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 13.1

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)	*Farmacie*
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. 5137/08.10.2026. 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.3.1.1, I.P.A.3.1.2, I.P.A.3.2.1, I.P.A.4.1.1 PÎ: I.P.A.2.2.1, 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: -

Motivarea deciziei	
În baza REE, a procesului verbal al ședinței CPS și a procesului verbal al ședinței DESU, Consiliul ARACIS analizează și validează propunerea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a Calităţii *constatând că din:* • *32 indicatori: 30 sunt îndepliniți, 2 parțial îndepliniți și 0 sunt neîndepliniți.* • *26 standarde: 26 sunt îndeplinite, 0 neîndeplinite.* *și, astfel, prin aplicarea art. 63 din Metodologie decide că* ***standardele sunt*** ÎNDEPLINITE	
Decizia	Menţinerea acreditării

The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education



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

Higher Education Institution/Education Provider Organization:	**University of Oradea**
Doctoral School:	**Doctorate School of Biomedical Sciences**
Doctoral Domain:	**Pharmacy**
The objective of the external evaluation:	**Maintaining accreditation (MAC)**

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

No.	Last Name and First Name	Team role	Signature
1.	**Radu OPREAN**	Expert evaluator	
2.	**Ahcene BOUMENDJEL**	International Expert	
3.	**Radu-Anton MOLDOVAN**	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

This external evaluation report was drafted in the context of the periodic evaluation procedure (for maintaining accreditation / reaccreditation) of the Pharmacy doctoral study domain within the Institution Organizing Doctoral University Studies (IOSUD) – University of Oradea. The evaluation covers the period from the previous external quality evaluation (November 2021) to the present (academic year 2025/2026). The ARACIS external evaluation panel consists of a coordinating expert evaluator (prof.dr. Radu OPREAN, University of Medicine and Pharmacy Iuliu Haţieganu Cluj-Napoca), an international expert (prof.dr. Ahcene BOUMENDJEL, University of Grenoble, France), and a PhD student evaluator (Radu-Anton MOLDOVAN, University of Sibiu), whose mission is to analyze the degree of fulfillment of the standards and performance indicators established by ARACIS for doctoral higher education.
Higher education in Oradea has a venerable tradition, dating back to 1780 with the founding of a higher institution for philosophical and, later, legal education. The modern institution was established in May 1990 as the Technical University of Oradea, becoming the University of Oradea (UO) in 1991. In 2023, the university celebrated six decades since the resumption of modern academic teaching traditions in Oradea. Currently, the University of Oradea is a strong comprehensive institution, encompassing 15 faculties with 47 teaching departments. The educational offer includes 102 bachelor's programs, 68 master's programs, and 25 doctoral fields (one of which is in liquidation), managed by 7 Doctoral Schools. The institution serves 23,075 beneficiaries of educational services and has a human resource base of 887 tenured teaching staff.
The assumed mission of the University of Oradea is to provide advanced education and research, with a major impact on regional, national, and European socio-economic and cultural development. Through the Strategic Plan 2025-2030, the university integrates the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), aiming for academic excellence, digitalization, and transformation into a top sustainable university. The governance system complies with Law no. 199/2023 and the UO Charter, operating based on the decisions of the University Senate (deliberative body) and the Board of Administration (executive body), both of which actively involve students in decision-making processes. The University of Oradea undergoes periodic external evaluations and currently holds the maximum rating of "HIGH DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE" (awarded by ARACIS in October 2024). Furthermore, the institution's quality is internationally recognized, being present in 30 international rankings in 2024 and holding the 9th position in the National University Metaranking.
The Pharmacy doctoral field has been operating within the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences since 2018. The current reaccreditation effort is driven by the need to respond to the growing demand for researchers in the pharmaceutical, biopharmaceutical, and biomedical fields, supported by a regional ecosystem favorable to health research and innovation (including laboratories, hospitals, and pharmaceutical units in Bihor County). Developments since the last evaluation: Since the last external evaluation in 2021 (after which all ARACIS recommendations were successfully fulfilled), the domain has undergone significant curricular and strategic adaptations. These aimed at aligning with digital transformations in the pharmaceutical industry (such as the digitalization of production processes and pharmacovigilance) and advancing research in biotechnology and drug safety evaluation. The mission of the domain is to generate original fundamental and applied scientific knowledge, and to train a scientific elite capable of holding decision-making and research positions in academia, the pharmaceutical industry, or regulatory agencies. Research directions include bioactive natural products, experimental pharmacology, development of innovative pharmaceutical dosage forms, and the chemistry of bioactive compounds. Currently, institutional capacity is supported by 9 teaching staff holding habilitation certificates and the status of doctoral supervisors, demonstrating remarkable international visibility of their scientific results.

II. Methods used

Based on the internal operational workflows approved via ARACIS Decision No. 56/07.05.2026, the evaluation methodology maps across:
Documentary Analysis included a complete systemic verification of the Internal Evaluation Report (REI) and its official appendices (including Erasmus agreements, publication lists, and internal grant databases). Additional documents were requested during the on-site visit and are uploaded on the ARACIS platform.
The on-site visit was performed between July 13th-14th 2026 and included various meetings (see timeline uploaded on the platform) and visits to research infrastructure în the field of pharmacy and connected research fields.

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

DOMAIN A. Institutional capacity

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

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

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

The activity within IOSUD - University of Oradea is coordinated by the Council of Doctoral Studies (CSUD) and the Doctoral Schools. The management system operates based on internal regulations, such as the Regulation on the organization and conduct of doctoral university studies (adopted by Senate Decision no. 23 of 23.04.2025) and the Regulation on the organization and functioning of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences. To prevent academic fraud, the institution utilizes CNATDCU-recognized anti-plagiarism software (Sistem Antiplagiat prin Internet SRL and iThenticate) for all doctoral and habilitation theses.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The university is presented as an interdisciplinary institution encompassing 7 doctoral schools and approximately 25 doctoral domains. Communication between coordinators, directors, and doctoral candidates operates smoothly via direct messaging (e.g., WhatsApp groups), internal mailing, and regular updates during research methodology courses. However, the evaluators noted that operational management and communication within the doctoral field are heavily centralized around the field coordinator (Prof. Simona Bungău).

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

Decentralize administrative leadership by delegating and distributing administrative responsibilities among all doctoral supervisors and student representatives to foster institutional resilience and shared governance.
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[1] and of other stakeholders are considered in the process of adopting and revising methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures.

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The university promotes a participatory governance system, ensuring the representation of students, academic staff, and employers in decision-making structures such as the CSUD, Doctoral School Council, University Senate, and Administrative Council. Requests submitted by doctoral students are processed and discussed during Doctoral School Council meetings, and an Annual Report regarding their needs and satisfaction levels is prepared.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
During the meetings, employers—including the Medical Director of the Bihor County Hospital, the Manager of Pelican Hospital, the Administrator of Synergy Therm SRL, and the President of the Bihor College of Pharmacists—confirmed tight collaborations with the university, emphasizing that their feedback shapes the need for highly trained PhD graduates. Furthermore, in the decentralized quality assurance structures, student members are directly designated and proposed by student bodies rather than being appointed by the faculty administration, ensuring authentic and direct representation in decision-making.

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, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The university's infrastructure includes 45 buildings, 305 laboratories, and a library covering 7,800 m² with over 265,000 items and access to major international databases (e.g., ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, Web of Science). For the Pharmacy field, specific research laboratories are available and registered on the ERRIS platform, such as the Pharmaceutical

[1] The faculty, department, subsidiary, extension - hereinafter “organisational components”

Research Laboratory and the Multidisciplinary Laboratory for Pharmaceutical Analysis. The university also provides accommodation through 6 student dormitories (with two more under construction) and ensures accessibility for persons with disabilities in the central library, dormitories, and other educational spaces.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The evaluation panel verified that doctoral students have direct access to highly specialized research facilities across the university. This infrastructure includes a Cell Culture Laboratory operating under strict sterile/aseptic conditions (equipped to handle cell lines stored at -80°C) and an Advanced Pharmaceutical Technology & Biomaterials lab equipped with electrospinning units, 3D bioprinting, potentiostats, and Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM). Additionally, it was confirmed that doctoral students have access to a powerful high-performance computing cluster acquired through a European-funded project, which is utilized for complex computational studies and molecular dynamics.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

Assets are maintained through an annual program for the rehabilitation and maintenance of lecture halls, laboratories, and administrative spaces. The digital infrastructure is continuously developed, recently supported by the "DigitalUO" project funded through the PNRR with a budget of over 30.2 million RON. Furthermore, the university has invested over 72 million RON in laboratory equipment and facilities.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

During the meetings with research laboratory staff, it was confirmed that reagents, specific cell lines, electrodes, and general laboratory consumables are fully funded through internal university research grants (typically between 30,000 and 50,000 RON), external research contracts, and publication incentive funds. PhD candidates do not pay out-of-pocket for standard research consumables. When research is supported by external contracts, the university retains an institutional administrative overhead (approximately 10% to 15%) which is specifically used to cover logistics, personnel costs, and facility upkeep. Major repairs and maintenance contracts are handled through the university administration, though staff noted that high repair costs sometimes make direct equipment replacement a more practical option. Faculty members also shared the institutional goal of centralizing advanced multi-disciplinary research equipment into a unified core facility.

✓ Recommendations

The external evaluators recommended establishing clear, accessible guidelines for doctoral students regarding how research consumables, reagents, and equipment maintenance are funded and procured. This recommendation was made because some students appeared

largely unaware of the institutional publication incentives and financial mechanisms available to them.
The indicator is: partially fulfilled

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

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The Pharmacy doctoral study field benefits from 9 habilitated doctoral supervisors, all of whom are tenured academic staff members at the University of Oradea. All 9 supervisors meet the currently applicable minimum CNATDCU criteria, and 6 of them (66.66%) already fulfill the newer, more stringent criteria applicable starting from 01.10.2026. The academic staff demonstrates significant international visibility, having published over 350 articles in Web of Science (ISI) indexed journals over the last five years.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
During the visit, it was noted that the Pharmacy domain has recently expanded its coordinating staff to 12 PhD coordinators, out of an overall department staff of roughly 23–24 members. 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 state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The university 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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The institution 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 state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
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 transparent and non-discriminatory access.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
Discussions during the evaluation visit corroborated that the academic staffing and recruitment environment is rigorous, 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 state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

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.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

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

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

The study programme is accessible through the cloud of the university of Oradea. The information needed to evaluate the study programme 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 the study and research project. The organization of the progress reports,

[2] The term “programmes” concerns the external quality evaluation for the study programmes contained in a master/doctoral domain. The term “programme” shall be used hereinafter.

evaluation by the guidance committee, and thesis defense modalities are sufficiently explained. The research areas in which students may perform their doctoral study covers seven domains, including: bioactive natural products and modern phytotherapy; experimental pharmacology, therapeutic safety and efficacy; development of pharmaceutical dosage forms and innovative drug delivery systems; pharmaceutical chemistry, organic chemistry and bioactive compounds; modern methods of pharmaceutical analysis and quality control; pharmacobotanical and ethnobotanical research and environmental factors; sustainability, ecology and natural resources with therapeutic use. The described research areas cover the major domains developed in pharmacy schools.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The two major expected skills are categorized 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 pertinent and fit within international standards.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
There are two aspects that constitute best practice examples. The first aspect is to propose a large panel of optional teaching units for the students. This can be very positive as the student can better build his/her professional orientations. The second aspect concerns the research activity in which doctoral students of the pharmacy doctoral study are involved. It addresses seven research area covering several disciplines including: organic chemistry, pharmaceutical chemistry, analytical chemistry, pharmacology, botany, drug delivery and sustainability. While reviewing the research topics, the Lead Evaluator noted a pronounced concentration of doctoral dissertations focused on phytotherapy, pharmacognosy, and natural plant extracts.

✓ Recommendations
The research activity in which doctoral students of the pharmacy doctoral study are involved should provide more offers to cover aspects regarding bioinformatic and AI and their applications in pharmaceutical sciences. If these aspects are already practiced, they are not well highlighted in the documents. The major and urgent effort should be focused on updating the information on the web site. For example, the study program is shown until the year 2021 and nothing after. Although acknowledging the valid pharmacological rationale of plant-based research (such as multi-target antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties), the panel recommended diversifying the research topics more broadly across other major directions of the field, such as clinical pharmacy, pharmaceutical technology, and molecular pharmacology.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The documents related to this indicator are provided through links which refer to the university's cloud. The outcomes of the study are clearly presented in five sections. The main outcome after

graduation, a PhD holder is expected to transition into advanced professional roles, which include conducting independent research, securing employment in academia or industry, and applying expert problem-solving skills in a discipline related to drug discovery and development. The other outcomes are related to the student ability to deal and manage the ethics and scientific integrity, obtention and management of research grants, writing of scientific articles and communicating about research results and dissemination of research outcomes in specific and general conferences.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
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 clinical pharmacists 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. Furthermore, industrial employers (such as a dermato-cosmetics manufacturer developing proprietary formulations) stressed that they specifically require highly trained specialists with R&D expertise to avoid batch failures and production errors. The College of Pharmacists also noted that having PhD researchers on teams is a critical asset when competing for European and international research projects. Finally, alumni confirmed that the structured methodology and analytical depth gained were highly applicable in professional pharmacy management, clinical settings, academic teaching, and even in multidisciplinary transitions into the IT/software development industry. From our perspective, the outcomes are clearly identified and are consistent with common standards.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
The best practice examples that can be highlighted is raising student awareness of the problems related to ethics, scientific integrity and deontology issues. The integration of latter elements into the training, earlier in the program is noteworthy.

✓ Recommendations
It is important to include incentives for intellectual property and to demonstrate technology transfer in promising areas related to the pharmacy field.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The 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 shown.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
In the first year of the program theoretical courses including compulsory and elective courses are proposed. These are related to research management, research grants, ethics and scientific integrity. These are precious prerequisite 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 improvment. 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.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
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.

✓ Recommendations
The students are too isolated. They participate very little in local, national and international scientific events. The doctoral school in coordination with the PhD supervisors need to find and implement instruments to strongly encourage students to travel outside Oradea. At the Pharmacy level, it is also strongly recommended to decompartmentalize and break down the barriers in training.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
Although the doctoral school is aware of the importance of the national and international mobility dimension, as indicated in the IER document, this activity remains poorly documented and less 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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The 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. During the evaluation period, the doctoral school has set 17 mobilities but limited to 3 universities from one country (Hungary). Moreover, for two years, some students from doctoral school of biomedical sciences have participated in a Blended Intensive Programme (BIP) in collaboration with five partner universities and supported by the EUGREEN initiative.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
Participation in the organization of the blended intensive programme (BIP) within the EUGREEN Organization.

✓ Recommendations
It is strongly recommended for the doctoral school to double efforts in promoting international mobility by providing information about available resources, ensuring financial accessibility, and offering support to participants. The impact of international mobility is significant on the path of young people in terms of self-esteem, social integration and cultural openness.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The evaluation panel found strong evidence of fairness and flexibility accommodating diverse student profiles. For instance, one candidate owns a rural community pharmacy and utilizes flexible working hours to conduct literature reviews and visit university laboratories for experiments. Another candidate is a practicing medical doctor balancing clinical work with doctoral research. 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 who demonstrate 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 the individual potential and aspirations; the inclusive environment by respecting the principles of non-discrimination and equal opportunities; mobility programmes, research resources, and participation in scientific events is 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.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
The flexibility allowed to students to choose the doctoral supervisor, to select research topics according to their own competences, interests and their professional projects.

✓ Recommendations
The modalities of access to scholarships doctorate school should better defined and explained. The information regarding this matter could not be find either in the IER nor elsewhere.

The indicator is: fulfilled

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

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
Accessibility and efficiency of the resources and support services are through a link provided by the University of Oradea. This 54 pages 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. Full information regarding resources, support, 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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The analysis of the 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 Center for Inclusion, which was established as part of the EU GREEN alliance. This center 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 example
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,

✓ Recommendations
It is strongly recommended that the organisational component should communicate about the existing facilities among undergraduate students in order to encourage and make it easier for students with disabilities to integrate doctoral studies.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.5. Learning outcomes

Standard S.B.5.1. Definition and evaluation

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
At the university level, there is an operational procedure regarding the internal evaluation and monitoring of doctoral schools. The content of operational procedure is provided through a link where information regarding the methods for evaluating the scientific activity of doctoral students.
At the pharmacy level, the course programs of the doctoral training are provided at the Faculty web site. Moreover, it address's the evaluation, grading methods as well as the requirements for course completion. Also, it provides the teaching units description ensured by academic staff who hold the status of doctoral supervisors / habilitated professors. Learning outcomes are evaluated. The program of the first year's studies 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 standards.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The provided information regarding the learning outcomes are well described and are accessible through the university and pharmacy 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 pharmacy management, and even the IT/software development industry.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
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 in the field of pharmacy.

✓ Recommendations
The academic staff and supervisors are encouraged to make it clearer about the difference between learning outcomes and learning objectives.
The academic staff and supervisors are encouraged to provide 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 state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)

The examination modalities are provided in the IER through two web links. The first one concerns the course syllabi and modalities of examinations for part of disciplines (evaluation and grading methods, as well as the requirements for course completion). However, it seems that not all disciplines are shown! In the second link, students are informed about the operational procedure regarding the internal evaluation and monitoring of doctoral study fields.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

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 either for the final graduation exam (PhD defense) or the continous evaluations. Discussions with students and teaching staff revealed that ongoing evaluations in the first-year modules are highly applied; 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.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The continuous assessment procedure can be highlighted. This allows to evaluate the progress of the work according to the initial objectives shown in the individual training plan. Moreover, the continuous assessment allows to detect any potential scientific or human difficulties. However, the modalities of the continuous assessment needs to be more clear, especially regarding the role of the evaluation committee.

✓ Recommendations

It is very important that the faculty show without any ambiguity the main objective of the individual monitoring committee of the thesis: is to evaluate the progress of research work, to check working conditions and training, and to prevent possible conflicts by offering a space for exchange independent of the thesis supervision.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

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

The admission procedures regarding the organization and conduct of the admission competition for doctoral university studies, are available for consultation on the university website. Specific links to theses information 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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
All specifications and practical information are provided. For foreign students, additional information are precised. However, for the latter category of students, most of the information is presented in Romanian language. In summary, the admission organization, the requested qualifications and modalities which are planned, decided and voted 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. Regarding place allocation for the current intake, out of 15 requested places (capped at 25%), the domain received only 3 state-budgeted positions (1 with a scholarship, 2 tuition-free), with the remainder being fee-paying students.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
The university improves the transparency of the admission procedures and organization including the access to information and clarity of communication.
It appears that the university moves forward for global digitization of registration, involving replacing paper forms with online processes. It allows users to register via the internet-upload supporting documents, thus reducing processing times.

✓ Recommendations
In order to increase the international visibility and attractiveness, more information can be provided for foreign students in English. Organization of 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. To ensure a highly competitive and transparent selection process, the panel recommended implementing formal application portfolios that include a letter of intent, a preliminary research project draft, and a detailed CV. Furthermore, evaluators expressed surprise at the comparatively low number of state-funded doctoral positions allocated to the university (approximately 25 budget places across a university of ~15,000 students), recommending continued institutional advocacy at the national ministry level to secure more funded places.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
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 the admission to doctoral programmes. The principles of equity and equal opportunities are taken into account.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The 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 holding a total of 300 ECTS credits.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
The aspects taken into account for the selection process are pertinent especially the one regarding the quality of the proposed doctoral research project, including the candidate's responses to the questions addressed by the evaluators.

✓ Recommendations
Include a criterion based on the candidate's career plan. This allows the admission jury to assess the candidate's motivation and to distinguish motivated students from students who want to do a thesis by default.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The IER provides five documents supposed to be linked to the regulations concerning the students' professional activity. However, two of the documents are empty!! 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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The Doctoral School applies the regulations regarding the professional activity of doctoral students, in accordance with the national legislation. From the available documents, it is clearly shown the importance of ethics and scientific integrity for the University deontology. Furthermore, the university roles is not limited to detect fraud and falsifications but implement 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 a formal collaboration agreement with the university in Timișoara, ensuring strict ethical compliance. Plagiarism or research misconduct follows graduated disciplinary steps up to expulsion (with the panel noting a past example from the Sociology domain where a student was expelled for falsifying data, proving the regulations are actively enforced). Thesis similarity thresholds are strictly monitored before defense, typically capped at 20% to 25%. Finally, to protect the

student's journey, a standard procedure exists allowing students to change supervisors or thesis topics if irreconcilable conflicts occur.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
The implementation of the individual training and results programme based on advanced university studies which is established between the student and the doctoral mentor, which is evaluated annually by the guidance and academic integrity committee and the doctoral school council.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.8. Internationalisation process

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The activities regarding the international collaborations are reported in the IER under the form of tables showing mostly the incoming and outgoing collaborations, including the participation of academic staff and doctoral students in Erasmus mobility programmes, and inviting scientists from partner universities to take part in thematic courses and seminars. It is pleasant to see that the IER provides exhaustive information regarding the internationalisation activities.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
Regarding the participation of academic staff and doctoral students in Erasmus mobility programmes, six members have participated in mobilities in four European countries (Hungary, Italy, Spain, Turkey) within six institutions. Within the evaluation period (21-25), three theses were co-supervised with international collaborators but all belong to the same university (University of Debrecen, Hungary). Four professors took part as foreign members of the guidance committee. Ten seminars were given by intentional collaborators but 90% of them are from the same country (Hungary). Ten participations in international conferences but this concerns only three students.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
The participation in Erasmus mobility programmes, 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 efforts for pushing more students to take part in international meetings, of course, depending on the financial means. The panel strongly recommended broadening international mobility across Europe and beyond to help doctoral candidates expand their scientific horizons, overcome communicative hesitation, 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 state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The expected achievement of learning outcomes based on scientific research were presented. These include: Being able to identify, analyse and solve unmet problems; interdisciplinary competences; autonomy, scientific integrity and dissemination.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The 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 to be delivered 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.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
The integration of the development of interdisciplinary skills which 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 state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The results of scientific research are disseminated and presented scientific publications, posters and oral communications for the evaluated period (2021-2025). The scientific production for each staff member, being involved in scientific research is presented together with IF (Impact Factor) and Q (Quartile) of the journal. For the evaluated period, 98 indexed articles were published, 25 and 48 communications 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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The bibliometric analysis reveals a disparity among members. Some are non-publishing, while others publish very little. For a number of them, their output is limited to one or a few scientific presentations. Except for few members, for those who do publish, articles in Q1 are relatively few. The evaluation panel verified that candidates are required by national and institutional criteria to publish scientific papers—typically 3 Web of Science/ISI-indexed papers—to be allowed to defend their doctoral thesis. In these publications, the PhD student is typically the first author, while the supervisor is the corresponding author, with equal-contribution authorship no longer accepted as standard practice unless strictly justified. To ensure candidates can meet these strict requirements within the standard 4-year study cycle, open-access publishing (e.g., MDPI) is frequently utilized due to its rapid review turnaround times (1–3 months) compared to traditional publishers. Crucially, the university maintains a dedicated research fund to cover all Article Processing Charges (APCs) for approved Web of Science indexed journals, ensuring students do not pay out of pocket. Students initiate this funding procedure via a written purchase request through their coordinator, and the university administration pays the publisher directly upon paper acceptance.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
Few members with regular and high quality of scientific production. Of course, this observation must be interpreted in light of the human and financial resources, work conditions available to staff members.

✓ Recommendations
Dissemination in Q1 journals should be privileged as it enhances high global visibility and citation potential. This can be achieved through publication of multidisciplinary work. Publication in predatory journals should be avoided as much as possible. It is advisable to prioritize quality of publications over quantity. These recommendations are given as an incentive, regardless of the resources available to staff members and students to conduct their scientific research.

The indicator is: fulfilled

DOMAIN C. Quality management

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

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The Doctoral School coordinating the Pharmacy doctoral study field consistently applies institutional quality assurance and improvement procedures in accordance with the Quality Manual, the Quality Assurance Code, and the specific regulations of IOSUD-UO. These procedures cover the main stages and activities of doctoral education, including admission, implementation and updating of the advanced university training programme, annual evaluation and monitoring of doctoral students, supervision of doctoral research, academic ethics and

integrity, and support for scientific activities. Their implementation is monitored by the Faculty CEAQ and the responsible IOSUD–UO structures, while the results are analysed within the Doctoral School Council and the Faculty Council. Based on these analyses, measures are adopted to improve course syllabi, update research topics, optimize individual work plans, strengthen scientific dissemination, and improve administrative processes. Doctoral students also contribute to this process through annual questionnaires and discussions with the Doctoral School management, with their feedback being used to adjust educational and administrative activities.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The systematic implementation, monitoring, and subsequent review of quality assurance procedures demonstrate that quality management within the Pharmacy doctoral study field operates as a continuous improvement mechanism rather than as a purely formal process. The impact of these procedures is reflected in the improvement of teaching and research activities, doctoral students' scientific performance through publications, conference participation and research projects, increased internationalization, and more efficient management of evaluations, deadlines, and academic documentation. Moreover, the use of doctoral student feedback and the adoption of corrective and improvement measures based on institutional analyses demonstrate that the results of quality monitoring are effectively incorporated into the development of the doctoral programme. Consequently, the available evidence supports the fulfilment of the performance indicator regarding the consistent application of procedures and their demonstrable contribution to improving the quality of doctoral education.

The evaluation panel confirmed that the university operates a comprehensive, tiered quality management architecture involving over 130 faculty members and students across several specialized bodies. This includes the Central Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance (CEAC) at the university level, the Department for Quality Assurance (DAC) as the administrative arm, a Center of Excellence in Quality Management, a Body of Internal Auditors, and decentralized units within each faculty. When internal audits or external reviews identify non-conformities, the relevant department director must draft and execute a corrective action plan (plan de măsuri), which is subsequently re-audited. The external evaluators acknowledged the historical evolution of the university's quality assurance framework, crediting its early engineering-led systematic structuring.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

The Quality Assurance committee and the evaluators emphasized that while national ARACIS guidelines must be rigorously followed, the university should ensure that internal regulations maintain sufficient flexibility to foster scientific creativity and prevent administrative paralysis across diverse academic fields.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

The Pharmacy doctoral study field integrates the opinions of members of the academic community and other relevant stakeholders into the implementation and improvement of quality assurance procedures through several institutional mechanisms. Doctoral students periodically evaluate teaching staff and study disciplines through questionnaires administered in accordance with the applicable operational procedure, while doctoral students and academic staff participate in meetings and consultations within the Doctoral School Council and CSUD. External perspectives are also incorporated through consultations with collaborators and employers, joint research projects, and international partnerships. The feedback collected through these channels is analysed and used to adjust course syllabi, revise internal procedures and individual research plans, and refine the Doctoral School's development strategy. Quality assurance is institutionally supported by the Department for Quality Assurance (DAC), the Central Commission for Evaluation and Quality Assurance (CCEAC), the university-level Commission for Evaluation and Quality Assurance (CEAQ), and the Quality Commission of the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy, which together ensure the implementation and monitoring of the University of Oradea's quality assurance system.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The mechanisms in place demonstrate that stakeholder participation is integrated into the implementation of quality assurance procedures rather than being limited to formal consultation. Feedback from doctoral students, academic staff, employers, external collaborators, and institutional partners provides relevant information for identifying areas requiring adjustment and for improving educational, research, and administrative activities. The use of this feedback to revise syllabi, research plans, procedures, and strategic directions demonstrates its practical contribution to decision-making and continuous quality improvement. Although no separate CEAC operates specifically at the level of the Pharmacy doctoral study field, the existing university- and faculty-level quality assurance structures provide the necessary institutional framework for systematically analysing and incorporating stakeholder opinions. Consequently, the available mechanisms support the fulfilment of the analysed performance indicator concerning the effective involvement of the academic community and other stakeholders in the implementation of procedures. During the interviews, the panel found that student members of quality commissions are directly designated and proposed by student bodies rather than being appointed by the faculty administration, which guarantees authentic representation. These student representatives actively participate in drafting curriculum plans, validating class timetables, and promoting teaching evaluation surveys. Furthermore, doctoral students conduct annual online evaluations of faculty and Ph.D. supervisors (commencing in January) using a questionnaire of over 30 questions that evaluates supervisor availability, office hours, guidance on research design, and communication quality. The results, statistical participation rates, and generated reports are published openly on the university's quality management web portal. The panel also observed strong engagement from external employers (including hospital directors and industry administrators), who provided clear feedback on how Ph.D. graduates meet highly specialized competence and clinical pharmacy skills required in the job market.

✓ Recommendations

The panel recommended continued institutional focus on improving student survey response rates and ensuring clear, bidirectional communication across doctoral schools.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

Standard S.C.2.2. Operation

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

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

The University Ethics and Academic Deontology Commission (CEDU) of the University of Oradea operates according to regulations approved by the University Senate and exercises its responsibilities independently from other institutional structures or individuals. Its activity is governed by the University's Code of Ethics and Academic Deontology and covers all study programmes, including the Pharmacy doctoral study field. CEDU monitors compliance with academic ethics and deontology standards and examines complaints and appeals concerning the conduct of members of the university community. Through these responsibilities, the Commission provides the institutional framework necessary for safeguarding academic integrity and ensuring that ethical issues are addressed in accordance with the applicable regulations and legislation.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The regulatory framework and the institutional position of CEDU demonstrate that the University of Oradea has established a functional mechanism for independently overseeing compliance with university ethics and academic deontology. The Commission's independence, combined with its competence to monitor ethical standards and address complaints and appeals across all study programmes, ensures that ethical matters concerning the Pharmacy doctoral study field can be examined objectively and without interference from other university structures. These arrangements contribute to maintaining academic integrity, fairness and accountability within doctoral education. Consequently, the Commission's operation under Senate-approved regulations and its institutional independence demonstrate the fulfilment of the analysed performance indicator.

The evaluation panel confirmed that alongside the main Ethics Committee, the university operates a highly functional, specialized Sub-Committee for Research Ethics that handles all scientific research and experimental ethics approvals. This sub-committee meets monthly, consists of 5 permanent members (including a Pharmacy representative and a legal counselor) alongside 2 doctoral student representatives, and typically delivers approvals or feedback within 30 days. The panel noted that the university website features a dedicated ethics page with standardized bilingual (Romanian/English) forms, templates, and informed consent drafts, and that committee staff actively assist students with incorrectly filled forms before formal review.

The procedural workflow is rigorous: for clinical studies, doctoral candidates must first obtain ethical clearance from the hospital/clinic where the data is collected before the application is submitted to the University Research Ethics Sub-Committee for institutional approval. Furthermore, because the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy in Oradea does not maintain an on-site animal testing facility, all research involving animal models is carried out via a formal institutional collaboration agreement with the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy in Timișoara; the ethical approval is issued by the Timișoara ethics board and subsequently endorsed by the Oradea committee, demonstrating strict adherence to legal and ethical frameworks. The committee also actively enforces disciplinary steps for plagiarism or research misconduct, which can escalate to expulsion (with the panel noting a past example from the Sociology domain where a student was expelled for falsified data). Additionally, the committee adapts to new

challenges, having recently created formal guidelines regarding accepted cultural and academic behavior following an intercultural misunderstanding between international students.
The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

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

The University of Oradea systematically applies the institutional procedures for the initiation, monitoring, and review of study programmes, thereby supporting the maintenance and continuous improvement of educational quality. These procedures are implemented at faculty level through the Faculty Councils and specialized departments, under the coordination of the Department for Quality Assurance, the Administrative Council, and the University Senate. At IOSUD level, a dedicated procedure for evaluating and monitoring the development of doctoral schools and doctoral study fields is periodically applied, providing a specific framework for monitoring the quality and evolution of doctoral education, including the Pharmacy doctoral study field.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The consistent application of procedures at both institutional and IOSUD levels provides a structured mechanism for monitoring and periodically reviewing doctoral study programmes. The involvement of academic and quality assurance structures supports the identification of areas requiring improvement and ensures that the Pharmacy doctoral study field develops in accordance with institutional requirements and applicable quality standards. Therefore, the systematic implementation of these procedures and their role in supporting continuous improvement demonstrate the fulfilment of the analyzed performance indicator.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

The University of Oradea ensures the involvement of its academic community and external stakeholders in the implementation and review of procedures through consultation and representation mechanisms. Students participate in relevant institutional structures, including the Council for Doctoral University Studies (CSUD), the Council of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences (CSD), the University Senate, and quality assurance structures. Stakeholder participation is further supported through consultations with employers, alumni surveys, international academic cooperation, and partnerships with the socio-economic environment. At the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences, doctoral supervisors, academic

staff, and doctoral student representatives participate in CSD meetings and contribute to decisions concerning the functioning and development of doctoral programmes. External partners are also involved through collaboration agreements and protocols that support research activities and contribute to the strategic development of the Doctoral School.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The mechanisms implemented by the University and the Doctoral School demonstrate that the application and improvement of procedures are based on the participation of both internal and external stakeholders. The representation of doctoral students and academic staff in decision-making structures ensures that the needs of the academic community are considered, while consultations with employers, alumni, international institutions, and other partners provide perspectives relevant to educational and research activities. For the Pharmacy doctoral study field, this participatory framework supports the adaptation of procedures and strategic priorities to academic, professional, and societal requirements. Consequently, the systematic involvement of the university community and other relevant stakeholders demonstrates the fulfilment of the analyzed performance indicator. The panel confirmed that stakeholder involvement is both highly active and structured. Student members of quality commissions are directly designated and proposed by student bodies (rather than appointed by faculty administration), and they actively participate in drafting curriculum plans and validating class timetables. External stakeholders, such as the administrator of a dermato-cosmetics company (Synergy Therm SRL) and the President of the Bihor College of Pharmacists, confirmed their close collaboration with the university on research projects and in advocating for the profession, which directly informs the practical relevance of the doctoral program. Graduates/alumni also confirmed that communication with their former research teams and supervisors remains active, occasionally collaborating on publications or consulting on research projects post-graduation.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

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

The Pharmacy doctoral study field systematically evaluates doctoral students' satisfaction with the academic and administrative activities associated with the doctoral programme. Doctoral students complete an online satisfaction questionnaire annually, covering aspects such as access to information, communication with the secretariat and doctoral supervisors, organization of doctoral activities, quality of scientific events, participation in projects and international programmes, IT facilities and research infrastructure, and involvement in teaching activities. The results are processed and analyzed by the Doctoral School Council (CSD), which identifies relevant issues and, where necessary, proposes improvement measures that are subsequently presented to the Council for Doctoral University Studies (CSUD). The results are also integrated into the internal monitoring and continuous improvement process in accordance with IOSUD-UO procedures.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The systematic collection and analysis of doctoral students' feedback provide the Doctoral School with an institutional mechanism for assessing the quality of teaching and related academic services. The analysis conducted by the CSD and the possibility of proposing corrective or improvement measures demonstrate that student feedback is not limited to data collection but is incorporated into the quality assurance process. Although the questionnaire addresses the doctoral programme more broadly than individual teaching performance alone, it provides relevant information on doctoral supervision, teaching activities, and the academic environment. Therefore, the documented analysis and subsequent use of evaluation results support the fulfilment of the analyzed performance indicator. During the meetings with the Quality Assurance representatives and the doctoral students, the panel confirmed that student evaluations of faculty and Ph.D. supervisors are conducted annually, commencing in January, via an online platform. The comprehensive questionnaire contains over 30 questions and specifically evaluates criteria such as supervisor availability, office hours, guidance on research design, and communication quality. The evaluation covers both the teachers delivering the advanced foundational lectures during the first year of doctoral studies and the Ph.D. supervisor and guidance committee throughout the multi-year research phase. Furthermore, the results, statistical participation rates, and generated reports are published openly on the university's quality management web portal. Student representatives in the decentralized quality units actively facilitate and promote these teaching evaluation surveys among their peers.

✓ Recommendations

While the system is highly transparent and functional, the evaluation panel recommended that the institution maintain a continued focus on improving student survey response rates to ensure the feedback remains statistically robust and fully representative of the student body.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

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

The Pharmacy doctoral study field systematically collects and analyzes data relevant to the internal quality assurance process. The information covers the organization and implementation of the doctoral programme, teaching staff activities, doctoral students' academic progress and results, participation in research projects and scientific events, as well as academic mobility and international activities. The data also include the results of annual doctoral student satisfaction questionnaires concerning programme organization, access to resources, academic and administrative services, and the support provided by the Doctoral School and teaching staff. The collected information is centralized, transmitted to the Council for Doctoral University Studies (CSUD), and integrated into the Quality Assurance and Evaluation System (SEAQ) for monitoring and reporting purposes.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The systematic collection, centralization, and analysis of information provide an evidence-based foundation for monitoring the quality of the Pharmacy doctoral study field. By combining data on

doctoral students' progress and scientific activity with feedback concerning academic and administrative services, the Doctoral School can identify both strengths and areas requiring improvement. The integration of these data into SEAQ and their reporting to CSUD further supports institutional oversight and the adoption of appropriate improvement measures. Consequently, the existence of a structured process for collecting and using relevant quality-related data demonstrates the fulfilment of the analyzed performance indicator. The evaluation panel confirmed during the interviews that data collection and management are handled efficiently at the domain level. The coordinator of the Pharmacy doctoral domain actively manages and updates student, publication, and activity records annually using structured spreadsheets and templates that are distributed to colleagues. Additionally, the panel verified that the data gathered from the online student evaluations—including the results, statistical participation rates, and generated reports—are published openly on the university's quality management web portal, demonstrating a transparent and highly functional data management system.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

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

The University of Oradea, through IOSUD and the Doctoral School, ensures public access to information concerning the entire doctoral study pathway, from admission to the completion of studies and the award of the doctoral degree. Information and relevant forms are made available through the institutional website and the IOSUD secretariat. Publicly accessible information includes the Doctoral School and admission regulations, doctoral study contract, procedures governing the completion of studies and public defense of doctoral theses, curricula and course syllabi, academic and scientific profiles of doctoral supervisors, research topics and institutional contact details, information on doctoral students, standards for preparing doctoral theses, and training and research programmes. Information concerning scheduled public defenses, including thesis summaries and organizational details, is also published in advance, in compliance with applicable data protection requirements.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The range and accessibility of the information published by IOSUD demonstrate an institutional commitment to transparency throughout the doctoral study cycle. For the Pharmacy doctoral study field, prospective and current doctoral students, academic staff, and other interested parties have access to essential information regarding admission, programme requirements, supervision, academic progression, research activities, and completion of doctoral studies. The publication of regulations, academic documents, and information concerning public thesis defenses facilitates informed participation and enables stakeholders to understand the requirements and functioning of the programme. Therefore, the systematic provision and public accessibility of relevant information demonstrate the fulfilment of the analyzed performance indicator.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations
The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
The University of Oradea ensures transparency in decision-making by documenting and publicly communicating the decisions adopted by its main governance structures. Decisions of the Administrative Council, the University Senate, and the Council for Doctoral University Studies (CSUD) are published through the University's official communication channels and made accessible on its website. This framework also applies to decisions relevant to doctoral education and, consequently, to the Pharmacy doctoral study field.

✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
The systematic publication of decisions adopted by the University's governing and doctoral structures provides the academic community and other stakeholders with access to relevant institutional decisions and their outcomes. This practice strengthens accountability and enables interested parties to follow decisions affecting the organization and functioning of doctoral studies. Therefore, the documented and public communication of decisions demonstrates the transparency of decision-making processes and supports the fulfilment of the analyzed performance indicator.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations
The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
IOSUD - University of Oradea, through the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences, carries out the procedures required for the external quality evaluation of the Pharmacy doctoral study field in accordance with the ARACIS methodology and applicable legislation. The process includes the preparation of the Internal Evaluation Report (REI) according to the current requirements and standardized evaluation framework, together with the collection and submission of supporting documentation concerning human resources, infrastructure, programme objectives, curricula, institutional partnerships, and quality assurance mechanisms. 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, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

The 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. The identified development directions, including periodic revision of quality procedures, greater stakeholder involvement, improved feedback mechanisms, further digitalization, continuous monitoring, and systematic preparation for external evaluations, also indicate an institutional approach oriented toward maintaining compliance and continuous improvement. Consequently, the procedures implemented for the Pharmacy doctoral study field provide adequate evidence that the requirements of the analyzed performance indicator are fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths:		Weaknesses:
✓ The University of Oradea holds the maximum "HIGH DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE" institutional rating. ✓ High scientific productivity, with over 350 Web of Science (ISI) articles published by supervisors and 90 by students in the last 5 years. ✓ The university fully covers Article Processing Charges (APCs) for ISI-indexed journals, ensuring students do not pay out of pocket. ✓ Excellent, modernized research infrastructure, including advanced facilities for cell cultures, electrospinning, and a high-performance computing cluster. ✓ Strong integration with the regional socio-economic environment; employers (hospitals, dermato-cosmetics industry) explicitly value and rely on the advanced R&D skills of these PhD graduates. ✓ Membership in the EU GREEN European University Alliance, which structurally supports internationalization. ✓ High student satisfaction regarding the strong mentorship and rapid feedback provided by PhD coordinators.	**INTERNAL FACTORS** ⑨	✓ A severely limited number of state-funded doctoral grants compared to the number of available supervisors and candidates (e.g., only 3 budgeted positions out of 15 requested places). ✓ Operational management and communication within the doctoral field are heavily centralized around the field coordinator, limiting shared governance. ✓ A pronounced over- concentration of doctoral research topics in phytotherapy and pharmacognosy, lacking broader diversity in areas like clinical pharmacy or molecular pharmacology. ✓ Doctoral student mobility is heavily concentrated in geographically adjacent partner universities (in Hungary) rather than spanning broader Europe. ✓ Doctoral students appear largely unaware of some institutional financial incentives (e.g., monetary reward allocations for ISI papers) due to communication gaps. ✓ No international doctoral students

SWOT analysis		
Opportunities: ✓ Access to national and European funding sources (PNRR, Horizon Europe, Digital Europe) to further develop infrastructure and research grants. ✓ Institutional goals and expansion plans to centralize advanced multi-disciplinary research equipment into a unified core facility. ✓ Expanding international mobility and collaboration networks beyond neighboring countries to broaden students' scientific horizons. ✓ Increasing interest and demand from regional employers for highly qualified graduates trained in applied and interdisciplinary fields. ✓ Implementing formal application portfolios (letter of intent, preliminary project draft) to ensure a more competitive and transparent candidate selection process	**EXTERNAL FACTORS**	**Threats:** ✓ Insufficient public funding for doctoral research and state-budgeted places, requiring continuous institutional advocacy at the national ministry level. ✓ Frequent changes in national regulations regarding doctoral education and evaluation frameworks. ✓ Demographic decline resulting in a decreasing number of graduates. ✓ Increasing competition between universities at both national and international levels. ✓ The potential migration of highly qualified human resources to the private sector or abroad.

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

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
DOMAIN A. Institutional capacity			
1.	**I.P.A.1.1.1** For delivering the study programme/domain, the HEI has adequate organisational components and an adequate management system, which operate based on methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.	F	Decentralize administrative leadership by delegating and distributing administrative responsibilities among all doctoral supervisors and student representatives to foster institutional resilience and shared governance.
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	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (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	
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.	PF	The external evaluators recommended establishing clear, accessible guidelines for doctoral students regarding how research consumables, reagents, and equipment maintenance are funded and procured. This recommendation was made because some students appeared largely unaware of the institutional publication incentives and financial mechanisms available to them.
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	
6.	**I.P.A.3.1.2** The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	
7.	**I.P.A.3.2.1** Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	
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	
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	The research activity in which doctoral students of the pharmacy doctoral study are involved should provide more offers to cover aspects regarding bioinformatic and AI and their applications in pharmaceutical sciences. If these aspects are already practiced, they are not well highlighted in the documents. The

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			major and urgent effort should be focused on updating the information on the web site. For example, the study program is shown until the year 2021 and nothing after. Although acknowledging the valid pharmacological rationale of plant-based research (such as multi-target antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties), the panel recommended diversifying the research topics more broadly across other major directions of the field, such as clinical pharmacy, pharmaceutical technology, and molecular pharmacology.
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	It is important to include incentives for intellectual property and to demonstrate technology transfer in promising areas related to the pharmacy field.
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	The students are too isolated. They participate very little in local, national and international scientific events. The doctoral school in coordination with the PhD supervisors need to find and implement instruments to strongly encourage students to travel outside Oradea. At the Pharmacy level, it is also strongly recommended to decompartmentalize and break down the barriers in training.
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	It is strongly recommended for the doctoral school to double efforts in promoting international mobility by providing information about available resources, ensuring financial accessibility, and offering support to participants. The impact of international mobility is significant on the path of young people in terms of self-esteem, social integration and cultural openness.
13.	**I.P.B.3.2.1** The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students, in line with their potential and aspirations, taking into account the diversity of learning styles and abilities.	F	The modalities of access to scholarships doctorate school should better defined and explained. The information regarding this matter could not be find either in the IER nor elsewhere.

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
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	It is strongly recommended that the organisational component should communicate about the existing facilities among undergraduate students in order to encourage and make it easier for students with disabilities to integrate doctoral studies.
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	The academic staff and supervisors are encouraged to make it clearer about the difference between learning outcomes and learning objectives. The academic staff and supervisors are encouraged to provide 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.
16.	**I.P.B.5.1.2** Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	It is very important that the faculty show without any ambiguity the main objective of the individual monitoring committee of the thesis: is to evaluate the progress of research work, to check working conditions and training, and to prevent possible conflicts by offering a space for exchange independent of the thesis supervision.
17.	**I.P.B.7.1.1** The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	In order to increase the international visibility and attractiveness, more information can be provided for foreign students in English. Organization of 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. To ensure a highly competitive and transparent selection process, the panel recommended implementing formal application portfolios that include a letter of intent, a preliminary research project draft, and a detailed CV. Furthermore, evaluators expressed surprise at the

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			comparatively low number of state-funded doctoral positions allocated to the university (approximately 25 budget places across a university of ~15,000 students), recommending continued institutional advocacy at the national ministry level to secure more funded places.
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	Include a criterion based on the candidate's career plan. This allows the admission jury to assess the candidate's motivation and to distinguish motivated students from students who want to do a thesis by default.
19.	**I.P.B.7.2.1** The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	
20.	**I.P.B.8.1.1** The organisational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.	PF	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 efforts for pushing more students to take part in international meetings, of course, depending on the financial means. The panel strongly recommended broadening international mobility across Europe and beyond to help doctoral candidates expand their scientific horizons, overcome communicative hesitation, 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	It is advisable to emphasize aspects concerning intellectual property protection and the transfer of research results to practical applications.
22.	**I.P.B.9.2.1** The results of scientific research are visible at national and international level in that scientific domain, and capitalised upon in an adequate manner.	F	Dissemination in Q1 journals should be privileged as it enhances high global visibility and citation potential. This can be achieved through publication of multidisciplinary work. Publication in predatory journals should be avoided as much as possible. It is advisable to prioritize quality of publications over quantity.

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			These recommendations are given as an incentive, regardless of the resources available to staff members and students to conduct their scientific research.
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	The Quality Assurance committee and the evaluators emphasized that while national ARACIS guidelines must be rigorously followed, the university should ensure that internal regulations maintain sufficient flexibility to foster scientific creativity and prevent administrative paralysis across diverse academic fields
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	The panel recommended continued institutional focus on improving student survey response rates and ensuring clear, bidirectional communication across doctoral schools.
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	
26.	**I.P.C.3.1.1** The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	
27.	**I.P.C.3.1.2** Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	F	
28.	**I.P.C.4.1.1** The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	F	While the system is highly transparent and functional, the evaluation panel recommended that the institution maintain a continued focus on improving student survey response rates to ensure the feedback remains statistically robust and fully representative of the student body
29.	**I.P.C.5.1.1** The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	F	
30.	**I.P.C.6.1.1** The organisational component ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
31.	**I.P.C.6.1.2** The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	
32.	**I.P.C.8.1.1** The organisational component carries out the procedures pertaining to the external quality evaluation process, aiming to organise the evaluated study programme as provided by the law.	F	

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfillment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity	7	1	0
Domain B. Educational efficacy	13	1	0
Domain C. Quality management	10	0	0
Total	30	2	0

VI. Conclusions

The evaluation panel proposes maintaining accreditation (MAC) for the Pharmacy doctoral domain, concluding that the doctoral school fulfills most of the ARACIS standards. Out of a total of 32 evaluated performance indicators, 30 were considered fully fulfilled, while 2 were only partially fulfilled.

Regarding the strengths, the evaluators appreciated the modernized research infrastructure, which includes advanced laboratories for cell cultures and high-performance equipment. The high scientific productivity of the domain was also noted, reflected by over 350 ISI-indexed articles published by supervisors and 90 published by students in the last 5 years. A major positive aspect is the financial support provided by the university, which fully covers open-access publication fees (APCs) for ISI-indexed journals, ensuring that students do not bear these costs out of pocket. The program's integration into the regional socio-economic environment is very strong, with employers from hospitals and the dermato-cosmetics industry validating the practical value of the graduates' advanced research skills. Additionally, students reported a high level of satisfaction regarding the guidance and rapid feedback received from their coordinators.

As for weaknesses and recommendations, the report highlights a major issue related to the insufficient number of state-funded places, with the domain receiving only 3 funded positions out of the 15 requested. The evaluators observed that operational management is highly centralized and recommended administrative decentralization. Another important recommendation concerns the diversification of research topics; the panel noted a heavy concentration on phytotherapy and pharmacognosy and suggested expanding towards clinical pharmacy, pharmaceutical technology, or molecular pharmacology. Internationalization requires significant improvements, as there are no international doctoral students, and academic mobilities are geographically limited, mainly to partner universities in Hungary. Furthermore, the panel requested that doctoral students be better informed regarding the internal funding mechanisms available for research and consumables.

Propose and substantiate a decision.

Following the completion of the maintaining accreditation procedure, the decision of the evaluation panel is: **maintaining accreditation** (MAC);

VII. Annexes

Supplementary requested annexes are uploaded on the platform

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

Instituţia de învăţământ superior/Organizaţia furnizoare de educaţie/ Higher Education Institution / Education Provider Organization: **Universitatea din Oradea**/ University of Oradea

Şcoala doctorală/ Doctoral School: **Şcoala doctorală de Ştiinţe Biomedicale**/Doctorate school of Biomedical Sciences

Domeniul de doctorat/ Doctoral Domain: **Farmacie**/Pharmacy

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

Perioada vizitei de evaluare/ The evaluation period: **13-14 lulie 2026**/July 13th-14th 2026

Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/Evaluation panel:

Nr./No.	Numele şi prenumele/ Last Name and First Name	Calitatea/Team role
1.	*Radu OPREAN*	*Membru - Cadru didactic RNE*
2.	*Ahcene BOUMENDJEL*	*Membru - Evaluator internațional RNE-I*
3.	*Radu-Anton MOLDOVAN*	*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. Constantin BUNGĂU*	*Rector*
2.	*Prof. univ. dr. ing. habil. Radu-Cătălin ŢARCĂ*	*Director CSUD/Director CSUD*
3.	*Simona BUNGĂU*	*Persoană de contact/Contact person*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
Luni/ *Monday*, 13.07.2026			
09:30-10:00	Discuţii tehnice în cadrul comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii/ *Technical discussions within the expert committee for external quality evaluation*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala/Locaţia/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ Facultatea de Medicină şi Farmacie (FMF), clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy (FMF), Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.*
10:00-10:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **reprezentanţii conducerii componentei organizatorice/** *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the representatives of the management of the organisational component*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanţi 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/Locaţia/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* 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.– Decan Facultatea de Medicină şi Farmacie/ *Dean of the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy* - Prof. univ. dr.– Director al Şcolii Doctorale de Ştiinţe Biomedicale/ *Director of the Doctoral School of Biomedical Sciences* - Prof. univ. dr.–Persoană de contact, coordonator al Domeniului de doctorat Farmacie/ *Contact person, Coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Pharmacy*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
10:50-11:00	Pauză/ *Break*		
11:00-11:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi evaluatori în evaluarea externă a calităţii 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 experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Echipa care a realizat REI/ *Team that has drafted the IER*	Sala/Locaţia/ Room/Location Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:* - Prof. univ. dr.– Prodecan, Cadru didactic / *Vicedean,Teaching staff* - Prof. univ. dr.– Cadru didactic / *Teaching staff* - Prof. univ. dr.–Persoană de contact, coordonator al Domeniului de doctorat Farmacie / *Contact person, Coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Pharmacy*
11:50-12:00	Pauză/ *Break*		
12:00 - 12:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu membri ai **Comisiei de etică universitară**/ *Meeting of the experts panel with members of the University Ethics Committee*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Membri ai Comisiei de etică universitară/ *Members of the University Ethics Committee*	Sala/Locaţia/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:* - Prof. univ. dr. habil.–Preşedintele comisiei de Etică/ *President University Ethics Committee*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
			- Conf. univ. dr.–Responsabil Comisia de etica cercetării/ *Responsible of the Research Ethics Comission*
12:50-13:00	Pauză/ *Break*		
13:00-13:50 Anuntat	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **personalul didactic** implicat în activităţile din cadrul DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the teaching staff involved in the activities within the DSUD*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Cadre didactice conducători de doctorat/ *Teaching staff who are PhD supervisors*	Sala/Locaţia/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:* - Prof. univ. dr.–Conducător de doctorat / *PhD supervisor* - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat / *PhD supervisor* - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat / *PhD supervisor* - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat / *PhD supervisor* - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat / *PhD supervisor* - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat / *PhD supervisor* - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat / *PhD supervisor* - Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat / *PhD supervisor*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanți/ *Participants*	Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants*
			- Prof. univ. dr.– Conducător de doctorat, Persoană de contact / *PhD supervisor, Contact person*
13:50-15:00	Pauză de prânz/ *Lunch break*		
15:00 - 15:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **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*	Sala/Locația/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* 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*
15:50-16:00	Pauză/ *Break*		
16:00-16:50 Anuntat	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **absolvenți**[1],[2] ai DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with alumni*[3] *of the DSUD*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Absolvenți ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ *Graduates*	Sala/Locația/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.*

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

[3] Avoid inviting alumni 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*
			Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:* -– an absolvire 2023/ *year of graduation 2023* -– an absolvire 2023/ *year of graduation 2023* -– an absolvire 2022/ *year of graduation 2022* -– an absolvire 2021/ year of graduation 2021 -– an absolvire 2022/ year of graduation 2022 -– an absolvire 2024/ *year of graduation 2024* -– an absolvire 2023/ *year of graduation 2023* -– an absolvire 2025/ *year of graduation 2025*
16:50-17:00	Pauză/ *Break*		
17:00-17:50 Anuntat	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **angajatori** ai absolvenților DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with employers[4] of the DSUD alumni*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Angajatori/ *Employers*	Sala/Locația/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:*

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

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
			-– Administrator, Clinica Medicală & Spital de Pneumologie Dr. Lavinia Davidescu / *Administrator, Dr. Lavinia Davidescu Medical Clinic and Pulmonology Hospital* -– Director Medical Spital Clinic Județean de Urgență Bihor / *Medical Director, Bihor County Emergency Clinical Hospital* -– Administrator SC Synergy Therm SRL/ *Administrator of SC Synergy Therm SRL* -– Administrator SC Spinex SRL/ *Administrator of SC Spinex SRL* -– Președinte al Colegiul Farmaciştilor Bihor/ *Prezident of Bihor College of Pharmacists*
Marţi/ *Tuesday*, 14.07.2026			
9:00 - 9:30	**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*	Sala/Locația/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.*
09:30 - 10:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu reprezentanți ai **structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calităţii/** *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ *Representatives of quality assurance organisational structures*	Sala/Locația/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
			- Prof. univ. dr.– Prorector responsabil cu Managementul Calităţii şi servicii administrative/ *Vicerector responsible for Quality Management and Administrative Services* - Prof. univ. dr.– membru al Comisiei de Calitate a FMF/ *Member of the Quality Commision of FMF* - Conf. univ. dr.– membru al Comisiei de Calitate a FMF/ *Member of the Quality Commision of FMF*
10:20 - 10:30	Pauză/ *Break*		
10:30-13:00	Vizitarea bazei materiale/ *Visiting the material resources*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanţi ai instituţiei 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.– Director Departament Farmacie/ *Director Pharmacy Department* - Prof. univ. dr.–*Persoană de contact/ Contact person*
13:00-14:00	Pauză de prânz/ *Lunch*		
14:00-14:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **studenţi**[5] **doctoranzi** din cadrul DSUD/	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Studenţi doctoranzi/ *Doctoral students*	Sala/Locaţia/ *Room/Location*

[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*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
	Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with doctoral students of the DSUD		Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:* -– an de studii III/ *year of study III* -– an de studii I/ *year of study I* -– an de studii IV/ *year of study IV* -– an de studii IV/ *year of study IV* -– an de studii III/ *year of study III* -– an de studii I/ *year of study I* -– an de studii IV/ *year of study IV* -– an de studii II/ *year of study II* -– an de studii VI/ *year of study VI*
14:50 - 15:00	Pauză/ *Break*		
15:00 - 16:00	Finalizarea activităților de evaluare/ *Completion of evaluation activities*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala/Locația/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.*
16:00-16:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **reprezentanţi ai conducerii componentei organizatorice/persoana de contact/reprezentanţi ai CEAC/reprezentanţi ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării**	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanți ai conducerii / reprezentanți ai CEAC / reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ *Representatives of the management / representatives of the*	Sala/Locația/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
	calităţii[6]/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the organisational component / contact person / representatives of the CEAC / representatives of quality assurance organisational structures*	*CEAC / representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures* - Persoana de contact/ *Contact person*	- Prof. univ. dr.– Prorector responsabil cu Managementul Calităţii şi servicii administrative/ *Vicerector responsible for Quality Management and Administrative Services* - Prof. univ. dr.– prodecan FMF/ *Vicedean FMF* - Prof. univ. dr.– Director Departament Farmacie, FMF/ *Director Department Pharmacy, FMF* - Prof. univ. dr.– membru al Comisiei de Calitate a FMF/ *Member of the Quality Commision of FMF* - Conf. univ. dr.– membru al Comisiei de Calitate a FMF/ *Member of the Quality Commision of FMF* - Prof. univ. dr.–Persoană de contact / *Contact person*
16:50- 17:00-	Pauză/ *Break*		

[6] Clarificarea unor aspecte rezultate din activităţile şi discuţiile desfăşurate pe parcursul efectuării vizitei, dacă se impune

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
17:00-17:30	Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experţi evaluatori cu reprezentanţii conducerii IÎS sau a OFE, după caz şi 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 experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanţi ai conducerii şi ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ *Representatives of the management* - Persoana de contact/ *Contact person*	Sala/Locaţia/ *Room/Location* Sala F3/ FMF, clădirea Centrul de simulări, Str. N. Jiga 29/ *Classroom F3/ FMF, Simulation Center building, N. Jiga 29 St.* Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ *List of participants attending the meeting:* - Prof. univ. dr.– prodecan FMF/ *Vicedean FMF* - Prof. univ. dr.– Director Departament Farmacie, FMF/ *Director Department Pharmacy, FMF* - Prof. univ. dr.–Persoană de contact/ *Contact person*