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 19.6

DATE DE IDENTIFICARE	
Instituţia de învăţământ superior/organizaţia furnizoare de educaţie	Universitatea de Vest din Timişoara
Şcoala(ile) doctorală(e)	Muzică şi Teatru
Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD)	*Teatru şi artele spectacolului*
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.** 4922/30.09.2026.
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

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.9.1.1, PÎ: **I.P.B.2.1.2, I.P.B.8.1.1, I.P.B.9.2.1** N: -
C	**Î:** S.C.1.1, S.C.1.2, S.C.2.2., S.C.3.1, S.C.4.1., S.C.5.1., S.C.6.1., S.C.8.1 N: -	**Î:** I.P.C.1.2.1, I.P.C.2.2.2, I.P.C.3.1.1, I.P.C.3.1.2, I.P.C.4.1.1., I.P.C.5.1.1, I.P.C.6.1.1, I.P.C.6.1.2, I.P.C.8.1.1 PÎ: **I.P.C.1.1.1** N: -

Motivarea deciziei

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: 28 sunt îndepliniți, 4 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	Menţinerea 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:	Music and Theatre
Doctoral Domain:	Theatre and Performing Arts
The objective of the external evaluation:	Maintaining accreditation (MAC)

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

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

I. Introduction

a) Context and scope of the external evaluation

This external quality evaluation concerned the periodic procedure for maintaining the accreditation of the doctoral study field Theatre and Performing Arts, organised by the Doctoral School of Music and Theatre within the West University of Timișoara (UVT). The evaluation examined developments since the previous external evaluation completed in November 2021, with particular reference to the academic years 2021/2022 to 2025/2026. The Internal Evaluation Report (IER), digitally signed on 30 March 2026, provided the principal documentary basis. The on-site stage took place on 22-23 September 2026, in accordance with the visit timetable.

The ARACIS external evaluation panel comprised Alexandru Boureanu, coordinator and academic expert (RNE); Leo Rafolt, international expert (RNE-I); and Alexandru-Florin Rădulea, doctoral student expert (RNE-S). The institutional contact person was Mihai Popean, Director of the Doctoral School of Music and Theatre. The evaluation considered compliance with the applicable standards, the implementation of previous recommendations and the capacity of the doctoral field to sustain and improve the quality of doctoral education and research.

b) Profile of the higher education institution and the organising structures

The West University of Timișoara was established in 1944 as a public higher education institution. 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 artistic creation and community engagement. The University sought to generate and transfer knowledge, develop professional and research competences, and contribute to the social, economic and cultural life of its region and wider society (IER, pp. 5-6).

Institutional governance was exercised through the University Senate and the executive management structures, including the Board of Directors. The IER described a university comprising 12 faculties, offering 83 bachelor's and 98 master's programmes across 35 fields of study. 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. UVT's membership of the Universitaria consortium and the UNITA European University Alliance provided a framework for inter-university cooperation and internationalisation (IER, pp. 5-8).

The Doctoral School of Music and Theatre began operating in 2015/2016 in the field of Music and added Theatre and Performing Arts in 2018/2019. It was governed by its Director and Doctoral School Council within the institutional framework of IOSUD-UVT and CSUD. The Council included doctoral supervisors and doctoral student representatives. In 2025/2026, the School reported 17 doctoral supervisors and 60 doctoral students across its two fields: 11 supervisors and 47 students in Music, and six supervisors and 13 students in Theatre and Performing Arts (IER, pp. 9-11).

UVT had participated in external quality evaluation procedures at IOSUD and doctoral-field level. The IER identified ARACIS Council Decision no. 100 of 25 November 2021 as the outcome of the previous doctoral evaluation cycle and reported that accreditation had been maintained for Theatre and Performing Arts. The present procedure therefore examined continuity since that

evaluation and progress in addressing the recommendations, including those reviewed at the intermediate follow-up stage (IER, pp. 8 and 45-46).

c) General description and evolution of the doctoral study field

The doctoral field Theatre and Performing Arts had operated since 2018/2019. It offered scientific and professional doctoral pathways within Humanities and Arts, combining advanced research with artistic creation. The IER described an individualised doctoral trajectory based on transferable credits, research training, practical artistic activities and periodic assessment of progress. Its stated learning outcomes concerneded independent research, advanced artistic creation, critical analysis and the dissemination of research results in academic and professional contexts (IER, pp. 11 and 23-24).

The field's supervisory capacity had expanded from four supervisors in 2021 to six in 2025/2026. The IER identified Maria-Adriana Hausvater and Patricia Nedelea as the two additional affiliations. The supervisory body at the time of the evaluation also included Otilia Huzum, Alina Mazilu, Eleonora Ringler-Pascu and Violeta Simona Zonte. Student numbers fluctuated over the review period: 16 in 2021/2022, 18 in both 2022/2023 and 2023/2024, 11 in 2024/2025 and 13 in 2025/2026. The latest total included 12 students in years I-IV and one student in an extension period (IER, pp. 9-10 and 46).

The IER reported measures concerning curriculum revision, research dissemination, access to bibliographic and digital resources, and international cooperation. Follow-up to the previous evaluation remained an important part of the present assessment. According to the IER, the intermediate review had classified four of ten recommendations as implemented, four as partially implemented and two as not implemented. The subsequent measures reported by the School addresseded supervisory recruitment, specialised library acquisitions, research funding, English-language information, external participation in doctoral committees and international mobility. Their effectiveness required assessment against evidence specific to Theatre and Performing Arts (IER, pp. 12 and 45-46).

II. Methods used

a) Documentary analysis

The documentary analysis undertaken for these sections covered the Internal Evaluation Report for Theatre and Performing Arts, including its statistical tables and account of the previous evaluation and follow-up, together with the timetable for the external evaluation visit. The external evaluation report template defined the structure of the assessment. The IER stated that supporting documents were referenced through hyperlinks to public webpages rather than provided as a separate set of annexes (IER, p. 48).

The documentary verification framework covered the institutional and doctoral school regulations; governance records; the curriculum and course descriptions; staff and doctoral student records; research and artistic outputs; infrastructure and library resources; mobility and funding records; academic integrity procedures; and internal quality assurance reports. The framework also included verification of the underlying documents from the previous evaluation and intermediate

follow-up. The sources used in the documentary assessment were identified in the list of documents reviewed.
The analysis distinguished regulatory provisions and institutional claims from evidence of implementation and results. Data relating to the University or the Doctoral School as a whole were distinguished from data specific to Theatre and Performing Arts. References to Music and music-specific activities in the IER required clarification before they could support judgements concerning the evaluated field.

b) On-site visit

The on-site stage took place on 22-23 September 2026, with meetings held principally in Room 201 of the Faculty of Music and Theatre. Structured discussions were organised with the management of the organisational component, the IER drafting team, doctoral supervisors, employers, the University Ethics Committee, quality assurance structures, doctoral students, graduates and staff responsible for research laboratories. The latter includedd representatives of the Music and Theatre Technology Laboratory and the Theatre Research and Creation Laboratory. The programme also included technical meetings of the panel and a closing meeting with institutional representatives to communicate the preliminary conclusions.
The material resources were visited on 23 September. The review concerned the teaching, rehearsal, research and documentation facilities actually available to Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral students, together with relevant equipment, accessibility and arrangements for use. The IER identified classrooms and seminar spaces, laboratory facilities and library resources, including the Faculty branch library and the Eugen Todoran Central University Library. The timetable identified the planned meetings and inspection activities but did not, by itself, establish actual attendance or the precise premises inspected. The timetable also allowed for additional consultations with IT support, international relations and mobility, or counselling and career guidance services, where necessary.

c) Other relevant methods and analytical safeguards

The evaluation methodology combined documentary review, stakeholder interviews and direct observation, with provision for selective verification of records. The methodological framework provided for cross-checking information across these sources, discussing inconsistencies and formulating indicator-level judgements through joint analysis. Particular attention was paid to the relationship between scientific research and artistic practice, the distribution and continuity of supervision, doctoral progression, academic integrity, international mobility and the implementation of previous recommendations. The formulation of final judgements and recommendations was subject to verification of the supporting evidence throughout the evaluation process.

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 a governance structure linking IOSUD-UVT and CSUD with the Director and Council of the Doctoral School of Music and Theatre, doctoral supervisors and administrative support services. The School operated under the institutional regulation for doctoral studies, its own doctoral studies regulation and its admission regulation. Procedures also covered doctoral progress, thesis completion and defence, and curriculum development and review. Quality assurance and ethics structures provided specialised support. Doctoral students were represented in the Doctoral School Council and CSUD (IER, pp. 11 and 13-14).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The allocation of responsibilities provided an identifiable framework for academic decisions, administrative support and institutional oversight. The combination of university-wide rules and doctoral school provisions was appropriate to a field embedded in a multidisciplinary doctoral school. The IER reported periodic review in response to regulatory changes and internal evaluation, rather than reliance on an unchanging set of rules. Its account supported the adequacy of the organisational framework. It did not, however, provide a detailed chronology of revisions or sample decision records in the narrative; this limited assessment of implementation rather than demonstrating a structural deficiency. The recommendation below aims to improve the traceability of decisions and regulatory updates within the existing organisational framework, without implying a failure of that framework.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples:** No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the expected governance 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.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER reported that academic staff, supervisors and doctoral student representatives participated in the adoption and revision of regulations through the School Council, CSUD and other institutional structures. It referred to the system procedure for preparing, approving, amending and withdrawing regulations and methodologies. School decisions were submitted to CSUD for validation and publication. Student views were also collected through questionnaires and direct consultations. The School identified more systematic consultation of graduates and formal involvement of external artistic and cultural experts as further development needs (IER, pp. 14-15).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported mechanisms enabled internal stakeholders to contribute before institutional approval and provided a route from School-level discussion to CSUD decisions. These arrangements supported fulfilment of the indicator at the level described in the IER. The principal improvement need concerned traceability: the narrative did not identify a specific regulatory change resulting from an external stakeholder proposal, while the School itself envisaged formalising this participation. This did not establish that consultation had been absent, but it justified a focused recommendation to document how external views influenced decisions. Attendance at an evaluation meeting alone would not demonstrate such influence.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was substantiated through a 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 classrooms 201a-d, audio-video teaching equipment, a technology laboratory with seven computers, the Orpheum and Concertino halls, individual study areas and university support services. Library provision included the Eugen Todoran Central University Library and the Music and Theatre branch, with 14 reading places and holdings reported as 2,889 books, 857 periodicals and audiovisual materials, alongside a substantial music-score collection. Electronic resources included JSTOR and databases available through institutional subscriptions. The IER referred generally to measures facilitating access for students with disabilities. Many of its detailed examples concerned musical instruments, music software and musical rehearsal facilities (IER, pp. 15-17).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported resources provided a general teaching and documentation base, including shared facilities relevant to theatrical research. However, the documentary narrative did not map all Theatre-specific rehearsal, performance, recording and research needs to identified spaces, equipment and access arrangements, or establish the accessibility of the premises used by the field. The recorded fulfilled rating therefore requires explicit support from the material-resource inspection and the relevant inventories or access records. These documentary limitations alone do not establish that facilities were absent or inaccessible. The recommendations address resource traceability, accessibility review and specialised bibliographic provision.

- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The shared library and electronic resources were relevant support arrangements, but their theatre-specific adequacy had not been demonstrated sufficiently to identify an exceptional practice.

Recommendations: Identify the spaces, essential equipment and access arrangements available for Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral teaching, rehearsal, performance, recording and research. Record accessibility barriers and the adjustments agreed with responsible services. Review specialist bibliographic needs with supervisors and doctoral students, prioritise acquisitions or electronic access within available resources, and record the resources obtained.

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 allocated infrastructure and logistical responsibilities to structures coordinated by the General Administrative Directorate. A dedicated service managed student accommodation, while a designated person at faculty level kept records of and administered material resources. Reported interventions included furniture and smart-board purchases and renovation of the School premises and the Orpheum and Concertino halls, including heating, electrical installations, surveillance systems and sanitary facilities. Buildings and specialised spaces were subject to periodic maintenance and checks; movable assets were inventoried and maintained under institutional procedures (IER, pp. 17-18).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported division between central infrastructure services and faculty asset administration provided a coherent maintenance framework. The identified renovation works supplied concrete examples beyond a general statement of intent. These arrangements supported fulfilment in relation to maintenance and continued operation of the assets. The narrative did not quantify downtime, maintenance frequency or response times, so it did not support stronger claims about operational performance. The separate question of whether all theatre-specific needs and accessibility requirements were demonstrably covered was addressed under I.P.A.2.1.1. No distinct maintenance failure was identified that justified duplicating that recommendation here.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No separate best-practice example was identified beyond the reported maintenance and renovation 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 IER identified six supervisors in Theatre and Performing Arts: Violeta Simona Zonte, Eleonora Ringler-Pascu, Maria-Adriana Hausvater, Otilia Huzum, Alina Mazilu and Patricia Nedelea. Five were affiliated as UVT tenured staff and Ringler-Pascu was retired. The field had 13 doctoral students, including one in an extension period. The supervisory table allocated six students to Zonte, five to Mazilu and two to Nedelea; the other three supervisors had no students recorded. The IER listed the orders granting supervisory status and reported annual approval of staffing and job descriptions, allocation of teaching by expertise and periodic staff evaluation. It also reported expansion from four supervisors in 2021 to six (IER, pp. 9-10, 18-20 and 46).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The named supervisory body, recognised supervisory qualifications and reported alignment between expertise and teaching responsibilities supported the adequacy of human resources for the recorded doctoral population. Supervision was concentrated in three members rather than distributed equally across all six. Thus, the aggregate ratio of 13 students to six supervisors described affiliation-level capacity, not the workload of each active supervisor. The distribution did not in itself demonstrate excessive workload or justify compulsory redistribution. The retired supervisor had no students recorded, so the IER did not establish an immediate transfer-of-supervision problem. The recent affiliations indicated renewal of capacity. A separate recruitment or succession recommendation was therefore not warranted by the information examined.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The expansion of the supervisory body was a positive development, but the IER did not establish a distinctive practice beyond normal capacity renewal.

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 continuing development through the UVT Teaching and Learning Brand programme, based on reflective-collaborative learning, and DEVELOP grants of RON 5,000 per year per eligible beneficiary. The grants were available to teaching and research staff with their main full-time appointment at UVT. Other opportunities included academic mobility, conferences, workshops, artistic residencies and training in digital technologies, academic management and transversal skills. The IER linked identification of development needs to staff evaluation and referred to exchanges within UNITA. Several examples of artistic events were music-oriented and were not evidence of participation by Theatre and Performing Arts staff (IER, pp. 20-21).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The combination of structured training and a defined funding mechanism supported the institution's provision for professional and personal development. The stated eligibility conditions were relevant because the supervisory body also included a retired member; access to the grant could not be assumed for every supervisor. The IER did not provide a theatre-specific participation table or demonstrate the impact of individual training activities. Accordingly, fulfilment was supported by the institutional provision described, without claiming universal uptake or measured improvements in teaching. The recommendation below concerns field-level monitoring of participation, without implying a demonstrated exclusion or unmet need.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The combination of structured pedagogical development and a defined annual professional-development grant offered a replicable support mechanism. Its value concerned the reported institutional design; individual uptake in the evaluated field was not quantified.

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 referred to the IOSUD-UVT framework procedure for affiliation and disaffiliation and the School's own affiliation regulation. It also described institutional recruitment procedures with eligibility criteria, selection stages, committees and appeal mechanisms. Vacancies were communicated through official university channels, and the process was reported as documented through announcements, application files, committee reports and minutes. Staffing establishments were approved annually in relation to academic needs. The field's increase from four to six supervisors provided contextual evidence of recent affiliations, without itself demonstrating every procedural step (IER, pp. 21-22 and 46).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The described framework addressed the core requirements of public information, defined criteria, documented decisions and avenues for appeal. Affiliation to a doctoral school and recruitment to an employment position were distinct processes and were considered separately in the assessment; an affiliation did not automatically constitute an appointment through a vacancy competition. The procedures reported by the institution supported fulfilment of the transparency requirement. The IER narrative did not supply a complete individual recruitment or affiliation file, so no claim was made that every recent appointment had been independently audited. No specific procedural irregularity was identified that warranted a corrective recommendation.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was substantiated beyond the transparency and documentation requirements expected of recruitment and affiliation procedures.

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 an institutional online admission system covering information, registration, candidate ranking and confirmation of places. Within the School, digital tools supported doctoral records, communication, document submission, scheduling and archiving. Google Classroom and Google Meet were used for teaching, resource sharing and communication, alongside institutional email. The wider quality-management account identified UMS for student records and DMS/SharePoint for document management. Public information was provided through UVT, IOSUD and School websites. Further integration of doctoral processes remained a stated development objective (IER, pp. 5, 22-23 and 43).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The functions described extended beyond electronic communication to practical administrative and academic services. Online admission and digital document handling supported access for applicants and doctoral students, while shared teaching resources and remote communication supported interaction with supervisors. The coexistence of several platforms did not, by itself, indicate a failure of the indicator, which concerned effective use of IT tools rather than a requirement for one integrated system. The IER did not quantify processing-time reductions or user satisfaction, so such benefits were not treated as measured outcomes. The recommendation

below aims to strengthen the integration of existing digital services and the monitoring of administrative processing times, building on the functional IT arrangements already described.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The admission platform brought the principal application stages together at one institutional entry point, a practical arrangement relevant to access and administrative simplification.

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 IER described an outcome-oriented curriculum organised through transferable credits and combining advanced training, research, artistic practice and assessment. Activities were grouped into research and training activities (Type I) and training and academic support activities (Type II). Individual research paths were adapted to doctoral topics and supervised throughout the programme. Expected outcomes covered advanced knowledge, research and creative skills, critical reflection, responsibility and autonomy. The School reported periodic curriculum review involving supervisors and doctoral students (IER, pp. 23-24).

✓ **Analysis**: The reported structure integrated the main components of doctoral education and supported progression towards independent research and artistic creation. The combination of common training and individual research was appropriate to Theatre and Performing Arts. However, the narrative did not reproduce the full credit distribution or a complete course list, and one methodological description referred specifically to music research. Such wording could not establish the content of theatre-specific training. The fulfilled judgement was based on the curricular framework described in the IER, including its organisation through transferable credits and the integration of training, research, artistic practice and assessment. The limited detail on individual courses restricted conclusions about their specific content and credit allocation.

✓ The recommendation below concerns continuous curricular improvement; occupational alignment is addressed separately under I.P.B.2.1.2.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: Review Theatre doctoral course syllabi against the needs of scientific and professional doctoral pathways, using documented student feedback. Record decisions on field-specific research methodology, academic writing, ethics and the balance of compulsory and optional training, with reasons for amendments or retention of existing provision.

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 associated expected outcomes with national and European qualification benchmarks and referred to occupational standards and ESCO. Outcomes included advanced scientific and artistic research, original creation, critical analysis, cultural-project management, communication, ethics and autonomous learning. The occupational examples included researcher, university teacher, performer, director, critic and cultural manager; the list also included composer. The report stated that the correlations were reflected in curricular documents but did not reproduce an explicit mapping to identified occupational competences (IER, pp. 24-25).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The research, artistic and transversal competences described were broadly relevant to doctoral-level work in Theatre and Performing Arts. Nevertheless, general occupational titles did not demonstrate the specific correlation required by the indicator. The mixed list, including a music-oriented occupation, further limited its field-specific evidential value. Without an identifiable correspondence between expected outcomes and relevant occupational-standard or ESCO competences, full fulfilment was not demonstrated by the narrative examined. The proposed partial judgement concerned the evidence of alignment, not a finding that graduates lacked appropriate competences. An existing approved mapping, if supplied and verified, could resolve this reservation.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: Approve a Theatre and Performing Arts matrix linking programme learning outcomes to relevant competences in identified occupational standards and/or ESCO profiles, the curricular or research activities developing them, and assessment evidence. Record consultation with at least one external theatre-sector representative or employer and the resulting revisions.

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 flexible individual research paths adapted to each doctoral topic, methodology and objectives. Teaching and learning included advanced research activities, seminars, artistic-creation workshops, individual supervision and periodic progress reviews. Students participated in defining objectives and selecting methods, while assessment was described as continuous and formative. The Scientific Research and Academic Writing course supported research preparation. Digital platforms supported access to materials and communication, and course descriptions were reportedly reviewed annually (IER, pp. 25-26).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported combination of individual supervision, active involvement in research decisions and formative feedback supported student-centred doctoral learning. It accommodated different scientific and practice-based projects without requiring identical outputs from all students. These arrangements supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. The narrative did not establish how consistently every supervisor applied them or quantify student satisfaction; neither outcome was

inferred. The recommendation below concerns consistency of formative feedback and systematic monitoring of student experience.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 a financial-support methodology for doctoral mobility and research, Erasmus+ short-term doctoral opportunities and UNITA virtual courses. Erasmus+ provision also included support arrangements for participants with special needs. Theatre doctoral students were reported to have access to research internships, courses, workshops, conferences and artistic projects. The IER linked to a Theatre mobility record but did not reproduce the numbers of participants, destinations or completed mobilities in its narrative (IER, pp. 26-27).

✓ **Analysis**: The institutional programmes and funding arrangements provided identifiable physical and virtual mobility opportunities appropriate to doctoral study. This supported fulfilment of an indicator concerned with the availability of opportunities. Availability was distinguished from actual participation: the narrative alone did not demonstrate a participation rate or achievement of the earlier mobility recommendation. Completed participation is assessed under I.P.B.8.1.1; the recommendation below concerns communication of existing opportunities.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: The combination of short-term doctoral mobility and virtual UNITA courses offered complementary routes for participation, including for candidates whose research or professional commitments restricted longer periods abroad. Actual uptake by Theatre students was not quantified in the narrative.

Recommendations: n/a

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 referred to institutional non-discrimination provisions, the Gender Equality Plan and the code for preventing antisemitism. It described equal access to supervision, educational resources and assessment, together with counselling, mediation and academic support. Individual research paths were presented as responsive to doctoral students' different academic, artistic and professional aspirations (IER, pp. 27-28).

✓ **Analysis**: The policy framework and individualised supervision arrangements supported equitable participation and respect for differing learning needs. The report did not identify a case of discriminatory treatment in the field. Equally, the existence of equality policies did not establish that every physical or digital access need had been met; this distinct requirement was addressed under I.P.B.4.1.1. The reported non-discrimination provisions, support services and individualised research pathways supported the fulfilled judgement. The recommendation below concerns equitable information about research support and monitoring of access barriers, while protecting personal data.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 reported access to university libraries, digital archives, study areas, research and artistic-creation spaces, technical support and electronic resources, including JSTOR, Project MUSE and other scientific and humanities databases. It also referred to educational and vocational counselling, career counselling and personal-development support. Accessibility for students with special educational needs or disabilities was asserted through institutional measures, without detailed examples of adjustments in the facilities and services used by Theatre doctoral students (IER, pp. 28-29; infrastructure context, pp. 15-17).

✓ **Analysis**: The reported access to library collections, electronic databases, research and artistic-creation spaces, technical assistance and counselling services provided a support framework relevant to doctoral learning in Theatre and Performing Arts. Institutional measures also addressed support for doctoral students with special educational needs or disabilities. Taken together, these arrangements supported the fulfilled judgement. However, the IER provided limited detail on individual accommodations and the accessibility of particular facilities; the assessment therefore did not imply that every potential access barrier had been eliminated. The recommendations focused on making access arrangements and support contacts clearer, documenting requests and responses, and reviewing difficulties encountered by doctoral students. The physical accessibility review recommended under I.P.A.2.1.1 complemented these measures without requiring a duplicate action.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: Provide one accessible guide identifying support contacts, library and digital-resource access, available doctoral research funding and eligible expenditure, and procedures for requesting admission or learning adjustments. Record requests and responses confidentially, review reported barriers in anonymised form and document any resulting changes.

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 reported that learning outcomes were set out in the curriculum and course descriptions and communicated to candidates and other stakeholders. They covered advanced research, critical analysis, original artistic creation and dissemination of results. Assessment tasks included practical work, projects, written examinations and presentations. Outcomes also provided reference points for assessing doctoral progress and completion (IER, pp. 29-30).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported formulation of outcomes connected doctoral-level expectations with curricular activities and assessment. This supported shared understanding between doctoral candidates and teaching staff. The narrative did not reproduce individual course outcomes, so their wording and measurability had not been independently checked in this documentary assessment. The fulfilled judgement concerned the reported arrangements for defining and communicating learning outcomes and linking them to assessment. It did not imply independent verification of the wording and measurability of every course-level outcome. Occupational correspondence was a separate issue under I.P.B.2.1.2 and did not warrant a duplicate recommendation here.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 assessment during doctoral studies and at completion. Research progress was reviewed against the individual plan under the supervisor and relevant committees. The curriculum requirement cited in the IER referred to four progress reports on scientific or applied research, normally one per year, and the corresponding credits before proceeding to the relevant thesis-defence stage. Course descriptions specified assessment types, criteria, methods, weighting and minimum performance standards. Completion included public defence of the doctoral thesis before a specialist committee (IER, pp. 30-31).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The combination of course assessment, periodic research reports and public thesis defence provided successive opportunities to check achievement of learning outcomes. It covered both the development of research and the final doctoral contribution. The four-report requirement was considered as a curricular provision reported in the IER. The material examined did not establish its application to every cohort or confirm completion of all required reports by each candidate. No contradictory assessment practice was established in the material examined, and no corrective recommendation was justified on that basis.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The IER described university-level admission procedures applied by the Doctoral School and adapted to the artistic fields. Selection included assessment

of relevant academic and artistic competences and research or artistic-creation potential. The report stated that admission methodologies were published through official university channels at least six months before application and referred to the regulation governing doctoral admission and its admission-test provisions (IER, p. 31).

- ✓ **Analysis:** The reported framework established a basis for transparent and academically relevant selection. The relationship between institutional rules and field-specific assessment was appropriate to doctoral admission in Theatre and Performing Arts. The publication lead time was an institutional statement, not an independently checked publication history. Likewise, the narrative did not permit an audit of individual rankings or appeals. The reported admission procedures, published selection requirements and field-specific assessment arrangements supported the fulfilled judgement. The documentary limitations restricted conclusions about individual admission decisions but did not reveal a specific procedural irregularity. No additional recommendation was warranted.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples:** No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 linked doctoral admission to the Charter's principles of non-discrimination and equal opportunity. It reported institutional support for candidates from vulnerable groups and for those with special educational needs or disabilities, including support services, accessibility information and assistive software. Admission conditions were communicated through university and School websites (IER, pp. 31-32).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The described combination of common admission criteria and targeted support provision supported equitable access. The report did not establish any field-specific exclusion or discriminatory selection practice. However, it did not quantify requests for adjustments or show individual decisions, so universal effectiveness was not claimed. The proposed fulfilled judgement rested on the reported admissions framework and available support measures. Access to learning resources is addressed under I.P.B.4.1.1. The recommendation below concerns confidential monitoring of admission accommodations.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled .

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described regulations governing doctoral students' rights and obligations, progression, assessment and completion deadlines. Each doctoral path was organised through an approved individual research plan and monitored through annual evaluations and progress reports. The School also reported an International Conference on Research in Music and Theatre organised from 2022 and the first edition of its doctoral students' Creation and

Interpretation Festival in 2025, providing opportunities to present research and artistic work (IER, pp. 32-33).

- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported research plans and progress reviews provided an operational connection between regulations and the individual doctoral journey. The conference and festival complemented formal monitoring through dissemination opportunities, although they did not themselves demonstrate compliance with progression rules. The narrative did not provide a field-level analysis of completion, interruption or withdrawal decisions; no reduction in dropout was therefore inferred. The described arrangements supported the proposed fulfilled judgement, with no specific regulatory failure requiring an additional recommendation.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The combination of an interdisciplinary doctoral conference and a dedicated creation-and-interpretation festival provided complementary academic and artistic dissemination settings. This was a School-level practice; the narrative did not quantify Theatre participation separately.
- ✓ Recommendations: n/a

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 described institutional cooperation agreements, Erasmus+ opportunities and UVT membership of the UNITA alliance. For Theatre and Performing Arts, it referred to cooperation through festivals, productions, performances, workshops, masterclasses and research-creation projects with partners abroad. However, the narrative did not identify a dated set of Theatre-specific partnerships and completed activities. The follow-up section also recorded only partial implementation of the earlier recommendation concerning outward mobility and a 20% participation objective (IER, pp. 33-34 and 45-46).
- ✓ **Analysis**: Institutional membership and mobility opportunities provided an enabling framework, but the indicator required cooperation actions supporting the evaluated community. University-wide alliance activity could not be treated as direct evidence of Theatre participation. The narrative statements and unresolved earlier follow-up did not establish the extent of completed field-level cooperation. The evidence presented did not sufficiently establish the extent of completed international cooperation involving Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral students and staff. The indicator was therefore assessed as partially fulfilled, reflecting the gap between the institutional cooperation framework and the field-specific results substantiated in the assessment. The earlier 20% objective was not treated as a numerical threshold in the present indicator or calculated using the School-wide student population.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: Complete and document at least one Theatre-specific international academic or research-creation activity with an identified foreign partner and participation by Theatre doctoral students. Provide targeted advice on funding and short, blended or virtual mobility. Record unique participants, physical and virtual activities, the eligible field-level population and resulting outputs, and assess progress against the earlier mobility recommendation using a stated calculation method.

The indicator is: partially fulfilled.

Criterion B.9. Scientific research results

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER described individual research plans and the integration of inquiry, research findings and artistic creation into supervision, teaching, assessment and thesis development. Dissemination included papers, performances, conferences and festivals. It also identified the Center for Musical and Transdisciplinary Research and the MUSiQ journal as School-level research structures; their descriptions were primarily music-oriented (IER, pp. 34-35).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The individual research plan and the reported use of research in mentoring and evaluation supported research-based doctoral learning. The indicator concerned how inquiry contributed to learning outcomes, rather than publication visibility alone. Music-oriented structures were not taken as proof of Theatre-specific participation or achievement, and planned journal indexing was not treated as an accomplished result. On the reported educational arrangements, a fulfilled judgement was proposed. The visit timetable identified a Theatre Research and Creation Laboratory and its representative. The recommendation below therefore concerns documenting and developing that existing provision. Research-output visibility is addressed under I.P.B.9.2.1.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 stated that staff and doctoral research was disseminated nationally and internationally through publications, collective volumes, conferences and artistic productions, including performances and festivals. It linked to student and staff activity records and described the use of results in doctoral education and thesis preparation. The narrative did not reproduce an attributable Theatre-specific list of outputs, venues, dates or indicators of recognition (IER, pp. 35-36).
- ✓ **Analysis:** The dissemination channels described were appropriate to scientific and artistic research. Nevertheless, their general enumeration did not establish the actual visibility or use of results in the evaluated field. School-wide achievements and music-related examples could not substitute for attributable Theatre outputs. Accordingly, the indicator was assessed as partially fulfilled because the narrative examined did not sufficiently substantiate the national and international visibility of identifiable Theatre research outputs or their use in doctoral education. This was an evidential limitation rather than a finding that research results were absent. For artistic research, documented professional presentation and reception were relevant evidence; bibliometric measures alone would have been insufficient.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples:** No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: Use existing institutional records to compile and review Theatre research and artistic-research outputs, identifying authors, doctoral affiliation where applicable, dates, venues,

verifiable references, national or international dissemination and use in doctoral learning. Include the Theatre Research and Creation Laboratory's contribution and doctoral participation. Identify dissemination gaps, agree targeted support within available resources and record the resulting outputs.

The indicator is: partially 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 an institutional quality-assurance framework covering programme evaluation, doctoral progression, teaching, research and academic ethics. The Doctoral School reported collecting student feedback, analysing it in its management structures and reviewing curricula annually. University-level procedures and regulations were also periodically revised. The follow-up section recorded ten earlier recommendations, of which four had been considered implemented, four partially implemented and two not implemented at the interim review, followed by an account of subsequent measures (IER, p. 37 and pp. 45-46).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The institutional framework provided a basis for systematic quality management. However, the indicator also required demonstrated impact. General statements about annual updates and improvement did not identify a complete Theatre-specific sequence linking an identified problem, an adopted measure and a verified result. The School itself identified impact monitoring as a development need. The follow-up account showed activity but did not establish that every outstanding recommendation had been resolved. Full fulfilment was therefore not demonstrated by the evidence examined, and a partial judgement was proposed. This concerned the traceability of results rather than the absence of quality-assurance structures.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: Maintain one Theatre and Performing Arts quality improvement plan covering outstanding external-evaluation recommendations and current internal findings. Link each action to a responsible role, baseline where relevant, intended result and verifiable completion evidence. Integrate programme review and consultation with doctoral students, supervisors, graduates and external theatre practitioners; record proposals, reasoned decisions, changes and their observed effects, and communicate relevant conclusions to students.

The indicator is: partially fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER reported that doctoral students, teaching staff and external stakeholders contributed through questionnaires, consultations, working meetings and

periodic evaluations. Doctoral students participated in CSUD and the Doctoral School Council, while teaching staff contributed to admission and completion methodologies, regulations and curricular revisions. For Theatre and Performing Arts, the report identified directors, actors, playwrights, set designers and cultural managers as relevant external contributors, without naming a specific consultation-to-decision case (IER, pp. 37-38).

- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported mechanisms provided internal and external channels through which opinions could inform the implementation of procedures. Formal student representation complemented direct consultation. These arrangements supported a proposed fulfilled judgement, although the narrative did not demonstrate the influence of each stakeholder category on a particular decision. The documented consultation recommended under I.P.A.1.2.1 also addressed this traceability issue. Its record should be used as shared evidence rather than generating a parallel consultation requirement under this indicator. The recommendation below uses these consultation records in annual quality reporting and does not require a parallel consultation process.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 described the University Ethics Commission as operating under a Senate-approved regulation and independently of other university structures or persons. Its responsibilities included examining complaints concerning academic ethics and conduct. The Code of Ethics addressed impartiality, integrity, transparency, the right of defence, non-discrimination and freedom from improper influence. At doctoral level, Ethics and Academic Integrity was reported as a compulsory course, including for Theatre and Performing Arts (IER, pp. 38-39).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported regulation, defined competence and independence provisions provided an appropriate institutional framework for the Commission's work. Compulsory ethics education complemented this framework but did not substitute for independent complaint handling. The narrative did not contain individual case files or evidence of interference, and neither the absence of complaints nor the effectiveness of particular decisions was inferred. On the institutional arrangements described, a fulfilled judgement was proposed. No specific operational irregularity was identified that justified a corrective recommendation.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The combination of university-level ethics oversight and compulsory doctoral training provided complementary preventive and corrective mechanisms. The evidence supported the design of this arrangement, rather than a measured reduction in ethical breaches.

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 referred to the UVT regulation governing the initiation, development, monitoring and periodic review of study programmes and domains. The Doctoral School reported annual curriculum review, collection of feedback from doctoral students and other stakeholders, and management analysis of educational, research and artistic activities. It stated that the results informed improvement proposals, but did not identify a dated Theatre-specific review decision together with the resulting change and subsequent assessment of its effects (IER, pp. 39-40).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported annual curriculum reviews, student feedback and stakeholder consultations provided a structured basis for monitoring and improving doctoral education in Theatre and Performing Arts. The IER indicated that the results informed improvement proposals, supporting the application of programme-review procedures. However, it did not present a complete documented example linking a review decision to an implemented change and an assessment of its effects. The evidence therefore supported the operation of the review process more clearly than its demonstrated impact. The recommendation addressed this limitation by requiring a traceable record of review findings, reasoned decisions and subsequent outcomes, integrated into the quality-improvement plan under I.P.C.1.1.1 and drawing on existing institutional records.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 described annual curriculum analysis involving the Doctoral School Council and University Senate. Inputs reportedly included student satisfaction questionnaires, teaching evaluations, staff proposals, and feedback from graduates and employers. Internal participation also took place through CSUD and School Council representation. The named external example was Dan Simion, artistic director at the Banat Philharmonic, and the report additionally referred to staff experience in music institutions and equipment requests (IER, pp. 40-41).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported internal participation and consultation channels supported stakeholder involvement in programme monitoring and review. However, the named music-sector example did not by itself demonstrate consultation with Theatre employers or alumni. Nor did equipment procurement establish the influence of external stakeholders on curricular decisions. A fulfilled judgement was proposed on the participatory arrangements reported, without treating those examples as field-specific proof. The consultation record recommended under I.P.A.1.2.1 and the programme-review record under I.P.C.3.1.1 should jointly provide the necessary traceability. A further, overlapping recommendation was not proposed.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 identified evaluare.uvt.ro as the institutional platform for student evaluation of teaching. The methodology provided two stages in each semester: formative feedback in weeks 7-8 and a final evaluation in weeks 13-14, with different arrangements for releasing results to teachers. It stated that the process also applied within the Doctoral School. Separately, it described a five-year evaluation of doctoral supervisors. No Theatre-specific semester results, response counts or documented Council analysis were reproduced in this section (IER, pp. 41-42).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The two-stage student-evaluation methodology provided a framework for feedback and review. This indicator concerns analysis of actual evaluation results; the five-year evaluation of supervisors is a separate process. The recorded fulfilled rating requires Theatre-specific evidence of the courses evaluated, eligible respondents, responses received, the analysis undertaken and any follow-up. The narrative did not reproduce these records. This evidential limitation does not establish that the platform was unavailable or that doctoral teaching evaluation had not been implemented.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The institutional distinction between mid-semester formative feedback and end-of-semester evaluation offered a mechanism for making and subsequently reviewing improvements within the same teaching period.

Recommendations: Include all delivered Theatre doctoral courses and their teachers in student evaluation in each teaching semester. Record eligible respondents, participation, analysis and justified follow-up, protecting anonymity in small cohorts and identifying limits caused by low participation. Include feedback on research-plan guidance where appropriate, distinguish it from course evaluation and communicate anonymised conclusions and resulting improvements to students.

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 identified UMS for academic records, digital teaching platforms, online feedback applications, research-reporting systems and electronic doctoral records covering research plans, progress reports, defences and committees. DMS/SharePoint supported document archiving, and survey tools supported data collection. The School reported regular updating and analysis of information on progression, teaching evaluations, research and artistic outputs, and mobility. It also referred to iThenticate in relation to academic integrity (IER, pp. 42-43).
- ✓ **Analysis**: The reported systems covered the main categories of information needed for internal quality assurance and supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. Their existence did not establish that every dataset had already been consolidated into a Theatre-specific analysis. In particular, it did not resolve the missing evaluation evidence under I.P.C.4.1.1 or the output and mobility verification issues in Domain B. iThenticate was relevant to text-similarity screening and was not treated as a bibliometric database. The annual quality-plan review under I.P.C.1.1.1 should use

these existing records; no new platform or duplicate database was justified by the evidence examined.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The IER reported that UVT and the Doctoral School published information on admission, tuition fees, supervisors, student activities, regulations, methodologies, the curriculum and learning outcomes. The follow-up section recorded an earlier recommendation to translate information relevant to foreign applicants as partially implemented at the interim review. It subsequently stated that translation was being undertaken on the UVT and School websites, without providing a dated inventory showing that the essential information was complete and consistent in English (IER, pp. 43-44 and 46).

✓ **Analysis**: The reported range of published information covered the principal needs of candidates and doctoral students and supported a proposed fulfilled judgement. This assessment did not constitute an independent audit of all live pages or links. The unresolved evidence on English-language coverage justified a focused follow-up recommendation, but did not establish that the underlying public information was absent. The recommendation concerned completion and maintenance of the earlier commitment rather than a requirement to translate every institutional document.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: Complete and maintain the English-language information essential to Theatre doctoral applicants: admission conditions and calendar, fees and funding, supervisors and research areas, programme structure, completion requirements and contacts. Assign a content owner and retain a dated record of pages checked and corrections made.

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 identified public repositories of Senate and Administrative Council regulations and decisions. The CSUD website provided the legal framework, decisions and reports, while the Doctoral School website included methodologies and regulations, including habilitation and affiliation procedures. The report stated that documents underlying decisions were publicly accessible subject to applicable restrictions (IER, p. 44).

✓ **Analysis**: The reported publication arrangements provided access to the regulatory framework and institutional decisions and supported transparency. Together with the representative arrangements described elsewhere in the IER, they offered channels for understanding and participating in governance. The narrative did not provide a sample establishing the publication timing of every

School decision, so universal or immediate disclosure was not inferred. No specific withheld decision or inconsistent publication practice was established. The proposed judgement was fulfilled, and no additional recommendation was justified beyond the consultation and review records addressed under other indicators.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

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 reported that both IOSUD-UVT and the Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral field had received decisions maintaining accreditation on 25 November 2021. It described preparation of the current self-evaluation documentation and arrangements for external evaluators' access to documents and institutional stakeholders. The follow-up section summarised the interim review of ten recommendations and subsequent measures, including the affiliation of two additional supervisors and provision of mobility support (IER, pp. 45-46).

✓ **Analysis**: The previous evaluation outcomes and the supplied current self-evaluation report demonstrated participation in the external-evaluation cycle. They supported a proposed fulfilled judgement for this procedural indicator, without establishing that every earlier recommendation had been completed. In particular, appointing a referee from another university did not necessarily demonstrate participation by a foreign referee, and informing students about funding did not establish increased grant uptake. These distinctions required evidence-based follow-up in the consolidated quality plan under I.P.C.1.1.1. Outstanding improvement measures did not, in themselves, demonstrate failure to participate in external evaluation. No separate recommendation was needed here.

✓ **Best-practice examples**: No distinct best-practice example was sufficiently substantiated beyond the arrangements expected under this indicator.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths:		Weaknesses:
✓ The supervisory body had expanded from four to six affiliated supervisors since 2021, providing a broader base of expertise for the field's 13 doctoral students in 2025-2026. ✓ Doctoral training combined	INTERNAL FACTORS ↑	✓ The adequacy of theatre-specific spaces, equipment and accessibility arrangements had not been sufficiently demonstrated. Follow-up to the earlier recommendation on specialised books had

individual research plans, personalised supervision, artistic practice and periodic progress assessment, supporting different research and creative trajectories. ✓ University regulations, doctoral student representation and institutional ethics structures provided an established framework for governance and academic integrity. ✓ Doctoral students had reported access to university libraries, electronic resources, counselling and digital academic services. ✓ The School had established an international research conference from 2022 and a doctoral creation and interpretation festival in 2025, providing complementary settings for presenting research and artistic work. These were School-level strengths; Theatre participation had not been separately quantified. ✓ The field had participated in external evaluation and had received a decision maintaining accreditation in November 2021.		remained partial at the interim review. ✓ The IER had acknowledged limited participation in additional research funding and outward mobility, limited staff involvement in research grants, and the absence of cotutelle doctorates. ✓ The documented correlation between Theatre learning outcomes and identified occupational-standard or ESCO competences had remained insufficiently explicit. ✓ Theatre-specific evidence of completed international cooperation and the national and international visibility of research outputs had been insufficiently detailed in the narrative. ✓ The impact of quality-assurance measures and programme review had not been demonstrated through a clear sequence of findings, decisions, implemented changes and verified results. ✓ The narrative had described semester-based student evaluation procedures but had not provided Theatre-specific results, participation figures or documented analysis and follow-up. ✓ The effects of external stakeholder consultation had remained difficult to trace, while completion of the earlier English-language information recommendation had not been fully evidenced.

SWOT analysis

Opportunities:		Threats:
✓ Erasmus+ and the UNITA alliance offered routes to short-term research mobility, virtual learning and exchanges with international academics and artists. ✓ Cooperation with universities abroad offered scope for cotutelle arrangements, joint research and artistic projects, and participation by foreign specialists in doctoral activities. ✓ Partnerships with theatres, festivals and cultural organisations offered settings for developing, presenting and critically discussing doctoral artistic research, as well as consulting employers and professional practitioners. ✓ International conferences, specialist publications and artistic networks offered additional channels for dissemination and professional recognition of Theatre research. ✓ Developments in digital documentation and research methods offered opportunities to expand access to resources and strengthen the study and dissemination of performance, subject to appropriate methodological and ethical safeguards.	EXTERNAL FACTORS	✓ Competition from other doctoral centres could have reduced the field's ability to attract candidates and establish distinctive research partnerships. ✓ Demographic fluctuations and potentially declining interest in doctoral study in vocational fields posed recruitment risks; the IER had not established a quantified forecast for Theatre. ✓ External financial pressures could have constrained investment in specialised resources, additional research support and international mobility. ✓ Rapid changes in artistic research practices, digital technologies and expectations concerning academic integrity could have increased the resources and expertise needed to keep doctoral training current.

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 revising methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures.	F	n/a
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	Identify the spaces, essential equipment and access arrangements available for Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral teaching, rehearsal, performance, recording and research. Record accessibility barriers and the adjustments agreed with responsible services. Review specialist bibliographic needs with supervisors and doctoral students, prioritise acquisitions or electronic access within available resources, and record the resources obtained.
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	F	n/a

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	the members of its own community and the indirect beneficiaries of education.		
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 Theatre doctoral course syllabi against the needs of scientific and professional doctoral pathways, using documented student feedback. Record decisions on field-specific research methodology, academic writing, ethics and the balance of compulsory and optional training, with reasons for amendments or retention of existing provision.
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 a Theatre and Performing Arts matrix linking programme learning outcomes to relevant competences in identified occupational standards and/or ESCO profiles, the curricular or research activities developing them, and assessment evidence. Record consultation with at least one external theatre-sector representative or employer and the resulting revisions.
11.	I.P.B.3.1.1 The organisational component ensures implementation of the student-centred learning in the curriculum and through the teaching strategies used in the learning and teaching activities and experiences.	F	n/a
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	n/a
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	Provide one accessible guide identifying support contacts, library and digital-resource access, available doctoral research funding and eligible expenditure, and procedures for requesting admission or learning adjustments. Record requests and responses confidentially, review reported barriers in anonymised form and document any resulting changes.
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

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
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	n/a
20.	I.P.B.8.1.1 The organisational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.	PF	Complete and document at least one Theatre-specific international academic or research-creation activity with an identified foreign partner and participation by Theatre doctoral students. Provide targeted advice on funding and short, blended or virtual mobility. Record unique participants, physical and virtual activities, the eligible field-level population and resulting outputs, and assess progress against the earlier mobility recommendation using a stated calculation method.
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.	PF	Use existing institutional records to compile and review Theatre research and artistic-research outputs, identifying authors, doctoral affiliation where applicable, dates, venues, verifiable references, national or international dissemination and use in doctoral learning. Include the Theatre Research and Creation Laboratory's contribution and doctoral participation. Identify dissemination gaps, agree targeted support within available resources and record the resulting outputs.
DOMAIN C. Quality management			
23.	I.P.C.1.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	PF	Maintain one Theatre and Performing Arts quality improvement plan covering outstanding external-evaluation recommendations and current internal

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			findings. Link each action to a responsible role, baseline where relevant, intended result and verifiable completion evidence. Integrate programme review and consultation with doctoral students, supervisors, graduates and external theatre practitioners; record proposals, reasoned decisions, changes and their observed effects, and communicate relevant conclusions to 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	Include all delivered Theatre doctoral courses and their teachers in student evaluation in each teaching semester. Record eligible respondents, participation, analysis and justified follow-up, protecting anonymity in small cohorts and identifying limits caused by low participation. Include feedback on research-plan guidance where appropriate, distinguish it from course evaluation and communicate anonymised conclusions and resulting improvements to students.
29.	**I.P.C.5.1.1** The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	F	n/a
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	Complete and maintain the English-language information essential to Theatre doctoral applicants: admission conditions and calendar, fees and funding, supervisors and research areas, programme structure, completion requirements and contacts. Assign a content owner and retain a

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			dated record of pages checked and corrections made.
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	-	-
Domain B. Educational efficacy	11	3	-
Domain C. Quality management	9	1	-
Total	28	4	-

A total of 32 performance indicators were analysed. Consolidation of the ratings recorded in Sections III.A-C gives 28 fulfilled indicators (87.5%), four partially fulfilled indicators (12.5%) and no unfulfilled indicators.

The four indicators recorded as partially fulfilled are I.P.B.2.1.2, I.P.B.8.1.1, I.P.B.9.2.1 and I.P.C.1.1.1.

Other general recommendations

No additional general recommendation was proposed. The consolidated quality-improvement plan recommended under I.P.C.1.1.1 already provided the framework for coordinating the actions, responsibilities, deadlines and verification evidence identified throughout the report.

VI. Conclusions

The doctoral field of Theatre and Performing Arts at West University of Timişoara had an established institutional framework, a supervisory body that had expanded since the previous evaluation, and an individualised approach to doctoral research and artistic creation. The reported curriculum, supervision arrangements, progress assessment, ethics education and access to institutional services provided a basis for continued doctoral training.

The evaluation also identified areas requiring stronger substantiation or improvement: the adequacy and accessibility of resources for Theatre research; explicit occupational alignment of learning outcomes; completed international cooperation and research dissemination; and documented evidence that programme review and student evaluation had led to quality improvements. These matters were addressed through specific recommendations rather than additional general commitments.

The decision of the evaluation panel:

a) maintaining accreditation (MAC);

for the doctoral field of Theatre and Performing Arts at West University of Timișoara.

VII. Annexes

Annex 1. Schedule of the on-site visit

*The supplied timetable states a visit period of 22-23 September 2026 but repeats Tuesday, 22 September above the second block, which starts with the doctoral-student meeting at 09:30. This annex assigns that entire block to Wednesday, 23 September, as the coherent reading of the two-day programme, subject to confirmation **against the final visit record. All supplied activity times have been retained. The schedule does not certify attendance or completion.***

Panel: Alexandru Boureanu, coordinator; Leo Rafolt, international evaluator; Alexandru Rădulea, student evaluator. Institutional contact: Mihai Popean. The timetable identified Room 201, Faculty of Music and Theatre, for meetings; the material-resource inspection concerned the relevant premises.

22 September 2026	***Scheduled activity***
08:00-09:00	*Panel technical discussions*
09:00-09:40	*Meeting with organisational management*
09:40-10:20	*Meeting with the IER drafting team*
10:20-10:30	*Break*
10:30-11:20	*Meeting with teaching staff involved in doctoral activities, including doctoral supervisors*
11:20-12:00	*Meeting with employers of doctoral graduates*
12:00-12:30	*Meeting with the University Ethics Committee*
12:30-13:20	*Break*
13:30-14:30	*Meeting with quality-assurance structures*
14:30-16:00	*Meeting with organisational management, the contact person, CEAC and quality-assurance representatives*
23 September 2026	***Scheduled activity***
08:00-09:30	*Panel technical discussions*
09:30-10:00	*Meeting with doctoral students*
10:00-10:30	*Meeting with alumni*
10:30-11:00	*Meeting with research-centre/laboratory representatives*
11:00-11:30	*Panel technical meeting to clarify aspects of the IER*
11:30-12:30	*Inspection of material resources*
12:30-13:30	*Break*
13:30-15:30	*Completion of evaluation activities*
15:30-16:00	*Closing meeting with institutional and organisational management to communicate the evaluation conclusions*