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. 13
la Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 318/H/22.10.2026

Anexa 13.5

DATE DE IDENTIFICARE	
Instituţia de învăţământ superior/organizaţia furnizoare de educaţie	Universitatea din Oradea
Şcoala(ile) doctorală(e)	Științe Biomedicale
Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD)	*Medicină*
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 - Științe Medicale (CPS_C12) din 08.10.2026, propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV nr. 5136/08.10.2026. Propunerea de decizie a fost analizată de către Departamentul de evaluare Studii Universitare (DESU), opinia DESU fiind consemnată în PV nr. 5321/ 20.10.2026.

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

Domeniul	Standarde Î / N	Indicatori de performanţă Î / PÎ / N
A	**Î:** S.A.1.1, S.A.1.2., S.A.2.1., S.A.2.2., S.A.3.1., S.A.3.2., S.A.4.1. N: -	**Î:** I.P.A.1.1.1, I.P.A.1.2.1, I.P.A.2.1.1, I.P.A.2.2.1, I.P.A.3.1.1, I.P.A.3.1.2, I.P.A.3.2.1, I.P.A.4.1.1 PÎ: - N: -
B	**Î:** S.B.1.1., S.B.2.1., S.B.3.1., S.B.3.2., S.B.4.1., S.B.5.1., S.B.7.1., S.B.7.2., S.B.8.1., S.B.9.1., S.B.9.2. N: -	**Î:** I.P.B.1.1.1., I.P.B.2.1.2, I.P.B.3.1.1, I.P.B.3.1.2, I.P.B.3.2.1, I.P.B.4.1.1., I.P.B.5.1.1, I.P.B.5.1.2, I.P.B.7.1.1, I.P.B.7.1.2, I.P.B.7.2.1, I.P.B.9.1.1, I.P.B.9.2.1 PÎ: I.P.B.8.1.1, N: -
C	**Î:** S.C.1.1, S.C.1.2, S.C.2.2., S.C.3.1, S.C.4.1., S.C.5.1., S.C.6.1., S.C.8.1 N: -	**Î:** I.P.C.1.1.1, I.P.C.1.2.1, I.P.C.2.2.2, I.P.C.3.1.1, I.P.C.3.1.2, I.P.C.4.1.1., I.P.C.5.1.1, I.P.C.6.1.1, I.P.C.6.1.2, I.P.C.8.1.1 PÎ: N: *(se enumeră și marchează cu footnote unde diferă de propunerea din REE)*

Motivarea deciziei

În baza REE, a procesului verbal al şedinţei CPS şi a procesului verbal al şedinţei DESU, Consiliul ARACIS analizează şi validează propunerea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a Calităţii *constatând că din:* • *Total indicatori: 31 sunt îndepliniți, 1 parțial îndeplinit și 0 sunt neîndepliniți.* • *Total standarde: 26 sunt îndeplinite, 0 neîndeplinite.* *şi, 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 maintaining accreditation of the Doctoral Study Domain

Higher Education Institution/ Education Provider Organization:	**UNIVERSITY OF ORADEA**
Doctoral School:	**DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES**
Doctoral Domain:	**MEDICINE**
Accreditation	**Maintaining accreditation**

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

No.	Last Name and First Name	Team role	Signature
1.	**Rogozea, Liliana**	Expert evaluator	
2.	**Carare Roxana**	International Expert	
3.	**Bouruc Petru-Liviu**	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

The University of Oradea (Universitatea din Oradea) was created in March 1991. It has 15 faculties, with 47 teaching departments, IOSUD with 7 doctoral schools, an ID-IFR department, a DPPD department, and a CEC-DRU center for postgraduate programs. There are 102 bachelor's programs, 68 master's programs, and 23 doctoral fields. These are supported by a total of 887 tenured teaching staff, including: 136 professors, 263 associate professors, 362 heads of theses/lecturers, and 126 assistants. Funds obtained from research activities and externally funded projects/programs and other sources for 2020–September 2024 are of 97,768,484 RON in total. The University of Oradea's mission is advanced education and research.

The Doctoral School (SD) of Biomedical Sciences (SDBS) operates within I.O.S.U.D.-University of Oradea under this name starting from the academic year 2011-2012 (HS no. 170 of 12.09.2011-Annex 11, Page 12 of 59 Doctorate School of Biomedical Sciences Internal Evaluation Report – 2026 Doctoral Field: Medicine according to the Regulation on the organization and conduct of doctoral studies and postdoctoral programs, https://www.uoradea.ro/wp-content/uploads/2024/documente/display22980.pdf, ROFSUD, art.6, paragraph (3)- ROFSUD, art.7, alin. (2), offering education at the doctoral study cycle in the fundamental field of Biological and Biomedical Sciences, for the doctoral fields: Biology, Pharmacy, Medicine and Dental Medicine https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/organizare/scoli-doctorale-conducatori-de-doctorat/scoala-doctorala-de-stiinte-biomedicale.

II. Methods used

As part of the external quality assessment of the program, the commission reviewed the institution's Internal Evaluation Report (IER) and accompanying annexes. The institution also uploaded updated, amended, and additional documents to the ARACIS online platform in response to the commission's findings during the preliminary stage and on-site visit.

During the external evaluation visit, the commission inspected the main facilities supporting doctoral studies in Medicine, including research centers, laboratories, and related research infrastructure. Visits covered facilities in areas such as dermatology, cardiorespiratory research, histology, surgery and medical imaging, biochemistry, public health, toxicology, microbiology, immunology, nutrition, genetics, and pediatrics.

The commission also met with key stakeholders involved in doctoral education, including university and IOSUD/ Doctoral School leadership, the team responsible for the internal evaluation report, research center and laboratory heads, academic staff and doctoral supervisors, employers and socio-economic partners, alumni, current doctoral students, and representatives of the quality assurance and ethics bodies (CEAC and the Ethics Commission).

Discussions focused on the organization and operation of the doctoral field, admission and training, research activities, available infrastructure and resources, quality assurance, ethics and academic integrity, as well as the experiences and perspectives of those involved in the program.

This report was compiled using the internal evaluation report and information gathered during the on-site meetings. These included the meetings with the leadership team, current PhD students, PhD graduates (alumni), employers and stakeholders. As a team, we had extensive discussions and feedback, and we were very satisfied with them.

III. Judgment 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 institution has a formal organizational structure and management system for both the institution and its doctoral studies, established through the University Charter and supported by regulations, methodologies, and procedures approved by the Senate. IOSUD operates through the CSUD (Council for Doctoral Studies) and doctoral schools, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Relevant regulations and information for doctoral students, including admission, study requirements, and completion procedures, are publicly available, including in English. Mechanisms are in place for the regular monitoring and evaluation of doctoral schools, supervisors, and students, as well as for collecting stakeholder feedback. Regulations and procedures are reviewed periodically.

Analysis of the state of facts. The evidence reviewed confirms that SDBS has appropriate organizational structures and a coherent procedural framework for managing doctoral fields, in accordance with legislative requirements. Responsibilities and decision-making powers are clearly defined, while procedures for admission, doctoral training, evaluation, supervisor affiliation, and completion are formally established. Student representation and feedback mechanisms support stakeholder participation, and the systematic publication of relevant information ensures managerial transparency. Overall, the evidence supports full compliance with the indicator.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Standard S.A.1.2. Stakeholder engagement
The HEI proves that it engages the relevant stakeholders in developing methodologies and regulations, as well as implementation procedures.

Indicator I.P.A.1.2.1	The opinions of the faculty and department members, of the subsidiary or extension and of other stakeholders are considered in the process of adopting and revising methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures.

Presentation of the state of facts: Within SDBS, stakeholders are involved in the adoption and revision of methodologies, regulations, and procedures through established consultation mechanisms. These include IOSUD and Doctoral School management, doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, and, where relevant, partners from the medical services sector. Consultation takes place through CSUD and SDSBM meetings, thematic meetings with supervisors and research teams, questionnaires for doctoral students, and discussions with partners involved in research, internships, or joint supervision.

Analysis of the state of facts: The evidence reviewed confirms the existence of institutionalized consultation and feedback mechanisms that facilitate stakeholder participation in decision-making and regulatory review. The involvement of doctoral students, supervisors, and partners from the medical field supports a participatory approach to these processes.

Recommendations: Strengthen the traceability of the consultation process by documenting stakeholders' comments and proposals, how these were considered, and the decisions taken, including the specific changes introduced in revised methodologies, regulations, and procedures.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

Presentation of the state of facts: SDBS provides adequate facilities for teaching and research, including classrooms, laboratories, research centers, a library, and spaces for students and staff. SDBS has dedicated teaching and research spaces and access to the university's research infrastructure and the clinical facilities of partner hospitals through collaboration agreements. Doctoral students have access to research facilities, bibliographic resources, and international databases, including remotely. Facilities and accessibility measures are also available for persons with disabilities.

Analysis of the state of facts: The evidence reviewed confirms that the available infrastructure meets the specific requirements of doctoral studies in SDBS and supports teaching, experimental, and clinical research activities. Access to university laboratories, research centers, and partner hospitals provides essential support for applied doctoral research, while access to scientific literature and international databases facilitates research and literature reviews. Student facilities and accessibility provisions further contribute to an environment conducive to study and research. Overall, the material resources and access arrangements meet the requirements of the doctoral field of Biomedical Sciences. The integration of university research infrastructure with the clinical facilities of partner hospitals, together with access to library resources and international databases, including remotely, represents a notable strength.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

Presentation of the current situation. SDBS manages, maintains, and modernizes its movable and immovable assets through designated administrative and specialized structures, in accordance with institutional procedures. SDBS carries out repair, maintenance, and modernization activities periodically, and inventories, maintains, and replaces equipment and other movable assets as needed. Occupational health and safety and accident prevention measures are also implemented.

Analysis of the current situation. The evidence reviewed and the committee's findings confirm that SDBS has effective mechanisms for managing and maintaining its material resources, ensuring appropriate conditions for teaching, research, and work activities.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: SDBS benefits from 38 doctoral supervisors who have obtained the habilitation certificate. All 43 supervisors meet the currently applicable minimum CNATDCU criteria, and 6 of them (13.95%) already fulfill the newer, more stringent criteria applicable starting from 01.10.2026. The academic staff demonstrates significant international visibility, having published over 950 articles in Web of Science (ISI) indexed journals over the last five years.

Analysis of the state of facts: 67% (29 out of 43) of supervisors meet the minimum CNATDCU criteria valid from 01.10.2026, but are already applying for habilitation/professor status in the field of Medicine, per the FMF Council decision of 25.02.2025. The current team averages between 4 and 9 doctoral students per coordinator, which fits within the legal limit (an average of 8 students, extendable by 25% up to 10–12 students). Ph.D. supervisors who reach the retirement age of 65 are permitted to apply for a retirement extension up to and beyond age 70, provided they meet national academic criteria and maintain active publication metrics, specifically at least one Web of Science/ISI publication per year. It was also confirmed that equal-contribution authorship is no longer standard practice under the current scoring system (except in rare, justified cases); first-author and corresponding/supervisor positions now carry the primary weight.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

Presentation of the current situation: The University of Oradea ensures professional development through continuing education programs (InnoScience), international mobility programs (such as Erasmus+ and EU Green), and institutional support for academic career development, including the habilitation process. Staff participation in national and international scientific events is supported through institutional funds or research grants.

Analysis of the state of facts: The University of Oradea actively supports career progression by covering the habilitation fee for first-time submissions. Additionally, an internal committee designated by the Director of the Doctoral School assists candidates by reviewing their habilitation files and helping correct formatting or impact factor calculations before external defense. Furthermore, the university offers a robust financial reward system for indexed publications in Web of Science/ISI journals, allocating approximately 2,800 RON for Q1 publications, 2,500 RON for Q2, and 2,000 RON for Q3-Q4. These reward funds are split evenly among the contributing authors affiliated with the university and are deposited into internal research accounts, which can then be used to purchase consumables, attend conferences, or pay open-access publication fees.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

Presentation of the current situation: Recruitment procedures for academic staff comply with the legal provisions in force. Competitions for filling vacant teaching or research positions are organized according to the institutional methodology and only after the positions have been published in the Official Monitor of Romania.

All open positions are publicly announced on the dedicated Teaching Positions Competitions webpage, ensuring transparency and complying with all aspects of equality, diversity, and inclusivity.

Analysis of the state of facts: Discussions during the evaluation visit corroborated that the academic staffing and recruitment processes are rigorous, transparent, functional, and fully compliant with national regulations. No non-conformities regarding staff recruitment processes were identified by the evaluation panel.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion A.4. Digitalisation of institutional processes

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

Presentation of the current situation: Digitalization is defined as a priority objective at the university, guided by the "Digitalization Strategy of the University of Oradea for the period 2022-2027". The institution utilizes a variety of digital platforms and databases to manage educational and administrative processes, including the UniWeb/StudInfo system for student management, the Moodle e-learning platform integrated with Microsoft 365 and MS Teams, and the Softlink Liberty5 system for library management. The university also provides full access to Matlab modules for members of the academic community. Routine administrative procedures for doctoral students—such as requests for certificates or notifications regarding schedules—can be completed online. Furthermore, the institution utilizes CNATDCU-recognized anti-plagiarism software (Sistem Antiplagiat prin Internet SRL and iThenticate) to verify all doctoral and habilitation theses.

Analysis of the state of facts: During the visit, the ethics committee confirmed that all doctoral reports, publications, and dissertations undergo mandatory software screening for plagiarism prior to the defense. The acceptable similarity threshold is determined per domain guidelines and is typically cited as approximately 20% to 25%. It was also noted that students receive dedicated training on these anti-plagiarism norms during mandatory first-year courses. Regarding research IT infrastructure, alumni and students confirmed access to necessary specialized software, databases, and a newly acquired high-performance computing cluster (secured through a European-funded project) utilized for complex molecular dynamics and in silico simulations. Administrative processes, such as the annual student evaluations of faculty and PhD supervisors, are also successfully conducted via an online platform. Additionally, institutional email accounts remain active for a period post-graduation, enabling alumni to continue collaborating with their former research teams. Finally, representatives mentioned a recent institutional phishing/cyber incident that had temporarily disrupted digital archives; while this necessitated manual document reconstitution for evaluation purposes, the institution managed the recovery process effectively.

The indicator is: fulfilled

DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy

Criterion B.1. Content and relevance of study programmes

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

Presentation of the current situation: The study program is available through the University of Oradea Cloud. The information needed to evaluate the study program can be easily found in the provided documents. The learning plan is aligned with the Romanian legislation and international standards. The curriculum is structured on two main pillars: training courses mainly proposed during the first year of study and a research project. The organization of the progress reports, evaluation by the guidance committee, and thesis defense modalities are sufficiently explained. The research areas in which students may perform their doctoral study cover seven domains, including clinical, fundamental, and public health. The described research areas cover the major domains developed in medical schools.

Analysis of the state of facts: The two major expected skills are classified into professional and transversal skills. The skills (seven for professional and five for transversal) are presented and highlight the competences that should be mastered. The skills are relevant and align with international standards. We remark two important aspects: The first aspect is the inclusion of interdisciplinary areas of study, and the second is the innovation and knowledge exchange element, as some students and supervisors are involved in different stages of patents

Recommendations: The research activities in which medical doctoral students are involved could offer more opportunities to cover bioinformatics and AI and their applications in biomedical sciences.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: The study outcomes are clearly presented in five online sections. Main outcome after graduation: A PhD holder is expected to transition into advanced professional roles, including conducting independent research, securing employment in academia or industry, and applying expert problem-solving skills in a discipline related to medicine, biomedicine, biological sciences, biotechnology, drug discovery, and development. The other outcomes relate to the student's ability to manage ethics and scientific integrity, obtain and manage research grants, write scientific articles, and communicate research results and disseminate research outcomes at specific and general conferences.

Analysis of the state of facts: During the meeting with employers from various sectors, it was explicitly confirmed that the competencies acquired during the doctoral program directly align with and elevate professional occupational standards. Representatives from the public and private healthcare sectors (such as the Bihor County Emergency Clinical Hospital and Pelican Hospital) emphasized that PhD-trained clinicians bring higher analytical thinking, rigorous methodology, and the ability to review and apply specialized clinical studies, facilitating superior intellectual communication and seamless collaboration with medical doctors. Alumni confirmed that the structured methodology and analytical depth gained were highly applicable in professional clinical management, clinical settings, and academic teaching. From our perspective, the outcomes are clearly identified and are consistent with the highest expected standards.

Recommendations: Include incentives for intellectual property and demonstrate technology transfer in promising areas related to the clinical and biomedical fields.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: The four years program is supported by a document provided through a link. It summarizes the expected professional and transversal competences. The courses proposed during the first year are listed, and specific competences for each course are specified in another link. The program for years II, III, and IV, which is fully focused on a research project, is provided. The organization of the three years as well as the student's obligations are provided. The number of credits required for each semester are clearly shown.

Analysis of the state of facts: In the first year of the programme, theoretical courses, including compulsory and elective courses are proposed. These are related to research management, research grants, ethics and scientific integrity. These are precious prerequisites for the next years. In this regard, the organisational component and the academic staff organize an interactive and stimulating teaching strategies focused on the student's interests, particularly with regard to socio-professional integration. The implemented student-centred learning curriculum is periodically evaluated by students where their feedbacks is taken into consideration to ensure continuous improvement. Both alumni and current doctoral students expressed strong satisfaction with the mentorship provided by their PhD coordinators. Students specifically praised the regular communication and rapid review times on draft manuscripts, often receiving detailed feedback within days. Additionally, it was confirmed that evaluations in the first-year modules are highly practical and student-centred; rather than standard exams alone, students are evaluated based on written research project proposals, structured study design drafts, and initial methodological frameworks for their dissertations. The educational content and organization of the first-year program are noteworthy. They offer students a diverse range of courses that prepare them for subsequent years

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

Presentation of the current situation: Although the doctoral school is aware of the importance of the national and international mobility dimension, as indicated in the IER document, this activity could be better highlighted. It is unclear to what extent students are aware of the benefits of mobility in terms of career opportunities.

Analysis of the state of facts: The panel verified that PhD students actively utilize Erasmus+ exchange programs. To accommodate working professionals (such as medical doctors or community pharmacists), short-term mobility formats (e.g., 1-week training visits) are effectively utilized alongside traditional longer stays.

Aspects that constitute best practice examples: The organizational component of the Doctoral Field of Medicine provides PhD students with consistent opportunities to participate in academic mobility programs, both in person and virtually. In the last two years, the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences has organized and facilitated the participation of PhD students in the Blended Intensive Programme (BIP) within the EUGREEN initiative.

Recommendations: It is strongly recommended for the doctoral school to intensify efforts in promoting international mobility by providing information about available resources, ensuring financial accessibility, and offering support to participants. This could be through increased collaborative efforts with other international laboratories, memberships of international learned societies, presentations at international conferences.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

Presentation of the current situation: The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students according to the code of ethics and internal regulations of the university, which promote the principles of non-discrimination and equal opportunities.

Analysis of the state of facts: The evaluation panel found strong evidence of fairness and flexibility accommodating diverse student profiles. From a financial perspective, the panel confirmed that fee-paying students receive the exact same lab access, consumables, equipment, and institutional coverage for publication fees as state-budgeted students. Furthermore, during the allocation of funded positions, supervisors communicate internally to prioritize candidates with significant financial need for scholarship-supported places, demonstrating a commitment to equity. The principal elements ensured by the organizational component regarding this indicator concern equitable opportunities for all doctoral students, regardless of social status and experience; flexibility afforded to students according to individual potential and aspirations; the inclusive environment by respecting the principles of non-discrimination and equal opportunities; and mobility programmes, research resources, and participation in scientific events are ensured on transparent and equitable bases. Through these mechanisms, the organizational component ensures an environment that supports the development of each doctoral student, in accordance with their profile, potential, and professional and scientific objectives. We also remark the flexibility offered to students to choose the doctoral supervisor, to select research topics according to their own competences, interests and their professional projects

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: Accessibility and efficiency of the resources and support services are available through a link provided by the University of Oradea. This document provides regulations of the University of Oradea concerning accommodation in student residences, regulations for the awarding of scholarships and other forms of material support to students of the University of Oradea. It also provides full information on resources, support, and specific help for students with special needs. The university has an office for students with visual impairments, which can benefit from adapted course materials.

Analysis of the state of facts: The analysis of the documents provided in the self-assessment document and the discussions we had with the faculty governance regarding access to adequate resources and support services, according to the needs of the students, are aligned with recognized standards. During the visit, it was confirmed that the university operates a Centre for Inclusion, which was established as part of the EU GREEN alliance. This centre actively supports students with special educational or medical needs by providing accommodations such as extra exam time, tailored testing conditions, and assistive technologies. Requests for such accommodations are processed through the center with input from special education experts (from the Faculty of Social Sciences) and are subsequently approved by faculty leadership. The panel also noted that while the university provides a

general student psychological counseling center, Ph.D. candidates rarely utilize it, as it primarily serves the undergraduate student population.

Aspects that constitute best practice examples: At the university level, there is a dedicated lab for students with special needs equipped with tools and software that facilitate access to reading and writing documents,

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.5. Learning outcomes

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

Presentation of the current situation: At the university level, an operational procedure governs the internal evaluation and monitoring of doctoral schools. The operational procedure is available via a link, which provides information on methods for evaluating the scientific activity of doctoral students. The faculty website provides the doctoral training course programs and the teaching unit descriptions ensured by academic staff who hold the status of doctoral supervisors/habilitated professors. Learning outcomes are evaluated. The first-year program is evaluated through written exams. For the three remaining years, the student work is evaluated annually through a thesis monitoring committee who evaluated the written report about the work progress and the oral presentation of the work. This evaluation method meets well-established high standards.

Analysis of the state of facts: The provided information regarding the learning outcomes is well described and are accessible through the university and doctoral school web-sites. The objectives of the program and syllabi are well defined. During the meetings with alumni, graduates emphasized the practical value of the clearly defined learning outcomes, particularly from first-year modules like Scientific Research Methodology and Academic Ethics/Integrity, which provided them with thorough training on rigorous scientific publishing standards. The practical realization of these learning outcomes was evident in the graduates' successful career trajectories, applying the structured methodology and analytical depth they acquired to roles in university teaching, community health management, and even the IT/software development industry. The academic staff of doctoral supervisors/habilitated professors provided arguments to support the alignment of the content of the discipline with the expectations of representatives of health professionals, health associations, and employers

Recommendations: The academic staff and supervisors are encouraged to make visible the testimonials from former doctoral students regarding the programs and results. Encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning by allowing them to track their progress through the course by checking learning outcomes regularly.

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 current situation: The IER provides the examination modalities through two web links. The first one concerns the course syllabi and modalities of examinations for part of the disciplines (evaluation and grading methods, as well as the requirements for course completion). The second link informs students about the operational procedure for internal evaluation and monitoring of doctoral study fields.

Analysis of the state of facts: Based on the information provided in the IER and discussions with faculty staff and students, the faculty operates the completion examination through the public defense of the doctoral thesis, in accordance with national legislation and IOSUD-UO procedures. The practice is aligned with

international standards for either the final graduation exam (PhD defense) or continuous evaluations. Discussions with students and teaching staff revealed that rather than relying solely on standard exams, students are evaluated based on written research project proposals, structured study design drafts, and initial methodological frameworks for their dissertations. Furthermore, to be eligible for the study completion exam (the public defense), doctoral candidates must first demonstrate the concrete achievement of their research outcomes by fulfilling strict national and institutional criteria. This typically includes the publication of 3 Web of Science (ISI) indexed papers—where the PhD student is usually the first author—as well as other indexed BDI papers and presentations at scientific conferences.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: The admission procedures regarding the organization and conduct of the competition for doctoral university studies are available for consultation on the university website. Specific links are provided in the IER. Admission is conducted based on a clear Methodology adopted by the University Senate (Decision no. 22 of 29.04.2025) and specific methodologies adopted by the CSUD. The institution also applies specific regulations regarding the admission and enrollment of foreign citizens and Romanians from abroad.

Analysis of the state of facts: All specifications and practical information are provided. For foreign students, additional information is offered. However, for this group, most information is presented in Romanian. In summary, the admission organization, the requested qualifications, and the modalities that are planned, decided, and voted on at the university level meet common standards. The panel verified the admission timeline: research topics and prospective titles are formulated and published on the institutional website approximately six months in advance (around March–April). Prospective candidates then apply and are selected through formal entrance interviews held in September. The university moves forward for global digitization of registration, involving replacing paper forms with online processes. This allows users to register online and upload supporting documents, reducing processing times.

Recommendations: To increase international visibility and attractiveness, provide more information for foreign students in English. Organize webinars to present the doctoral school and its strengths. The panel recommended that the admission process should avoid any informal pre-arrangements between prospective students and supervisors.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

Presentation of the current situation: Documents and supporting information are provided through a document entitled: Methodology for admission to university doctoral studies - September 2026 session; ANNEXES - FORMS. The latter is available at the university cloud. The applicants are informed about the criteria for admission to doctoral programs. The principles of equity and equal opportunities are taken into account.

Analysis of the state of facts: The three criteria used for the selection are meaningful: previous experience, understanding the research project and its mastery. However, the weighting of each criterion is not specified. Sometimes, the academic results mentioned in the CV do not truly reflect the student's ability to conduct a

research project. This is just an example among others. The panel noted that the admission process fairly accommodates candidates from multidisciplinary backgrounds; while most candidates hold a pharmacy degree, graduates from medicine, biology, and nutrition/dietetics are also admitted equitably, provided they meet the national requirement of 300 ECTS credits. The aspects taken into account for the selection process are meaningful, especially the one regarding the quality of the proposed doctoral research project, including the candidate's responses to the questions addressed by the evaluators

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

Presentation of the current situation: The available documents provide information about the doctoral contract regarding the conduct of research and academic activities, deontology and scientific integrity. The professional activity of students is rigorously regulated by the Individual Training and Results Programme, which is established with the supervisor and evaluated annually by the Guidance and Academic Integrity Committee and the Doctoral School Council. Compliance with the Code of Ethics and University Deontology is strictly enforced, and all theses undergo mandatory verification using CNATDCU-recognized anti-plagiarism software.

Analysis of the state of facts: The Doctoral School applies the regulations regarding the professional activity of doctoral students, in accordance with the national legislation. The importance of ethics and scientific integrity for the University's deontology is clearly described. Furthermore, the university's role is not limited to detecting fraud and falsification but also to implementing concrete measures to prevent such practices. The standard duration of the Ph.D. is 4 years, but students who require additional time can formally apply for legal extensions up to 2 years. The panel verified that the academic journey is heavily supported by robust ethical frameworks: for clinical studies, students must first obtain ethical clearance from the partner hospital/clinic before seeking final approval from the University Ethics Committee. Because the faculty lacks an on-site animal testing facility, research involving animal models is conducted via collaboration agreements with the universities in Timișoara or Cluj, ensuring strict ethical compliance.

The indicator is: fulfilled

Criterion B.8. Internationalisation process

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

Presentation of the current situation: The IER reports international collaboration activities in tables showing mostly incoming and outgoing collaborations, including the participation of academic staff and doctoral students in Erasmus mobility programs and the invitation of scientists from partner universities to take part in thematic courses and seminars. It is encouraging to see that the IER provides comprehensive information on internationalization activities.

Analysis of the state of facts: Regarding the participation of academic staff and doctoral students in Erasmus mobility programs, three members have participated in mobilities in four European countries within six institutions. Within the evaluation period (21-25), one thesis was co-supervised with international collaborators. Ten seminars were given by international collaborators, but 90% of them were from the same country (Hungary).

Several students and supervisors have participated in international conferences. The participation in Erasmus mobility programs, invited scientists from abroad to take part in doctoral guidance committees, and delivering seminars.

Recommendations: It is urgent that the doctoral school should diversify its collaboration network. So far, most of the collaborations are conducted with one or two Hungarian institutions. The doctoral school should make more effort to encourage more students to actively participate in and present at international meetings. The panel strongly recommended broadening international mobility across Europe and beyond to help doctoral candidates expand their scientific horizons and build independent research networks.

The indicator is partially fulfilled

Criterion B.9. Scientific research results

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

Presentation of the current situation: The expected achievement of learning outcomes based on scientific research was presented. These include identifying, analyzing, and solving problems; interdisciplinary competences; autonomy; scientific integrity; and dissemination.

Analysis of the state of facts: The expected achievement of learning outcomes provided in the IER are pertinent. They are aligned with common and standard practices. The panel observed that doctoral candidates actively draft initial manuscripts based on their experimental findings, which then undergo extensive review and correction by their coordinators, providing hands-on training in scientific writing and publishing. Furthermore, students present their yearly progress at university-organized events, such as the Oradea Pharmacy Days and Oradea Medical Days, which host international guests and require presentations in both Romanian and English. The robust methodological and computational skills gained through this research training are highly transferable; for instance, one alumnus successfully transitioned into the IT industry working on machine learning implementation, highlighting the multidisciplinary versatility acquired during their computational doctoral research. Integrating interdisciplinary skills involves combining several subjects to solve complex problems. This method goes beyond simply accumulating knowledge. It fosters critical thinking, collaboration, and adaptation to real situations.

Recommendations: It is advisable to emphasize aspects concerning intellectual property protection and the transfer of research results to practical applications.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

Presentation of the current situation: The results of scientific research are disseminated and presented through scientific publications, posters, and oral communications for the evaluated period (2021-2025). The scientific production of each staff member involved in scientific research is presented together. For the evaluated period, 98 indexed articles were published, and 25 and 48 communications were presented at international and national levels, respectively. It would have been relevant to highlight the doctoral student's name in the list of authors.

Furthermore, it would have been interesting to differentiate between review articles and other articles.

Analysis of the state of facts: The results of scientific research are disseminated and presented in scientific publications, posters, and oral communications for the evaluated period (2021-2025). The scientific production for each supervisor, together with the students, is presented and divided into Web of Science and BDI. During the evaluation period, 153 articles were published in Web of Science, and 27 presentations were given at international conferences. It would have been interesting to differentiate between review articles and primary data articles. 17 supervisors and students have no outputs at all. There are a few supervisors with regular and high-quality scientific outputs

Recommendations: Dissemination in Q1 journals should be encouraged as it enhances global visibility and citation potential. Prioritize publication quality over quantity. These recommendations are given as an incentive, regardless of the resources available to staff members and students to conduct their scientific research. Support supervisors and students with no outputs over 5 years to improve performance management.

The indicator is: fulfilled

DOMAIN C. Quality management

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: The Medicine Doctoral School consistently implements institutional quality assurance procedures in compliance with the Quality Manual, the Quality Assurance Code, and IOSUD-UO regulations. These mechanisms oversee curriculum updates, transparent admissions, annual candidate evaluations, academic integrity, and research infrastructure. Monitoring by the Faculty CEAC and IOSUD-UO structures leads to regular reviews by both the Doctoral School and Faculty Councils, enabling concrete improvements such as syllabus adjustments, updated research topics, and enhanced scientific dissemination.

Analysis of the state of facts: The evaluation panel noted that quality assurance processes are coordinated through institutional structures dedicated to academic quality management, which supports the development, monitoring, and evaluation of quality assurance policies and procedures at university level. The doctoral domain applies periodic monitoring and evaluation mechanisms concerning doctoral supervision, research activity, academic performance, doctoral students' progression and institutional procedures. The documentation and discussions during the evaluation visit confirmed the use of internal evaluation procedures, feedback mechanisms, performance monitoring, and periodic review processes aimed at improving the quality of doctoral education and research activities. The IER has a committee made up of students and professors who are members of ARACIS.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Presentation of the current situation: When adopting and revising methodologies, regulations, and procedures developed at the level of university structures, endorsed by the Board of Directors and approved by the University Senate, the opinions of members of the academic community and other stakeholders are taken into

account. Regarding the renewal of the study programs, the bases are written on the Regulation on the initiation, monitoring and periodic review of study programs in the University of Oradea.

Analysis of the state of facts: The panel also noted that stakeholder perspectives are integrated through institutional consultation mechanisms involving doctoral students, academic staff and external collaborators, contributing to the continuous development of doctoral education and research activities.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: The documentation analyzed indicates that academic ethics activities within University of Oradea and the doctoral study domains are regulated and implemented in accordance with national legislation and institutional regulations. The Ethics Commission operates independently, based on regulations approved by the University Senate.

Analysis of the state of facts: The evaluation panel noted that the University Ethics Commission functions according to the Regulation for the Organization and Functioning of the Ethics Commission, which establishes its responsibilities, operational procedures, and institutional independence. During the discussion, the students mentioned that they had a good experience with the Research Ethics Subcommission.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Standard S.C.3.1. Procedures and implementation of procedures The HEI has procedures for initiating, monitoring, and periodically reviewing the study programmes and domains and the performed activities, and applies them systematically.	
Indicator I.P.C.3.1.1	The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.

Presentation of the current situation: The documentation analyzed indicates that the doctoral study domain Medicine consistently applies institutional quality assurance procedures integrated within the quality management system of the University of Oradea and IOSUD.

Analysis of the state of facts: The procedures are implemented with the involvement of the relevant bodies of the doctoral school and the university, such as the Doctoral School Council, the advisory committees, the CEAC, and the Ethics Committee. Continuous monitoring of these activities helps enhance the quality of doctoral programs, supports doctoral students' progress, and fosters an institutional quality culture.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Presentation of the current situation: The curriculum and subjects for DSUD Medicine are periodically reviewed, in accordance with the Regulation on the initiation, monitoring, and periodic review of study programs at the University of Oradea.

Analysis of the state of facts: The evaluation panel noted that doctoral students, academic staff, and institutional management representatives participate in evaluation, feedback, and quality assurance processes through formal consultation mechanisms, representation in governance structures, and periodic academic evaluations. External stakeholders are also involved through collaborative academic and research activities supporting the continuous improvement of doctoral education and research quality.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Standard S.C.4.1. Procedures Applying the methodologies and procedures contributes to improving the quality of the staff's activities.	
Indicator I.P.C.4.1.1	The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.

Presentation of the current situation: The documentation analyzed indicates that the University of Oradea and the doctoral study domain systematically analyze the results of students' evaluations of teaching activities through institutional quality assurance procedures coordinated at IOSUD level.

Analysis of the state of facts: The evaluation panel noted that the evaluation of teaching activities by doctoral students is conducted biannually. The Doctoral School Council analyzes the results and communicates them individually to faculty members; when necessary, it establishes and implements measures to improve performance.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: The Medicine doctoral field systematically collects and evaluates data regarding academic curricula, faculty performance, candidate progress, scientific and project engagement, and international mobilities. This tracking incorporates annual student satisfaction surveys assessing resource accessibility, educational quality, and institutional support. Centralized and reported to the CSUD via the Quality Assessment and Assurance System (SEAQ).

Analysis of the state of facts: The evaluation panel noted that the available digital infrastructure allows the systematic collection, monitoring, and analysis of academic, administrative, and quality assurance data.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Standard S.C.6.1. Transparency The organisational component ensures transparency of information, as required by the law.

Indicator I.P.C.6.1.1	The organisational component ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.

Presentation of the current situation: All essential information regarding the doctoral cycle, from initial admission through to the awarding of the doctoral degree, is made available to candidates through the IOSUD secretariat and published on the institutional website (including standard forms accessible via the university's doctoral portal).

Analysis of the state of facts: The evaluation panel observed that the university ensures transparent and diversified communication with stakeholders by using both digital and traditional dissemination channels. Information concerning the study program, admission procedures, academic regulations, student services, and institutional activities is publicly accessible and regularly updated, facilitating informed access for prospective students, current students, graduates, and other interested parties. However, English content across the platform is not updated as systematically or thoroughly as the Romanian content.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Presentation of the current situation: The organizational component ensures transparent decision-making processes through institutional regulations, participatory governance structures, and public communication mechanisms. Relevant institutional decisions, regulations and procedures are communicated through dedicated university platforms, including the dedicated digital platforms of the University of Oradea (the institutional intranet and the e-learning platform) and the official website.

Analysis of the state of facts: Institutional regulations, Senate decisions, administrative procedures and information relevant to the academic community are publicly communicated through digital institutional platforms and official communication channels.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

Presentation of the current situation: The Doctoral School of Medicine at the University of Oradea strictly applies the procedures for external quality assessment, in accordance with the provisions of Higher Education Law No. 199/2023, the Framework Regulation on Doctoral Studies approved by Ministerial Order No. 3020/2024, and ARACIS standards and methodology. The process is coordinated by the Doctoral School Council and CSUD, in cooperation with the University's quality assurance structures, ensuring appropriate documentation, traceability, and institutional responsibility throughout the external evaluation process

Analysis of the state of facts: Institutional regulations, Senate decisions, administrative procedures, and information relevant to the academic community are publicly communicated through digital institutional platforms and official communication channels. The preparation of the REI and supporting evidence, together with the coordinated involvement of the relevant doctoral and quality assurance structures, demonstrates that the University has established and applies the mechanisms necessary for participation in external quality evaluation. Consequently, the procedures implemented for the Medical doctoral study field provide adequate evidence that the requirements of the analyzed performance indicator are fulfilled

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths: ✓ A strong institutional base with excellent infrastructure and opportunities for students. ✓ Elaboration and compliance with the documents stating the performance of the activity in the OU ✓ The provisions of the Code of Ethics apply, ensuring internal and external auditing ✓ Curricula reviewed annually and approved by the Faculty Council and the Senate ✓ Student-centered teaching and assessment methods ✓ Qualified human resources ✓ Transparency of information on the activity of the OU, through a well-structured and managed website. ✓ Development of a new university campus ✓ The existence of teachers with experience in the field of general management, marketing, or law	INTERNAL FACTORS	**Weaknesses:** ✓ There is a discrepancy between very productive supervisors and some who do not appear to have had scientific outputs over the period analyzed ✓ Empowering students regarding the importance of correct feedback on the evaluation of the teaching process
SWOT analysis		
Opportunities: ✓ There are national and international collaboration opportunities that are open to the supervisors and students. ✓ Existence of attractiveness for medical degree programs ✓ Developing the profession and structuring skills and responsibilities more clearly ✓ European funding programs (Erasmus+, Horizon Europe, Interreg, PNRR Education and Health) dedicated to curriculum development and clinical research	EXTERNAL FACTORS	**Threats:** ✓ The current geopolitical and economic situation may interfere with the amount of grant funding available. ✓ Financial difficulties in case of relocation to another post ✓ Migration of teachers and graduates to European institutions with more attractive salaries and research offers ✓ Volatile political environment, which can influence (modify) the regional agenda of priorities

V. Extent to which the standards and performance indicators are fulfilled, and recommendations

No.	Extent to which it was fulfilled		
	Performance Indicator	F/PF/UF	Recommendations
DOMAIN A. Institutional capacity			
1.	**I.P.A.1.1.1** For delivering the study programme/domain, the HEI has adequate organisational components and an adequate management system, which operate based on methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.	F	None
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	None

No.	Extent to which it was fulfilled		
	Performance Indicator	F/PF/UF	Recommendations
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	None
4.	**I.P.A.2.2.1** The movable and immovable assets are properly maintained to ensure optimal conditions for studying, living and research, as well as for work.	F	None
5.	**I.P.A.3.1.1** The human resources of the organisational component are suitable to perform the activities pertaining to the evaluated study programme/domain. The teaching staff has the required qualifications and professional competences to teach the subject matters assigned to them in the job list.	F	None
6.	**I.P.A.3.1.2** The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	The professional and personal development process should be strengthened through clear objectives and if necessary, performance managing those who are not productive.
7.	**I.P.A.3.2.1** Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	None
8.	**I.P.A.4.1.1** The organisational component uses IT tools in its own procedures, to improve access and provide good quality services for the members of its own community and the indirect beneficiaries of education.	F	None
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	None
10.	**I.P.B.2.1.2.** The expected learning outcomes are correlated with the competences required by those occupations, according to the occupational standards and/or the European Skills, Competences and Occupations (ESCO).	F	None
11.	**I.P.B.3.1.1** The organisational component ensures implementation of the student-centred learning in the curriculum and through the teaching strategies used in the learning and teaching activities and experiences.	F	None
12.	**I.P.B.3.1.2** The organisational component ensures opportunities for students to participate in academic mobility programmes organised in person and/or virtually.	F	None
13.	**I.P.B.3.2.1** The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students, in line with their potential and	F	None

No.	Extent to which it was fulfilled		
	Performance Indicator	**F/PF/UF**	**Recommendations**
	aspirations, taking into account the diversity of learning styles and abilities.		
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	A regular review of accessibility for students with all disabilites.
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	None
16.	**I.P.B.5.1.2** Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	None
17.	**I.P.B.7.1.1** The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	To increase international visibility and attractiveness, provide more information for foreign students in English. Organize webinars to present the doctoral school and its strengths. The panel recommended that the admission process should avoid any informal pre-arrangements between prospective students and supervisors
18.	**I.P.B.7.1.2** Admission in higher education study programmes complies with the principles of fairness and equal opportunities, and with the establishing of support measures to ensure access of vulnerable groups at social and educational risk, including candidates with special educational needs and/or disabilities.	F	None
19.	**I.P.B.7.2.1** The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	None
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	The doctoral school urgently needs to diversify its collaboration network. So far, most of the collaborations are conducted with one or two Hungarian institutions. The doctoral school should make more effort to encourage more students to actively participate in and present at international meetings. The panel strongly recommended broadening international mobility across Europe and beyond to help doctoral candidates expand their scientific horizons and build independent research networks
21.	**I.P.B.9.1.1** Learning based on scientific investigation and research results support and are capitalised upon in achieving the learning outcomes envisaged through the study programme.	F	None
22.	**I.P.B.9.2.1** The results of scientific research are visible at national and international level in that scientific	F	Support supervisors and students with no outputs over 5 years to improve

No.	Extent to which it was fulfilled		
	Performance Indicator	F/PF/UF	Recommendations
	domain, and capitalised upon in an adequate manner.		performance management.
DOMAIN C. Quality management			
23.	**I.P.C.1.1.1** The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	None
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	None
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	None
26.	**I.P.C.3.1.1** The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	None
27.	**I.P.C.3.1.2** Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	F	None
28.	**I.P.C.4.1.1** The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	F	None
29.	**I.P.C.5.1.1** The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	F	None
30.	**I.P.C.6.1.1** The organisational component ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.	F	It is recommended to maintain the regular updating of online information targeting prospective international students.
31.	**I.P.C.6.1.2** The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	None
32.	**I.P.C.8.1.1** The organisational component carries out the procedures pertaining to the external quality evaluation process, aiming to organise the evaluated study programme as provided by the law.	F	None

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfillment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators			
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled	Total
Domain A. Institutional capacity	8	0	0	8
Domain B. Educational efficacy	13	1	0	14
Domain C. Quality management	10	0	0	10
Total	31	1	0	32

VI. Conclusions

As outlined in the performance indicators, the SDBS has excellent infrastructure and organizational processes, with very high satisfaction from staff and students. The current and past students are of excellent international caliber and have very high visibility and employability. The only areas that require future monitoring and work are: 1) ensuring that all supervisors have similar mindsets and training, monitored through annual professional and personal development reviews with clear objectives regarding scientific outputs; 2) increasing the number and quality of publications and presentations on the international arena. This may be achieved by broadening collaborations and memberships in international professional societies.

- In terms of institutional capacity:
  - IOSUD has implemented the efficient functioning mechanisms provided for in the specific legislation on the organization of doctoral studies;
  - IOSUD has the logistical resources necessary to fulfill the mission of doctoral studies;
  - IOSUD has a modern research infrastructure to support the development of activities specific to doctoral studies.
- From the point of view of educational efficiency:
  - Students admitted to doctoral studies demonstrate academic, research and professional performance, are diversified in gender and social representation;
  - The content of the doctoral degree programs is appropriate to the doctoral fields, in accordance with the legal requirements in force;
  - There are procedures for evaluating the results of doctoral studies.
- From the point of view of research and the quality of doctoral theses:
  - The research is capitalized by doctoral students through presentations at scientific conferences, scientific publications, through technology transfer, through products, technologies and services necessary for the socio-economic environment;
- From the point of view of quality management:
  - In IOSUD there is and is applied an internal quality assurance system, and a procedure for the evaluation and internal monitoring of the activities within the doctoral schools is developed and applied periodically
  - Elections for positions in the CSUD are organized among doctoral students, by universal, direct and secret suffrage, all doctoral students having the right to elect and be elected;
  - There is a total transparency of information of interest to doctoral students and future candidates, respectively information of public interest is available for consultation in electronic format;
  - IOSUD implements the provisions in force regarding ethics and deontology/academic integrity, respectively academic freedom.

Following the completion of the accreditation[1]/maintaining accreditation procedure, the decision of the evaluation panel shall be one of the following:

a) **maintaining accreditation** (MAC);

VII. Annexes

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

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

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

Instituția de învățământ superior/Organizația furnizoare de educație/ Higher Education Institution / Education Provider Organization**: Universitatea din Oradea**/ University of Oradea

Școala doctorală/ Doctoral School**: Școala doctorală de Științe Biomedicale**/Doctorate school of Biomedical Sciences

Domeniul de doctorat/ Doctoral Domain**: MEDICINA/MEDICINE**

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

Perioada vizitei de evaluare/ The evaluation period: **23-24 Iulie 2026**/July 23th-24th 2026

Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/Evaluation panel:

Nr./No.	Numele şi prenumele/ Last Name and First Name	Calitatea/Team role
1.	***Prof. univ. dr. med. Liliana ROGOZEA***	*Membru - Cadru didactic RNE*
2.	***Prof. univ. dr. med. Roxana Octavia CĂRARE***	*Membru - Evaluator internațional RNE-I*
3.	***Stud. Petru-Liviu BOURUC***	*Membru - Student doctorand RNE-S*

Reprezentantul IÎS/OFE:

Nr./No.	Numele şi prenumele/ Last Name and First Name	Calitatea/Team role
1.	***Prof. univ. dr. ing. habil. Radu-Cătălin ȚARCĂ***	*Director CSUD/Director CSUD*
2.	***Dana Carmen ZAHA***	*Persoană de contact/Contact person*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanți/ *Participants*	Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants*
Joi, Thursday, 09.07.2026			
19:00-19:30	Discuții tehnice în cadrul comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității/ ***Technical discussions within the expert committee for external quality evaluation***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members***	
Joi/ Thursday 23.07.2026			
12:00-12:30	Discuții tehnice în cadrul comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității/ ***Technical discussions within the expert committee for external quality evaluation***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members***	
12:30-13:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **reprezentanții conducerii componentei organizatorice/** ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the representatives of the management of the organisational component***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Reprezentanți ai conducerii componentei organizatorice aferente domeniului de studii de doctorat evaluat/ ***Representatives of the management of the organisational component*** - Persoana de contact/ ***Contact person***	Sala/Locația/ ***Room/Location*** Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universității nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** - Prof. univ. dr. ing. *Director CSUD/* ***Director CSUD*** - *Prof. univ. dr.– Prorector, Managementul cercetării /* ***Vice-rector, Research Management*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Prodecan Facultatea de Medicină și Farmacie/ ***Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Director al Școlii Doctorale de Științe Biomedicale/ ***Director of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences*** - Prof. univ. dr.–Persoană de contact, coordonator al Domeniului de doctorat Medicina/ ***Contact person, Coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Medicine***
13:20-13:30	**Pauză/** ***Break***		

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanți/ *Participants*	Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants*
13:30-14:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți evaluatori în evaluarea externă a calității cu **echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă (REI)/** ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the team that has drafted the internal evaluation report***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Echipa care a realizat REI/ ***Team that has drafted the IER***	Sala/Locația/ ***Room/Location*** Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universităţii nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Director al Școlii Doctorale de Științe Biomedicale, cadru didactic / Director of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences, ***Teaching staff*** - Conf. univ. dr.– Cadru didactic / ***Teaching staff*** - Prof. univ. dr.–Persoană de contact, coordonator al Domeniului de doctorat Medicina, cadru didactic / ***Contact person, Coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Medicine, Teaching staff***
14:20-14:30	**Pauză/** ***Break***		
14:30 - 15:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **angajatori** ai absolvenților DSUD/ ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with employers[1] of the DSUD alumni***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Angajatori/ ***Employers***	Sala/Locația/ ***Room/Location*** Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universităţii nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** –– Director Medical Spital Clinic Județean de Urgență Bihor / ***Medical Director, Bihor County Emergency Clinical Hospital*** - - Președinte al Colegiul Medicilor Bihor/ ***Prezident of Bihor College of Physicians*** - -Manager Spital de Recuperare Băile Felix

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

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanți/ *Participants*	Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants*
			- Conf. univ. dr.– Manager Spital Universitar/ ***University Hospital Manager***
15:20-15:30	**Pauză/** ***Break***		
15:30-16:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **personalul didactic și responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare /** ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the staff in charge with the research centres/laboratories***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare/ ***Staff in charge with research centres/laboratories*** -- Cadre didactice conducători de doctorat/ Responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare**/Teaching staff who are PhD supervisors- Staff in charge with research centres/laboratories**	Sala/Locația/ ***Room/Location*** Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universităţii nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Cadru didactic/ ***Teaching staff*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Cadru didactic/ ***Teaching staff*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Cadru didactic/ ***Teaching staff*** - Prof. univ. dr. habil. Conducător de doctorat ***/ PhD supervisor*** - Prof. univ. dr. habil. / Conducător de doctorat ***/ PhD supervisor*** -- Prof. univ.dr. habil.– Conducător de doctorat / ***PhD supervisor*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat ***/ PhD supervisor*** - Prof. univ.dr. habil.– Conducător de doctorat / ***PhD supervisor*** - Sef lucrări habil.– Conducător de doctorat / ***PhD supervisor*** - Conf. univ.dr. habil., – Conducător de doctorat / ***PhD supervisor*** - Conf. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat / ***PhD supervisor*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat, Persoană de contact ***/ PhD supervisor, Contact person***

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanți/ *Participants*	Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants*
16:20-16:30	**Pauză/ *Break***		
16:30 - 17:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **absolvenți**[2],[3] ai DSUD/ ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with alumni***[4] ***of the DSUD***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Absolvenți ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ ***Graduates***	Sala/Locația/ ***Room/Location*** Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universităţii nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** - - an absolvire 2026/ ***year of graduation 2026*** — an absolvire 2024/ ***year of graduation 2024*** - — an absolvire 2024/ **year of graduation 2024** — an absolvire 2024/ ***year of graduation 2024*** — an absolvire 2025/ ***year of graduation 2025*** - — an absolvire 2024/ *year of graduation 2024*
17:20-17:30	**Pauză/ *Break***		
17:30-18:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **studenți**[5] **doctoranzi** din cadrul DSUD/ ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with doctoral students of the DSUD***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Studenți doctoranzi/ ***Doctoral students***	Sala/Locația/ ***Room/Location*** Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universităţii nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** — an de studii VI/ ***year of study VI*** - — an de studii III/ ***year of study II*** - — an de studii II/ ***year of study II***

[2] Se va evita invitarea absolvenților care sunt angajați ai IÎS sau ai OFE, după caz.
[3] Nu este obligatorie în cazul autorizării domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat

[4] Avoid inviting alumni who are also staff of the HEI or members of the Romanian Academy, as applicable.
[5] Nu este obligatorie în cazul autorizării domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat/ It is not mandatory in the case of authorization of doctoral university study domain.

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanți/ *Participants*	Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants*
			- ---– an de studii II/ year of study II - -– an de studii III/ ***year of study III*** - -– an de studii I/ ***year of study I*** - -– an de studii III/ ***year of study III*** - ---– an de studii I/ ***year of study I*** - ----– an de studii I/ ***year of study I*** - --- an de studii I/ ***year of study I*** - -- an de studii VI/ ***year of study VI*** - - an de studii II/ ***year of study II*** - - an de studii III/ ***year of study III*** - ---– an de studii I/ ***year of study I***
Vineri/ *Friday, 24.07.2026*			
8:00 - 8:50	**Întâlnirea tehnică** a comisiei de experți evaluatori (Activitate în colaborare pentru clarificarea aspectelor prezentate în REI)/ ***Technical meeting of the expert evaluation panel (Collaborative activity for clarifying the aspects presented in the Internal Evaluation Report - IER)***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members***	
8:50-9:00	**Pauză/ *Break***		
09:00 - 10:00	Vizitarea bazei materiale/ ***Visiting the material resources***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Reprezentanți ai instituției sau Academiei Române, după caz/ ***Representatives of the HEI or the Romanian Academy, as applicable***	Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** - Prof. univ. dr.– prodecan FMF/ ***Vicedean FMF*** - Prof. univ. dr. -Conducător de doctorat / ***PhD supervisor*** - Conf. univ. dr. Conducător de doctorat / ***PhD supervisor*** - Prof. univ. dr.–*Persoană de contact/* ***Contact person***
10:00-10:10	**Pauză/ *Break***		
10:10-11:00	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu reprezentanți ai **structurilor**	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members***	Sala/Locația/ ***Room/Location***

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanți/ *Participants*	Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants*
	organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității și ai Comisiei de etică universitară/ / ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the quality assuranceand ethics organisational structures***	- Reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ ***Representatives of quality assurance organisational structures***	Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universităţii nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Prorector responsabil cu Managementul Calității și servicii administrative/ ***Vicerector responsible for Quality Management and Administrative Services*** - Prof. univ. dr.– membru al Comisia Centrală de Evaluare a Calității a UO/ ***Member of the Central Quality Commision of UO*** - -Conf. univ. dr.– membru al Comisiei de Calitate a FMF/ ***Member of thel Quality Commision of FMF*** - Prof. univ. dr. habil.–Președintele comisiei de Etică/ ***President University Ethics Committee*** - Conf. univ. dr.–Responsabil Comisia de etica cercetării/ ***Responsible of the Research Ethics Comission***
11:00-11:10	**Pauză*/ Break***		
11:10-12:00	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți evaluatori în evaluarea externă a calității cu **echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă (REI)/** ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the team that has drafted the internal evaluation report***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Echipa care a realizat REI/ ***Team that has drafted the IER***	Sala/Locația/ ***Room/Location*** Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universităţii nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Director al Școlii Doctorale de Științe Biomedicale, cadru didactic / Director of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences, ***Teaching staff*** - Conf. univ. dr.– Cadru didactic / ***Teaching staff***

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanți/ *Participants*	Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants*
			- Prof. univ. dr.–Persoană de contact, coordonator al Domeniului de doctorat Medicina / ***Contact person, Coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Medicine, Teaching staff***
12:00 - 12:10	**Pauză/** ***Break***		
12:10-13:00	Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții conducerii IÎS sau a OFE, după caz și ai conducerii componentei organizatorice pentru comunicarea concluziilor procesului de evaluare/ ***Meeting of the members of the expert evaluators' panel with representatives of the management of the HEI or the EP, as applicable, and management of the organisational component, to communicate the conclusions of the evaluation process***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Reprezentanți ai conducerii și ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ ***Representatives of the management*** - Persoana de contact***/ Contact person***	Sala/Locația/ *Room/Location* Sala C2, etaj 1, cladirea Medicina Dentara, Str. Universităţii nr. 4/ ***Room C2, 1st floor, Dental Medicine building, 4 Universităţii Street.*** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ ***List of participants attending the meeting:*** - Prof. univ. dr.– prodecan FMF***/ Vicedean FMF*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Director al Școlii Doctorale de Științe Biomedicale, cadru didactic / Director of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences***, Teaching staff*** - Prof. univ. dr.– Persoană de contact, coordonator al Domeniului de doctorat Medicina / ***Contact person, Coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Medicine, Teaching staff***
13:00-13:10	**Pauză/** ***Break***		
13:10-14:00	Finalizarea activităților de evaluare/ ***Completion of evaluation activities***	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members***	