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. 7
la Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 318/H/22.10.2026

Anexa 7.8

DATE DE IDENTIFICARE	
Instituţia de învăţământ superior/organizaţia furnizoare de educaţie	Universitatea „Babeş-Bolyai“ din Cluj-Napoca
Şcoala(ile) doctorală(e)	Administrație și Politici Publice
Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD)	*Ştiinţe administrative*
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 şedinţa Comisiei permanente de specialitate Ştiinţe Administrative, ale Educaţiei şi Psihologie (CPS_C5) din 17.09.2026, propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV nr. 4659 /17.09.2026.
Propunerea de decizie a fost analizată de către Departamentul de evaluare Studii Universitare (DESU), opinia DESU fiind consemnată în PV nr. 5321/ 17.09.2026.

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

Domeniul	Standarde Î / N	Indicatori de performanţă Î / PÎ / N
A	**Î:** S.A.1.1, S.A.1.2., S.A.2.1., S.A.2.2., S.A.3.1., S.A.3.2., S.A.4.1. **N:**	**Î:** I.P.A.1.1.1, I.P.A.1.2.1, I.P.A.2.1.1, I.P.A.2.2.1, I.P.A.3.1.1, I.P.A.3.1.2, I.P.A.3.2.1, I.P.A.4.1.1 **PÎ:** **N:**
B	**Î:** S.B.1.1., S.B.2.1., S.B.3.1., S.B.3.2., S.B.4.1., S.B.5.1., S.B.7.1., S.B.7.2., S.B.8.1., S.B.9.1., S.B.9.2. **N:**	**Î:** I.P.B.1.1.1., I.P.B.2.1.2, I.P.B.3.1.1, I.P.B.3.1.2, I.P.B.3.2.1, I.P.B.4.1.1., I.P.B.5.1.1, I.P.B.5.1.2, I.P.B.7.1.1, I.P.B.7.1.2, I.P.B.7.2.1, I.P.B.8.1.1, I.P.B.9.1.1, I.P.B.9.2.1 **PÎ:** **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	
Consiliul ARACIS în ședința din 22.10.2026 analizează și validează propunerea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității, constatând că din: • *Total indicatori: 32 sunt îndepliniți, 0 parțial îndeplinit și 0 neîndeplinit* • *Total standarde: 26 sunt îndeplinite, 0 neîndeplinite,* *și, astfel, prin aplicarea art. 63 din Metodologie decide că* ***standardele sunt ÎNDEPLINITE.***	
Decizia	Menţinerea acreditării

The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education



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

Higher Education Institution/Education Provider Organization:	Babes Bolyai University
Doctoral School:	Administration and Public Policies
Doctoral Domain:	Administrative sciences
The objective of the external evaluation:	Periodical evaluation

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

No.	Last Name and First Name	Team role	Signature
1.	Prof univ dr Sevastian Cercel	Expert evaluator	
2.	Prof univ dr Stefan Handke	International Expert	
3.	DRD Carmen Iacob	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

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

This report was prepared in the framework of the external evaluation visit of the doctoral study domain in ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCES at BABEȘ-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY. The evaluation visit took place between 3-4 September 2026, and the panel of external evaluation experts consisted of:

- Prof. Sevastian Cercel, PhD
- Prof. Stefan Handke, PhD
- Student representative: Carmen Iacob

The coordinator of the doctoral study domain is Prof. Cătălin Ovidiu Baba, PhD.

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

Babeș-Bolyai University (UBB) is one of Romania's largest and most comprehensive higher education institutions, with an academic tradition dating back to 1581 and a distinctive multicultural profile. The University currently comprises 22 faculties and a broad network of research centres and institutes, offering programmes in Romanian, Hungarian, German as well as in English and other international languages. Doctoral education is coordinated at institutional level through the Institute for Doctoral Studies and the Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD), which provide the regulatory and administrative framework for the functioning of UBB's doctoral schools and promote interdisciplinary cooperation and common quality standards.

The Faculty of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences (FSPAC), established in 1995, is a dynamic academic unit of UBB with educational and research activities in political science, administrative science and communication science. Its mission combines academic education and research with a strong orientation towards societal and labour-market relevance. The doctoral field of Administrative Sciences is organised within FSPAC through the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies, established in 2015, which provides the institutional framework for doctoral education and research in the field.

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

The doctoral study domain in Administrative Sciences at Babeș-Bolyai University represents a consolidated component of doctoral education in Romania, contributing to the diversification and strengthening of research capacity in public administration and public policy at both national and regional levels. The domain has a clear interdisciplinary profile, integrating public administration,

public policy, public management, political science, economics and administrative law, with an appropriate emphasis on applied and societally relevant research. Its mission and objectives are clearly defined and focus on advanced research competences, methodological capacity, internationalisation, and the production of knowledge relevant to both academia and public-sector practice.

Since the previous external evaluation, the doctoral domain has undergone visible academic and institutional consolidation. Supervision capacity has increased, while the thematic portfolio has expanded to include emerging areas such as public leadership, organisational development, digital transformation and the responsible use of artificial intelligence in research. The increase in the number of successfully completed doctoral theses further indicates the maturation and stabilisation of the doctoral training process. Overall, these developments demonstrate the capacity of the doctoral domain to evolve in response to contemporary research agendas and transformations in public administration.

The Doctoral School of Administration and Public Management currently includes 11 doctoral supervisors who are tenured academic staff members at Babeș-Bolyai University. Ten of them hold habilitation in the field of Administrative Sciences and one in Finance (focus on public sector).

In the 2025–2026 academic year, the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies had 36 doctoral students enrolled in years 1, 2, 3 and 4, as well as an additional 20 doctoral students in the extension period.

The scientific research conducted within the Doctoral School undergoing accreditation follows three major research directions, corresponding to the academic profiles of its affiliated doctoral supervisors: public administration, including subfields such as public management, strategic planning, national and European public law, programme and project evaluation, urban planning, public policy and finance; conflict studies; and public health and public health policy.

II. Methods used

- Analysed documents (internal evaluation report and its annexes; additional documents requested before and during the on-site visit, if any; other documents or data);
- On-site visit (general list of visited locations and categories of persons with whom debates have been organised);
- Other relevant methods or aspects.

The main findings of the evaluation were developed through a combination of document analysis, direct observation, and stakeholder consultation. The evaluation team reviewed the self-evaluation report and its supporting annexes, additional institutional documents and data provided during the visit, as well as relevant information available on the websites of UBB, IOSUD and the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies. The evaluation also included on-site visits to the educational and research infrastructure and face-to-face meetings with the main stakeholder groups, including doctoral students, graduates, employers, doctoral supervisors, the management of the Doctoral School, and representatives of relevant institutional structures responsible for quality assurance, ethics, student support and doctoral administration. The triangulation of documentary

evidence, direct observations and stakeholder perspectives provided the basis for the findings and conclusions presented in this report.

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 doctoral field operates within the institutional and governance framework of Babeș-Bolyai University (UBB), whose organisational and management structures are regulated by the UBB Charter and by specific regulations governing the functioning and election of the University's decision-making and executive bodies. The institutional framework includes the University Senate, the Administrative Council, Faculty Councils and Department Councils, with responsibilities and decision-making mechanisms established through publicly available regulations. Student participation in university governance is formally ensured through elected representatives, including the statutory representation of students within the University Senate and Faculty Councils.

At doctoral level, doctoral studies are coordinated institutionally through the Institute for Doctoral Studies (ISD) and the Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD). Doctoral Schools constitute the organisational structures through which doctoral programmes are implemented and are managed by a Doctoral School Council and a Director. Their position and responsibilities within the broader UBB governance system are established through the University Charter and the regulations applicable to doctoral education.

The documents examined indicate that the organisational structures, responsibilities, decision-making mechanisms and procedures for the election or appointment of management structures are formally regulated and publicly available. The regulatory framework has also been updated following changes in the national higher education legislation, including the adoption in 2024 of the General Regulation governing elections to UBB leadership structures and positions.

✓ 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 documentary evidence demonstrates that UBB has a clearly defined and comprehensive governance architecture, within which responsibilities for the organisation and management of doctoral education can be identified at university, faculty and Doctoral School levels. In particular, the existence and functioning of the ISD, CSUD, Doctoral School Council and Director provides a distinct organisational framework for the management of doctoral studies, while their integration within the broader university governance structure ensures connections with institutional decision-making bodies.

The regulatory framework examined (it is approved by the UBB Senate) defines the composition, responsibilities and decision-making mechanisms of the relevant governance structures and provides formal mechanisms for the participation of academic staff and students. The recent revision of institutional regulations following the adoption of Higher Education Law No. 199/2023 also provides evidence that the regulatory framework is updated in response to legislative changes.

Based on the documents reviewed and the information obtained during the site visit, the organisational and management arrangements appear adequate for the implementation of the doctoral field. The responsibilities of the different governance levels are sufficiently defined, and no evidence was identified of organisational gaps that would impede the functioning of the doctoral field.

The evidence therefore supports the conclusion that the indicator is fulfilled. While the documentation provides extensive evidence regarding the existence and formal revision of regulations, the periodic review of procedures could be documented more systematically by indicating, where relevant, the dates and rationale of revisions and the stakeholders involved in the review process.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The extensive public availability of the University's governance regulations and normative documents contributes to institutional transparency and facilitates access by members of the academic community to information concerning responsibilities, decision-making structures and representation mechanisms.

A further positive aspect is the integration of doctoral governance within a clearly articulated multi-level institutional structure, while maintaining dedicated structures for doctoral education through the ISD, CSUD and Doctoral Schools. This arrangement allows doctoral education to retain specific governance mechanisms while remaining connected to the University's broader academic and administrative decision-making system.

✓ Recommendations

The University and the Doctoral School are encouraged to continue the periodic review of regulations and procedures applicable to doctoral education and to maintain systematic evidence of this process, including the rationale for significant amendments and, where appropriate, the involvement of doctoral students, supervisors and other relevant stakeholders. This would make it possible to demonstrate more clearly that regulatory development is not limited to ensuring formal compliance with legislative changes but also responds to experience gained from the implementation of doctoral programmes and to feedback from the academic community.

The indicator is: FULFILLED

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

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

The UBB Charter establishes consultation and participation of members of the academic community in institutional decision-making processes, including the development and revision of methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures. At university level, consultation is supported through collegial governance structures and specialised advisory bodies, including councils established for specific areas of academic activity.

At the level of the Faculty of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences and the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies (SDAPP), decisions concerning doctoral education are taken through the relevant collegial structures, including the Faculty Council, the Doctoral School Council and, where appropriate, the Council for Doctoral University Studies (CSUD). The organisation and operation of the Doctoral School, including its decision-making structures and procedures, are further regulated through the SDAPP Regulation.

The institutional framework therefore provides formal opportunities for academic staff, doctoral supervisors and student representatives to participate in decision-making processes concerning doctoral education.

✓ 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 and governance framework provides mechanisms through which members of the academic community can participate in the development and revision of institutional regulations and procedures. The representation of academic staff and students in collegial decision-making structures, together with the existence of consultation mechanisms at university and faculty levels, creates the formal conditions for stakeholder views to be expressed and considered.

At the level of the doctoral field, the Doctoral School Council represents the main collegial structure through which doctoral supervisors and doctoral students can contribute to decisions concerning the organisation and implementation of doctoral education. The discussions held during the site visit confirmed that relevant academic actors are able to express their views on matters affecting the functioning of the Doctoral School and doctoral programmes.

However, the documentation included in the self-evaluation report provides more extensive evidence concerning the formal decision-making structures than concerning the actual process through which stakeholder feedback has resulted in the adoption or revision of specific methodologies, regulations or

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

procedures. The evidence would therefore be strengthened by concrete examples documenting the consultation process and demonstrating how proposals originating from academic staff, doctoral students or other stakeholders have been incorporated into revised institutional documents.

Taking into consideration the regulatory framework, the collegial character of decision-making and the information obtained during the site visit, there is sufficient evidence that stakeholder views are considered within the institutional decision-making process. The indicator can therefore be considered fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The participation of academic staff and student representatives in collegial governance structures provides an established channel through which the perspectives of the main internal stakeholders can be incorporated into decision-making concerning doctoral education.

The existence of consultation mechanisms at several institutional levels – Doctoral School, faculty and university – also facilitates the consideration of issues that may require intervention beyond the level of the individual doctoral programme.

✓ Recommendations

The Doctoral School is encouraged to document stakeholder consultation more systematically when methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures are developed or revised. In addition to recording participation in collegial decision-making bodies, the School could maintain evidence of the issues raised by doctoral supervisors, doctoral students and other relevant stakeholders, together with information on how such feedback was considered and, where appropriate, incorporated into revised documents.

Where significant changes to doctoral regulations or procedures are envisaged, broader consultation beyond the formal representatives in governance structures could also be considered, particularly when the changes directly affect doctoral students or supervisors.

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)

Babeș-Bolyai University has an extensive physical infrastructure supporting teaching, research, administrative activities and student services. The University manages more than 100 buildings, including over 85 buildings allocated to educational activities, comprising lecture halls, classrooms, seminar rooms, laboratories and reading rooms. The University also provides student accommodation, dining facilities, sports infrastructure, practical training and research centres, libraries and a range of student support services.

Doctoral students have access to the Lucian Blaga Central University Library and its network of branch and specialised libraries, as well as to electronic collections and online resources. For doctoral candidates online data bases are critical for completion of research even when based outside of Cluj. Research activities are supported through the University's research infrastructure and research units.

At the level of the Faculty of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences (FSPAC), educational and research activities are conducted in three buildings. The Faculty has documented the teaching spaces available in these buildings, together with its teaching and research laboratories, equipment, software and information systems. The doctoral field also benefits from access to specialised literature in administrative sciences through the Central University Library, the Faculty library and electronic resources.

Teaching and research spaces are equipped with IT and multimedia infrastructure. Following the modernisation of FSPAC educational spaces, academic staff have also received training in the use of interactive technologies, while technical support is available in the Faculty buildings.

At university level, dedicated structures and services are in place to support students with disabilities, including the Centre for Students with Disabilities, alongside access to accommodation, dining, medical, counselling and other student support services.

- ✓ 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 documentary evidence demonstrates that UBB has extensive infrastructure for teaching, research, administrative activities and student services. At the level of FSPAC, the documentation provides specific evidence concerning the spaces, laboratories, equipment and software available for educational and research activities. The resources available to the Doctoral School are complemented by the University's broader research and library infrastructure.

During the site visit, the review panel had the opportunity to inspect facilities relevant to the implementation of the doctoral field, including teaching and research spaces and facilities available to doctoral students. The facilities observed were adequately equipped and suitable for the educational and research activities associated with doctoral studies.

The availability of specialised library resources is particularly relevant to the doctoral field. Doctoral students have access to the Central University Library, the Faculty library and electronic resources, including specialised literature in Romanian and English covering administrative sciences and related fields. The availability of physical resources is complemented by electronic access to a substantial range of academic publications.

The University also provides a broader infrastructure supporting student life, including accommodation, dining, sports, medical and counselling services. Institutional arrangements are in place to facilitate access to university services and facilities for persons with disabilities.

On the basis of the documentary evidence and the facilities inspected during the site visit, the physical, technical and learning resources available are adequate for the implementation of doctoral education and research in the assessed field. The indicator is therefore fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The extensive integration of physical and digital learning and research resources constitutes a particular strength. Doctoral students have access not only to the infrastructure available within the Faculty but also to the wider research and library infrastructure of a large comprehensive university, including specialised and branch libraries, electronic collections and online academic resources.

The continued modernisation of FSPAC teaching spaces, accompanied by training for academic staff in the use of interactive technologies and the availability of dedicated IT support, represents a positive approach to ensuring that investment in infrastructure translates into effective use in educational activities.

✓ Recommendations

The Faculty is encouraged to continue the systematic monitoring of the use of its recently modernised teaching and research infrastructure, including the utilisation of interactive equipment and the support needs of academic staff and doctoral students. Such monitoring could inform future investment decisions and ensure that technological resources continue to respond effectively to changing educational and research needs.

The University and Faculty should also continue to monitor the accessibility of all spaces used by doctoral students and ensure that physical and technological infrastructure remains fully accessible to persons with disabilities.

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)

UBB has institutional mechanisms for the maintenance and development of its physical and technical infrastructure. Faculties periodically plan infrastructure development and upgrading needs, while university-level initiatives, including the UBB for Sustainable Development programme, also address the improvement and sustainable management of existing infrastructure.

At FSPAC level, teaching, research and administrative spaces are subject to regular maintenance and progressive modernisation. Teaching and research equipment, IT infrastructure and specialised software are updated according to identified needs. The Faculty reports procedures for periodic inspection of infrastructure and allocation of material resources, complemented by technical and IT support

✓ 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 documentary evidence indicates that infrastructure maintenance and modernisation are addressed through both institutional planning and routine management at Faculty level. The information provided regarding periodic inspection, technological upgrading and IT support indicates that maintenance is approached as an ongoing process rather than exclusively through ad hoc interventions.

The facilities inspected during the site visit were in an appropriate state of maintenance and provided suitable conditions for teaching, research and academic work. No significant deficiencies affecting the implementation of doctoral education and research in the assessed field were identified.

Based on the documentary evidence and direct observations during the site visit, the movable and immovable assets relevant to the doctoral field are properly maintained and provide appropriate conditions for study, research and work. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The integration of infrastructure development and maintenance with the University's broader sustainability objectives represents a positive institutional approach. The continuous modernisation of FSPAC facilities, accompanied by technical support and measures aimed at ensuring the effective use of new equipment, also contributes to the sustainability of infrastructure investments.

✓ Recommendations

The Faculty is encouraged to continue the systematic monitoring and preventive maintenance of its physical and technological infrastructure, with particular attention to the timely upgrading of IT equipment and specialised software used for teaching and research.

The indicator is: FULFILLED

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

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

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

The doctoral field of Administrative Sciences is supported by 11 doctoral supervisors affiliated with the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies (SDAPP) (1 more supervisor joined since the self evaluation report was submitted). The courses included in the doctoral training programme are delivered by doctoral supervisors whose academic and research profiles are related to the subjects assigned to them.

The documentation submitted for the evaluation includes information on the doctoral supervisors, their curricula vitae, scientific publications, research projects, fulfilment of national qualification standards and doctoral students currently supervised. All 11 doctoral supervisors meet the CNATDCU standards currently in force, in most cases their points exceed the minimum.

The academic staff demonstrates research activity in areas relevant to Administrative Sciences and Public Policy, including public administration and management, governance, digitalisation, regional and local development, public policy, public health policy and related interdisciplinary areas. Their research activity includes publications in internationally indexed journals, books and book chapters, participation in national and international research projects, as well as involvement in international academic and professional networks.

- ✓ 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 documentation examined demonstrates that the doctoral field benefits from an adequate core of qualified doctoral supervisors. All eleven supervisors fulfil the national standards applicable to doctoral supervision, providing objective evidence regarding the academic qualifications and research performance of the staff involved in the doctoral field. One more professor is expected to join the PhD School in the next months.

An examination of the academic and research profiles of the doctoral supervisors indicates a good correspondence between their areas of expertise and the thematic scope of the Administrative Sciences doctoral field. The diversity of expertise represented within the Doctoral School – covering public administration, public management, public policy, governance, local and regional development, digitalisation and sectoral policy areas – provides an appropriate basis for supporting a range of doctoral research topics.

The recent scientific output of the doctoral supervisors further demonstrates continued research activity rather than reliance exclusively on previous academic achievements. The staff is involved in publications, research projects, international academic networks and professional activities relevant to the field. The information reviewed regarding teaching responsibilities also indicates that subjects within the doctoral training programme are assigned in accordance with the academic and research expertise of the respective teaching staff.

The information obtained during the meetings with doctoral supervisors and doctoral students was consistent with the documentary evidence regarding the academic expertise available within the Doctoral School and the capacity of the staff to support doctoral research. Doctoral students also

reported having access to academic expertise relevant to their research and appropriate interaction with their supervisors.

Based on the qualifications, research profiles, recent scientific activity and correspondence between academic expertise and teaching and supervision responsibilities, the review panel considers the human resources available to the doctoral field suitable for the implementation of doctoral education and research. The indicator is fulfilled.

University year	Number of doctoral supervisors SDAPP	Number of PhD students SDAPP
2025-2026	10	36
2024-2025	9	30
2023-2024	9	32
2022-2023	9	40
2021-2022	9	39

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The strong international profile of the body of doctoral supervisors constitutes a particular strength of the doctoral field. Members of the Doctoral School are involved in international research and academic networks, professional organisations, editorial activities, international projects and academic mobility, providing doctoral students with access to expertise and networks extending beyond the national academic environment. Another positive aspect is that doctoral students also benefit from the involvement of highly qualified academic staff in their guidance committees, including recognised specialists whose expertise provides additional scientific support and contributes to the quality and interdisciplinarity of doctoral supervision.

Another positive aspect is the combination of expertise across different areas of public administration and public policy. This diversity supports interdisciplinary doctoral research while maintaining a clear connection with the core disciplinary area of Administrative Sciences.

✓ Recommendations

The Doctoral School is encouraged to maintain a strategic approach to the development of its body of doctoral supervisors, ensuring both continuity of existing areas of expertise and the progressive inclusion of emerging research themes relevant to Administrative Sciences and Public Policy. Particular attention should be given to maintaining a balanced distribution of doctoral supervision responsibilities and to supporting the development of the next generation of potential doctoral supervisors.

The Doctoral School is also encouraged to continue using the international networks and research collaborations of its academic staff to expand opportunities for doctoral students to participate in international research projects, academic mobility, joint publications and other forms of integration into the international research community.

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)

UBB has institutional mechanisms supporting the professional and personal development of its staff. For academic and research staff, the Individual Career/Academic Development Plan (PIC) provides a framework for setting development objectives, monitoring academic activities and supporting professional and peer evaluation. The University also provides professional development programmes and continuing education opportunities.

At FSPAC level, staff development is further supported through participation in specialised training, national and international research projects, academic mobility, fellowships and cooperation with partner universities and international academic networks.

✓ 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 evidence indicates that professional development is supported through both formal institutional mechanisms and opportunities for research, training and international academic engagement. The PIC provides a structured framework linking individual development objectives with academic activities and performance evaluation, while research projects, mobility and international cooperation offer additional opportunities for developing teaching and research competences.

The significant participation of FSPAC academic staff in national and international research and academic activities provides further evidence that these opportunities are effectively used. Based on the documentation reviewed and discussions held during the site visit, the review panel considers that adequate mechanisms and opportunities for staff professional development are in place. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The strong international engagement of academic staff, including participation in international mobility, research collaborations, academic networks and professional organisations, represents a particular strength and contributes to the continuous development and internationalisation of the academic environment.

✓ Recommendations

The University and Faculty are encouraged to continue supporting professional development opportunities and international academic engagement and to periodically assess how these opportunities contribute to the development needs of academic staff. The “personal development” component of the indicator is less explicitly evidenced than professional development.

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)

UBB recruitment procedures are regulated through institutional methodologies and procedures adopted in accordance with national legislation. Vacant academic and research positions are publicly advertised, and specific provisions are in place to ensure the national and international visibility of vacancies.

For doctoral supervisors, habilitation and subsequent co-option into a Doctoral School are governed by dedicated UBB regulations. At SDAPP level, additional criteria apply to the admission of new doctoral supervisors, including research performance requirements, compliance with academic ethics standards and approval by a qualified majority of Doctoral School members.

✓ 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 documentation reviewed indicates that recruitment and academic advancement are governed by clearly established and publicly available procedures. The recruitment of doctoral supervisors involves several levels of academic review and institutional approval, contributing to transparency and quality assurance.

SDAPP applies additional criteria for the co-option of doctoral supervisors, including a research performance threshold based on the median performance of existing members. This provides an additional mechanism for maintaining the academic quality of the supervisory body.

Based on the documentary evidence and information obtained during the site visit, recruitment procedures are transparent and compliant with the applicable legal and institutional framework. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The additional research-performance criteria established by SDAPP for the admission of new doctoral supervisors represent a positive practice, as they establish a quality threshold linked to the performance of the existing academic community and are periodically updated.

✓ Recommendations

The Doctoral School is encouraged to maintain its current transparent recruitment procedures while also adopting a more proactive approach to the future development of its supervisory capacity. In particular, promising younger academic staff who meet or are close to meeting the relevant academic criteria could be encouraged and supported to prepare their habilitation theses and, subsequently, to apply for membership in the Doctoral School. Such an approach would contribute to generational renewal, continuity of expertise and the long-term sustainability of the doctoral field.

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)

UBB implements a university-wide Digital Transformation Strategy through its Information and Communications Technology Directorate (DTIC) and provides a broad range of digital services for academic staff and students.

Doctoral administration is substantially digitalised. Electronic platforms are used for doctoral student records, administrative requests and appointments, admission-related procedures, public thesis defences and other administrative processes. Information concerning doctoral studies is available through the Doctoral Studies Institute and Doctoral School websites. At SDAPP level, digital tools are also used for communication and for collecting information regarding doctoral students' research activities and scientific output.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates extensive use of IT tools in both university-wide administration and processes specifically related to doctoral education. Digital platforms cover different stages of the doctoral trajectory, from admission and student records to administrative requests, monitoring and public thesis-defence procedures.

The use of these systems facilitates access to information and administrative services and reduces reliance on exclusively paper-based procedures. Based on the documentation reviewed and information obtained during the site visit, the review panel considers that IT tools are effectively integrated into the administration and delivery of doctoral education. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The extensive digitalisation of procedures specifically addressing doctoral students, including dedicated platforms for administrative requests, appointments, student records and public thesis-defence procedures, represents a positive practice that facilitates access to services and information.

✓ Recommendations

The University is encouraged to continue the digitalisation of doctoral administration, with particular attention to the integration and interoperability of the different platforms and to providing doctoral students with a clear and user-friendly single point of access to the digital services relevant to their studies. The University should also reflect upon AI challenges in the near future in connection to research in higher education.

The indicator is: FULFILLED

DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy

Criterion B.1. Content and relevance of study programmes

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

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

The doctoral programme is organised on the basis of ECTS credits and combines structured training with individual doctoral research and periodic evaluation of research progress. Course syllabi specify the competences and expected learning outcomes associated with each course.

Each doctoral student follows an individual training plan agreed with the doctoral supervisor and selects courses from the Doctoral School's offer or other doctoral schools. Training in research methodology, ethics and academic integrity is compulsory. The programme combines theoretical and methodological training, individual research and scientific dissemination activities leading to the doctoral qualification.

✓ 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 curriculum demonstrates a coherent relationship between the expected learning outcomes, the competences to be developed and the educational and research activities included in the doctoral programme. The use of ECTS provides a transparent framework for recognising student workload, while the individual training plan allows the educational pathway to be adapted to the doctoral student's research needs.

The combination of methodological and specialised courses with individual research, scientific dissemination and periodic progress evaluation is appropriate to the nature and level of doctoral

* 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.

education. The documentation also provides an explicit mapping of learning outcomes and competences to the courses contributing to their development.

University year	Semester SDAPP	Number of subjects SDAPP	Number of credits
2025-2026	1	4	30
2024-2025	1	4	30
2023-2024	1	4	30
2022-2023	1	4	60
2021-2022	1	4	60

University year	Semester SDAPP	Number of research reports SDAPP	ECTS Number SDAPP
2025 – 2026	sem. 2-8	1P+3R	240ECTS
2024 – 2025	sem. 2-8	1P+3R	240ECTS
2023 – 2024	sem. 2-8	1P+3R	180ECTS
2022 – 2023	sem. 2-8	1P+3R	180ECTS
2021 – 2022	sem. 2-8	1P+3R	180ECTS

Based on the curriculum, course syllabi and supporting documentation, as well as the discussions held during the site visit, the review panel considers the structure of the programme coherent with its expected learning outcomes and doctoral-level qualification. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The possibility of tailoring the training pathway to the individual research needs of doctoral students, while maintaining compulsory training in research methodology, ethics and academic integrity, represents a particular strength of the programme.

✓ Recommendations

The Doctoral School is encouraged to periodically review the learning outcomes and curriculum together with doctoral students, graduates and other relevant stakeholders, ensuring that the structured training component continues to reflect evolving methodological approaches, digital research tools and the changing competences required for advanced research in Administrative Sciences.

The indicator is: FULFILLED

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

Standard S.B.2.1. Alignment with the qualification level and the intended competences In the curriculum design and development process, the organisational component seeks to ensure the qualification level, as well as correlation with the envisaged occupations.	
Indicator	The expected learning outcomes are correlated with the competences required by

I.P.B.2.1.2	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 Doctoral School has undertaken an explicit analysis correlating the expected learning outcomes of the programme with competences included in the ESCO classification. Relevant occupations were identified and their associated competences were mapped against the learning outcomes and courses of the doctoral programme.

The analysis covers competences related to scientific research, research methodology and data analysis, academic communication, public policy analysis, public management and the dissemination and application of research results.

The documentation explains the mapping process and establishes a direct correspondence between programme learning outcomes and ESCO competences.

✓ 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 documentation provides a clear and systematic correspondence between expected learning outcomes and the competences associated with the selected ESCO occupations. The mapping covers knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy and identifies the courses contributing to their development.

The integrated matrix explicitly connects ESCO occupational competences, learning outcomes and contributing courses.

The review panel therefore considers that the expected learning outcomes are appropriately correlated with relevant occupational competences. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

No specific best practice was identified beyond the systematic mapping of expected learning outcomes against the relevant ESCO competences.

✓ Recommendations

The Doctoral School is encouraged to periodically update the ESCO mapping and to consider extending it to a broader range of occupations reflecting the diverse career pathways of doctoral graduates in Administrative Sciences, including advanced professional roles in public administration, public policy and research-intensive organisations.

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)

Student-centred learning is supported at UBB through institutional policies, student participation in governance, mechanisms for student feedback and institutional support for innovation in teaching.

At SDAPP level, the doctoral programme provides substantial individualisation of the learning and research pathway. Doctoral students benefit from regular interaction with supervisors and guidance committees, individualised research guidance and continuous feedback. Teaching and learning activities include research-oriented methods such as case studies, policy analysis, methodological workshops, academic debates and presentations of research results. The doctoral pathway can also be adapted to the research topic, methodological needs and professional profile of individual doctoral students.

✓ 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 structure and implementation of the doctoral programme are consistent with the principles of student-centred learning. In particular, the individualised relationship with the doctoral supervisor and guidance committee, flexibility in selecting training activities, continuous feedback and the emphasis on active participation in research allow doctoral students to assume an active role in shaping their academic development.

Discussions conducted during the site visit confirmed the importance of direct interaction between doctoral students and supervisors and the possibility of adapting research and training activities to individual needs. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The high degree of individualisation of the doctoral pathway, combined with regular interaction with supervisors and guidance committees and the integration of doctoral students into research-oriented activities, represents a particular strength of the programme. More specifically, doctoral students who demonstrate strong research skills, following their assessment during the initial stage of the doctoral programme, may be involved by their supervisors in national and international research projects.

A particular strength of the programme is the regular involvement of international guest speakers in activities addressed to doctoral students. Interaction with academics and experts from different institutional and national contexts exposes doctoral students to diverse theoretical, methodological and professional perspectives, complements the expertise available within the Doctoral School, and contributes to the internationalisation of the doctoral learning environment.

✓ Recommendations

The Doctoral School is encouraged to complement individual supervision and informal feedback with systematic opportunities for doctoral students to provide feedback on the structured training component, supervision experience and overall doctoral learning environment, and to use this feedback in the periodic improvement of the programme.

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)

UBB provides students with opportunities for physical, virtual and blended international mobility through Erasmus+, the EUTOPIA European University Alliance, Blended Intensive Programmes, summer schools and other international partnerships. Procedures are also in place for the recognition of study periods and credits obtained abroad.

Doctoral students in Administrative Sciences actively participate in international mobility and training opportunities, including Erasmus+, Fulbright programmes, research secondments within international research projects, summer schools and specialised training activities. FSPAC and SDAPP provide administrative and academic support and encourage doctoral students to use these opportunities as part of their research and professional development.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates that academic mobility is effectively integrated into the opportunities available to doctoral students and is not limited to the formal existence of institutional agreements. Doctoral students participate in physical, virtual and blended mobility, international training and research secondments, benefiting from exposure to different academic environments and research networks.

The diversity of mobility instruments and the documented participation of doctoral students demonstrate effective implementation of the institutional internationalisation framework at the level of the doctoral field. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

A particular strength is the diversity of international mobility opportunities effectively accessed by doctoral students, ranging from Erasmus+ and blended programmes to Fulbright mobility, international summer schools and research secondments within international research projects. These opportunities facilitate the early integration of doctoral students into international research environments and networks.

✓ Recommendations

The Doctoral School is encouraged to continue actively promoting international mobility and to further increase the number of doctoral students undertaking research stays or other forms of mobility abroad,

including shorter and blended formats that can accommodate different personal and professional circumstances.

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)

UBB has institutional policies and support mechanisms aimed at ensuring equal opportunities, inclusion and non-discrimination, including policies addressing gender equality, discrimination, multiculturalism and student well-being.

At SDAPP level, doctoral students have equal access to educational and digital resources and academic support. The individualised nature of doctoral education allows training and research activities to be adapted to students' research interests, professional profiles, abilities and academic development needs. FSPAC also provides physical accessibility measures for students with disabilities.

✓ 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 institutional framework provides appropriate safeguards for equity and inclusion. At doctoral level, the flexibility of the individual study and research pathway, together with individual supervision and academic guidance, enables doctoral students to pursue research trajectories consistent with their potential, interests and professional aspirations.

Based on the documentation reviewed and discussions during the site visit, the review panel considers that doctoral students are provided with fair opportunities for academic development while individual differences and needs can be accommodated. The indicator is fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

No specific best practice was identified beyond the flexible and individualised approach inherent in the organisation of the doctoral pathway.

✓ Recommendations

The Doctoral School is encouraged to periodically assess the individual academic and support needs of doctoral students and to ensure that appropriate forms of support and reasonable adaptation are available where necessary, particularly for students whose personal, professional or accessibility circumstances may affect their participation in doctoral activities.

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)

The self-evaluation report provides a relatively comprehensive presentation of the institutional mechanisms intended to ensure access to learning resources and support services. At university level, relevant measures include the activity of the Centre for Students with Disabilities, arrangements for adapting study materials and assessment methods, flexibility regarding study options and language of instruction, and institutional initiatives supporting accessibility and inclusion. The report also identifies physical accessibility measures available at FSPAC, including access ramps and floor guidance systems for blind and visually impaired persons, as well as access to specialised library resources, laboratories, digital learning platforms and online administrative services.

The presentation is supported by links to relevant institutional documents and structures.

✓ 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 evidence presented indicates that an institutional framework is in place to provide doctoral students with access to learning resources and support services and to accommodate students with special educational needs or disabilities. Particularly relevant are the existence of a specialised university structure for students with disabilities, mechanisms for adapting teaching materials and assessment methods, physical accessibility measures at faculty level, and access to digital and specialised research resources.

Nevertheless, the self-evaluation report remains predominantly descriptive and provides limited analysis of the effectiveness and adequacy of these arrangements specifically in relation to doctoral education. For example, it does not systematically assess whether the available resources correspond to the particular requirements of doctoral research in Administration and Public Policies or how individual doctoral students' needs are identified and subsequently addressed. Similarly, internationalisation and the possibility of using different languages are relevant to inclusiveness but are only indirectly related to the central requirement of this indicator, namely access to resources and services adequate to individual learning needs. Overall, the available evidence supports fulfilment of the indicator, although a more explicit connection between identified needs, services provided and their actual use by doctoral students would strengthen the assessment.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The existence of a dedicated Centre for Students with Disabilities at university level, combined with measures implemented directly within FSPAC to improve physical accessibility, represents a positive institutional practice. Particularly noteworthy is the combination of physical accessibility measures with academic support, including recommendations for adapting learning materials, assessment methods and academic activities. The institutional approach therefore addresses accessibility beyond physical access to university premises and considers participation in the educational process more broadly.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that the Doctoral School develop a more systematic mechanism for documenting the individual learning and accessibility needs of doctoral students and the manner in which available institutional services and resources respond to these needs. Future self-evaluation exercises should include doctoral-school-specific evidence on the use and adequacy of learning and research resources, accessibility arrangements and support services, including feedback from doctoral students. The Doctoral School could also periodically assess the accessibility of its physical, digital and research environments in cooperation with the Centre for Students with Disabilities and use the results to identify further improvements.

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)

The self-evaluation report provides evidence that learning outcomes are defined at the level of the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies and are included in the syllabi of the courses offered within the doctoral programme. The report indicates that these learning outcomes are communicated to doctoral students through the course syllabi and at the beginning of each course and that they are linked to the competences expected to be acquired. A summary document presenting the learning outcomes for the four courses offered within the doctoral programme is also provided.

The report further explains that learning outcomes are formulated with reference to Level 8 of the European Qualifications Framework, with emphasis on advanced research competences, intellectual autonomy and the capacity to produce original scientific contributions. This represents relevant evidence for the doctoral level. However, part of the presentation focuses extensively on assessment methods, grading, formative assessment and appeal procedures, which are only indirectly relevant to this indicator. The presentation could be strengthened by providing more explicit evidence regarding the correspondence between individual course content, learning activities, learning outcomes and the overall learning outcomes of the doctoral programme.

✓ 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 available evidence indicates that learning outcomes are formally defined and communicated to doctoral students and that they provide a framework for understanding the competences and level of performance expected within the taught component of the doctoral programme. Their explicit connection with Level 8 of the European Qualifications Framework is particularly relevant, as it situates course-level expectations within the broader requirements of doctoral education.

The learning outcomes also appear to serve both sides of the educational process: they inform doctoral students about the competences they are expected to develop and provide teaching staff with reference points for organising teaching and assessment. The indicator can therefore be considered fulfilled. Nevertheless, the analysis presented in the self-evaluation report could more clearly demonstrate constructive alignment between learning outcomes, course content, teaching and learning activities, and assessment methods. Such an analysis would provide stronger evidence that learning outcomes function as an effective instrument for curriculum design and communication rather than primarily as a formal component of course documentation.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

A positive practice is the systematic inclusion of learning outcomes in course syllabi and their explicit communication to doctoral students at the beginning of courses. The explicit alignment of learning outcomes with the requirements associated with Level 8 of the European Qualifications Framework is also noteworthy, particularly the emphasis placed on advanced research competences, intellectual autonomy and the production of original scientific contributions. However, based on the evidence provided in the self-evaluation report, these elements primarily demonstrate sound academic practice and compliance with doctoral-level requirements rather than a clearly distinctive best practice. A stronger case for best practice would require evidence of systematic curriculum mapping, periodic review of learning outcomes based on stakeholder feedback, or demonstrated use of learning-outcome achievement data for curriculum improvement.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that the Doctoral School further develop and document the systematic alignment between course-level learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, assessment methods and the overall learning outcomes of the doctoral programme. A curriculum mapping exercise covering the courses included in the doctoral training programme could help demonstrate how individual courses contribute to the progressive development of Level 8 competences and could also identify possible overlaps or gaps.

Future self-evaluation reports should focus more directly on evidence demonstrating the formulation, communication, implementation and periodic review of learning outcomes, while information concerning assessment procedures and appeals should primarily be addressed under indicators specifically concerned with student assessment.

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 self-evaluation report provides detailed information on the mechanisms used to verify the achievement of learning outcomes throughout the doctoral study cycle. At the level of the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies, assessment covers both the advanced university training programme and the individual scientific research programme. Within the taught component, continuous and final assessment methods include written assignments, applied projects, academic presentations and research analyses, in accordance with the course syllabi. The report further documents the progressive assessment of doctoral research through the first-year research project and annual research reports presented before the guidance and academic integrity committee, as well as the final assessment represented by the public defense of the doctoral thesis.

The description is supported by references to university regulations governing doctoral studies and the assessment of student competences. However, some of the information included in the general section, particularly that concerning completion examinations for bachelor's and master's programmes, is not directly relevant to doctoral education.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates that the achievement of learning outcomes is assessed at successive stages of the doctoral programme rather than exclusively at its completion. Course-level assessment verifies the competences associated with the advanced training programme, while the research project and annual progress reports provide mechanisms for assessing the progressive development of doctoral-level research competences. The public defense of the doctoral thesis constitutes the final assessment of the doctoral student's capacity to undertake autonomous research and produce an original scientific contribution.

Particularly relevant is the combination of formal assessment stages with feedback from the guidance and academic integrity committee, which allows the doctoral student's progress to be monitored and provides opportunities for adjustments during the research process. The sequence of course assessment, research project evaluation, annual progress evaluation and final thesis defense provides evidence of a coherent system of ongoing and summative assessment. On the basis of the evidence presented, the indicator can be considered fulfilled.

Year of graduation	Graduates SDAPP
2025	10
2024	13
2023	6
2022	8
2021	1

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

A particularly positive practice is the organisation of informal research presentation sessions prior to the formal annual progress evaluations. These sessions allow doctoral students to present work in progress, receive feedback from peers and academic staff, discuss methodological and conceptual difficulties, and revise their research before formal evaluation. This practice complements the mandatory assessment mechanisms with a formative and collegial dimension and contributes to the development of a research community within the Doctoral School.

The progressive assessment of doctoral research through the research project and annual reports before the guidance and academic integrity committee also represents a strong feature of the programme, ensuring regular academic feedback and systematic monitoring of doctoral progress.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that the Doctoral School make the correspondence between learning outcomes and the assessment methods and criteria used at the different stages of doctoral training more explicit. A mapping of programme-level learning outcomes against course assessments, the research project, annual progress reports and the final doctoral thesis could provide clearer evidence that all intended doctoral-level competences are systematically assessed.

The self-evaluation report should also distinguish more clearly between university-wide assessment regulations and the mechanisms specifically applicable to doctoral education, removing references to bachelor's and master's completion examinations where these are not relevant. All supporting documents should be accessible to external reviewers through functional institutional links rather than local file paths.

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 self-evaluation report describes the regulatory framework governing admission to doctoral studies at Babeș-Bolyai University and explains its application at the level of the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies. Admission is organised as a competitive selection process in accordance with national legislation, the university-level Admission Methodology for Doctoral Studies and the Regulation on the Organisation and Conduct of Doctoral Studies. The report also indicates that information concerning admission is publicly available and that research topics associated with vacant doctoral positions are proposed by doctoral supervisors and approved by the Doctoral School Council.

The regulatory framework is supported by links to the relevant institutional documents. However, the presentation focuses predominantly on the existence of admission regulations and provides comparatively limited evidence concerning their actual application by SDAPP. The report would be strengthened by including concrete evidence from recent admission cycles, such as published

admission announcements, available doctoral positions and research topics, composition of admission committees, selection criteria, examination procedures, results and, where appropriate, statistical data on applicants and admitted candidates.

✓ 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 evidence indicates that admission to doctoral studies is conducted within a clearly defined institutional and regulatory framework and that SDAPP applies the admission requirements established at university level. The use of common institutional regulations contributes to consistency in the organisation of doctoral admission, while the publication of admission information supports transparency and equal access to the selection process. The involvement of the Doctoral School Council in approving the research topics associated with vacant doctoral positions also provides an internal academic oversight mechanism.

On the basis of the information provided, the indicator can be considered fulfilled. Nevertheless, the self-evaluation report primarily demonstrates that appropriate procedures exist rather than systematically analysing whether and how they have been applied in recent admission cycles. A stronger assessment would require evidence demonstrating the consistent implementation of the procedures, including compliance with announced selection criteria and timelines, transparency of ranking and results, and consistency between the published admission requirements and the procedures actually followed.

Admission section	**Number of admitted candidates** (Including the tuition)
2025	15
2024	9
2023	8
2022	11
2021	13

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The public availability of information concerning doctoral admission and the application of a common university-level regulatory framework contribute positively to the transparency and consistency of the admission process. The approval by the Doctoral School Council of the research topics associated with vacant doctoral positions also provides an appropriate academic quality assurance mechanism.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that future self-evaluation reports complement the description of the regulatory framework with evidence concerning its implementation in recent admission cycles. Such evidence could include the number of available doctoral positions, number of applicants and admitted

candidates, published research topics, selection and ranking criteria, composition of admission committees and examples of published admission results.

The Doctoral School should also periodically review admission data in order to assess the effectiveness, transparency and attractiveness of the admission process and to identify relevant trends in the profile and number of applicants. Where appropriate, such analysis could also inform decisions concerning the future development of the doctoral programme and its recruitment strategy.

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)

The self-evaluation report presents the general institutional framework through which the principles of fairness and equal opportunities are incorporated into admission to doctoral studies. It specifies the personal characteristics that cannot constitute selection criteria and identifies categories for which dedicated admission places are available, including Romanians from abroad and candidates of Roma ethnicity.

At the level of the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies, the report states that admission information and selection criteria are publicly available and that candidates with special educational needs or disabilities may benefit from specific accommodations, including adapted examination conditions, accessible information and appropriate facilities. The involvement of the Director of the Doctoral School, the admissions office and selection committees in responding to individual accommodation needs is also described.

The information presented is relevant to the indicator, but supporting evidence concerning the actual implementation of these measures at SDAPP level is limited. The report would benefit from references to the specific institutional procedures governing reasonable accommodations during admission, information on how candidates request such accommodations, and, where available and compatible with data protection requirements, aggregated evidence regarding their implementation in recent admission cycles.

✓ 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 institutional framework described in the self-evaluation report supports the principles of fairness and equal opportunities in doctoral admission. The explicit exclusion of discriminatory criteria, the availability of dedicated places for certain underrepresented or disadvantaged categories, and the possibility of adapting admission procedures for candidates with special educational needs or disabilities provide evidence that equal access is addressed both through general non-discrimination provisions and through targeted support measures.

At SDAPP level, the reported possibility of adapting examination conditions to individual needs is particularly relevant to the indicator, as it moves beyond formal equality towards measures intended to ensure effective participation in the admission process. The indicator can therefore be considered fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The possibility of adapting admission arrangements to the individual requirements of candidates with special educational needs or disabilities represents a positive practice, particularly where accommodations are coordinated between the Doctoral School, the admissions office and the relevant selection committee. The allocation of dedicated places to specific disadvantaged or underrepresented categories also contributes to widening access to doctoral education.

Based on the evidence currently provided, however, these measures are better characterised as appropriate mechanisms for ensuring equitable access rather than distinctive examples of best practice.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that the Doctoral School provide clearer and more easily accessible information to prospective candidates on the accommodations and support measures available during the admission process, including the procedure for requesting such support and the institutional contact point responsible for facilitating it.

The Doctoral School should also consider systematically monitoring, in aggregated and anonymised form, relevant aspects of access and participation in the admission process in order to identify potential barriers affecting vulnerable or underrepresented groups. Particular attention could be given to whether existing measures address not only disability-related accessibility but also socio-economic and educational disadvantage. Such monitoring would enable the Doctoral School to move from a predominantly compliance-based approach to a more evidence-based assessment of equal opportunities in doctoral admission.

The indicator is: FULFILLED

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

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

The self-evaluation report identifies the main institutional regulations governing students' academic activity, including the Regulation on Students' Academic Activity based on ECTS, the Code of Students' Rights and Responsibilities, the University Charter and the relevant provisions of the Higher Education Law. At the level of the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies, the report states that doctoral students receive information concerning the requirements of doctoral studies, the structure of academic activities, assessment methods and promotion criteria through applicable regulations and course syllabi.

The report also identifies the institutional actors responsible for implementing these provisions, namely the Director of the Doctoral School, the administrative office and doctoral supervisors. The representation of doctoral students within the Doctoral School Council, at a level of 25%, is also documented and constitutes relevant information concerning their participation in the governance of doctoral studies.

However, a significant part of the evidence presented concerns the general student population, student organisations and university-wide student representation and is only indirectly relevant to the professional activity of doctoral students. The presentation would be strengthened by more specific evidence concerning the regulations applicable to doctoral studies and their implementation at SDAPP level, including the individual doctoral study plan, requirements for progression, annual research reports, credit recognition, interruption or extension of studies, and other procedures directly affecting the academic pathway of doctoral students.

- ✓ 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 evidence presented indicates that the academic activity of doctoral students is conducted within an established regulatory framework and that responsibilities for its implementation are clearly assigned. The combination of university-level regulations, doctoral-study-specific provisions, course syllabi and the involvement of doctoral supervisors provides an appropriate framework for organising and monitoring doctoral students' academic and research activities.

The participation of doctoral student representatives in the Doctoral School Council also provides a mechanism through which doctoral students can contribute to decisions affecting the organisation of their studies. Based on the available evidence, the indicator can be considered fulfilled.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The representation of doctoral students within the Doctoral School Council, in accordance with the applicable regulatory framework, contributes positively to participatory governance and provides doctoral students with a formal mechanism for involvement in decisions concerning doctoral education.

The availability and public dissemination of the relevant regulations, together with institutional efforts to communicate students' rights and responsibilities in an accessible manner, also represent positive practices supporting transparency.

Based on the evidence provided, however, these arrangements primarily demonstrate appropriate implementation of institutional and legal requirements. No practice sufficiently distinctive to be characterised as a best practice is documented for this indicator.

- ✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that the Doctoral School provide more systematic evidence of the practical implementation of regulations governing doctoral students' academic activity throughout the entire doctoral trajectory. This could include evidence concerning the approval and monitoring of individual doctoral study plans, completion of required credits, annual research progress evaluations, procedures

for modification of the doctoral pathway, and the implementation of relevant decisions of the Doctoral School Council.

Future self-evaluation reports should also distinguish more clearly between regulations applicable to the general student population and those specifically governing doctoral studies. Greater emphasis on doctoral-specific procedures and evidence of their implementation would allow for a more direct assessment of compliance with this indicator.

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 self-evaluation report provides extensive information regarding international cooperation and internationalisation at institutional, faculty and doctoral-school levels. At university level, UBB participates in major international academic networks and alliances and maintains a substantial portfolio of Erasmus+ partnerships and international research collaborations. At the level of the doctoral field, internationalisation is supported by the international academic networks of doctoral supervisors, participation in international professional organisations and research networks, involvement in international academic journals, and previous participation in international mobility programmes.

More specifically, SDAPP provides doctoral students with opportunities for direct interaction and collaboration with international academics. Dedicated workshops involving professors from foreign universities are organised for doctoral students, addressing both transversal research competences and topics related to their doctoral research. The report provides examples of international professors hosted between 2021 and 2025 and describes the involvement of international academics in activities associated with the Transylvanian International Conference on Public Administration. SDAPP also participates in Erasmus+ mobility programmes and provides evidence concerning international mobility and conference participation by both doctoral supervisors and doctoral students.

The presentation is supported by links to institutional documents and lists of international activities. However, the extensive description of UBB-wide internationalisation initiatives sometimes obscures the evidence specifically relevant to SDAPP.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates that international cooperation is an established component of the academic and research environment of the doctoral field rather than an occasional activity. Internationalisation

operates through several complementary mechanisms: mobility programmes, international institutional partnerships, participation of doctoral supervisors in international academic and professional networks, international conferences, visiting scholars, and dedicated activities bringing international academics into direct contact with doctoral students.

Particularly relevant to the indicator is the direct involvement of doctoral students in internationalisation activities. The organisation of workshops with international professors, opportunities for individual interaction with visiting academics, participation in international conferences, and access to Erasmus+ mobility contribute to the integration of doctoral students into international academic and research networks. The international networks maintained by doctoral supervisors further facilitate access to research collaboration, mobility and international academic opportunities.

The evidence therefore supports the conclusion that the indicator is fulfilled to a high degree. Nevertheless, the self-evaluation report demonstrates the existence and diversity of international opportunities more convincingly than their actual uptake and outcomes. A more systematic analysis of doctoral student mobility, international research stays, co-authored publications, participation in international research projects and other measurable outcomes would allow the impact of international cooperation on doctoral training and research to be assessed more precisely.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The systematic organisation of dedicated workshops in which international professors work directly with doctoral students represents a best practice in the internationalisation of doctoral education. These activities go beyond conventional international mobility by bringing international expertise directly into the doctoral training environment and providing doctoral students with opportunities for specialised feedback, methodological development and interaction with researchers from different academic systems.

Another particularly positive feature is the use of the established international networks of doctoral supervisors to facilitate doctoral students' integration into the international scientific community. The combination of incoming international academics, outgoing mobility, participation in international conferences and sustained involvement of supervisors in international academic and professional networks creates multiple pathways for international exposure and research collaboration.

The continuity and diversity of international academics hosted by the Doctoral School over several years further indicate that internationalisation is embedded in the academic activities of the doctoral field rather than being dependent on isolated events.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that the Doctoral School develop a more systematic approach to monitoring and documenting the outcomes of its internationalisation activities. In addition to recording participation in international mobility and conferences, monitoring could include the number and duration of outgoing and incoming doctoral mobilities, international research stays, participation of doctoral students in international research projects and networks, internationally co-authored publications, and other research outputs resulting from international collaboration.

The Doctoral School could also consider establishing explicit internationalisation objectives for doctoral education and periodically evaluating the extent to which available international opportunities are accessed across the doctoral student population. This would help identify whether participation is broadly distributed or concentrated among a limited number of doctoral students and supervisors and could inform measures aimed at extending international exposure to a larger proportion of the doctoral community.

The indicator is: FULFILLED

Criterion B.9. Scientific research results

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

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

The self-evaluation report presents a doctoral training model in which scientific investigation is closely integrated with the learning process. At the level of SDAPP, doctoral training is described as combining theoretical, empirical and experiential research, with doctoral students participating in research activities conducted within the departments and the university. These activities include data collection and analysis, development of studies, dissemination of research results, research placements and participation in collaborative projects.

The report provides concrete examples of doctoral students involved in international research and mobility programmes, including participation in a Marie Skłodowska-Curie doctoral consortium and Fulbright-supported activities, as well as doctoral research incorporating international comparative components. It also indicates that some doctoral students in the public health field have benefited from scholarships supported by partners from the socio-economic environment and industry, demonstrating connections between doctoral research and societal or professional contexts.

The information provided is relevant to the indicator and illustrates several mechanisms through which research is incorporated into doctoral training. However, the evidence could be presented more systematically.

✓ 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 evidence indicates that research-based learning constitutes a central component of doctoral education within SDAPP. Doctoral students are not limited to acquiring knowledge about research methods but are provided with opportunities to participate directly in scientific investigation, including data collection and analysis, collaborative research, international comparative research and dissemination activities. Such involvement is consistent with doctoral-level learning outcomes related to advanced research competence, methodological capacity, intellectual autonomy and the ability to generate and communicate original scientific knowledge.

The participation of doctoral students in national and international research projects is particularly relevant, as it provides opportunities to apply research methods in authentic research environments and to interact with broader scientific communities. Connections with public institutions, international organisations and socio-economic actors further support the applied dimension of research and opportunities for knowledge transfer.

On the basis of the evidence presented, the indicator can be considered fulfilled to a high degree. Nevertheless, the self-evaluation report could demonstrate more explicitly how participation in these research activities contributes to the achievement of specific programme-level learning outcomes. At present, this relationship is largely inferred from the nature of the activities rather than demonstrated through systematic mapping or assessment.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The direct integration of doctoral students into national and international research projects represents a strong feature of the doctoral training environment. Particularly noteworthy are opportunities for doctoral students to participate in international research programmes and mobility schemes and to incorporate international comparative dimensions into their doctoral research.

The involvement of doctoral students in the complete research process—from data collection and analysis to scientific dissemination and collaborative research—provides an appropriate environment for developing doctoral-level research competences through direct scientific practice. The use of supervisors' research networks and institutional partnerships to connect doctoral students with international research environments and external stakeholders can also be considered a positive practice in supporting research-based doctoral education.

The examples of doctoral students participating in major international research and mobility programmes provide particularly strong illustrations of how research opportunities can be capitalised upon within individual doctoral trajectories.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that the Doctoral School more systematically document the relationship between doctoral students' participation in research activities and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the doctoral programme. This could be achieved through a mapping of major research activities—such as participation in research projects, international research placements, data collection and analysis, scientific publication and conference participation—against the relevant programme-level learning outcomes.

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 self-evaluation report provides evidence that the scientific results generated within the Doctoral School of Administration and Public Policies are disseminated through several channels at national and international level. Doctoral students publish scientific articles, including publications in internationally indexed journals, participate in international scientific conferences, contribute to collective volumes, and publish research in co-authorship with doctoral supervisors. The report provides specific examples of doctoral students publishing in Q1 journals and indicates that SDAPP provides financial support for article processing charges in order to facilitate publication in internationally visible outlets.

The dissemination of doctoral research is further supported through collective volumes dedicated to doctoral students and through the publication of doctoral theses by academic publishers. Evidence of international recognition is also provided, including an international award granted by NISPAcee for a doctoral thesis. The report is supplemented by dedicated lists of doctoral students' scientific publications and participation in international conferences.

The evidence concerning SDAPP is relevant and relatively diverse.

- ✓ 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 available evidence demonstrates that research conducted within the doctoral field is disseminated through appropriate national and international academic channels. Publication in internationally indexed journals, including Q1 outlets, participation in international conferences, publication of doctoral research with academic publishers, and international recognition through scientific awards indicate that doctoral research extends beyond the immediate institutional environment and reaches relevant scientific communities.

The integration of doctoral students into research activities and co-authorship with doctoral supervisors further contributes to the dissemination and visibility of research results. Institutional financial support for publication costs also demonstrates that the Doctoral School actively facilitates dissemination rather than relying exclusively on individual initiatives.

On the basis of the evidence provided, the indicator can be considered fulfilled to a high degree.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The financial support provided by SDAPP for the publication of doctoral students' research in internationally visible scientific outlets represents a positive practice, as it directly facilitates the dissemination of doctoral research and reduces financial barriers associated with publication.

Particularly noteworthy are the examples of doctoral students publishing multiple articles in Q1 journals and the international recognition of doctoral research through awards granted by relevant professional academic organisations, such as the NISPAcee award for a doctoral thesis. The publication of collective volumes involving doctoral students, including their participation as editors, also contributes to the development of scientific publication and dissemination competences.

Taken together, these mechanisms demonstrate an institutional environment that actively encourages doctoral students to disseminate their research and seek visibility beyond the national academic context.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that the Doctoral School develop a more systematic framework for monitoring and analysing the scientific visibility and impact of research produced by doctoral students and recent graduates. In addition to maintaining lists of publications and conference participation, periodic analysis could include the proportion of doctoral students publishing during their doctoral studies, the quality and international indexing of publication outlets, international co-authorship, citations, scientific awards and other relevant indicators of academic visibility.

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 self-evaluation report describes a well-established quality assurance framework at UBB and FSPAC levels, based on institutional policies, strategic and operational planning, annual quality assurance programmes, and dedicated quality assurance structures. At faculty level, the Quality Evaluation and Assurance Commission develops and monitors quality assurance programmes, while periodic programme evaluations and student feedback are used to support educational improvement.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates that SDAPP operates within a systematic institutional quality assurance framework and that mechanisms for periodic evaluation and feedback are available. The indicator can therefore be considered fulfilled in terms of the existence and application of quality assurance procedures.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

Not applicable

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP systematically document the impact of its quality assurance processes by linking identified issues and stakeholder feedback to specific improvement measures and their subsequent results.

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 self-evaluation report describes several mechanisms for incorporating the views of internal and external stakeholders, including student evaluation of teaching, student representation in the FSPAC Quality Evaluation and Assurance Commission, consultations with doctoral students and academic staff, questionnaires, focus groups, and consultations with alumni and employers. The Director of the Doctoral School also conducts consultations with doctoral students and academic staff and forwards proposals to the relevant faculty structures.

The evidence demonstrates the existence of multiple consultation channels.

✓ 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 described provide opportunities for doctoral students, academic staff and external stakeholders to contribute to quality assurance and programme development. Particularly relevant are the regular evaluation of doctoral supervisors by doctoral students and the direct consultations organised at Doctoral School level.

The indicator can be considered fulfilled. The analysis would be strengthened by documenting specific cases in which feedback from doctoral students, academic staff, alumni or employers resulted in changes to courses, procedures, learning activities or other aspects of the doctoral programme.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The combination of formal consultation mechanisms, such as student representation in quality assurance structures and teaching evaluations, with direct consultations organised by the Director of the Doctoral School represents a positive approach to stakeholder participation.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP systematically document how stakeholder feedback is considered and acted upon. Examples should identify the stakeholder group consulted, the issue or proposal raised, the

decision taken and the resulting change. Particular attention should be given to demonstrating how doctoral student feedback influences the organisation of doctoral training and supervision. The Doctoral School could also periodically communicate to stakeholders how their feedback has been used, thereby closing the feedback loop and strengthening participation in future consultation processes.

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 self-evaluation report clearly identifies the UBB Ethics Committee as the institutional structure responsible for monitoring compliance with academic ethics standards. Its activity is based on national legislation, the Framework Regulation governing university ethics committees, the UBB Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, and its own Organisation and Operation Regulation. The report explicitly states that the Committee operates independently from the University Senate and Rector's Office and indicates that students represent at least 25% of its membership.

The report also presents complementary mechanisms promoting research ethics and academic integrity within doctoral education, including training on plagiarism, responsible use of artificial intelligence, data protection and research involving vulnerable groups.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates that the Ethics Committee has a clearly defined regulatory basis and institutional status and that its independence is formally established. Its composition and operation are regulated in accordance with the applicable national and university-level framework. The indicator can therefore be considered fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The integration of research ethics into doctoral training, including attention to plagiarism prevention, ethical use of artificial intelligence, personal data protection and research involving vulnerable groups, represents a positive practice in developing a culture of research integrity.

The FSPAC "red button" mechanism provides an additional accessible channel for reporting potentially unethical conduct. However, these mechanisms complement rather than constitute evidence of the independent operation of the University Ethics Committee itself.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that evidence concerning the actual activity of the Ethics Committee be presented more systematically, including aggregated information on referrals, types of cases considered, decisions and preventive activities, while fully respecting confidentiality requirements.

For doctoral education, SDAPP should continue to integrate emerging research ethics issues, particularly the responsible use of artificial intelligence, data protection and ethical requirements for research involving human participants, into doctoral training and supervision.

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 self-evaluation report describes the procedures for the development, review and approval of doctoral curricula, involving the Doctoral School Council, Faculty Council and CSUD. It also explains how approved courses are incorporated into individual doctoral study plans and how doctoral progress is periodically monitored.

The procedures and responsibilities are clearly presented. However, the evidence focuses predominantly on procedural implementation, while fewer concrete examples are provided of changes introduced as a result of these quality assurance processes.

✓ 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 evidence indicates that SDAPP consistently applies institutional procedures concerning curriculum development, approval, individual study planning and monitoring of doctoral progress. The involvement of several academic governance levels provides mechanisms for academic oversight and quality control.

The indicator can be considered fulfilled. The report would be stronger if it identified specific curriculum or programme changes resulting from internal or external evaluation, doctoral student needs, progress monitoring or developments in the scientific field.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The integration of the approved curriculum into an individual doctoral study plan developed together with the doctoral supervisor represents a positive practice, as it allows the general training framework to be adapted to the doctoral student's research trajectory.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP systematically document the impact of its quality assurance procedures by providing concrete examples of improvements resulting from curriculum reviews, doctoral progress monitoring, student feedback and internal or external evaluations. Evidence should establish a clear link between an identified need, the procedural action taken, the resulting programme-level change and its subsequent effects.

The Doctoral School could also periodically evaluate whether individual doctoral study plans and curriculum adjustments effectively respond to doctoral students' research and training needs.

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 self-evaluation report clearly describes the institutional process for the initiation, authorisation, accreditation, monitoring and periodic evaluation of doctoral fields and schools, involving successive review and approval by the Doctoral School Council, Faculty Council, CSUD, Administrative Council and University Senate.

At SDAPP level, doctoral supervisors, Doctoral School Council members, doctoral student representatives and administrative staff participate in the preparation, monitoring and evaluation of relevant documents and procedures. Academic staff and doctoral students are also involved in discussions concerning curriculum revisions, internal regulations and new academic directions. The report further indicates that alumni and institutional partners are consulted, although their specific involvement is less extensively documented.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates a structured and participatory approach to procedure implementation. Internal stakeholders are involved at different stages, from preparation and discussion at Doctoral School level to review and approval within faculty and university governance structures. The representation of doctoral students in the Doctoral School Council provides a formal mechanism for their participation in decisions concerning the doctoral programme.

The indicator can therefore be considered fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The formal involvement of doctoral students alongside doctoral supervisors in the Doctoral School Council and in discussions concerning curriculum and programme development represents a positive participatory practice. The multi-level review of major programme documents also provides opportunities for academic scrutiny and institutional oversight.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP more systematically document the involvement of external stakeholders, particularly alumni and institutional or professional partners, in the implementation and review of procedures. Evidence could include consultation records, issues discussed, recommendations received and examples of changes resulting from stakeholder input. The Doctoral School could also maintain concise records demonstrating how proposals from doctoral students and academic staff are considered within its governance structures and reflected, where appropriate, in subsequent decisions.

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 self-evaluation report describes the institutional framework for evaluating academic staff and the doctoral experience, including management evaluation, peer evaluation, course evaluations by doctoral students and the annual evaluation of the doctoral stage. The Qualitas Centre prepares annual and summary reports based on these evaluations.

At Doctoral School level, student feedback is collected through institutional course evaluations, additional feedback mechanisms used by teaching staff and direct discussions between doctoral students and the Director of the Doctoral School. However, limited information is provided on how the results of the biannual student evaluations of teaching are specifically analysed at SDAPP level.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates that mechanisms for collecting doctoral student feedback are in place and that evaluation results are analysed at institutional level. During the site visit the committee was presented evidences which demonstrate a systematic process at Doctoral School level through which the results of students' evaluations of teachers are reviewed, discussed and translated into improvement measures.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The combination of standardised institutional evaluations with direct meetings and additional feedback mechanisms provides multiple opportunities for doctoral students to express their views regarding teaching and the doctoral experience.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP establish and document a systematic procedure for analysing the results of doctoral students' evaluations of teaching. The analysis should identify recurring strengths and areas for improvement, discuss relevant findings within the appropriate Doctoral School structures, and document any measures adopted in response.

Where the small number of doctoral students raises confidentiality concerns, results could be aggregated across several semesters or analysed at programme level while preserving respondent anonymity.

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 self-evaluation report describes an extensive institutional infrastructure for systematic data collection, including AcademicInfo, ManageAsist and the UBB Academic/Research Activity Management system. These platforms collect data concerning academic trajectories, course evaluations, research activity and other relevant institutional processes.

At SDAPP level, data concerning doctoral progress, completion, scientific output, international mobility, conference participation and doctoral student feedback are monitored and used in annual reporting and quality assurance processes. The Doctoral School Council and school management periodically analyse relevant indicators together with information concerning supervisors' research activity and internal and external evaluations.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates that SDAPP has access to multiple institutional data sources and systematically collects information relevant to the quality of doctoral education. The combination of administrative, academic, research and student-feedback data provides an appropriate basis for evidence-informed quality assurance. The indicator can be considered fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The integration of academic, administrative and research information through university-wide digital platforms represents a strong institutional practice, particularly as it allows information to be aggregated and analysed at different organisational levels.

At SDAPP level, the combination of quantitative indicators with direct feedback from doctoral students provides a useful basis for a more comprehensive assessment of doctoral programme quality. However, evidence of the systematic use and impact of these analyses would be needed to identify this clearly as a distinctive best practice.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP formalise a concise set of key performance indicators for the doctoral programme and periodically document their evolution. These could include admission and completion rates, time to degree, scientific outputs, international mobility, conference participation, doctoral student feedback and other indicators relevant to programme quality.

The analysis should be explicitly connected to quality improvement decisions, documenting identified trends or problems, actions adopted in response and subsequent results. This would strengthen the transition from systematic data collection to evidence-based quality management.

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 self-evaluation report describes multiple institutional channels for publishing information of public interest, including university, faculty and departmental websites and social media platforms. SDAPP has a dedicated webpage providing information concerning the Doctoral School and the doctoral field of Administrative Sciences.

✓ 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 evidence indicates that information concerning SDAPP is publicly accessible through several complementary communication channels. The existence of a dedicated webpage, supported by faculty and departmental communication platforms, demonstrates adequate transparency and accessibility. The indicator can be considered fulfilled. The report could, however, focus more explicitly on the specific categories of doctoral programme information that are publicly available.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The use of multiple complementary digital communication channels, including dedicated faculty and departmental platforms, represents a positive practice for increasing the accessibility and visibility of information. No distinctive best practice beyond effective institutional communication is clearly demonstrated.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP ensure that its dedicated webpage provides, in an easily identifiable and regularly updated format, all key information concerning admission, curriculum, doctoral supervisors, regulations, doctoral student support, quality assurance and completion of doctoral studies.

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 self-evaluation report describes the decision-making process at SDAPP level, including deliberation within the Doctoral School Council and the participation of doctoral supervisors and doctoral student representatives. Decisions are documented through minutes and formal records and communicated through institutional channels and official platforms.

✓ 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 described provide an appropriate framework for transparent decision-making, ensuring participation, documentation and traceability of decisions. The involvement of doctoral student representatives further contributes to transparency and accountability. The indicator can be considered fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The participation of doctoral student representatives in the Doctoral School Council and the formal documentation of decisions represent sound governance practices. No distinctive practice exceeding normal requirements for transparent academic governance is clearly demonstrated.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP ensure systematic and easily accessible publication of relevant decisions or summaries of decisions adopted by the Doctoral School Council, while respecting confidentiality and data protection requirements.

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)

The self-evaluation report provides evidence of UBB's participation in national and international external quality evaluations. More specifically, the doctoral field of Administrative Sciences underwent the ARACIS periodic external evaluation in 2021, when all 35 performance indicators were assessed as fulfilled, and a progress evaluation was subsequently conducted in 2025.

The report also indicates that recommendations resulting from the 2021 evaluation were followed up through measures addressing areas such as internationalisation and financial support for doctoral students.

✓ 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 evidence demonstrates that SDAPP participates systematically in the legally required external quality evaluation processes and undertakes the associated reporting and follow-up activities. The 2021 accreditation evaluation and the subsequent 2025 progress evaluation provide direct evidence of compliance with external quality assurance requirements.

The reported measures adopted in response to previous recommendations further demonstrate that external evaluation is used as an instrument for programme improvement. The indicator can therefore be considered fulfilled.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

The systematic follow-up of recommendations from previous external evaluations, particularly through measures supporting internationalisation and increased financial support for doctoral students, represents a positive quality enhancement practice.

✓ Recommendations

It is recommended that SDAPP continue systematically monitoring the implementation and impact of recommendations resulting from external evaluations and maintain clear evidence linking each recommendation to the measures adopted and the results achieved.

The indicator is: FULFILLED

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths:		Weaknesses:
- Highly qualified and academically diverse body of doctoral supervisors, with strong research profiles, fulfilment of national academic standards, and expertise covering the main and emerging areas of Administrative Sciences and Public Policy. - Strong international profile of the Doctoral School, supported by supervisors' participation in international research networks, projects, professional organisations and academic collaborations. - Systematic international exposure of doctoral students, including mobility, research stays, international conferences and, particularly, dedicated workshops where international academics interact directly with doctoral students. This was identified as a specific best practice. - Highly individualised and student-centred doctoral pathway, based on close interaction with supervisors and guidance committees, flexible training choices and adaptation to individual research needs. - Strong integration of research into doctoral training, with doctoral students involved in research projects, data collection and	INTERNAL FACTORS	- Quality assurance is stronger in terms of procedures than demonstrated impact - Insufficient systematic analysis of doctoral-school-specific data, despite extensive institutional data collection; a consolidated set of KPIs covering completion, time to degree, publications, mobility, internationalisation and student feedback would strengthen evidence-based management. - External stakeholder involvement is less developed and documented than internal stakeholder participation, particularly regarding alumni, employers and institutional/professional partners. - Internationalisation outcomes are not monitored systematically enough; opportunities are extensive, but participation rates, duration of mobility, international co-publications and research-project involvement are not consolidated. - Some quality assurance and regulatory evidence remains predominantly university-wide, rather than demonstrating implementation and outcomes specifically at

analysis, dissemination activities and international research environments. - Progressive and formative assessment of doctoral research, including research projects, annual progress reports and informal research presentation sessions providing feedback before formal evaluation. - Well-developed physical, digital and research infrastructure, benefiting from both FSPAC resources and the wider infrastructure of a large comprehensive university. - Clear and participatory governance framework, including formal doctoral student representation and multi-level academic oversight. - Strong institutional framework for ethics and research integrity, complemented by doctoral training addressing plagiarism, responsible use of AI, data protection and research involving vulnerable groups. - Transparent and demanding procedures for affiliation of new doctoral supervisors, including SDAPP-specific research-performance requirements exceeding basic formal eligibility criteria.		SDAPP level. - Alignment between learning outcomes, teaching activities and assessment could be documented more systematically, including explicit programme-level curriculum and assessment mapping.

SWOT analysis

Opportunities:		Threats:
- Expansion of participation in European and international research programmes, building on the School's existing international networks and experience with Erasmus+, MSCA, Fulbright and other international collaborations. - Further exploitation of UBB's participation in European university alliances and international partnerships to develop joint doctoral activities, research stays, co-supervision, international workshops and blended mobility. - Growing international research agendas in areas already represented within SDAPP, including digital governance, artificial intelligence, public-sector innovation, public leadership, urban governance and evidence-based policymaking. - Development of stronger partnerships with public institutions and other societal actors, creating opportunities for applied doctoral research, access to administrative data, research placements and increased societal impact. - Expansion of international publication and collaborative research opportunities by leveraging supervisors' existing international networks to integrate a larger	 EXTERNAL FACTORS	- Increasing international competition for high-quality doctoral candidates and early-career researchers, which may affect recruitment and retention. - Changes in national higher-education legislation, doctoral education regulations and quality assurance requirements, potentially generating additional administrative and adaptation demands. - Increasing competition for national and European research funding, which may affect opportunities for doctoral students to participate in funded research and international mobility. - Financial constraints affecting doctoral students' capacity to participate in international conferences, research stays and publication activities, particularly as international participation costs continue to increase. - Rapid methodological and technological change, particularly developments in AI, digital research methods and data-intensive research, requiring continuous updating of doctoral training and research-integrity frameworks. - Changing labour-market expectations for doctoral

proportion of doctoral students into international research teams. - Increasing availability of digital and blended mobility formats, which can broaden international participation among doctoral students unable to undertake longer physical mobility periods. - Growing emphasis on doctoral graduate employability and diverse doctoral careers, creating opportunities to strengthen links with alumni, employers and professional organisations and to broaden the programme's ESCO/career mapping.		graduates, requiring the programme to continuously balance traditional academic research competences with advanced professional and transferable skills relevant to public administration and policy practice. - Potential dependence on individual supervisors' international networks for internationalisation opportunities, creating a risk of uneven access if opportunities are not progressively institutionalised and distributed across the doctoral student population. The assessment already identifies the possibility that international participation may be concentrated among a limited number of students and supervisors.

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.	FULFILLED	The University and the Doctoral School are encouraged to continue the periodic review of regulations and procedures applicable to doctoral education and to maintain systematic evidence of this process, including the rationale for significant amendments and, where appropriate, the involvement of doctoral students,

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			supervisors and other relevant stakeholders. This would make it possible to demonstrate more clearly that regulatory development is not limited to ensuring formal compliance with legislative changes but also responds to experience gained from the implementation of doctoral programmes and to feedback from the academic community.
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.	FULFILLED	The Doctoral School is encouraged to document stakeholder consultation more systematically when methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures are developed or revised. In addition to recording participation in collegial decision-making bodies, the School could maintain evidence of the issues raised by doctoral supervisors, doctoral students and other relevant stakeholders, together with information on how such feedback was considered and, where appropriate, incorporated into revised documents. Where significant changes to doctoral regulations or procedures are envisaged, broader consultation beyond the formal representatives in governance structures could also be considered, particularly when the changes directly affect doctoral students or supervisors.
3.	I.P.A.2.1.1 The HEI legally owns venues for the related education, research and administrative processes, as well as for	FULFILLED	The Faculty is encouraged to continue the systematic monitoring of the use of its recently

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	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.		modernised teaching and research infrastructure, including the utilisation of interactive equipment and the support needs of academic staff and doctoral students. Such monitoring could inform future investment decisions and ensure that technological resources continue to respond effectively to changing educational and research needs. The University and Faculty should also continue to monitor the accessibility of all spaces used by doctoral students and ensure that physical and technological infrastructure remains fully accessible to persons with disabilities.
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.	FULFILLED	The Faculty is encouraged to continue the systematic monitoring and preventive maintenance of its physical and technological infrastructure, with particular attention to the timely upgrading of IT equipment and specialised software used for teaching and research.
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.	FULFILLED	The Doctoral School is encouraged to maintain a strategic approach to the development of its body of doctoral supervisors, ensuring both continuity of existing areas of expertise and the progressive inclusion of emerging research themes relevant to Administrative Sciences and Public Policy. Particular attention should be given to maintaining a balanced distribution of doctoral supervision responsibilities and to supporting the development of the next generation of potential

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			doctoral supervisors. The Doctoral School is also encouraged to continue using the international networks and research collaborations of its academic staff to expand opportunities for doctoral students to participate in international research projects, academic mobility, joint publications and other forms of integration into the international research community.
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	FULFILLED	The University and Faculty are encouraged to continue supporting professional development opportunities and international academic engagement and to periodically assess how these opportunities contribute to the development needs of academic staff. The "personal development" component of the indicator is less explicitly evidenced than professional development.
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	FULFILLED	The Doctoral School is encouraged to maintain its current transparent recruitment procedures while also adopting a more proactive approach to the future development of its supervisory capacity. In particular, promising younger academic staff who meet or are close to meeting the relevant academic criteria could be encouraged and supported to prepare their habilitation theses and, subsequently, to apply for membership in the Doctoral School. Such an approach would contribute to generational renewal, continuity of expertise and the long-term sustainability of the doctoral field.
8.	I.P.A.4.1.1 The organisational component uses		The University is encouraged to

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	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.	FULFILLED	continue the digitalisation of doctoral administration, with particular attention to the integration and interoperability of the different platforms and to providing doctoral students with a clear and user-friendly single point of access to the digital services relevant to their studies. The University should also reflect upon AI challenges in the near future in connection to research in higher education.
DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy			
9.	I.P.B.1.1.1 The study programme is developed and structured according to the expected learning outcomes, and organised based on transferable study credits. It includes all learning, teaching, practical training, research and evaluation experiences, which, together, lead to a higher education qualification.	FULFILLED	The Doctoral School is encouraged to periodically review the learning outcomes and curriculum together with doctoral students, graduates and other relevant stakeholders, ensuring that the structured training component continues to reflect evolving methodological approaches, digital research tools and the changing competences required for advanced research in Administrative Sciences.
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).	FULFILLED	The Doctoral School is encouraged to periodically update the ESCO mapping and to consider extending it to a broader range of occupations reflecting the diverse career pathways of doctoral graduates in Administrative Sciences, including advanced professional roles in public administration, public policy and research-intensive organisations.
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.	FULFILLED	The Doctoral School is encouraged to complement individual supervision and informal feedback with systematic opportunities for doctoral students to provide feedback on the

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			structured training component, supervision experience and overall doctoral learning environment, and to use this feedback in the periodic improvement of the programme.
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.	FULFILLED	The Doctoral School is encouraged to continue actively promoting international mobility and to further increase the number of doctoral students undertaking research stays or other forms of mobility abroad, including shorter and blended formats that can accommodate different personal and professional circumstances.
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.	FULFILLED	The Doctoral School is encouraged to periodically assess the individual academic and support needs of doctoral students and to ensure that appropriate forms of support and reasonable adaptation are available where necessary, particularly for students whose personal, professional or accessibility circumstances may affect their participation in doctoral activities.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that the Doctoral School develop a more systematic mechanism for documenting the individual learning and accessibility needs of doctoral students and the manner in which available institutional services and resources respond to these needs. Future self-evaluation exercises should include doctoral-school-specific evidence on the use and adequacy of learning and research resources, accessibility arrangements and support services, including feedback from doctoral students. The Doctoral School could also periodically assess the accessibility of its physical, digital

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			and research environments in cooperation with the Centre for Students with Disabilities and use the results to identify further improvements.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that the Doctoral School further develop and document the systematic alignment between course-level learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, assessment methods and the overall learning outcomes of the doctoral programme. A curriculum mapping exercise covering the courses included in the doctoral training programme could help demonstrate how individual courses contribute to the progressive development of Level 8 competences and could also identify possible overlaps or gaps. Future self-evaluation reports should focus more directly on evidence demonstrating the formulation, communication, implementation and periodic review of learning outcomes, while information concerning assessment procedures and appeals should primarily be addressed under indicators specifically concerned with student assessment.
16.	I.P.B.5.1.2 Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that the Doctoral School make the correspondence between learning outcomes and the assessment methods and criteria used at the different stages of doctoral training more explicit. A mapping of programme-level learning outcomes against course assessments, the research project,

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			annual progress reports and the final doctoral thesis could provide clearer evidence that all intended doctoral-level competences are systematically assessed. The self-evaluation report should also distinguish more clearly between university-wide assessment regulations and the mechanisms specifically applicable to doctoral education, removing references to bachelor's and master's completion examinations where these are not relevant. All supporting documents should be accessible to external reviewers through functional institutional links rather than local file paths.
17.	I.P.B.7.1.1 The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that future self-evaluation reports complement the description of the regulatory framework with evidence concerning its implementation in recent admission cycles. Such evidence could include the number of available doctoral positions, number of applicants and admitted candidates, published research topics, selection and ranking criteria, composition of admission committees and examples of published admission results. The Doctoral School should also periodically review admission data in order to assess the effectiveness, transparency and attractiveness of the admission process and to identify relevant trends in the profile and number of applicants. Where appropriate, such analysis could also inform decisions concerning the future development

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			of the doctoral programme and its recruitment strategy.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that the Doctoral School provide clearer and more easily accessible information to prospective candidates on the accommodations and support measures available during the admission process, including the procedure for requesting such support and the institutional contact point responsible for facilitating it. The Doctoral School should also consider systematically monitoring, in aggregated and anonymised form, relevant aspects of access and participation in the admission process in order to identify potential barriers affecting vulnerable or underrepresented groups. Particular attention could be given to whether existing measures address not only disability-related accessibility but also socio-economic and educational disadvantage. Such monitoring would enable the Doctoral School to move from a predominantly compliance-based approach to a more evidence-based assessment of equal opportunities in doctoral admission.
19.	I.P.B.7.2.1 The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that the Doctoral School provide more systematic evidence of the practical implementation of regulations governing doctoral students' academic activity throughout the entire doctoral trajectory. This could include evidence concerning the approval and monitoring of individual

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			doctoral study plans, completion of required credits, annual research progress evaluations, procedures for modification of the doctoral pathway, and the implementation of relevant decisions of the Doctoral School Council. Future self-evaluation reports should also distinguish more clearly between regulations applicable to the general student population and those specifically governing doctoral studies. Greater emphasis on doctoral-specific procedures and evidence of their implementation would allow for a more direct assessment of compliance with this indicator.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that the Doctoral School develop a more systematic approach to monitoring and documenting the outcomes of its internationalisation activities. In addition to recording participation in international mobility and conferences, monitoring could include the number and duration of outgoing and incoming doctoral mobilities, international research stays, participation of doctoral students in international research projects and networks, internationally co-authored publications, and other research outputs resulting from international collaboration. The Doctoral School could also consider establishing explicit internationalisation objectives for doctoral education and periodically evaluating the extent

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			to which available international opportunities are accessed across the doctoral student population. This would help identify whether participation is broadly distributed or concentrated among a limited number of doctoral students and supervisors and could inform measures aimed at extending international exposure to a larger proportion of the doctoral community.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that the Doctoral School more systematically document the relationship between doctoral students' participation in research activities and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the doctoral programme. This could be achieved through a mapping of major research activities—such as participation in research projects, international research placements, data collection and analysis, scientific publication and conference participation—against the relevant programme-level learning outcomes.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that the Doctoral School develop a more systematic framework for monitoring and analysing the scientific visibility and impact of research produced by doctoral students and recent graduates. In addition to maintaining lists of publications and conference participation, periodic analysis could include the proportion of doctoral students publishing during their doctoral studies, the quality and international indexing of publication outlets, international

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			co-authorship, citations, scientific awards and other relevant indicators of academic visibility.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that SDAPP systematically document the impact of its quality assurance processes by linking identified issues and stakeholder feedback to specific improvement measures and their subsequent results.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that SDAPP systematically document how stakeholder feedback is considered and acted upon. Examples should identify the stakeholder group consulted, the issue or proposal raised, the decision taken and the resulting change. Particular attention should be given to demonstrating how doctoral student feedback influences the organisation of doctoral training and supervision. The Doctoral School could also periodically communicate to stakeholders how their feedback has been used, thereby closing the feedback loop and strengthening participation in future consultation processes.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that evidence concerning the actual activity of the Ethics Committee be presented more systematically, including aggregated information on referrals, types of cases considered, decisions and preventive activities, while fully respecting confidentiality requirements. For doctoral education, SDAPP should continue to integrate emerging research ethics issues, particularly the responsible use of

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			artificial intelligence, data protection and ethical requirements for research involving human participants, into doctoral training and supervision.
26.	I.P.C.3.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that SDAPP systematically document the impact of its quality assurance procedures by providing concrete examples of improvements resulting from curriculum reviews, doctoral progress monitoring, student feedback and internal or external evaluations. Evidence should establish a clear link between an identified need, the procedural action taken, the resulting programme-level change and its subsequent effects. The Doctoral School could also periodically evaluate whether individual doctoral study plans and curriculum adjustments effectively respond to doctoral students' research and training needs.
27.	I.P.C.3.1.2 Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that SDAPP more systematically document the involvement of external stakeholders, particularly alumni and institutional or professional partners, in the implementation and review of procedures. Evidence could include consultation records, issues discussed, recommendations received and examples of changes resulting from stakeholder input. The Doctoral School could also maintain concise records demonstrating how proposals from doctoral students and academic staff are considered within its governance structures and reflected, where appropriate, in

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			subsequent decisions.
28.	I.P.C.4.1.1 The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that SDAPP establish and document a systematic procedure for analysing the results of doctoral students' evaluations of teaching. The analysis should identify recurring strengths and areas for improvement, discuss relevant findings within the appropriate Doctoral School structures, and document any measures adopted in response. Where the small number of doctoral students raises confidentiality concerns, results could be aggregated across several semesters or analysed at programme level while preserving respondent anonymity.
29.	I.P.C.5.1.1 The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that SDAPP formalise a concise set of key performance indicators for the doctoral programme and periodically document their evolution. These could include admission and completion rates, time to degree, scientific outputs, international mobility, conference participation, doctoral student feedback and other indicators relevant to programme quality. The analysis should be explicitly connected to quality improvement decisions, documenting identified trends or problems, actions adopted in response and subsequent results. This would strengthen the transition from systematic data collection to evidence-based quality management.
30.	I.P.C.6.1.1 The organisational component		It is recommended that SDAPP

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.	FULFILLED	ensure that its dedicated webpage provides, in an easily identifiable and regularly updated format, all key information concerning admission, curriculum, doctoral supervisors, regulations, doctoral student support, quality assurance and completion of doctoral studies.
31.	I.P.C.6.1.2 The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that SDAPP ensure systematic and easily accessible publication of relevant decisions or summaries of decisions adopted by the Doctoral School Council, while respecting confidentiality and data protection requirements.
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.	FULFILLED	It is recommended that SDAPP continue systematically monitoring the implementation and impact of recommendations resulting from external evaluations and maintain clear evidence linking each recommendation to the measures adopted and the results achieved.

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfillment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity			
Domain B. Educational efficacy			
Domain C. Quality management			
Total			

Other, general recommendations that were not given within the analysis of a specific performance indicator can be presented here.
Sum up the number of analysed performance indicators, and specify how many were assessed as fulfilled, partially fulfilled, and unfulfilled, if any.

VI. Conclusions

The Doctoral School of Administration and Public Management currently includes 11 doctoral supervisors who are tenured academic staff members at Babeș-Bolyai University. Ten of them hold habilitation in the field of Administrative Sciences and one in Finance (focus on public sector).

The scientific research conducted within the Doctoral School undergoing accreditation follows three major research directions, corresponding to the academic profiles of its affiliated doctoral supervisors: public administration, including subfields such as public management, strategic planning, national and European public law, programme and project evaluation, urban planning, public policy and finance; conflict studies; and public health and public health policy.
All quality standards stipulated by the applicabile regulations are met.

Propose and substantiate a decision.

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

VII. Annexes

Calendar of the external quality evaluation visit

for doctoral university study programmes

Higher education institution: Babeș-Bolyai University Cluj

Faculty of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences

Doctoral field Administrative Sciences

Doctoral university study programme: Public Administration and Policy

Form of education: IF

Objective of the external evaluation: *(provisional operating authorization/periodic accreditation evaluation) - maintaining accreditation*

Period of the evaluation visit*: 3-4 September 2026*

ARACIS expert evaluation committee: Representative of the higher education institution:

No.	Name and surname	Role
1.	Prof Sevastian Cercel	*Coordinator*
2.	Prof Handke Stephan	*Member*
3.	Iacob Carmen Gabriela	*Member - student*
4.		

No.	Name and surname	Role
1.		

Time interval	Activity	Participants	Location/List of participants
Day 1, date 3 September 2026			
9:30-10:00	Discussions within the external quality evaluation expert committee	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
10:00-10:30	Meeting of the evaluation committee with **the management representatives of the organizational component** (dean, contact person, study programme coordinator); presentation of the purpose, objectives and detailed programme of the evaluation visit	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Representatives of the institution and of the evaluated study programme	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
10.30-11:30	Meeting of the expert evaluation committee with the contact person and with **the team that prepared the internal evaluation report (REI)**	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - The team that prepared the REI	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
11.30-12:00	Visit of the material base	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee -Representatives of the institution and of the evaluated study programme	
12.00-13:00	Lunch break		
13.00-14.00	Meeting of the external quality evaluation expert committee with **students** of the PSUL	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Students of the evaluated study programme	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, room IV/3
14.00-15.00	Meeting of the external quality evaluation expert committee with **graduates**[1] of the PSUL	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Graduates of the evaluated study	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, room IV/3

		programme	
15.00-16.00	Meeting of the external quality evaluation expert committee with **the teaching staff** involved in the activities within the PSUL	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Teaching staff from the evaluated study programme	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, room IV/3
16.00-17.00	Meeting of the external quality evaluation expert committee with **employers**[2] of the PSUL graduates	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Representatives of employers	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, room IV/3
17.00-18.00	Meeting of the external quality evaluation expert committee with the members **CEAC/**or similar structure established at the level of the organizational component, and with representatives of **the organizational structures in the field of quality assurance**	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Representatives of CEAC/similar structure - Representatives of the organizational structures in the field of quality assurance	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
Day 2, date 4 September 2026			
9:00 - 9:30	**Technical meeting** of the expert evaluation committee (Collaborative activity for clarifying aspects presented in the REI)	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
9:30 - 10:20	Meeting of the external quality evaluation expert committee with **the heads of research centers/laboratories** in the PSUL field	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Heads of research centers/laboratories	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
10:20 - 10:30	Break		
10:30 - 11:20	Meeting of the external quality evaluation expert committee with members of **the University Ethics Committee**	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Members of the University Ethics Committee	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
11:20 - 11:30	Break		
11:30 - 12:20	Technical meeting of the expert evaluation committee	- ARACIS expert evaluation committee	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room

12:30-13:30	Lunch break		
13:30 - 14:20	Meeting of the external quality evaluation expert committee with **representatives of the management of the organizational component/contact person/representatives of CEAC/representatives of the organizational structures in the field of quality assurance**[3]	ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Representatives of management/representatives of CEAC/representatives of the organizational structures in the field of quality assurance - Contact person	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
14:20-14:30-	Break		
14:30-16.00	Technical meeting of the expert evaluation committee	ARACIS expert evaluation committee	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room
16:00-16:50	Meeting of the members of the expert evaluation committee with **representatives of the HEI management and of the organizational component management** for communicating the conclusions of the evaluation process	ARACIS expert evaluation committee - Representatives of the management and of the evaluated study programme - Contact person	FSPAC 1, Traian Mosoiu 71, Ground floor Council Room

If deemed necessary, and depending on the organizational form of the PSUL, other meetings may also take place, for example with representatives of:

- Departments providing IT support, for example for organizing online activities;
- Departments of international relations and student mobility;
- The Career Counseling and Guidance Center, etc.

Prepared by,

Prof. Sevastian Cercel