students with disabilities. Overall, the available resources and services are appropriate for the field, the doctoral cycle, and training needs.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation. According to the self-evaluation report, the learning outcomes associated with the DSUD-Medicine program are presented as clearly and coherently defined in the course descriptions—in terms of knowledge, skills, and competencies, including aspects of responsibility and autonomy. The institution notes the use of modern educational taxonomies and the alignment of learning outcomes with course objectives, the program's mission, the National Qualifications Framework, and ARACIS standards.

Analysis of the current situation. An analysis of the course descriptions submitted to the commission reveals that they appropriately include course objectives, specific competencies, and skills, as well as elements regarding responsibility and autonomy; these are suitable for qualification level 8 and the specific nature of doctoral studies. However, contrary to the statements in the self-evaluation report, the expected learning outcomes are not distinctly highlighted or explicitly formulated in terms of the targeted knowledge, skills, and competencies. In the current structure, the delineation and direct identification of learning outcomes for each course are less clear for both students and teaching staff. This represents a shortcoming in the documentation and presentation of learning outcomes, though it does not diminish the relevance or appropriateness of the competencies and objectives already formulated.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendation:

- Revise course descriptions by introducing a distinct section dedicated to "Expected Learning Outcomes"—explicitly formulated in terms of knowledge, skills, and competencies, and aligned with Qualification Level 8 and current standard requirements—to ensure greater transparency and traceability among learning outcomes, training activities, and assessment.

The indicator is: **partially 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 current situation. The documents analyzed highlight the existence of a system for the continuous and final evaluation of doctoral students' activities, organized in accordance with the curriculum, the individual doctoral study program, and institutional regulations. Throughout the course of study, evaluation is carried out via assignments and projects within advanced training courses, as well as through the periodic presentation and defense of literature review and research reports before the doctoral supervisor and the guidance and academic integrity committee. Progress is also monitored via an annual activity report. Completion of studies entails the evaluation of the doctoral thesis, its public defense, and the completion of validation stages stipulated by applicable legislation.

Analysis of the current situation. The mechanisms described ensure the progressive verification of the acquisition of knowledge, competencies, and skills specific to qualification level 8, through formative assessments and the evaluation of research outcomes. Presenting scientific reports to the guidance committee allows for the systematic assessment of progress and the formulation of recommendations for the continuation of research. The evaluation of the doctoral thesis by competent academic bodies and its public defense constitute the final verification mechanism for the outcomes of doctoral training.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation. The documents analyzed highlight the existence of an institutionally approved methodology for admission to doctoral studies, which establishes the conditions, criteria, and procedures for conducting the admission competition. Candidate selection is carried out by evaluating their background and knowledge in the field, their ability to approach research problems, and the innovative nature of the proposed research topic, including through an oral examination. Admission requirements, the schedule, necessary documents, topics, and bibliography are published on the dedicated doctoral admission webpage, in accordance with institutional regulations and timeframes.

Analysis of the current situation. The procedural framework ensures that the admission competition is organized based on pre-established evaluation criteria and methods relevant to the selection of doctoral candidates. The selection criteria allow for the assessment of both academic background and research capacity, as well as the candidate's potential to conduct doctoral research, by evaluating the proposed topic and its innovative nature. Making admission information publicly available in advance supports process transparency and ensures candidates have access to information regarding participation and evaluation requirements.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations.

- Incorporate explicit and transparent criteria regarding the distribution of state-funded places into the regulations for admission to doctoral studies, ensuring the allocation process is predictable and verifiable.

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 current situation. The documents analyzed highlight that admission to doctoral studies is conducted in compliance with the principles of equal opportunities and non-discrimination, as explicitly stipulated in the institutional methodology. Specific support measures are in place for candidates with disabilities, allowing them to compete for specially allocated state-funded places as well as for standard state-funded and fee-paying places. The methodology also provides for an exemption from the application fee and free accommodation for this category of candidates. A Gender Equality Plan, which promotes non-discrimination and equal opportunities, is also implemented at the institutional level.

Analysis of the current situation. The procedural framework and established measures demonstrate the application of equity and equal opportunity principles within the admission process. The provision of state-funded places specifically allocated to candidates with disabilities, combined with financial and social support measures, constitutes a concrete mechanism designed to facilitate their access to doctoral studies. These provisions go beyond a mere statement of principle and provide an institutional framework for non-discriminatory access to the admission competition. Overall, the established procedures and measures meet the indicator's requirements and lay the groundwork for a fair and inclusive admission process.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation: The documents analyzed highlight the existence of a coherent institutional framework regarding the academic path of doctoral students, comprising regulations and procedures that establish the stages and conditions for doctoral studies, from admission to completion. The individual path is regulated by the individual study and research plan—part of the study contract—while academic and scientific progress is periodically monitored through annual activity reports, which are reviewed and approved by the doctoral supervisor and the guidance and academic integrity committee. Provisions also exist for extending the duration of studies, subject to applicable regulations. Information regarding the organization and conduct of doctoral studies is made available to students through regulatory documents and the Doctoral Student Guide.

Analysis of the current situation: The regulatory framework and monitoring mechanisms presented ensure the implementation of regulations concerning the professional activity of doctoral students and allow for the systematic tracking of their individual paths. The use of individual study and research plans and the annual evaluation of activities provide a formalized mechanism for monitoring progress and identifying the steps necessary to continue and complete the studies. The availability of counseling services and forms of academic support complements the institutional mechanisms designed to facilitate the doctoral journey.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation. The documents analyzed highlight the adoption of internationalization as a strategic direction for UDJG and the existence of institutional mechanisms to support international mobility and cooperation. At the level of the DSUD-Medicine (Doctoral School of Medicine), the participation of doctoral students in international scientific events is documented; notably, all 24 doctoral students who completed their studies between 2020 and 2025 attended at least one international conference. Also presented are support measures for international joint doctoral supervisions (cotutelle), the invitation of international experts for academic activities, and UDJG's participation in networks and initiatives with an international dimension.

Analysis of the current situation. The measures and activities presented demonstrate an institutional commitment to internationalization and clearly support the international participation and visibility of the doctoral community. Participation in international scientific events and the involvement of experts from abroad contribute to the dissemination of results and the exchange of academic experience. However, the evidence presented is more substantial regarding mobility and international participation than regarding actual international collaboration in academic and research activities. Forms of sustained international cooperation—such as joint research projects, partnership-based academic activities, publications resulting from international collaborations, or concrete outcomes of international joint supervisions—are insufficiently documented in relation to the indicator's requirements.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendation:

- Establishing and developing active and sustainable forms of international cooperation in academic and research activities through international partnerships, resulting, where appropriate, in joint research projects, co-authored publications, international cotutelle arrangements and joint academic activities, as well as through the systematic documentation of the outcomes of these collaborations.

The indicator is: partially 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 current situation. Within the DSUD-Medicine program, scientific research is integrated into doctoral training through the involvement of doctoral students in research projects, experimental activities, and the critical analysis of specialized literature. Between 2020 and 2025, doctoral supervisors conducted eight research projects involving doctoral students. Research findings are disseminated through scientific publications and presentations at national and international scientific events, including the Scientific Conference of Doctoral Schools.

Analysis of the current situation. Involving doctoral students in scientific research activities and utilizing the resulting findings contributes to the development of advanced research skills, critical thinking, and the ability to interpret and disseminate results. These activities provide concrete opportunities to apply knowledge and research methods, while supporting the achievement of doctoral-level learning outcomes. The evidence presented confirms the integration of inquiry-based learning into the educational process.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation. Research activities within the DSUD-Medicine program are aligned with the program's objectives and thematic areas, involving both doctoral supervisors and doctoral students. Results are disseminated through publications in Web of Science-indexed journals—including those in Q1–Q4 categories—and through presentations at national and international scientific events. Patents and patent applications resulting from research activities are also reported.

Analysis of the current situation. The presented results demonstrate the national and international visibility of research conducted in the field of Medicine, as well as its capitalization through publications, scientific presentations, and outcomes with potential for practical application. The involvement of doctoral students in publishing and disseminating results confirms their integration into research activities. The evidence presented supports the fulfillment of the indicator's requirements.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation

Within the SDSBM, regulations and procedures are implemented for the periodic monitoring and evaluation of the activities of doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, and the study program, as well as the research infrastructure. Internal evaluation is conducted annually, and feedback mechanisms include the evaluation of doctoral supervisors by doctoral students and the evaluation of the doctoral program by students. Reported results indicate a high level of satisfaction among doctoral students and favorable assessments of academic and research activities.

Analysis of the current situation

Coherent and consistently applied mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate the quality of the doctoral program, and evaluation results indicate a high level of satisfaction. However, the documents presented primarily highlight the conduct of evaluation processes and their results; there is insufficient documentation regarding how feedback and evaluation outcomes have led to concrete measures and changes to the program or educational processes, or regarding their impact on quality improvement. Consequently, the requirement to demonstrate impact is only partially met.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations.

- Strengthen the mechanism for tracking improvement measures resulting from periodic evaluations and doctoral student feedback by systematically monitoring questionnaire response rates, recording measures adopted to increase participation (along with responsible parties and implementation deadlines), and subsequently evaluating the effectiveness of these measures.

The indicator is: **partially 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 current situation

UDJG employs mechanisms to consult and involve members of the academic community and other stakeholders in the processes of developing, reviewing, and implementing procedures. Feedback is gathered through consultations within academic and administrative bodies, student surveys, and consultations with employers and partner institutions. Students are represented in governance structures, and periodic satisfaction assessments cover the educational process, services, and university infrastructure.

Analysis of the current situation

Existing institutional mechanisms ensure the participation of key stakeholder groups and provide a framework for incorporating their views into quality assurance processes. The variety of consultation channels—including student representation in governance bodies and direct evaluation of the study program and learning environment—supports the participatory nature of the process. The information provided indicates that the feedback collected is used to revise documents and procedures, thereby demonstrating stakeholder involvement in their implementation.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation. UDJG has a Code of University Ethics and Professional Conduct and a Regulation on the organization and functioning of the University Ethics Commission (CEU), both approved by the University Senate. The CEU has a publicly disclosed composition and operates as an autonomous body responsible for promoting and upholding principles of ethics and academic integrity. The Commission's decisions and annual reports are made public on the university's website. Preventive mechanisms regarding academic integrity are also implemented at the institutional level, including the verification of the originality of scientific output and procedures addressing conflicts of interest, incompatibilities, and the reporting of irregularities.

Analysis of the current situation. The existence of the Senate-approved regulation, an autonomous body with a transparent composition, and the publication of decisions and annual reports demonstrate the institutionalized functioning of the Ethics Commission. Mechanisms for the prevention and verification of academic integrity complement the framework for ensuring university ethics and professional conduct. The evidence presented supports the conclusion that the CEU operates in compliance with the legal framework and exercises its role autonomously from other university structures.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Standard S.C.3.1. Procedures and implementation of procedures

The HEI has procedures for initiating, monitoring, and periodically reviewing the study programmes and domains and the performed activities, and applies them systematically.

Indicator I.P.C.3.1.1	The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.
--	---

Presentation of the current situation. UDJG has regulations in place regarding the initiation, monitoring, and periodic review of study programs, applicable to doctoral studies as well. The internal evaluation of doctoral programs and the activities of doctoral supervisors and doctoral students is conducted annually, based on reports approved by the Senate. At the level of the DSUD-Medicine, the

curriculum, course specifications, allocation of teaching activities, and learning outcomes are periodically monitored, as is the activity of teaching staff, through self-assessment, student evaluation, and evaluation by academic leadership.

Analysis of the current situation. Institutional procedures are applied systematically and ensure the periodic monitoring of the doctoral program's key components. Analyzing the curriculum, course specifications, student results, and teaching staff activity allows for the identification of adjustment needs and provides a basis for interventions regarding the program. Through the periodic nature of the evaluation and the use of the resulting information in the decision-making process, the implemented mechanisms contribute to maintaining and improving the quality of the doctoral study program.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation. Members of the academic community—including teaching staff and students—are involved in the implementation of quality assurance procedures through their participation in bodies responsible for quality evaluation and monitoring, such as the CEAC, CSUD, and the Doctoral School Council. Students also contribute by periodically evaluating teaching activities, doctoral supervisors, and the learning environment; the results are made available to the bodies responsible for quality management.

Analysis of the current situation. The involvement of teaching staff and students is institutionalized and takes place through representation in academic bodies and via periodic feedback mechanisms. These enable the academic community to participate directly in monitoring and evaluating the doctoral program and in quality assurance processes. Consultation mechanisms at the institutional level are mentioned regarding external stakeholders, although their concrete contribution to the implementation of procedures is less explicitly documented. Nevertheless, the evidence presented supports compliance with the indicator's requirements.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation. Student evaluation of teaching staff is conducted periodically using standardized anonymous questionnaires that assess the quality of teaching, competence, clarity of presentation, availability for guidance, and adherence to academic ethics standards. The results are aggregated and analyzed by the bodies responsible for quality assurance and are communicated to the management and the evaluated teaching staff.

Analysis of the current situation. Periodic evaluation provides a systematic mechanism for assessing teaching staff performance from the students' perspective and enables the identification of areas requiring improvement. The analysis of results by the responsible academic bodies and their use to inform measures for enhancing teaching activities demonstrate the effectiveness of the evaluation mechanism.

Through its periodic nature and the use of results within the quality assurance process, the procedure contributes to the monitoring and improvement of teaching activities.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation. UDJG employs a secure, institutionalized IT system to collect and manage data relevant to academic activities and internal quality assurance. Dedicated IT platforms enable the management of information regarding curricula, teaching resources, faculty activity, and the academic progress of students and doctoral candidates. Furthermore, an online evaluation platform facilitates the periodic collection of feedback from students and doctoral candidates concerning the performance of teaching staff and doctoral supervisors, as well as the learning environment. The collected data are analyzed by bodies responsible for quality assurance—including the Quality Assurance and Evaluation Commission (CEAC)—and the findings are reflected in internal evaluation reports that are subsequently approved and published.

Analysis of the current situation. The IT systems in use ensure the systematic collection and organization of data categories essential for monitoring and evaluating the quality of the educational process. Integrating data on academic activity with evaluation results provided by students and doctoral candidates enables evidence-based internal monitoring and evaluation processes. The analysis of data by responsible bodies and their utilization in evaluation reports demonstrate the functionality of the information system and its contribution to internal quality assurance processes. The evidence presented confirms that the indicator requirements are met.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

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 current situation. IOSUD-UDJG ensures the publication of and open access to public-interest information regarding the doctoral study program in the field of Medicine. Information concerning the doctoral school and the doctoral field, program objectives and structure, applicable regulations and procedures, the rights and obligations of doctoral students, and admission requirements is available on the institution's website. Also published are proposed research topics, the list of doctoral supervisors, and information regarding mobility and international collaboration. This information is supplemented by annual reports, admission announcements, and data concerning qualifications and study documents.

Analysis of the current situation. The publicly available information covers the main categories of data necessary to provide accurate and transparent information to candidates, doctoral students, and other

interested parties. The publication of regulations, admission procedures, research topics, and information on doctoral supervisors facilitates access to the essential elements required for choosing and pursuing the doctoral program. The availability of activity reports and information on academic opportunities complements the framework of institutional transparency. The evidence presented supports compliance with the indicator's requirements.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Presentation of the current situation. IOSUD-UDJG ensures transparency in decision-making processes by applying institutional regulations and procedures and by publishing and communicating the decisions of governing bodies, including the Doctoral School Council, the Senate, and the Administrative Board. Decisions regarding the organization of the doctoral program, admission, the evaluation of academic activity, mobility, and other relevant aspects are communicated through official university channels. The decision-making process provides for the participation of members of the academic community and doctoral students, in accordance with the legal framework.

Analysis of the current situation. The institutional mechanisms presented ensure a formal and transparent framework for adopting and communicating decisions regarding doctoral activities. Publishing decisions and using official communication channels allow the academic community and doctoral students to access information about the decisions adopted. The participation of doctoral student representatives in governing bodies contributes to the participatory nature of the decision-making process. The evidence presented supports the existence of functional mechanisms for transparency and access to information regarding the decision-making process, in line with the indicator's requirements.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

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 current situation. The Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences and Medicine (DSUD-Medicine) underwent a periodic external evaluation by ARACIS in 2021, resulting in the confirmation of its continued accreditation. The organization and conduct of external evaluation processes are carried out in accordance with the IOSUD-UDJG Regulations and the applicable methodology, with the process initiated and approved at the level of the Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD). In 2024, IOSUD-UDJG submitted the annual report regarding the periodic evaluation of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences and Medicine, as part of institutional monitoring and external evaluation mechanisms.

Analysis of the current situation. The participation of DSUD-Medicine in the periodic external evaluation and the maintenance of its accreditation confirm compliance with institutional obligations regarding external quality evaluation. The existence of institutionalized procedures and the involvement of competent management structures in initiating and conducting evaluation processes demonstrate the integration of external evaluation into the quality assurance system. The periodic submission of requested documentation complements the monitoring mechanism and demonstrates the institution's willingness to

undergo external evaluation processes in accordance with the law. The evidence presented supports the fulfillment of the indicator's requirements.

Examples of good practice. Not applicable.

Recommendations. None.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths: ✓ Effective collaboration with local organizations and other university faculties ✓ Adherence to ethical regulations and alignment of research with institutional standards ✓ International research competitiveness in the fields of psychiatry, dermatology, toxicology and forensic medicine, and pediatrics ✓ High-performance infrastructure and facilities in the fields of dermatology, pediatrics/genetics, and forensic medicine ✓ Institutional support for participation in congresses and conferences, as well as for the presentation of scientific papers	INTERNAL FACTORS ↑	Weaknesses: ✓ Insufficiently developed interdisciplinary collaboration ✓ Lack of clear demarcation between the fields of Dentistry and General Medicine ✓ Insufficient development of certain fields, such as biochemistry and pathological anatomy ✓ Excessively bureaucratic administrative procedures for doctoral students ✓ Low number of doctoral programs with international involvement ✓ Insufficiently developed infrastructure in morphopathology and biochemistry ✓ Limited opportunities for postdoctoral activities and academic development after completing the doctorate
SWOT analysis		
Opportunities: ✓ Access to European research and development grants ✓ Funding opportunities for research infrastructure	EXTERNAL FACTORS ↓	Threats: ✓ Impact of the geopolitical context on academic and research activities ✓ Diversity of research topics, with variations in

✓ Development of international partnerships and opportunities ✓ Expansion of transdisciplinary collaborations ✓ Development of a biobank/biorepository to support research activities.		the quality of guidance and material resources ✓ Absence of experimental projects involving basic scientific research
--	--	--

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	
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	Strengthening the traceability of the consultation process by explicitly documenting the observations and proposals submitted by stakeholders, the manner in which they were analyzed, and the decisions adopted—including by highlighting the resulting changes to the revised methodologies, regulations, and procedures.
3.	I.P.A.2.1.1 The HEI legally owns venues for the related education, research and administrative processes, as well as for services for students, doctoral students and trainees, thus providing an enabling environment for living and studying, including for disabled persons. Optimal venues are also provided for activities of the staff. Such venues are adequately equipped.	F	
4.	I.P.A.2.2.1 The movable and immovable assets are properly maintained to ensure	F	It is recommended to develop and implement a phased plan for diversifying and developing the

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	optimal conditions for studying, living and research, as well as for work.		research infrastructure of the DSUD-Medicine—prioritizing the biobank, histopathology, and biochemistry—aligned with doctoral research directions and the development needs of the field.
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	Elaboration of a plan for the development and consolidation of human resources, in order to ensure the sustainability of DSUD-Medicine by reporting to the new CNATDCU standards. Continuously verifying and monitoring the status of affiliated doctoral supervisors and strictly adhering to the legal provision stating that a doctoral supervisor may not simultaneously supervise doctoral students at more than one IOSUD, with the exception of joint supervisions (cotutelle).
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	Review the recruitment/engagement practices of doctoral supervisors, so as to explicitly document the relevance of skills and scientific activity for the field of Medicine.
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	Expanding and integrating the digitalization of administrative and scientific processes, prioritizing activities specific to doctoral studies.
DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy			
9.	I.P.B.1.1.1 The study programme is developed and structured according to the expected learning outcomes, and organised based on transferable study credits. It includes all learning, teaching, practical training, research and evaluation experiences, which, together, lead to a higher education qualification.	F	
10.	I.P.B.2.1.2 The expected learning outcomes are correlated with the competences required by those occupations, according to the occupational standards and/or the European Skills, Competences and Occupations (ESCO).	F	
11.	I.P.B.3.1.1 The organisational component ensures implementation of the student-centred	F	Strengthening interdisciplinary collaboration within the doctoral

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	learning in the curriculum and through the teaching strategies used in the learning and teaching activities and experiences.		program by developing training and research activities that foster interaction between doctoral students and supervisors from complementary scientific fields—including through interdisciplinary research projects, joint scientific activities, and the utilization of infrastructure and expertise available across the university's various academic and research structures.
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	
13.	I.P.B.3.2.1 The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students, in line with their potential and aspirations, taking into account the diversity of learning styles and abilities.	F	
14.	I.P.B.4.1.1 The organisational component provides students, including those with special educational needs/disabilities, with access to resources and services designed to support the learning process, adequate for the individual learning needs, the study domain, the study cycle, and the form of organisation of the study programme.	F	
15.	I.P.B.5.1.1 Learning outcomes are adequately described, and they support understanding of the students' and teachers' expectations regarding the content of the subject matters in the curriculum.	PF	Revision of course specifications through the distinct inclusion of a section dedicated to "Expected Learning Outcomes"—explicitly formulated in terms of knowledge, skills, and competencies in alignment with qualification level 8 and current standard requirements—to ensure greater transparency and traceability among learning outcomes, training activities, and assessment.
16.	I.P.B.5.1.2 Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	
17.	I.P.B.7.1.1 The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	Incorporating explicit and transparent criteria into the regulations on admission to doctoral studies regarding the distribution of state-funded places, so that the allocation process is predictable and verifiable.
18.	I.P.B.7.1.2 Admission in higher education study programmes complies with the principles of	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	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.		
19.	I.P.B.7.2.1 The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	
20.	I.P.B.8.1.1 The organisational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.	PF	Establishing and developing active and sustainable forms of international cooperation in academic and research activities through international partnerships, resulting, where appropriate, in joint research projects, co-authored publications, international cotutelle arrangements and joint academic activities, as well as through the systematic documentation of the outcomes of these collaborations.
21.	I.P.B.9.1.1 Learning based on scientific investigation and research results support and are capitalised upon in achieving the learning outcomes envisaged through the study programme.	F	
22.	I.P.B.9.2.1 The results of scientific research are visible at national and international level in that scientific domain, and capitalised upon in an adequate manner.	F	
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.	PF	Establishing a mechanism to track improvement measures resulting from periodic evaluations and doctoral student feedback—by recording the measures adopted, the persons responsible, and implementation deadlines—as well as subsequently evaluating their impact on the doctoral program.
24.	I.P.C.1.2.1 The opinions of the members of its own community and of other stakeholders are taken into account in the procedure implementation process.	F	
25.	I.P.C.2.2.2. The academic ethics commission operates based on the regulation approved by the University Senate, and performs actions that are compliant with the law, independently from any other structure or person in the higher education institution.	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
26.	I.P.C.3.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	
27.	I.P.C.3.1.2 Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	F	
28.	I.P.C.4.1.1 The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	F	
29.	I.P.C.5.1.1 The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	F	
30.	I.P.C.6.1.1 The organisational component ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.	F	
31.	I.P.C.6.1.2 The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	
32.	I.P.C.8.1.1 The organisational component carries out the procedures pertaining to the external quality evaluation process, aiming to organise the evaluated study programme as provided by the law.	F	

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfillment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity	8	0	0
Domain B. Educational efficacy	12	2	0
Domain C. Quality management	9	1	0
Total	29	3	0

VI. Conclusions

The evaluation of the doctoral study field of Medicine within the IOSUD – "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați confirms the existence of the institutional framework, resources, and mechanisms necessary for conducting the doctoral program and ensuring its quality, in compliance with applicable requirements.

Some vulnerabilities were identified in the explicit formulation of expected learning outcomes in subject sheets, in the development of international collaboration in academic and research activity, as well as in the monitoring of improvement measures based on student feedback. A series of measures are also needed to ensure the sustainability of the material base and human resources, to ensure the traceability of documents, as well as the explicit justification of decisions related to the organization, conduct and quality assurance of doctoral studies. However, overall, these aspects do not significantly affect the field's ability to ensure the proper conduct of doctoral studies.



Based on the documents analysed, the information provided during the on-site visit, and the findings of the evaluation committee, we recommend **maintaining the accreditation of the Doctoral Study Domain in Medicine organised within the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences of “Dunărea de Jos” University of Galați.**

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.



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>
Marți/ <i>Tuesday</i> , 28.04.2026			
18:00-19:00	Întâlnirea tehnică a comisiei de experți evaluatori (Activitate în colaborare pentru clarificarea aspectelor prezentate în REI)/ <i>Technical meeting of the expert evaluation panel (Collaborative activity for clarifying the aspects presented in the Internal Evaluation Report - IER)</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i>	Sala de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
Miercuri/ <i>Wednesday</i> , 29.04.2026			
09:00-09:50	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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
09:50-10:00	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
10:00-10:50	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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
10:50-11:00	Pauză/ <i>Break</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>
11:00-11:50	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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
11:50-12:00-	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
12:00 - 13:30	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>	Spitalul Clinic Județean de Urgență „Sf. Apostol Andrei” Galați • Serviciul de Medicină Legală • Laborator Toxicologie Spitalul Clinic de Urgență pentru Copii • Laborator Integrat de Chirurgie și Imagistică Medicală • Laboratorul Clinic de Analize Medicale Spitalul Clinic de Boli Infecțioase „ Sf. Cuvioasa Parascheva" Galați • Centrul Integrat Multidisciplinar pentru Cercetare de Interfață Dermatologică
13:30 - 14:00	Pauză de prânz/ <i>Lunch</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>
14:00 - 14:50	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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
14:50-15:00	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
15:00-15:50	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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
15:50-16:00	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
16:00-16:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu absolvenți ^{2,3} ai DSUD/ <i>Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with alumni⁴ of the DSUD</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i> - Absolvenți ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ <i>Graduates</i>	Sala de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
16:50-17:00	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		

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

² Se va evita invitarea absolvenților care sunt angajați ai ÎIS sau ai OFE, după caz.

³ Nu este obligatorie în cazul autorizării domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat

⁴ 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>
17:00-17:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu studenți ⁵ 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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
17:50-18:00-	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
18:00-19:00	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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
Joi/ Thursday, 30.04.2026			
09:00 - 09:50	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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
09:50 - 10:00	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
10:00 - 10:50	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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF

⁵ 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>
10:50-11:00	Pauză/ <i>Break</i>		
11:00-12:00	Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții conducerii ÎIS sau a OFE, după caz și ai conducerii componentei organizatorice pentru comunicarea concluziilor preliminare ale 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 de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF
12:00-13:00	Întâlnire tehnică a comisiei de experți evaluatori de finalizare a vizitei de evaluare/ <i>Technical meeting of the expert evaluation panel to conclude the evaluation visit</i>	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ <i>Panel members</i>	Sala de conferințe nr. 1.1, corpul MD, FMF