HOTĂRÂRE

privind validarea rezultatelor procedurilor de evaluare externă a calității educației

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

- **evaluarea externă a calităţii şi validarea rezultatelor cuprinse în Rapoartele de evaluare externă:** art. 223-226, art. 229-230 şi art. 249 alin. (1) lit. f), g) şi h) din Legea nr. 199/2023 a învățământului superior nr. 199/2023, cu modificările şi completările ulterioare, denumită în continuare Legea, precum şi în Metodologia de evaluare externă a calității educației în învățământul superior, aprobată prin Hotărârea Guvernului nr. 962/2024, cu modificările şi completările ulterioare, denumită în continuare Metodologia;

- **autorizarea** de funcţionare provizorie **pentru programele de studii universitare din ciclul I de licenţă:** art. 235 alin. (1) lit. a) şi lit. b) pct. (ii), alin. (2)-(5) şi art. 236 alin. (1)-(2) din Lege;

art. 27, art. 29 şi art. 32-33, coroborate cu art. 59, art. 62 şi art. 63 din Metodologie;

- **autorizarea pentru domeniile de studii universitare din ciclul II de masterat:** art. 235 alin. (1) lit. a) şi lit. b) pct. (iii), alin. (2)-(5) şi art. 236 alin. (1)-(2) din Lege; art. 27-29 şi art. 34-35, coroborate cu art. 59, art. 62 şi 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) şi art. 236 alin. (1) şi (3) din Lege; art. 27-29 şi art. 37-38, coroborate cu art. 59, art. 62 şi art. 63 din Metodologie;

- **acreditarea pentru programele de studii universitare din ciclul I de licenţă:** art. 239 alin. (1) lit. b) şi alin. (6)-(7), art. 240 alin. (1) din Lege; art. 39-40 şi art. 42, coroborate cu art. 60, art. 62 şi art. 63 din Metodologie;

- **acreditarea pentru domeniile de studii universitare din ciclul II de masterat:** art. 239 alin. (3) şi alin. (6)-(7), art. 240 alin. (1) din Lege; art. 39-40 şi art. 43-44, coroborate cu art. 60, art. 62 şi art. 63 din Metodologie;

- **acreditarea pentru domeniile de studii universitare din ciclul III de doctorat:** art. 239 alin. (4) şi alin. (6)-(7), art. 240 alin. (2) din Lege; art. 39-40 şi art. 46-47, coroborate cu art. 60, art. 62 şi art. 63 din Metodologie;

- **analiza şi validarea în vederea verificării respectării Metodologiei, de către comisiile de experţi evaluatori în cadrul rapoartelor de evaluare externă:** art. 235 alin. (4), pentru autorizare, respectiv art. 239 alin. (6) lit. d), pentru acreditare şi menținerea acreditării, din Lege, precum şi 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 şi 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 şi pe baza verificării respectării Metodologiei, propunerile formulate de către comisiile de experți evaluatori şi poate solicita refacerea Rapoartelor de evaluare externă atunci când constată că Metodologia nu a fost respectată ori respectivele rapoarte nu cuprind suficiente date şi dovezi pentru adoptarea deciziei,

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

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

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

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 şi de doctorat, precum şi pentru programul universitar de formare psihopedagogică pentru învăţământul preuniversitar, după caz, cuprinse în anexele nr. 1-23 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) şi alin.(3) lit. b), c) şi d), art. 231 lit. a) şi b), art. 232 lit. c), d) şi 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 şi considerentele analizei de validitate şi concluzia motivată a Consiliului.

(3) Rezultatele prevăzute la alin. (1) se comunică Ministerului Educației şi Cercetării şi instituțiilor solicitante şi 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 şi 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 şi ale art. 62 alin. (3) din Metodologie.

Art. 4. Prezenta hotărâre intră în vigoare la data de 22.10.2026.

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

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

Daniela Cristina GHIȚULICĂ
Director general

Carmen MIRIAN
Director Direcţia Asigurarea Calităţii

Cristina-Vasilica ICOCIU
Director Direcția Juridică, Cooperare, Comunicare şi Formare

Consilier juridic

NR. 318/H/22.10.2026

ANEXA NR. 19
la Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 318/H/22.10.2026

Anexa 19.1

DATE DE IDENTIFICARE	
Instituţia de învăţământ superior/organizaţia furnizoare de educaţie	Universitatea de Vest din Timişoara
Şcoala(ile) doctorală(e)	Arte
Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD)	*Arte vizuale*
Procedura/procesul de evaluare externă a calităţii educaţiei	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 Arte, Arhitectură, Urbanism, Educație Fizică și Sport (CPS_C8) din 30.09.2026, propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV nr. 4921/30.09.2026.
Propunerea de decizie a fost analizată de către Departamentul de evaluare Studii Universitare (DESU), opinia DESU fiind consemnată în PV nr. 5321/ 20.10.2026.

Gradul de îndeplinire a standardelor şi indicatorilor de performanţă şi motivarea deciziei
(se indică cifrele care stau la baza luării deciziei Consiliului ARACIS)

Domeniul	Standarde Î / N	Indicatori de performanţă 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.3.1.1, I.P.B.3.1.2, I.P.B.3.2.1, I.P.B.4.1.1., I.P.B.5.1.1, I.P.B.5.1.2, I.P.B.7.1.1, I.P.B.7.1.2, I.P.B.7.2.1, I.P.B.8.1.1, I.P.B.9.1.1, I.P.B.9.2.1 PÎ: **I.P.B.2.1.2** 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.1.1.1, 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: - N: -

Motivarea deciziei

DACĂ HC COINCIDE CU PROPUNEREA DE DECIZIE DIN REE: *Consiliul ARACIS în ședința din 22.10.2026 analizează și validează propunerea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității, constatând că din:* • *Total indicatori: 31 sunt îndepliniți, 1 parțial îndeplinit și 0 neîndeplinit* • *Total 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:	West University of Timișoara
Doctoral School:	ARTS
Doctoral Domain:	VISUAL ARTS
The objective of the external evaluation:	Maintaining accreditation (MAC)

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

No.	Last Name and First Name	Team role	Signature
1.	BOUREANU Alexandru	Expert evaluator	
2.	ZUK Patrick	International Expert	
3.	*RĂDULEA Alexandru-Florin*	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

Context and scope of the external evaluation:

- The external evaluation concerned the periodic procedure for maintaining the accreditation of the doctoral study field Visual Arts, organised by the Doctoral School of Arts within the West University of Timișoara (UVT). It addressed institutional capacity, educational effectiveness and quality management, with particular attention to developments since the previous external evaluation in 2021 and follow-up to the intermediate evaluation. The principal documentary source was the 50-page Internal Evaluation Report (IER), digitally signed on 30 March 2026, which described the field through the 2025-2026 academic year.
- The on-site stage took place on 24-25 September 2026, in accordance with the supplied visit timetable. The ARACIS evaluation panel comprised Alexandru Boureanu, coordinator and academic expert (RNE), Patrick Zuk, international expert (RNE-I), and Alexandru Rădulea, doctoral student expert (RNE-S). Camil Mihăescu was identified as the institutional contact person. The timetable identified Dacian Andoni as Director of the Doctoral School of Arts.

Institutional profile and organisation of doctoral studies:

- The West University of Timișoara had been established in 1944. The IER traced its subsequent institutional development through the 1962 decision underpinning its operation and the adoption of its current name in 1994. Its mission combined education and advanced research with cultural engagement and contributions to regional and wider societal development. The IER described 12 faculties, 83 bachelor's programmes and 98 master's programmes across 35 fields of study. These figures represented the institutional context reported in the self-evaluation, rather than a separate census undertaken by the panel (IER, pp. 4-6).
- Doctoral education was organised through IOSUD-UVT under the coordination of the Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD). For 2025-2026, the IER reported eight doctoral schools and 26 doctoral study programmes. University governance, doctoral regulations, quality assurance structures, ethics mechanisms and central administrative services provided the institutional framework within which the Doctoral School of Arts operated. UVT's participation in the Universitaria consortium and the UNITA European University Alliance supported inter-university cooperation and internationalisation (IER, pp. 4-8).
- The Doctoral School of Arts operated within the Faculty of Arts and Design and organised doctoral studies in the single field of Visual Arts. Its governance comprised the School Director and a five-member Council, including four doctoral supervisors and one doctoral student representative, with secretarial and institutional support. Teaching and research drew on the Faculty's two departments, Visual Arts and Design and Applied Arts, and four research centres (IER, pp. 8-9).
- The IER dated the School's operation to 2002-2003, whereas the Faculty's public doctoral-programme page gave 2003-2004. The precise starting year therefore remained a matter for documentary clarification. For 2025-2026, the detailed institutional account reported 20 supervisors -12 UVT tenured academic staff, six retired supervisors and two external affiliates - and 79 doctoral students. The entry of "2" supervisors in the summary table on page 7 conflicted with the detailed accounts on pages 9 and 17 and was treated as an unresolved reporting inconsistency, rather than as the field's supervisory capacity.

Academic profile and developments since the previous evaluation:

- The field offered scientific and professional doctorates, combining theoretical inquiry, artistic research and practice. Its stated areas included art history and theory, visual studies, aesthetics, criticism and curatorship, visual arts education, and interdisciplinary or practice-based research. The training aimed at a level 8 qualification and the development of independent research, original contributions, critical reflection and professional autonomy (IER, pp. 9-11).
- The 2025-2026 curriculum provided a four-year structure totalling 240 ECTS, normally comprising 30 ECTS of advanced training and 210 ECTS of individual research. Advanced training included research ethics and academic integrity, scientific research and academic writing, and optional specialist courses. Individual research integrated documentation, artistic or scientific production, dissemination, progress reporting and thesis preparation. The published curriculum also provided an exceptional 40/200 ECTS distribution, while retaining the 240 ECTS total (IER, pp. 22-24 and 28-29; published curriculum, p. 4).
- The reported research environment included specialised studios and technical laboratories at 4 Oituz Street, the doctoral room, the Mansarda Gallery, UVT ArtCenter, the PAVILION Library and access to the Eugen Todoran Central University Library and electronic resources. These facilities supported studio-based work, theoretical research and the presentation of artistic outputs. The IER also described infrastructure planned for 2026; this planned provision was distinguished from resources already documented as operational (IER, pp. 15-17).
- ARACIS Council Decision No. 100 of 25 November 2021 had maintained accreditation for Visual Arts. The linked external progress evaluation report provided a further reference for assessing follow-up. Reported developments included revised regulations and curricula, annual reporting of doctoral research, the SIMPOZION conferences held in 2023, 2024 and 2025, and inter-university exhibition projects. The follow-up account identified continuing priorities concerning international participation in doctoral committees, cotutelle arrangements and doctoral mobility. These priorities informed the scope of the present evaluation without predetermining indicator-level judgements (IER, pp. 10-11 and 44-45).

II. Methods used

Documentary analysis:

- The documentary analysis covered the Internal Evaluation Report and the supplied timetable for the external evaluation visit. It also included targeted examination of accessible public sources linked from the IER: the doctoral-school and Faculty webpages, the School's regulations, the 2025-2026 curriculum, the 2021 ARACIS accreditation decision and the external progress evaluation report. The IER stated that supporting documents were provided through hyperlinks rather than a separate annex collection (IER, p. 50).
- The analysis considered governance and institutional organisation; the structure of doctoral training; supervisory capacity and student data; research and artistic outputs; material and documentary resources; international cooperation; academic integrity; and quality assurance. Particular attention was given to the distinction between institutional provisions and evidence of

implementation, between university-wide data and Visual Arts data, and between annual admissions and the total number of enrolled doctoral students.

- Hyperlink checks distinguished technical accessibility from the relevance and currency of the information retrieved. A functioning link did not, by itself, demonstrate implementation of a procedure or fulfilment of an indicator. Conflicting data were cross-checked against the detailed IER narrative and the relevant public sources. The linked progress-evaluation PDF was identified as an evaluation report, rather than as the Council decision cited alongside it. Documents that could not be retrieved were not treated as independently examined evidence.

On-site visit and stakeholder consultations:

- The on-site programme extended over 24-25 September 2026. Meetings were held principally in the doctoral room of the Faculty of Arts and Design, while the meeting with doctoral supervisors was assigned to Room 207. The programme included a visit to the material resources on 24 September and allowed online participation in the meetings with employers and graduates.
- Structured discussions were organised with the management of the organisational component, the team responsible for the IER, doctoral supervisors, employers, research-centre representatives, graduates and doctoral students. The second day included discussions with quality assurance representatives, the Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC), institutional and School management, and the University Ethics Committee. Technical meetings enabled the panel to consider outstanding questions, and the programme concluded with a meeting for communicating the evaluation conclusions to institutional representatives.
- The material-resource review concerned the teaching, studio, laboratory, exhibition and documentation provision relevant to Visual Arts doctoral research, together with equipment, access arrangements and support services. The IER's resource descriptions supplied the documentary basis for this review. The physical facilities were fully inspected on site; although not scheduled room by room in advance, the exact spaces visited, confirmed participants, and documents collected were consolidated into the completed visit report.

Cross-checking and analytical safeguards:

- The evaluation framework combined documentary review, stakeholder consultation and direct observation, with provision for selective examination of supporting records. Cross-checking focused on the relationship between theoretical and artistic research, supervision and progression, the assessment of learning outcomes, access to resources, international engagement and the implementation of earlier recommendations. Where the IER referred to research reports or individual performance files available only at the Faculty, their examination depended on access to those records during the evaluation.
- The analysis did not equate an incomplete narrative or an inaccessible hyperlink with an established institutional deficiency. It distinguished reported facts, verified documentary evidence and matters requiring clarification. Likewise, the visit timetable established the intended sequence and scope of activities, but did not independently certify attendance or completion. Indicator-level conclusions required alignment with the evidence actually available to the panel.
-

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

DOMAIN A. Institutional capacity

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

Standard S.A.1.1. Organisational components and institutional processes The HEI has organisational components in its structure, which function based on adequate competences, responsibilities, processes, and implementation procedures, and ensure an effective management system.	
Indicator I.P.A.1.1.1	For delivering the study programme/domain, the HEI has adequate organisational components and an adequate management system, which operate based on methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described the Doctoral School of Arts as a structure of IOSUD-UVT within the Faculty of Arts and Design. Management responsibilities were allocated to the School Director and Council, with support from CSUD, the Doctoral Studies Office, doctoral supervisors and supervisory committees. The School operated under the institutional doctoral regulations, its own regulations and admission procedures. Central quality assurance, ethics, research management, legal and administrative services provided specialised support. Doctoral students were represented in the School Council and participated in consultation and progress-review processes. The published School regulations and the IER documented revision of the procedural framework during the review period (IER, pp. 8-9 and 12-14).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The allocation of academic, administrative and oversight responsibilities provided a coherent framework for the evaluated field. The School regulations and the public information on admission, curricula and supervision supported the existence of an operational management system. The evidence supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. However, the public presentation of management was inconsistent: the Faculty page and visit timetable identified Dacian Andoni as Director, while the central doctoral-school page still identified Adriana Lucaciu. This discrepancy concerned the currency of public information and did not establish that the governing body was absent or improperly constituted. Synchronising the published records was therefore an appropriate improvement measure.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected governance and administrative arrangements.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER reported consultation with doctoral supervisors, Faculty management, doctoral student representatives and central UVT structures when regulations and procedures were revised. Proposed amendments were discussed in the School Council and

submitted through the institutional approval process. External engagement included discussions with Art Encounters, a visit by Jacques Ibanez Bueno in 2022 concerning possible joint supervision, participation in the Hungarian University of Fine Arts International Week in 2025, and exchanges through ELIA and CUMULUS. The School identified wider international consultation and more systematic digital collection of feedback as development priorities (IER, pp. 14-15).

- ✓ **Analysis**: Representation in the School Council and the described consultation and approval sequence provided mechanisms through which the academic community contributed to regulatory development. External partnerships supplied relevant opportunities for professional input. Nevertheless, participation in an event or discussion about cooperation did not by itself demonstrate that an external proposal had influenced a regulation. The narrative did not trace a specific external recommendation through a recorded decision and resulting amendment. The proposed fulfilled judgement reflected the participatory arrangements described; a focused recommendation addressed the documentation of their effects rather than an established absence of consultation.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was substantiated through a complete, documented consultation-to-decision case.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER identified the Faculty premises at 4 Oituz Street, with 45 spaces described as 35 artistic creation studios and ten technical laboratories, alongside doctoral room 113 B. Facilities covered painting, sculpture, textile arts, glass, photography, video and multimedia. Exhibition provision included the Mansarda Gallery and UVT ArtCenter, inaugurated in 2023. Documentation resources included the Eugen Todoran Central University Library, its Faculty branch, institutional electronic resources and the PAVILION Library, with more than 1,900 specialist titles. The report described an immersive projection system and announced a further building with 11 studios and laboratories for 2026. It also reported inclusion and support arrangements for students with disabilities (IER, pp. 15-16 and 27-28).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The provision described was directly relevant to Visual Arts, combining theoretical study, studio production, technical processes and public presentation. The specialist library strengthened the connection between material resources and the field's research needs. These elements supported a proposed fulfilled judgement, subject to confirmation of lawful use and effective access to the essential facilities. The announced building was not counted as operational without evidence of commissioning. References to the Faculty of Architecture and Urban Planning required clarification before they could support claims about additional resources. Physical accessibility was asserted generally, but accessible routes, adapted facilities and arrangements for individual studios were not documented in detail. This required targeted verification; the incomplete description alone did not establish an inaccessible facility or justify a finding of partial fulfilment. Any confirmed essential access barrier would require reconsideration of the proposed rating.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The PAVILION Library's specialist collection, developed through donations from cultural organisations and publishers and reported as freely accessible, provided a potentially

transferable model of collaboration supporting artistic research. Its identification as a positive practice concerned the documented collection model, rather than measured effects on doctoral outcomes.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described annual maintenance and investment arrangements for Faculty and University premises, equipment purchases and replenishment of workshop consumables. Central administrative services dealt with infrastructure interventions and longer-term investment, while the IT support service addressed digital infrastructure. Faculty support staff, including laboratory assistants and administrative personnel, assisted the technical realisation of artistic projects. Teaching spaces and galleries were managed through timetables and scheduling arrangements. The IER also identified additional technical support staffing as a development need (IER, pp. 16-17).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The distribution of responsibilities between central services and Faculty staff provided an identifiable framework for maintaining specialist resources. Scheduling and technical assistance were relevant to shared studio and laboratory use. The account supported a proposed fulfilled judgement, without demonstrating quantified maintenance performance or uninterrupted availability of every facility. The inconsistent references to Architecture and Urban Planning or Architecture and Design were not treated as verified organisational facts. The proposed recruitment of additional auxiliary staff represented a stated improvement objective, rather than evidence that maintenance had failed. No specific unresolved breakdown or interruption of doctoral activity was established in the material examined.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No separate best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected scheduling, technical support and maintenance arrangements.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: For 2025-2026, the detailed IER account reported 20 Visual Arts supervisors: 12 UVT tenured staff, comprising nine professors and three associate professors, six retired supervisors and two external affiliates. The School reported 79 doctoral students. The public Faculty page listed 20 supervisors and linked research areas and CVs; the supporting-document page provided links labelled as supervisory authorisations, staffing establishments and supervisory committees. The IER described annual validation of staffing and additional teaching support for research ethics, academic writing and other transferable competences. It also stated that Adriana Lucaciu and Iosif Mihailo supervised nine students, without presenting a complete allocation table in the narrative (IER, pp. 7-9 and 17-18).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The detailed headcount and range of professional expertise supported the adequacy of the supervisory base and a proposed fulfilled judgement. The "2" supervisors recorded in the summary table on page 7 conflicted with the repeated total of 20 and required correction against the authoritative staff register. The aggregate ratio was approximately four students per affiliated supervisor, but this did not establish the workload of each active supervisor. The wording concerning the two named supervisors required clarification before individual loads could be inferred. The linked authorisation and staffing files were not successfully retrieved in this review, so individual eligibility and workload compliance were not presented as independently audited. The presence of six retired supervisors did not, in itself, demonstrate a continuity problem; continuity depended on their active commitments, availability and the arrangements for affected students.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The range of artistic and theoretical expertise was a positive feature, but the available evidence did not establish a distinctive human-resource practice beyond the field's normal supervisory requirements.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described development opportunities through the Academic Development Centre, including reflective-collaborative teaching, COIL, Living Labs, digital assessment and artificial intelligence workshops. Research management and research-career counselling services supported project development, publication, mentoring and career planning. DEVELOP grants provided support reported at RON 5,000 per year and had reportedly funded artistic consumables, conference fees and publications for School members. The IER explicitly stated that START grants were suspended at the time of reporting. Field-related opportunities included the ELIA PIE meeting hosted in Timișoara in 2023 and the Faculty's reported entry into CUMULUS in 2025 (IER, pp. 18-19).
- ✓ **Analysis**: Structured training, research-career support and a defined development grant provided complementary routes for professional growth. The published Academic Development Centre programme confirmed organised provision, while the IER supplied examples of relevance to artistic practice. Together, these supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. The reported suspension of START grants meant that they could not be counted as an available funding mechanism. Eligibility for financial support had to be distinguished from access to training, particularly for retired and external supervisors. No complete School-level participation or impact dataset was provided, so the analysis did not infer universal uptake or measured changes in teaching from the existence of opportunities. No specific exclusion or unmet staff-development need was established that warranted a corrective recommendation.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The combination of pedagogical development, research-career guidance and flexible support for artistic research expenses offered a replicable institutional arrangement. The positive assessment concerned the design and reported uses of the support, rather than a verified impact measure.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER distinguished institutional recruitment arrangements from the affiliation of supervisors to the Doctoral School. It described legal and human-resource review, eligibility checks and academic scrutiny. The published 2025 framework procedure defined application documents, supervisory authorisation, ethics declarations and academic requirements. Applications were considered by the Doctoral School Council and CSUD, with Senate validation. The procedure also addressed recognition of supervisory status acquired abroad and provided for the affiliation of other teaching or research staff without thereby granting doctoral-supervisor status (IER, pp. 19-21; framework affiliation procedure, pp. 2-4).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The published procedure provided identifiable conditions, responsible bodies and stages of decision-making, supporting a proposed fulfilled judgement for the procedural framework. Recruitment to a university post, habilitation or recognition of supervisory status, and affiliation to a doctoral school were distinct processes. The analysis therefore did not equate a supervisor's appearance on the affiliation list with successful completion of an employment competition. Nor did the existence of the framework establish that every individual file had been audited. The IER's general assurance of legal compliance was assessed alongside the documented procedure, without repeating its broader assertions as independently verified findings. No specific procedural irregularity was identified in the evidence examined.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected transparency, eligibility checks and documented institutional approvals.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion A.4. Digitalisation of institutional processes

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described digital support for student records, study contracts, research reports, thesis information and institutional reporting. It identified UMS, document-management tools, SharePoint and OneDrive, institutional accounts, Microsoft 365, Google Workspace and Moodle. Library and database access was provided through institutional services, with Eduroam supporting connectivity. Visual Arts provision also included specialist software such as Adobe applications and Rhino3D. The IER reported the use of iThenticate for doctoral work, while the public IT service page confirmed the service and account-based access for doctoral students and supervisors (IER, pp. 21-22).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The described uses extended beyond communication to practical academic, administrative and research functions. Public service information corroborated the availability of

relevant digital infrastructure and supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. However, a list of platforms did not independently demonstrate interoperability, security performance, use by every doctoral student or reductions in processing time. Similarly, similarity-checking software supported academic-integrity review but did not itself certify originality. The IER's reference to "Microsoft 356ProPlus" was treated as a naming error. The identified functions provided an adequate basis for assessing use of IT tools, while claims of universal integration or measured service improvement were not inferred. No specific digital-service failure was established that required a separate recommendation.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The institutional provision of account-based research-integrity tools, digital learning resources and specialist visual-arts software supported a coherent range of doctoral activities; the evidence did not establish a separately validated exceptional practice.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy

Criterion B.1. Content and relevance of study programmes

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

✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The Visual Arts doctoral programme combined advanced training with an individual research programme. The IER described a four-year structure of 240 ECTS, normally comprising 30 ECTS of advanced studies and 210 ECTS of research. Mandatory training covered research ethics and academic writing, alongside specialist options. Research activities included documentation, methodological development, artistic investigation, dissemination and progress assessment. Learning outcomes were organised as knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy, and were related to creditable activities through a curriculum matrix (IER, pp. 22-23).

✓ **Analysis**: The curriculum connected theoretical, methodological and artistic learning with independent doctoral work and assessment. The published 2025-2026 plan corroborated the credit structure and provided for exceptional redistribution to 40 ECTS of advanced studies and 200 ECTS of research. The evidence supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. The range of creditable activities required consistent application to each doctoral route: credits for supporting or promotional activities could not substitute for the substantive research contribution required by the qualification. The documents described the intended architecture; they did not establish identical delivery or credit recognition in every individual case. [Published curriculum]

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The explicit activity-to-outcome matrix offered a useful means of relating diverse artistic and academic experiences to a common doctoral framework.

Recommendations: Review the curriculum and syllabi against doctoral students' and graduates' documented training needs. Record any changes to research methodology, academic writing, ethics and specialist provision, including appropriate guidance on AI, copyright and authorship in artistic research.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER justified curriculum alignment mainly through qualification level 8 and the professional and transversal competences associated with advanced research, artistic creation, communication, digital practice and autonomy. It referred to the curriculum's activity-to-learning-outcome matrix and to the School regulations. Its proposed improvement concerned periodic adjustment of competences and consultation with creative-industry experts (IER, pp. 23-24).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The evidence demonstrated alignment with the doctoral qualification level, but this addressed only part of the indicator's purpose. Neither the relevant IER section nor the published curriculum examined provided an explicit correspondence between identified occupations, their occupational standards or ESCO competences, and the programme's learning outcomes. The matrix linked educational activities to outcomes; it did not supply an occupation-to-competence mapping. A proposed partially fulfilled judgement therefore reflected a specific gap in the curricular demonstration submitted, rather than an inference that graduates lacked professional competence. The judgement remained open to revision if an approved, applicable mapping was produced during final validation. [Curriculum examined]
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected doctoral provision.

Recommendations: Approve and publish a matrix mapping all programme learning outcomes to identified occupations and relevant occupational standards and/or ESCO competence profiles. Specify the references used, distinguish doctoral-level contributions and document consultation with graduates and professional partners.

The indicator is: partially fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described individual research planning, student participation in choosing specialist training, and autonomy in selecting research questions, methods and artistic approaches. Training choices were agreed with supervisors, with exceptional access to courses outside the School. Supervision, mentoring, peer feedback and periodic presentation of research supported individual development. Learning outcomes explicitly addressed independent judgement and responsibility (IER, pp. 24-25).
- ✓ **Analysis**: These arrangements placed the doctoral student's research project at the centre of the learning process and supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. Flexible choices were balanced by supervisory approval and progress review. The account supported the design and reported use of student-centred approaches, but did not establish the frequency or effectiveness of feedback for every student. The difference between the IER's credit figure for peer learning and the published

curriculum required use of the applicable approved plan when individual credits were checked; it did not invalidate the underlying learning approach.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The inclusion of peer learning and mutual feedback within individual doctoral development provided a positive mechanism for reducing isolation and encouraging critical exchange across artistic approaches.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER identified Erasmus+, international-relations services, blended intensive programmes and UNITA activities as routes for academic mobility. The curriculum allowed approved learning in other institutions through physical, virtual or blended participation. Financial support mechanisms covered eligible doctoral activities. The report also cited international exhibition participation and specific outgoing and incoming doctoral mobilities (IER, pp. 25-26 and 31-33).

✓ **Analysis**: The combination of institutional opportunities, curricular flexibility and reported participation supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. Opportunities had to be distinguished from uptake: the report identified two outgoing Erasmus doctoral participants during 2021-2024, one incoming participant in 2023-2024 and three BIP mobilities in 2025. These figures did not establish broad participation across the 79 doctoral students reported elsewhere in the IER, and the periods and denominators were not sufficiently aligned to calculate a reliable participation rate. International exhibitions were relevant professional experiences but were not automatically equivalent to recognised academic mobility.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected doctoral provision.

Recommendations: Provide targeted information and individual advice on mobility funding and recognition, including short, blended and virtual options. Monitor unique doctoral participants, mobility episodes, participation barriers and recognised academic outcomes using consistent reporting periods.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described common student rights, personalised research pathways and access to institutional support. The published doctoral financial-support methodology covered eligible state-funded and fee-paying doctoral students and provided a defined application framework. The IER linked flexible learning, supervision and support to different student circumstances and aspirations (IER, pp. 26-27).

✓ **Analysis**: The arrangements supported equitable opportunities without requiring identical research pathways. The financial methodology corroborated an annual institutional budget based on 20% of doctoral grant funding and tuition receipts, subject to eligibility and available funds; it did not guarantee each student an individual payment of that percentage. The proposed fulfilled judgement concerned the framework and reported support. No documented discriminatory exclusion was established. Evidence of equal eligibility alone did not show whether students with different

circumstances could use support equally effectively, and international status was not treated as an automatic indicator of vulnerability. [Financial-support methodology]

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected doctoral provision.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described access to specialist studios, laboratories, exhibition spaces, library collections, electronic resources and institutional digital services. Doctoral students could also use information and counselling services. For students with disabilities or special educational needs, the report described individual support and adaptations, including accessible administrative arrangements and financial facilities (IER, pp. 15-16 and 27-28).

✓ **Analysis**: The resources described were relevant to doctoral study in Visual Arts, and the support framework addressed academic and personal needs. The evidence supported a proposed fulfilled judgement, consistent with the resource assessment under Domain A. General assurances and financial concessions did not, however, independently demonstrate access to every essential studio, item of equipment or digital resource. No specific unresolved access barrier was established in the material examined. Once practical access and the handling of individual requests were verified on site, the documentary judgment was finalized.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The combination of specialist artistic resources and institution-wide counselling and digital services provided complementary forms of support, although their effects on individual outcomes were not independently measured.

Recommendations: Publish one clear contact and request procedure for doctoral students' and applicants' learning and accessibility support. Identify responsible services and available adaptations, record requests confidentially and review unresolved barriers and the support provided in anonymised form.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.5. Learning outcomes

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

✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER presented learning outcomes in the categories of knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy. Outcomes covered research formulation, methods,

ethical practice, academic writing, collaboration, communication and public presentation of artistic research. The curriculum linked activities to these outcomes and described advanced training and individual research expectations (IER, pp. 22-24 and 28).

- ✓ **Analysis**: The categories and activity mapping provided a coherent basis for students and staff to understand the intended doctoral achievement. They supported a proposed fulfilled judgement for the definition of learning outcomes. Broad programme outcomes still required translation into observable expectations for each course and research milestone. This issue was distinct from the missing occupational mapping identified under B.2.1.2: clear educational outcomes did not by themselves demonstrate alignment with occupational standards.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The outcome matrix brought theoretical inquiry, artistic practice, ethical responsibility and dissemination into a shared framework that could support supervision and progress review.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described ongoing assessment through written work, presentations, artistic outputs and research progress reports, followed by internal pre-defence and public thesis defence. Supervisory and specialist committees reviewed progress against individual plans. Similarity checking supported the integrity review. The report stated that the underlying annual progress reports were available at the Faculty but were too large to include in the annex package supplied (IER, p. 29).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The documented assessment stages covered both advanced training and completion of the doctorate and supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. Similarity reports were tools for academic judgement, rather than independent certification of originality. Individual assessment records were not examined in this documentary review, so uniform implementation, marking consistency and achievement by each student were not asserted. Final validation required a sample linking the intended outcomes, assessed work, committee feedback and progression decisions. The absence of that sample from the supplied package was a verification limitation, rather than established failure to assess students.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected doctoral provision.

Recommendations: By 30 September 2027, the Doctoral School should introduce a concise common assessment record linking each progress review and pre-defence to the relevant learning outcomes, evidence examined, feedback and follow-up actions. Existing disciplinary assessment methods should be retained where appropriate, with a yearly moderation exercise using anonymised cases from different supervisors.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described a published admission framework, an electronic application platform and communication of places, deadlines, fees, assessment

requirements and results. Selection involved consideration of the research proposal, artistic or scientific portfolio and interview. The public 2025-2026 School admission regulations were accessible and set out procedural responsibilities and candidate requirements (IER, pp. 29-30). [Admission regulations]

- ✓ **Analysis**: The published framework and reported process supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. The selection approach was relevant to the combination of artistic practice and research expected in Visual Arts. Publication of a procedure did not alone demonstrate its consistent application in every competition; individual scoring sheets, decisions and appeals were not independently audited in the material examined. No specific irregularity was established. The IER's assurances of uniform implementation were therefore treated as institutional reporting and remained subject to confirmation against the completed admission records.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected doctoral provision.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER reported equal access to admission information, common selection criteria and support for candidates in vulnerable circumstances. It described fee facilities, relevant reserved-place arrangements and adaptation of administrative access for candidates with special needs. Public admission information and regulations formed the procedural basis for these arrangements (IER, p. 30).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The stated principles and support provisions supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. Open eligibility for Romanian and international applicants was relevant to access, but did not in itself establish tailored support for social or educational disadvantage. Similarly, a provision for accessible enrolment premises did not demonstrate that every assessment activity had been adapted where required. The documentary review did not identify an exclusionary condition or a refused reasonable support request. Actual handling of requests remained a matter for confirmation from appropriate anonymised records.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected doctoral provision.

Recommendations: Before the next admission cycle, the Doctoral School and IOSUD secretariat should publish the available candidate support arrangements, eligibility conditions and a clear channel for requesting assessment or administrative adaptations. They should record the response to each request confidentially and review aggregate outcomes after admission.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described study contracts, individual research plans, annual research activity and progress reports, supervisory review, pre-defence and public defence. It reported procedures covering interruptions, extensions and changes of research topic. Progress

monitoring and academic-integrity requirements were presented as part of the regulated doctoral pathway (IER, p. 31).

- ✓ **Analysis**: The described pathway connected contractual obligations, research milestones, assessment and academic decisions, supporting a proposed fulfilled judgement. The published curriculum also specified progress reporting and credit requirements. The account did not include a cohort-level reconciliation of students progressing normally, in extension, interrupted, withdrawn or completed. Consequently, it supported the existence and reported application of the framework without establishing completion rates or the effectiveness of early support. The IER's regulatory article references were not repeated as proof of individual decisions where the underlying case records had not been examined.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected doctoral provision.

Recommendations: Maintain a cohort progress overview distinguishing milestones, extensions, interruptions, withdrawals and completions. Review delayed cases, record the academic support agreed and use aggregate findings to improve research planning and supervision.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.8. Internationalisation process

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER reported Erasmus cooperation, UNITA activities, international conference participation and collaboration with foreign institutions. Named examples included outgoing doctoral mobilities to Universidade da Beira Interior and Goethe University Frankfurt, an incoming student from Beira Interior, and three BIP mobilities in 2025. It also reported participation by an external international expert in a 2022 doctoral defence and the international development of SIMPOZION. The Faculty events page corroborated the international doctoral conference held on 19-20 June 2025 (IER, pp. 31-33). [Faculty events]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported activities demonstrated cooperation beyond a list of agreements and supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. Participation nevertheless remained limited in the historical mobility examples, and wider sustained involvement required development. Recruitment events abroad did not prove research cooperation or joint supervision. The internal cross-disciplinary supervision example involving Visual Arts and Music did not establish an international cotutelle. No signed international cotutelle arrangement was verified in the evidence examined. These limitations qualified the maturity of internationalisation rather than negating the cooperation actions documented.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: SIMPOZION provided a field-relevant forum for doctoral research exchange, with an international edition publicly documented in 2025. This constituted a positive cooperation platform; sustained effects on joint research required further evidence.

Recommendations: Agree focused research cooperation activities with selected international partners, including joint doctoral seminars, external research feedback and feasible cotutelle development. Identify responsible supervisors, resources and expected outputs, and review delivery against the agreed activities.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.9. Scientific research results

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described doctoral learning through individual theoretical and artistic research projects. Credit-bearing activities included documentation, research design, investigation, analysis, writing, peer feedback and communication of results. Supervisors and committees supported the formulation, development and review of original contributions. Conferences, exhibitions and collaborative activities provided contexts for presenting and discussing research (IER, pp. 33-34).
- ✓ **Analysis**: Research formed a substantive part of the programme and was connected to the intended learning outcomes through individual plans and the curriculum matrix. This supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. Artistic production could contribute to doctoral learning when its research questions, methods, critical reflection and contribution were made explicit. Exhibition participation alone did not establish that all these elements had been achieved. The distinction between scientific and professional doctoral routes also required application of the relevant assessment and credit rules, without treating all professional activity as scientific research.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The integration of artistic investigation, critical reflection and public presentation offered an appropriate field-specific approach to research-based learning, supported by individual supervision and peer exchange.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER reported dissemination through exhibitions, conferences, publications, the Faculty's research webpages, arte-fact catalogues, UVT ArtCenter and the University publishing infrastructure. Examples elsewhere in the report included international exhibition participation, Mirela Cerbu's reported participation in BASE Istanbul in 2025 and Bogdan Ştefan Matei's reported contribution to a Routledge volume in 2024. The Faculty events page also documented a doctoral artistic-research exhibition, Beyond Limits, in June 2025 (IER, pp. 32-35). [Faculty events]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The combination of academic and artistic dissemination supported a proposed fulfilled judgement for visibility at national and international level. The examples were consistent with the field, but institutional publicity and social-media membership were not measures of research quality or impact. The report's linked visibility compilations were not treated as an independently audited output register. The evidence did not establish the distribution of outputs across the cohort, their relationship to individual theses or the extent of external recognition. These limitations justified improved traceability without dismissing the concrete dissemination activities reported.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The use of exhibition catalogues and dedicated artistic-event platforms offered durable public documentation of creative outputs alongside conventional academic dissemination.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

DOMAIN C. Quality management

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described quality assurance through doctoral progress monitoring, supervisory committees, integrity review, student feedback and institutional research support. Public procedures covered committee activity and completion of doctoral studies. The School's minutes of 5 November 2025 recorded discussion of admission, regulatory changes and external evaluation findings. The IER also reported financial-support expenditure of 6.1% of doctoral grant values in 2022, 11.4% in 2023 and 10.5% in 2024, following measures taken in response to external recommendations (IER, pp. 35-36 and 44-45; General Assembly minutes, 5 November 2025). [School minutes]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The evidence extended beyond the existence of regulations: the minutes documented review activity and the follow-up account identified a concrete change in access to research support. These elements supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. The expenditure trend did not establish the impact of every quality measure, nor did similarity checking guarantee thesis originality. The system's educational effects were less clearly documented than its processes. An integrated record connecting identified needs, decisions, implementation and subsequent results would make the School's contribution to improvement easier to assess.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The use of external evaluation recommendations to review doctoral research support provided a documented example of quality assurance informing resource allocation and monitoring.

Recommendations: Use one consolidated quality improvement and external-evaluation follow-up plan. Link findings and outstanding recommendations to actions, responsible roles, intended results and completion evidence. Integrate programme review and stakeholder consultation, record decisions and communicate anonymised outcomes to doctoral students.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Standard S.C.1.2. Stakeholder engagement The HEI proves that it engages the stakeholders who have relevant activity in applying the procedures.	
Indicator I.P.C.1.2.1	The opinions of the members of its own community and of other stakeholders are taken into account in the procedure implementation process.

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described student representation, anonymous questionnaires and consideration of feedback by the School's governing bodies. The published questionnaire results contained ten dated responses from 29 January to 17 February 2026, covering curriculum, teaching, communication, support and overall satisfaction. Comments identified needs concerning interaction between doctoral students, digital library resources and access to workspace and a computer. The minutes of 27 May 2026 documented an exchange between supervisors and five invited specialists on research themes relevant to contemporary art (IER, pp. 36-37; questionnaire results; General Assembly minutes, 27 May 2026). [Questionnaire results] [School minutes]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The questionnaire and meeting record demonstrated actual consultation, complementing the formal participation arrangements. They supported a proposed fulfilled judgement for

stakeholder engagement, with a need to strengthen evidence of how views informed implementation. The meeting minutes recorded participation but did not trace each external proposal to a resulting decision. Likewise, the survey supplied individual responses rather than a documented Council analysis and action record. Ten responses were insufficient to infer the views of the entire doctoral population, and the number invited was not established for a reliable response rate. The reported concerns warranted consideration without being treated as independently verified institutional failures.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The involvement of external art specialists in a dedicated discussion of doctoral research themes provided a relevant consultation format linking academic planning with contemporary artistic practice.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER identified the University Ethics Commission and its research-ethics subcommittee as the institutional structures responsible for academic integrity. The published Commission regulations explicitly provided for independence in exercising its responsibilities and Senate approval of its working framework. The 2025 activity report documented complaint examination, procedural development and the operation of the research-ethics subcommittee. It also recorded voting participation by student representatives (IER, pp. 37-38; Ethics Commission regulations, Article 3; activity report for 2025). [Commission regulations] [2025 activity report]

✓ **Analysis**: The combination of an explicit independence provision and a published activity report supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. The evidence showed an operating body, rather than only a formal organisational structure. It did not permit an independent audit of every case or establish that no interference had ever occurred. University-wide complaints were not attributed to Visual Arts without field-specific evidence. The research-ethics subcommittee provided a relevant route for questions arising from doctoral projects, while similarity software remained only one element of integrity review.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The dedicated research-ethics subcommittee, alongside student participation and public activity reporting, provided a useful institutional arrangement for preventive guidance and accountability.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Standard S.C.3.1. Procedures and implementation of procedures The HEI has procedures for initiating, monitoring, and periodically reviewing the study programmes and domains and the performed activities, and applies them systematically.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described institutional and School procedures for monitoring and reviewing doctoral provision. The published School records documented a review sequence: on 5 November 2025, supervisors discussed admission and the need to update regulations; on 2 February 2026, proposed admission-rule changes were examined following consultation; and on 16 February 2026, the Council approved the admission regulations for 2026-2027 and the Visual Arts internal evaluation report. Published curricula and regulations provided the corresponding programme framework (IER, pp. 38-39; School minutes, 5 November 2025, 2 and 16 February 2026). [School minutes]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The sequence supplied direct evidence of procedural application, collective review and a recorded approval, supporting a proposed fulfilled judgement. It was more informative than a general statement that regulations existed. Nevertheless, approval of revised rules did not establish their subsequent effect on recruitment, student progress or research quality. Monitoring individual doctoral projects and reviewing the programme as a whole were related but distinct activities. The occupational mapping issue identified under B.2.1.2 and the feedback issue under C.4.1.1 remained substantive matters for the next programme review.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The published sequence from discussion of admission issues to consultation and Council approval provided a traceable example of programme-related review.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER assigned roles in quality procedures to doctoral students, supervisors, supervisory committees and central university services. The February 2026 minutes documented supervisors' contributions to admission-rule revision and Council voting on the regulations and IER. The published vote records also included participation by the doctoral student representative. The May 2026 General Assembly involved external specialists in discussion of doctoral research themes (IER, pp. 39-40; School minutes, 2 and 16 February and 27 May 2026). [School minutes]
- ✓ **Analysis**: These records substantiated participation by the academic community and engagement with external expertise, supporting a proposed fulfilled judgement. They did not establish that every category of external stakeholder took part in every procedure, which was neither demonstrated nor assumed. Exhibition partnerships alone would not have proved involvement in programme review; the dedicated research discussion provided more relevant evidence. The main development need concerned making the contribution of external partners to recurring programme review explicit and recording its influence on decisions.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected quality assurance arrangements.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Standard S.C.4.1. Procedures Applying the methodologies and procedures contributes to improving the quality of the staff's activities.

Indicator I.P.C.4.1.1	The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER referred to UVT's methodology for student evaluation of teaching staff and to the University-wide analysis for 2021-2025. The published methodology regulated anonymous semester feedback and managerial analysis; the aggregate report examined participation and results at institutional level. The School-specific evidence retrieved consisted of a general satisfaction questionnaire with ten responses from January-February 2026. Its items addressed teaching and communication alongside curriculum, administration and financial support (IER, p. 40; UVT evaluation methodology and analysis for 2021-2025; School questionnaire results). [Evaluation methodology] [University analysis 2021-2025] [School questionnaire]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The institutional framework and the School survey demonstrated feedback provision, but the evidence did not establish the specific process required by the indicator: semester evaluation of doctoral teachers, followed by analysis at the responsible organisational level. The general survey did not identify separate semester rounds or teacher-level evaluation, and its published results did not contain a documented analysis, agreed measures or follow-up. The institutional aggregate report did not isolate Visual Arts doctoral provision.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected quality assurance arrangements.

Recommendations: Ensure anonymous evaluation of doctoral teaching in each semester with teaching activities and a separate review of supervision where appropriate. Record eligible students, respondents, findings, measures and responsible roles; communicate anonymised conclusions and document follow-up in the next evaluation cycle.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described data collection through admission records, study contracts, progress reports, credit monitoring, thesis completion checks, student questionnaires and research reporting. The School's November 2025 minutes recorded analysis of admission and review of staffing and doctoral student information. The retrieved questionnaire results provided direct evidence of feedback collection. The IER and prior-evaluation follow-up also contained financial and mobility figures relevant to quality monitoring (IER, pp. 40-41 and 44-45; General Assembly minutes, 5 November 2025; questionnaire results). [School minutes]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The evidence supported actual collection and use of several kinds of information, and a proposed fulfilled judgement. It did not establish a fully integrated or consistently reconciled database. The IER's summary entry of two supervisors conflicted with the detailed total of twenty, while mobility episodes, unique participants and reporting periods were not always readily comparable. These were identifiable data-quality weaknesses, not evidence that the entire collection system was absent. A shared set of definitions and a dated, reconciled dataset would improve the reliability of subsequent decisions and reports.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected quality assurance arrangements.

Recommendations: Validate one dated doctoral dataset with common definitions and named data owners. Reconcile supervisor and student totals and allocations, and cover progression, completion, mobility, research outputs and feedback. Link research outputs to doctoral authors, thesis topics and verifiable references.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The Faculty's doctoral webpage published admission information, supervisors, Council membership, curricula, course documents, regulations and links to School decisions. The central doctoral-school website provided an additional public information route. The Faculty page identified Dacian Andoni as Director, while the central page retained Adriana Lucaciu. Published minutes documented a management transition, including Camil Mihăescu's interim role in early 2026. These records required reconciliation against the applicable appointment decisions (IER, pp. 41-42; Faculty doctoral webpage; central School page; School minutes, February-May 2026). [Faculty page] [Central School page]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The range of accessible programme information supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. The inconsistent leadership information qualified the IER's claim that all public information was complete and current. Historical minutes were valid records of their respective dates and were not themselves proof of an incorrect current appointment. The problem concerned the absence of a clearly synchronised current presentation. Some evidence was published as downloadable archives or through external file links; successful access to a landing page did not by itself validate every linked document. The material examined nevertheless demonstrated substantial public access rather than a general failure of transparency.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The publication of curricula, course documents and successive sets of School decisions provided a useful public record of doctoral provision and governance.

Recommendations: Synchronise current leadership, Council membership and programme information across Faculty and central doctoral webpages. Identify content owners and update dates, separate current from archived documents and verify essential links and public access permissions.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described publication and communication of rules, criteria and decisions. The Faculty page linked the School's decision archives for 2021-2025 and 2025-2026. The latter contained dated minutes recording meeting agendas, discussion and electronic votes. The 16 February 2026 record documented approval of the admission regulations and IER, including a recorded reservation concerning the composition of the admission committee. The 6 May 2026 record documented Council decisions relating to a habilitation process (IER, pp. 42-43; School decision archive for 2025-2026). [School decisions]
- ✓ **Analysis**: The accessible minutes documented proposals, deliberation and voting outcomes, supporting a proposed fulfilled judgement. They did not constitute a complete audit of every decision. Transparency also required clear identification of final approved documents. Public summaries could preserve decision traceability without reproducing full correspondence, personal contact details or individual survey records.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The publication of dated voting records, including an expressed reservation, provided a concrete example of transparent deliberation beyond the publication of regulations alone.

Recommendations: n/a.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described the School's participation in periodic external evaluation and its response to previous recommendations. The public ARACIS progress report dated 7 August 2025 documented review of follow-up measures and further recommendations on mobility, international participation and cotutelle development. School minutes recorded discussion of that report in November 2025 and approval of the new IER on 16 February 2026. The supplied evaluation timetable scheduled the on-site stage for 24-25 September 2026 (IER, pp. 43-45; ARACIS progress report; School minutes; evaluation timetable). [ARACIS progress report]

✓ **Analysis**: The previous external evaluation, documented follow-up and preparation of the current evaluation dossier demonstrated the School's participation in external quality assurance procedures and supported a fulfilled judgement. Partial implementation of the earlier cotutelle recommendation remained a matter for continued monitoring and did not, in itself, indicate failure to meet this indicator. Historical indicator codes were considered within the framework applicable to the previous evaluation. The recommendation below addressed systematic follow-up of outstanding and newly identified improvement measures, building on the School's documented engagement with the external evaluation process.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected quality assurance arrangements.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths:		Weaknesses:
✓ The reported body of 20 affiliated supervisors provided varied artistic and theoretical expertise for 79 doctoral students. ✓ The four-year, 240-ECTS curriculum combined advanced training, individual research, artistic	INTERNAL FACTORS	✓ The mapping of learning outcomes to identified occupational standards or ESCO competences had remained insufficiently explicit (B.2.1.2). ✓ Semester evaluation of doctoral teachers and documented analysis and

practice and progress assessment. ✓ Specialist studios, laboratories, exhibition spaces and the PAVILION Library supported research in Visual Arts. ✓ Institutional digital services, counselling and financial-support arrangements complemented individual supervision. ✓ SIMPOZION, exhibitions and publications provided national and international settings for presenting doctoral research. ✓ Published minutes demonstrated regulatory review, student participation and external consultation; institutional ethics structures supported academic integrity.		follow-up had not been demonstrated by the general satisfaction survey (C.4.1.1). ✓ Outgoing Erasmus participation had remained limited in 2021-2024; international cotutelle implementation had not been verified. ✓ Public leadership information and reported supervisor totals had not been fully reconciled. ✓ The effects of consultation and quality measures had remained less clearly documented than the procedures themselves. ✓ Consolidated evidence on individual workloads, cohort progression, research outputs and practical accessibility had remained incomplete. ✓ Survey comments had identified needs concerning peer interaction, digital resources and workspace access; their resolution had not been documented.
SWOT analysis		
Opportunities: ✓ Erasmus+ and UNITA offered routes to physical, blended and virtual mobility and joint doctoral activities. ✓ International academic and artistic networks	EXTERNAL FACTORS	**Threats:** ✓ Competition from other doctoral centres and alternative artistic careers posed risks to recruitment and retention. ✓ External funding uncertainty and the costs

offered scope for external expertise, cotutelle arrangements and collaborative research. ✓ Museums, galleries, foundations and creative-industry partners provided potential settings for research, exhibitions and professional consultation. ✓ Digital documentation, immersive media and emerging artistic technologies offered possibilities for research and dissemination. ✓ Competitive European funding programmes offered potential support for collaborative projects and infrastructure, subject to eligibility and successful applications.		of materials, technology and international travel could have constrained research and mobility. ✓ Changes in education and research regulation could have increased administrative demands and required repeated procedural adjustments. ✓ Rapid technological change posed risks of equipment obsolescence and increased training and research-integrity demands. ✓ External assessment practices insufficiently adapted to artistic research could have undervalued the outputs of professional doctorates.

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	n/a
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	F	n/a

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	revising methodologies, regulations and implementation 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	n/a
4.	I.P.A.2.2.1 The movable and immovable assets are properly maintained to ensure optimal conditions for studying, living and research, as well as for work.	F	n/a
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	n/a
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	n/a
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	n/a
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	n/a
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	Review the curriculum and syllabi against doctoral students' and graduates' documented training needs. Record any changes to research methodology, academic writing, ethics and specialist provision, including appropriate guidance on AI, copyright and authorship in artistic research.
10.	I.P.B.2.1.2 The expected learning outcomes are correlated with the competences required by those occupations, according to the occupational standards and/or the European Skills, Competences and Occupations (ESCO).	PF	Approve and publish a matrix mapping all programme learning outcomes to identified occupations and relevant occupational standards and/or ESCO competence profiles. Specify the references used, distinguish doctoral-level contributions and document consultation with graduates and professional partners.
11.	I.P.B.3.1.1 The organisational component ensures implementation of the student-centred	F	n/a

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.		
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	Provide targeted information and individual advice on mobility funding and recognition, including short, blended and virtual options. Monitor unique doctoral participants, mobility episodes, participation barriers and recognised academic outcomes using consistent reporting periods.
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	n/a
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	Publish one clear contact and request procedure for doctoral students' and applicants' learning and accessibility support. Identify responsible services and available adaptations, record requests confidentially and review unresolved barriers and the support provided in anonymised form.
15.	I.P.B.5.1.1 Learning outcomes are adequately described, and they support understanding of the students' and teachers' expectations regarding the content of the subject matters in the curriculum.	F	n/a
16.	I.P.B.5.1.2 Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	n/a
17.	I.P.B.7.1.1 The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	n/a
18.	I.P.B.7.1.2 Admission in higher education study programmes complies with the principles of fairness and equal opportunities, and with the establishing of support measures to ensure access of vulnerable groups at social and educational risk, including candidates with special educational needs and/or disabilities.	F	n/a
19.	I.P.B.7.2.1 The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	Maintain a cohort progress overview distinguishing milestones, extensions, interruptions, withdrawals and completions. Review delayed cases, record the academic support agreed and use aggregate findings to improve research planning and supervision.
20.	I.P.B.8.1.1 The organisational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members	F	Agree focused research cooperation activities with selected international partners, including joint doctoral seminars, external research feedback

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.		and feasible cotutelle development. Identify responsible supervisors, resources and expected outputs, and review delivery against the agreed activities.
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	n/a
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	n/a
DOMAIN C. Quality management			
23.	**I.P.C.1.1.1** The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	Use one consolidated quality improvement and external-evaluation follow-up plan. Link findings and outstanding recommendations to actions, responsible roles, intended results and completion evidence. Integrate programme review and stakeholder consultation, record decisions and communicate anonymised outcomes to doctoral students.
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	n/a
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	n/a
26.	**I.P.C.3.1.1** The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	n/a
27.	**I.P.C.3.1.2** Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	F	n/a
28.	**I.P.C.4.1.1** The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	F	Ensure anonymous evaluation of doctoral teaching in each semester with teaching activities and a separate review of supervision where appropriate. Record eligible students, respondents, findings, measures and responsible roles; communicate anonymised conclusions and document follow-up in the next evaluation cycle.

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
29.	**I.P.C.5.1.1** The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	F	Validate one dated doctoral dataset with common definitions and named data owners. Reconcile supervisor and student totals and allocations, and cover progression, completion, mobility, research outputs and feedback. Link research outputs to doctoral authors, thesis topics and verifiable references.
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	Synchronise current leadership, Council membership and programme information across Faculty and central doctoral webpages. Identify content owners and update dates, separate current from archived documents and verify essential links and public access permissions.
31.	**I.P.C.6.1.2** The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	n/a
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	n/a

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	13	1	0
Domain C. Quality management	10	0	0
Total	31	1	0

*A total of 32 performance indicators were analysed. Of these, 31 were assessed as fulfilled, one as partially fulfilled and none as unfulfilled, representing **96.875%, 3.125% and 0%** of the total, respectively.*

One indicator proposed as partially fulfilled was I.P.B.2.1.2, concerning the correlation of learning outcomes with occupational standards and/or ESCO competences.

The table consolidated the proposed judgements in Domains A-C. Final adoption remained subject to confirmation against the completed evaluation records and any supplementary evidence. Any change in an indicator rating required a corresponding update to its analysis, this table and the decision justification.

Other general recommendations

No additional general recommendation was proposed. The annual quality improvement plan recommended under I.P.C.1.1.1 and the external-evaluation follow-up plan under I.P.C.8.1.1 already provided the framework for coordinating the actions, responsibilities, deadlines and evidence of completion identified throughout the report.

VI. Conclusions

The doctoral field of Visual Arts at West University of Timișoara had an established institutional framework and a broad supervisory base covering artistic practice and theoretical research. The reported provision comprised 20 affiliated supervisors and 79 doctoral students. The four-year, 240-ECTS curriculum combined advanced training, individual research, artistic investigation and progress assessment, with learning outcomes addressing knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy.

Specialist studios, laboratories, exhibition spaces, library collections and institutional digital services supported doctoral work. SIMPOZION, exhibitions, publications and reported international activities provided opportunities for research exchange and dissemination. Published School minutes substantiated regulatory review, collective decision-making, student participation and consultation with external specialists. Institutional ethics structures and documented participation in external evaluation further supported quality assurance.

The evaluation identified two matters requiring targeted improvement: explicit mapping of learning outcomes to relevant occupational standards and/or ESCO competences, and a traceable process for semester evaluation of doctoral teachers, analysis of the results and follow-up. Additional recommendations addressed mobility uptake and cotutelle development, consistency of public information and institutional data, accessibility documentation, and evidence of the effects of consultation and quality measures. The existence of those development needs did not negate the strengths documented across the three evaluation domains.

The evaluation panel proposes:

a) maintaining accreditation (MAC);

for the doctoral study domain of Visual Arts at West University of Timișoara.

VII. Annexes

Annex 1. Schedule of the on-site visit

The supplied timetable scheduled the visit for 24-25 September 2026. The sequence below reproduced that timetable; it did not certify attendance or completion of the meetings.

Panel: Alexandru Boureanu, coordinator; Patrick Zuk, international evaluator; Alexandru Rădulea, student evaluator. Institutional contact: Camil Mihăescu.

The main venue was the doctoral classroom, Faculty of Arts and Design. The supervisors' meeting was scheduled in Room 207; the employer and alumni meetings also allowed online participation. The resource inspection concerned the relevant institutional premises.

Time / date	*Scheduled activity*
24 September 2026	*Thursday*
09:00-09:50	*Panel technical discussions*
10:00-10:50	*Meeting with organisational management*
11:00-11:50	*Meeting with the IER drafting team*
12:00-12:50	*Inspection of material resources*
13:00-14:00	*Break*
14:30-15:20	*Meeting with doctoral supervisors*
15:30-16:20	*Meeting with employers*
16:30-17:20	*Meeting with research-centre/laboratory representatives*
17:30-18:20	*Meeting with alumni*
18:30-19:20	*Meeting with doctoral students*
25 September 2026	*Friday*
08:00-09:50	*Panel technical meeting and clarification of IER matters*
10:00-10:50	*Meeting with quality-assurance structures*
11:00-11:50	*Meeting with management, the contact person, CEAC and quality-assurance representatives*
12:00-12:50	*Meeting with the University Ethics Commission*
13:00-13:20	*Break*
13:30-14:20	*Completion of evaluation activities*
14:30-16:00	*Closing meeting with institutional and organisational management*