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 7.9

DATE DE IDENTIFICARE	
Instituţia de învăţământ superior/organizaţia furnizoare de educaţie	Universitatea „Babeş-Bolyai“ din Cluj-Napoca
Şcoala(ile) doctorală(e)	Teatru şi Film
Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD)	*Teatru şi artele spectacolului*
Procedura/procesul de evaluare externă a calităţii educaţiei	Menținerea acreditării

DECIZIA

Descrierea pe scurt a procesului de luare a deciziei

Raportul de evaluare externă (REE) a fost analizat în ședința Comisiei permanente de specialitate Arte, Arhitectură, Urbanism, Educație Fizică și Sport (CPS_C8) din 30.09.2026, propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV **nr.** 4919/30.09.2026.
Propunerea de decizie a fost analizată de către Departamentul de evaluare Studii Universitare (DESU), opinia DESU fiind consemnată în PV nr. **5321/ 20.10.2026**.

Gradul de îndeplinire a standardelor şi indicatorilor de performanţă şi motivarea deciziei

Domeniul	Standarde Î / N	Indicatori de performanţă Î / PÎ / N
A	**Î:** S.A.1.1, S.A.1.2., S.A.2.1., S.A.2.2., S.A.3.1., S.A.3.2., S.A.4.1. N: -	**Î:** I.P.A.1.1.1, I.P.A.1.2.1, I.P.A.2.1.1, I.P.A.2.2.1, I.P.A.3.1.1, I.P.A.3.1.2, I.P.A.3.2.1, I.P.A.4.1.1 PÎ: - N: -
B	**Î:** S.B.1.1., S.B.2.1., S.B.3.1., S.B.3.2., S.B.4.1., S.B.5.1., S.B.7.1., S.B.7.2., S.B.8.1., S.B.9.1., S.B.9.2. N:	**Î:** I.P.B.1.1.1., I.P.B.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: **I.P.B.4.1.1** N: -
C	**Î:** S.C.1.1, S.C.1.2, S.C.2.2., S.C.3.1, S.C.4.1., S.C.5.1., S.C.6.1., S.C.8.1 N: -	**Î:** I.P.C.1.1.1, I.P.C.1.2.1, I.P.C.2.2.2, I.P.C.3.1.1, I.P.C.3.1.2, I.P.C.5.1.1, I.P.C.6.1.1, I.P.C.6.1.2, I.P.C.8.1.1 PÎ: **I.P.C.4.1.1.** N: -

Motivarea deciziei

DACĂ HC COINCIDE CU PROPUNEREA DE DECIZIE DIN REE:

Consiliul ARACIS în ședința din 22.10.2026 analizează și validează propunerea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității, constatând că din:

- *Total indicatori: 30 sunt îndepliniți, 2 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:	Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
Doctoral School:	Doctoral School of Theatre and Film
Doctoral Domain:	Theatre and Performing Arts
The objective of the external evaluation:	Maintaining accreditation (MAC)

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

No.	Last Name and First Name	Team role	Signature
1.	CREȚU Adina Bogdana	Expert evaluator	
2.	MORARU Emila	International Expert	
3.	ARDELEANU Claudiu-Constantin	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

Context and scope of the external evaluation

The present External Evaluation Report concerns the periodic external quality evaluation conducted for the purpose of **maintaining the accreditation of the doctoral study field Theatre and Performing Arts**, organised by the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film within Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca. The on-site evaluation visit took place on 7 and 8 September 2026. The assessment focuses primarily on the developments that have taken place since the previous external evaluation carried out in November 2021 and uses documentary evidence updated through the 2025/2026 academic year and up to the date of the present evaluation procedure.
The ARACIS external quality evaluation panel comprises:

- **Adina Bogdana Crețu**, academic evaluator registered in the National Register of Evaluators - RNE;
- **Emilia Moraru**, international evaluator registered in RNE-I;
- **Claudiu-Constantin Ardeleanu**, doctoral student evaluator registered in RNE-S.

Professor Ioan-Simion Pop-Curșeu, PhD, Director of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film, was designated as the institutional contact person for the evaluation procedure.

General description of Babeș-Bolyai University

Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca is a comprehensive higher education institution with a long academic tradition. According to the Internal Evaluation Report, its institutional history can be traced back to the Jesuit Major College founded in Cluj in 1581. Subsequent milestones include the establishment of the University of Cluj in 1872, the foundation of the Romanian University of Cluj in 1919, and the 1959 merger of the Romanian Victor Babeș University and the Hungarian Bolyai University, which resulted in the present Babeș-Bolyai University. In 1995, UBB adopted a multicultural academic model structured around Romanian, Hungarian, and German lines of study. The Internal Evaluation Report states that, starting with the 2020/2021 academic year, the University offered study programmes through 22 faculties, together with numerous research centres and institutes.
The governance system of the University includes the University Senate as its principal deliberative and decision-making body, the Administrative Council, the Rectorate, faculty councils, and department councils. The University Senate is composed of 75% teaching and research staff and 25% student representatives, while the Administrative Council provides the operational management of the institution. The governance arrangements also provide for student participation at university, faculty, and doctoral-school levels.
Doctoral education is institutionally coordinated by the Institute for Doctoral Studies, established on 1 May 2006. The Institute operates under the authority of the Council for Doctoral Studies - CSUD and in cooperation with the councils of the individual doctoral schools. Its role is to ensure the unitary organisation of doctoral studies, support interdisciplinary approaches, and facilitate communication between faculties and doctoral schools.
The initiation, authorisation, accreditation, monitoring, and periodic evaluation of doctoral study programmes involve a sequence of institutional approvals. Proposals are initially examined by the relevant doctoral school council and faculty council, after which they are reviewed by the Institute

for Doctoral Studies and endorsed by CSUD. They are subsequently submitted to the Administrative Council and, following examination by the Senate Curriculum Committee, to the University Senate for final approval.

Babeș-Bolyai University has participated regularly in national and international external quality assurance procedures. The Internal Evaluation Report records ARACIS institutional evaluations resulting in the rating **"High Degree of Confidence"** in 2009, 2014, and 2020. It also refers to the previous external evaluation of the doctoral study fields within the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film, carried out in autumn 2021, as well as to the interim evaluation activities undertaken in 2024 and 2025.

General description of the Faculty of Theatre and Film and the Doctoral School

The Faculty of Theatre and Film was established in 2005, initially under the name Faculty of Theatre and Television. Before becoming an autonomous faculty, theatre studies had been organised as a department within the Faculty of Letters. The Faculty's academic mission combines teaching, scientific research, and artistic creation and is implemented through five organisational components: the Department of Theatre, the Hungarian Department of Theatre, the Department of Film and Media, the Hungarian Department of Film and Media, and the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film.

The Faculty aims to train highly qualified professionals capable of working in an increasingly competitive and international cultural environment. Its educational approach seeks to develop artistic and imaginative abilities, critical thinking, research competences, and the capacity to use classical, experimental, and alternative media in the production of artistic and cultural outputs.

The Doctoral School began its activity in 2009, initially offering doctoral studies in the field of Theatre and Performing Arts. In 2015, following the establishment of the doctoral study field Film and Media Studies, it adopted the name **Doctoral School of Theatre and Film**. It currently organises doctoral education in the following two fields:

- *Theatre and Performing Arts;*
- *Film and Media Studies.*

The Doctoral School operates as one of the five constituent units of the Faculty and is governed by a seven-member Doctoral School Council, chaired by its Director. The Council includes representatives of both doctoral study fields, doctoral students, and external academic members. A dedicated Statute of the Doctoral School was drafted in 2025 following consultation with its members.

The official Doctoral School webpage also confirms that the School has operated since 2009, organises accredited programmes in the two fields, and combines theoretical research with research based on artistic creation. It also presents Romanian and English as languages of doctoral training and Romanian, English, and Hungarian as possible languages for doctoral theses. doctorat.teatrufilm.ubbcluj.ro

General description and evolution of the doctoral study field Theatre and Performing Arts

The scientific mission of the doctoral study field Theatre and Performing Arts is defined as the production of high-quality knowledge at the intersection of innovative theoretical approaches and original artistic practices, the dissemination of research and artistic results within professional communities and society, and the creation of a framework for intellectual dialogue open to a diversity of approaches and methodologies.

The main objectives of the doctoral programme are:

- to provide high-quality advanced courses and an appropriate academic framework for the preparation and completion of doctoral theses;
- to offer a multicultural and multilingual environment, with activities conducted in Romanian and English and with the possibility of preparing research outputs in Romanian, English, and Hungarian;
- to train highly qualified specialists through both scientific doctorates and DLA - Doctor of Liberal Arts - doctorates;
- to encourage the development, testing, and validation of innovative research hypotheses;
- to facilitate continuous interaction between experienced researchers, artists, and doctoral candidates.

The field combines theoretical research, theatre historiography and criticism, interdisciplinary performance studies, and artistic research or practice-based research. Its academic profile reflects the vocational and artistic specificity of the field while also seeking to comply with the requirements applicable to third-cycle higher education and level-eight qualifications.

According to the Internal Evaluation Report, 64 doctoral theses have been defended since the establishment of the doctoral field and the Doctoral School, under the successive classifications used during this period. Nineteen of these theses were defended after the previous external evaluation of November 2021: five in 2022, three in 2023, six in 2024, and five in 2025 or the 2025/2026 academic year. The IER further states that the theses defended since the previous accreditation procedure were validated by CNATDCU and that no ethical problems were identified in relation to them. These statements constitute institutional evidence to be examined and corroborated during the external evaluation.

Since the previous external evaluation, the Doctoral School has also undergone an interim evaluation process, comprising a Periodic Internal Assessment Report in 2024, an ARACIS external evaluation report and Decision No. 193/H/07.08.2025 concerning the Film and Media Studies field, and an External Progress Evaluation Report concerning Theatre and Performing Arts. The IER states that the recommendations formulated in the previous procedure were implemented. The principal measures reported include:

- increased use of financial resources for the academic and professional development of doctoral candidates;
- the introduction, beginning with the 2022/2023 academic year, of the compulsory course Ethics and Academic Integrity;
- the development of international mobility arrangements;
- support for doctoral candidates participating in research placements abroad;
- the development of international cotutelle arrangements;
- participation in the EUTOPIA academic network.

The present external evaluation therefore examines not only the formal existence of these measures but also their effective implementation, sustainability, accessibility to doctoral candidates, and contribution to the quality of doctoral education and research.

II. Methods used

1. Documentary analysis

- The evaluation is based on an evidence-informed approach combining documentary analysis, direct observation, stakeholder consultation, verification of publicly available information, and collective deliberation within the external evaluation panel. The findings are assessed against the applicable ARACIS standards and performance indicators for maintaining the accreditation of a doctoral study field.
- At the initial stage of the evaluation, the documentary analysis covered the following principal materials:
- the **Internal Evaluation Report for the Purpose of Maintaining the Accreditation of the Doctoral Study Field Theatre and Performing Arts**, registered under No. 3468/11.03.2026, together with the information, tables, references, and institutional links included in the report;
- the proposed timetable for the external evaluation visit of 7-8 September 2026;
- the **Annex to the List of Teaching Staff Positions for the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film, academic year 2025/2026**, containing information on doctoral candidates, doctoral study fields, languages of study, years of study, doctoral supervisors, and guidance committees;
- the **List of Teaching Staff Positions for the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film, academic year 2025/2026**, including information on teaching staff, courses, doctoral supervision and guidance activities, languages of instruction, and corresponding teaching workloads;
- the information concerning the previous external evaluation procedure, the progress evaluation, the recommendations formulated, and the measures reported by the institution as having been implemented;
- the regulations, methodologies, curricula, course descriptions, public information, and official institutional webpages referenced in the Internal Evaluation Report, where relevant to the individual standards and performance indicators;
- The Addenda Description included in the Internal Evaluation Report lists the two 2025/2026 staffing documents as the formal annexes to the report.
- The documentary analysis did not rely exclusively on the narrative statements contained in the IER. Where possible, information was cross-checked against the annexes, institutional regulations, official webpages, quantitative records, and evidence obtained during the meetings conducted as part of the external evaluation.
- The links identified in the Internal Evaluation Report included the official webpages of the Institute for Doctoral Studies, the regulations governing doctoral education, the public doctoral-thesis defence platform, platforms for administrative requests and appointments, and webpages dedicated to doctoral research and academic information. These sources were cited selectively under the indicators for which they provided relevant evidence, rather than being reproduced indiscriminately in the introductory section of the report.

2. On-site visit

- The on-site component of the external evaluation took place on **7 and 8 September 2026**. According to the proposed timetable, the visit includes technical working meetings of the external evaluation panel and meetings or discussions with the following categories of participants:
- representatives of the management of the organisational component responsible for the evaluated doctoral study field;
- the team that prepared the Internal Evaluation Report;
- doctoral supervisors and other teaching staff involved in the doctoral programme;
- employers of graduates of the doctoral study field;
- representatives responsible for research centres or laboratories;
- representatives of institutional quality assurance structures;
- members of the University Ethics Committee;
- doctoral candidates from different years of study;
- graduates of the evaluated doctoral study field;
- the institutional contact person and representatives of the University and Faculty management.
- The programme also provides for a visit to the material resources used in the organisation of doctoral education and research, technical panel meetings for the clarification of matters arising from the documentary review, a final clarification meeting with institutional representatives, and a closing meeting for communicating the preliminary conclusions of the evaluation process.
- Depending on the evidence gathered during the evaluation, the timetable allows for additional discussions with representatives of IT support structures, international relations and student mobility services, and counselling and career guidance services.

3. Other relevant methods and aspects

- The meetings conducted during the external evaluation used a semi-structured format based on the ARACIS standards and performance indicators. The questions addressed to each category of participants were adapted to their institutional role and aimed to test the consistency between written policies, reported activities, stakeholder experience, and actual implementation.
- The principal complementary methods are:
- direct observation of the material, educational, research, administrative, and digital resources made available to the doctoral programme;
- examination of selected documentary evidence relevant to doctoral supervision, academic progress, research and artistic creation, mobility, ethics, quality assurance, and graduate employability;
- triangulation of information obtained from the IER, annexes, official webpages, institutional records, and stakeholder discussions;
- verification of the consistency of quantitative data across the different documents submitted for evaluation;
- requests for clarification or additional supporting documents where the available evidence is incomplete, inconsistent, or insufficiently precise;

- separate technical meetings of the evaluation panel for comparing observations, discussing the evidence, and reaching a common assessment of compliance;
- consideration of the views expressed by doctoral candidates, graduates, and employers, while preserving the confidentiality required for an open and meaningful consultation process.
- the assessment of each performance indicator was distinguished between:
- the existence of a formal regulation, structure, or procedure;
- evidence that the regulation or procedure is effectively implemented;
- the measurable or observable results of its implementation;
- the degree to which the practice is sustainable and contributes to the continuous improvement of the doctoral study field.

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***:* Babeș-Bolyai University has a clearly defined governance structure at university, faculty and doctoral-school levels. Doctoral studies are coordinated by the Institute for Doctoral Studies and CSUD. The Doctoral School of Theatre and Film is managed by a seven-member Council comprising representatives of both doctoral fields, doctoral students and external academic members. Its activity is governed by university regulations and by the Doctoral School Statute, revised in 2025.
- ✓ **Analysis**: The organisational structures and the distribution of responsibilities provide an adequate framework for managing the Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral field. The regulations are publicly available and evidence of their recent revision is provided. The effective application of these provisions was further confirmed during the visit through selected decisions and minutes of the Doctoral School Council.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples**: The participation of doctoral students and external academic members in the Doctoral School Council, together with the representation of both doctoral fields, supports transparent and balanced decision-making.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: Stakeholder participation is ensured through the governance structures of the University and the Doctoral School. A relevant example is the revision of the Doctoral School Statute in 2025, when doctoral supervisors and doctoral students, through their elected representatives, were consulted and their proposals were considered before the document was approved.
- ✓ **Analysis**: The evidence demonstrates that relevant internal stakeholders participate in the adoption and revision of regulations. The consultation concerning the 2025 Statute appears to have been substantive rather than merely formal. However, the involvement of employers, graduates and professional organisations is less clearly documented.
- ✓ **Best-practice examples***:* The participatory revision of the Doctoral School Statute and the permanent representation of doctoral students and external members in the Doctoral School Council constitute examples of good practice.

Recommendations: The Doctoral School should extend and document consultations with graduates, employers and relevant cultural or professional organisations, particularly when revising procedures concerning artistic research, employability and professional competences.

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***:* According to the IER, UBB manages an extensive infrastructure comprising teaching, research, library, accommodation and student-support facilities. Services for students with disabilities are provided through specialised university structures.
- ✓ During the restoration of the Faculty's premises on Kogălniceanu Street, the Faculty of Theatre and Film transferred its activities to the temporary premises at **2 Burebista Street**. The IER identifies a faculty library with a dedicated area for doctoral students, a consultation room, offices for the Doctoral School management and administration, and access to classrooms and seminar rooms. Computers, multimedia equipment, stage equipment and teaching furniture were also transferred to the temporary premises.
- ✓ **Analysis**: The available facilities and equipment appear adequate for the educational, research and administrative activities of the doctoral field. The temporary relocation has been organised so as to preserve access to teaching spaces, documentation resources and individual supervision activities.
- ✓ **Best practice examples***:* The dedicated study area for doctoral students within the Faculty Library and the separate consultation room represent positive arrangements supporting doctoral research and supervision.

Recommendations: It is recommended that the Faculty ensure and document the full accessibility of the temporary premises for 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***:* The IER states that UBB facilities are maintained in accordance with technical, safety and sanitary requirements. Infrastructure development and maintenance are included in the strategic planning of the faculties, while the University also implements the **UBB Goes Green** programme.
- ✓ Within the Faculty of Theatre and Film, the material resources are managed with the support of specialised technical and administrative staff. The technical team supports the use of stage, multimedia and research equipment, while the Faculty librarian manages the documentary resources, assists doctoral students in accessing databases and contributes to digitisation activities.
- ✓ **Analysis**: The institutional and faculty-level arrangements provide an adequate framework for maintaining the spaces, equipment and documentary resources used by the doctoral field. The existence of specialised technical and library staff supports the continuous and appropriate use of these resources.
- ✓ The actual condition of the facilities and equipment, as well as the maintenance arrangements applicable to the temporary premises, was confirmed during the visit.
- ✓ **Best practice examples**: The integration of technical support, library assistance and digitisation activities contributes positively to the sustainable use of the resources available to doctoral students.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts**: The Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral field is supported by seven doctoral supervisors: five professors and two associate professors, six of whom have voting rights within the Doctoral School. Their academic and artistic profiles cover theatre theory and history, acting, dramaturgy, artistic research and performance studies. The 2025/2026 staffing plan documents the courses, doctoral supervision and guidance activities assigned to the teaching staff.
- ✓ The guidance committees also include specialists from other Romanian and international universities, contributing complementary academic and professional expertise.

- ✓ **Analysis**: The number, qualifications and fields of competence of the teaching staff are adequate for the delivery of the doctoral programme. The subjects included in the staffing plan are generally consistent with the academic and artistic expertise of the staff members.
- ✓ The IER nevertheless identifies a medium-term risk related to the retirement of several experienced doctoral supervisors. This does not affect current compliance but requires forward planning
- ✓ **Best practice examples**: The participation of external specialists in doctoral guidance committees supports interdisciplinarity and connects doctoral research with other academic and artistic institutions.

Recommendations: It is recommended that the Doctoral School develop a medium-term succession and recruitment plan to ensure continuity in the main research and artistic areas of the doctoral field.

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***:* UBB supports staff development through the Individual Career/Academic Development Plan and through institutional professional-development programmes. The Doctoral School regularly circulates information on training courses, academic exchanges, workshops, conferences and research partnerships. The IER also provides examples of staff participation in national and international professional-development activities.
- ✓ **Analysis***:* The institutional framework and the activities reported provide adequate opportunities for the professional and personal development of teaching and administrative staff. The evidence also indicates an orientation towards continuous updating in doctoral teaching, research and artistic practice.
- ✓ **Best practice examples***:* The participation of staff in international academic and artistic training activities, together with the proposed development of a guide to good practices in doctoral education, represents a positive approach to professional development.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts***:* Recruitment and promotion procedures at UBB are governed by institutional methodologies and procedures adopted in accordance with national legislation. For doctoral supervisors, recruitment involves two stages: obtaining or recognising the habilitation certificate and subsequent co-option into the Doctoral School, based on approvals at Doctoral School, Faculty, CSUD and University Senate levels.
- ✓ The relevant procedures and information are published through the Institute for Doctoral Studies. The Doctoral School also applies additional academic and artistic performance criteria for the co-option of new doctoral supervisors.
- ✓ **Analysis***:* The documented recruitment framework is transparent, clearly regulated and consistent with the applicable legal provisions. The successive approval stages provide institutional control over the habilitation and co-option processes.
- ✓ **Best practice examples***:* The additional criteria adopted by the Doctoral School, concerning publications, research or artistic grants and professional performance, strengthen the quality requirements applied to new doctoral supervisors.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion A.4. Digitalisation of institutional processes

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts***:* UBB uses a wide range of digital services for academic and administrative processes. Doctoral activities are supported through AcademicInfo, the national student registry, the public doctoral-thesis defence platform, online request and appointment systems, the electronic clearance platform, the pre-registration platform for international candidates and the websites of the Institute and the Doctoral School.
- ✓ The Doctoral School website provides information on doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, graduates, curricula, regulations, publications and academic events.
- ✓ **Analysis***:* The digital tools cover the main stages of the doctoral academic pathway and contribute to administrative simplification, access to information and transparency. The available evidence indicates that digitalisation is integrated into the regular operation of doctoral studies rather than being limited to isolated services.
- ✓ **Best practice examples**: Broad use of digital tools in academic and administrative processes. Online access to essential information and services. Integration with national academic-information systems. Greater transparency of doctoral thesis defence procedures. Accessible web resources for the Institute and the Doctoral School.

Recommendations: The organisational component should continue to monitor the usability, accessibility and interoperability of its digital services, including the consistency of information across platforms and the needs of international candidates. Feedback from doctoral students and staff could further support service improvement.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy

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:** According to the IER (pp. 22-23) and the linked curriculum and course syllabi, the doctoral programme includes in the first semester three 36-hour courses, each carrying 10 ECTS. Ethics and Academic Integrity and Research Methodology in Performing Arts.

* 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.

Interpretation Strategies are compulsory; the curriculum also offers a diversified package of optional courses in Romanian and English, including theatre reception, institutional and managerial models, recent performing arts theory, playwriting and storytelling, and academic writing. Beyond coursework, the programme includes individual supervision, annual research reports, research and/or artistic outputs, publication and conference requirements, and the public defence of the doctoral thesis (IER, pp. 30-31).

- ✓ **Analysis:** The programme is coherently organised through ECTS and combines structured teaching, discipline-specific methodology, ethical training, supervised research, artistic and research practice, formative and summative assessment, and completion requirements. The documentary evidence shows that these components jointly support the acquisition of doctoral-level learning outcomes and the award of the qualification.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The compulsory ethics course explicitly addresses contemporary challenges, including artificial intelligence and academic imposture, while the methodology course integrates research-creation and multiple interpretive approaches specific to theatre and performing arts.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The IER (pp. 23-24) explicitly relates the programme to occupational profiles in ESCO: theatre critic (2642.1.7) and drama teacher (2355.4), and, for the professional doctorate (DLA), actor/actress (2655.1), theatre director (2654.1.6), theatre and stage technician (3435.25; 3435.25.5), and performing arts theatre instructor (2310.1.30). The curriculum develops advanced research, critical analysis, academic writing, teaching, cultural management, dramaturgy, directing and artistic-creation competences.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The identified occupations are relevant to the doctoral field and the described curricular and research activities are substantively consistent with doctoral-level competences. The correlation is nevertheless presented mainly in narrative form; a direct learning-outcome-to-competence mapping is not visible in the IER.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The distinction between scientific and professional doctoral pathways is linked to differentiated occupational and competence profiles, while preserving a common advanced research core.

Recommendations: By the next annual curriculum review, prepare and approve a programme-level matrix linking each expected learning outcome to the relevant ESCO competences, the curricular or research activities through which it is developed, and the assessment evidence used to verify achievement. The matrix should avoid an extensive list of targeted occupations and should instead identify only one or two research-oriented professional profiles that are genuinely relevant to the doctoral programme.

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:** At institutional level, student-centred education is supported by the UBB Teaching Council, the Centre for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, the Student Rights and Responsibilities Code and the assessment methodology (IER, p. 24). At programme level, doctoral students choose among five optional courses, their suggestions are integrated into classes, and interactive methods, analysis and debate are systematically used. Supervision is individualised through regular follow-up, applied feedback, permanent access to resources and information on career and funding opportunities. The IER also documents doctoral candidates' participation in teaching activities in the Romanian and Hungarian departments during 2024-2026 (pp. 25-26).
- ✓ **Analysis:** The evidence shows that student-centred principles are operationalised through curricular choice, participatory teaching, continuous personalised supervision, feedback and opportunities for increasing academic autonomy. The involvement of doctoral candidates in teaching and collaborative academic activities further supports active learning and professional development.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The structured integration of doctoral candidates into bachelor and master teaching, in activities aligned with their qualifications and research topics, creates a productive cycle between learning, research and teaching practice.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** UBB provides a formal framework through the Internationalisation Strategy 2025-2029, the Centre for International Cooperation, Erasmus+, Blended Intensive Programmes and EUTOPIA, including credit recognition for short-term programmes (IER, pp. 26-27). The Doctoral School documents actual Theatre and Performing Arts mobilities between 2021 and 2026 to Estonia, France, Hungary, Switzerland, Croatia and Portugal, funded through doctoral research grants, Erasmus short-term mobility and cotutelle arrangements. It also hosted an incoming Eugene Ionesco fellow from Universite de Franche-Comte in 2023 (pp. 27-28).
- ✓ **Analysis:** The opportunities are diversified, public, financially and institutionally supported, and used in practice. They include outbound and inbound mobility, short-term study and research, conference and artistic activity, Erasmus mobility and international cotutelle, with formal recognition mechanisms at university level.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The combination of doctoral research grants, Erasmus short-term mobility, international cotutelle and incoming research fellowships provides multiple mobility routes adapted to doctoral research and artistic practice.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Standard S.B.3.2. Fairness The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** UBB applies institutional policies on gender equality, combating discrimination and harassment, together with procedures supporting student mental well-being and the Open2UBB social-equity project (IER, p. 28). At Doctoral School level, women represent 8 of the 16 active supervisors and 5 of the 7 Council members; in Theatre and Performing Arts, 12 of 25 doctoral students are women. Two doctoral students sit on the Council, one for each field. Equity is also supported through Romanian, Hungarian and English supervision and thesis writing (pp. 28-29).
- ✓ **Analysis:** The institutional and programme-level evidence supports fair participation and a multicultural, multilingual environment. The quantitative data confirm balanced representation in supervision, governance and enrolment. However, the IER documents diverse learning styles and individual abilities less systematically than gender and language dimensions.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The operational use of Romanian, Hungarian and English for supervision and doctoral theses, together with balanced student and staff representation in governance, constitutes a strong equity practice for a multicultural doctoral school.

Recommendations: It is recommended that the Doctoral School's annual reports include clear, evidence-based information on the procedures used to identify doctoral candidates' diverse learning needs and individual abilities, the support measures implemented in response, and relevant monitoring indicators or outcomes. This should complement the School's established monitoring of gender and linguistic equity.

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:** According to the IER (pp. 11 and 29), doctoral students have access to the Central University Library and digitised collections, a faculty library with a dedicated area for doctoral students, an individual and small-group consultation room, classrooms and seminar rooms, recordings of performances and films, and online information resources. Professional doctorate candidates also have access to rehearsal and artistic-study spaces, props, technical equipment and collaboration opportunities with actors and actresses. The Centre for Students with Disabilities provides recommendations and support, including through CNFIS-FDI-2024-F-0292.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The resources are varied, relevant to both scientific and professional doctoral routes, and supported by specialised institutional services. Nevertheless, the IER expressly acknowledges that the relocation to the Burebista Street building has left "many challenges" regarding physical accessibility, without documenting a completed accessibility audit, the current accessible route to all essential spaces, or a remediation timetable. Consequently, access is not yet fully demonstrated for students with disabilities.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The co-location of documentary resources, consultation facilities and professional production infrastructure enables doctoral students to combine scholarly research with practice-based artistic work.

Recommendations: Complete a formal accessibility audit of the Burebista Street premises and adopt a time-bound remediation plan covering the entrance and circulation routes, lifts or equivalent access, adapted sanitary facilities, signage, emergency evacuation, rehearsal and production spaces, and alternative arrangements until all essential spaces are accessible.

The indicator is: partially 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:** Course instructors communicate evaluation methods, tasks, criteria and their weighting in advance through course descriptions; the linked syllabi are presented at the beginning of the teaching process and specify learning outcomes (IER, p. 30). Students may use the institutional assessment appeals procedure. Within the Doctoral School, learning outcomes are interpreted in relation both to common doctoral standards and to the individual scientific or artistic research profile.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The learning outcomes are sufficiently explicit to guide students and teachers, and the assessment framework is transparent. The programme appropriately combines common quality expectations with the flexibility required by knowledge production in the humanities and arts, without weakening the clarity of expectations.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The evaluation approach explicitly balances measurable criteria with the necessary flexibility for individualised scientific and artistic research profiles.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** Achievement of learning outcomes is verified through continuous and summative course assessment, including tests, participation in debates and research papers (IER, pp. 30-31). Doctoral progress is monitored through annual 15-20 page research reports assessed by the guidance and academic ethics committee. Completion requirements are differentiated: the DLA route requires at least three research reports and two publicly available artistic products; the scientific doctorate requires at least three research reports, an article published or accepted in a recognised indexed venue, and a peer-reviewed conference, symposium or workshop paper. The process culminates in the public defence of the thesis under the applicable legal and institutional regulations.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The assessment system verifies learning outcomes at successive stages, from coursework to annual progress and final completion. The differentiated evidence requirements are appropriate to the scientific and professional doctoral routes and ensure that both research competence and, where applicable, artistic practice are assessed.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The combination of annual evaluation by a guidance and academic ethics committee with route-specific scientific and artistic completion outputs is a robust doctoral assessment mechanism.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled .

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** Admission is governed by Higher Education Law no. 199/2023, the annually updated UBB Admission Methodology for Doctoral Studies and the Regulation on the Organisation and Operation of Doctoral Studies (IER, p. 31). The Faculty operationalises the university framework through specific selection and ranking criteria, examinations, calendar and registration conditions. The Doctoral School also publishes a concise field-specific admission methodology on its website.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The regulatory hierarchy is clear, current and publicly accessible. University-level provisions are translated into field-specific requirements, providing predictability and transparency for candidates and supporting consistent implementation of the admission procedure.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The publicly available Doctoral School methodology complements the university regulations with a concise, field-specific operational framework.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** Admission is based exclusively on academic and/or artistic competence and excellence. The UBB framework excludes age, sex, ethnicity, mother tongue, religion, race, political affiliation, lawful organisational membership and non-risk chronic illness as selection criteria, and provides special places for Romanians abroad and candidates of Roma ethnicity (IER, p. 31). Candidates with disabilities may receive specialised institutional support, while the Institute for Doctoral Studies communicates the places available for disadvantaged categories and the University allocates them in response to Doctoral School requests.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The principles of non-discrimination, equal opportunity and support for vulnerable categories are clearly stated and aligned with the law. The IER, however, offers limited operational evidence on how candidates with special educational needs or disabilities request and receive reasonable accommodations during registration, examination and communication of results.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The admission framework combines merit-based selection with centrally allocated places for disadvantaged categories and an explicit prohibition of discriminatory criteria.

Recommendations: For every admission session, publish an accessible notice specifying the contact point, request procedure and deadlines for reasonable accommodations, the types of support available at registration and examination, and the appeal route; retain anonymised evidence of requests and solutions for annual quality monitoring.

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:** Students' academic activity is regulated through the ECTS-based Academic Activity Regulation, the Code of Students' Rights and Responsibilities, the UBB Regulation on Doctoral Studies, the doctoral studies contract and the individual doctoral study plan (IER, p. 32). Doctoral students are represented in the Doctoral School Council by two members, one for each field, and participate in decisions concerning regulations, funding requests and community needs. They are also connected to the UBB Student Council and the Faculty's student association.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The regulations are implemented through individual contractual and planning instruments and through active student participation in governance. This creates a predictable academic path, clarifies rights and obligations, and allows doctoral students to contribute directly to decisions affecting their studies.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The guaranteed representation of both doctoral fields in the School Council, including participation in funding and regulatory decisions, is a strong mechanism for applying student regulations in partnership with students.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.8. Internationalisation process

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** UBB's internationalisation framework includes Erasmus partnerships with more than 700 universities, the EUTOPIA European University Alliance and The Guild (IER, pp. 32-33). At Doctoral School level, supervisors participate in international teaching, artistic creation, examination and research; foreign specialists are invited for lectures and seminars; two Theatre and Performing Arts courses are taught in English; all supervisors can provide supervision in English; and doctoral theses are prepared in English and Hungarian. The School also supports international committees, mobilities and cotutelle arrangements (pp. 33-34).
- ✓ **Analysis:** Internationalisation is embedded in curriculum, supervision, research collaboration, mobility and dissemination. The evidence concerns concrete activities and outputs, not only institutional intentions, and reflects the multilingual and multicultural profile of UBB and the Doctoral School.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The combined use of Romanian, Hungarian and English in doctoral education, including English-taught courses, theses in international languages, cotutelle and foreign experts, creates a genuinely multilingual and internationally connected doctoral environment.

Recommendations: In line with the views expressed by doctoral supervisors during the evaluation, it is recommended that the Doctoral School identify and implement feasible mechanisms for attracting internationally recognised academics and researchers to affiliate with the School. Such mechanisms may include visiting professorships, co-supervision and cotutelle arrangements, short-term teaching or research appointments, and participation in doctoral committees, thereby broadening the international academic network and strengthening the international dimension of doctoral supervision and research.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.9. Scientific research results

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The programme integrates doctoral students into research projects and internships. Two major examples are the Multimedia Dictionary of Romanian Theatre (DMTR) (2020-2023) and the feminist theatre archive FEM100 (2024-2025), both involving supervisors, doctoral candidates, alumni and, in the case of DMTR, bachelor and master students (IER, pp. 34-35). The projects produced open digital archives, archival-research methods, international conferences, workshops and a performative installation; doctoral candidates also presented research at the 2024 conference "Invisible (theatrical) stories. Female Perspectives II."
- ✓ **Analysis:** Research is directly connected to teaching, thesis development and the acquisition of advanced methodological and collaborative competences. Doctoral candidates participate in generating, interpreting and disseminating knowledge, while project results become accessible learning and research resources for the wider community.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The intergenerational and inter-institutional project teams, combined with open digital archives, provide an exemplary model for integrating doctoral education, research, public access and professional knowledge transfer.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** Research outputs are recorded in the UBB Academic/Scientific Activity Management application and disseminated through conferences, indexed open-access journals, digital archives and artistic practice (IER, pp. 35-38). The 2025 international colloquium "Film, Video, Digital and AI in Theater Stages" brought together 38 participants from Europe and Asia, including 11 doctoral candidates, and selected contributions were peer-reviewed and published in Critical Stages/Scenes Critiques and Studia UBB Dramatica. The IER lists ten relevant doctoral publications since 2021 and numerous nationally and internationally presented artistic outputs. Faculty journals, including Ekphrasis and Studia UBB Dramatica, provide indexed dissemination channels accessible to doctoral candidates.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The evidence demonstrates sustained national and international visibility and adequate capitalisation of both scientific and practice-based research. Outputs are disseminated through recognised publications and conferences, open digital resources, professional performances, festivals and community-oriented projects, matching the dual scientific and artistic profile of the field.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The direct pathway from international conference participation to peer-reviewed publication, together with indexed open-access journals and internationally presented artistic research, is a particularly strong dissemination and capitalisation practice.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

DOMAIN C. Quality management

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** According to the IER (p. 39 and pp. 45-48), quality assurance at UBB is governed by the Quality Assurance Policy, the 2024-2029 Strategic Plan, annual operational plans and annual Quality Assurance Programmes. Procedures are developed by the Quality Council and relevant administrative units and are published in the Quality Manual, on the Qualitas Centre website and through the Administrative Council. At Doctoral School level, the Statute of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film assigns the Director responsibility for research, artistic creation and quality. The IER follow-up section records concrete measures taken after the 2021 evaluation, including increased use of doctoral research funding, expanded mobility and professional training, stronger dissemination of research and closer consultation with employers.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The evidence demonstrates a functioning multi-level quality cycle and shows impact through the implementation of previous recommendations. The framework is current, public and connected to annual planning and evaluation. At the same time, the School's own SWOT analysis describes quality management as underdeveloped, indicating that programme-level actions and results are not yet consolidated in a single measurable monitoring instrument. This is an improvement need rather than a failure of the indicator.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The recommendation-follow-up table that links each previously identified weakness to concrete measures and a fulfilment status is a strong example of accountability and institutional learning.

Recommendations: Starting with the 2026-2027 academic year, adopt an annual quality assurance plan for the Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral field, with indicators, baselines, targets, responsibilities, deadlines, evidence sources and a year-end implementation report approved by the Doctoral School Council.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The IER (pp. 39-41) shows that internal evaluation is conducted annually, academic staff are evaluated by management and peers, and students provide feedback through AcademicInfo and annual doctoral-stage surveys. The Doctoral School Council evaluates doctoral programmes and monitors the ARACIS performance indicators; its seven-member composition includes two doctoral students and two external members. The entire School community was consulted when the 2025 Statute was drafted, while the Director regularly consults employers, specialists, master's students and prospective doctoral candidates regarding curriculum and policy.

- ✓ **Analysis:** Stakeholder engagement is embedded both in governance and in operational procedures. Students and external experts have formal voting or advisory roles, while employers and professional representatives are consulted on curricular relevance. These mechanisms provide credible channels through which opinions can influence decisions and the implementation of procedures.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The simultaneous presence of elected doctoral students and external field specialists in the Doctoral School Council strengthens both participatory governance and the impartiality of internal evaluation.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** According to the IER (p. 40), the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct was updated in 2025 and is implemented through the UBB Ethics Committee, an independent structure in relation to the Senate and Rector's Office. The Committee operates under Higher Education Law no. 199/2023, Government Decision no. 305/2024, Order no. 6,869/2024 and its Senate-approved organisation and operation regulation; at least 25% of its members are students. At School level, ethics is addressed through a compulsory course, provisions in the Doctoral School Statute, conflict-mediation responsibilities of the Council and sanctions for serious breaches established by the competent bodies.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The institutional framework clearly establishes the legal basis, independence, composition and responsibilities of the Ethics Committee. The Doctoral School's educational and mediation mechanisms complement the central committee without replacing or subordinating it, and decisions at School level must comply with the UBB ethics framework. The evidence supports lawful and independent operation.
- ✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples:** The combination of an independent university-level Ethics Committee, mandatory doctoral training in ethics and academic integrity, and School-level conflict mediation provides a coherent preventive and corrective framework.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The IER (pp. 6-7, 41 and 45-47) describes a multi-stage procedure for initiating, authorising, accrediting, monitoring and periodically reviewing doctoral programmes. Curricula are prepared and updated annually by the Doctoral School, validated by the Doctoral School Council and Faculty Council, approved by the Council for University Doctoral Studies, and then published. The approved curriculum is reflected in each student's individual doctoral study plan. Courses may be introduced or removed in response to doctoral research trajectories, labour-market requirements and the profile of prospective candidates. Concrete impact is also documented through the implementation of the 2021 recommendations, including the compulsory ethics course, expanded mobilities and professional training, stronger research dissemination and employer-informed DLA development.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The procedures are applied in a recurrent annual cycle and are supported by clear approval levels and individual planning instruments. The evidence of curricular and organisational changes made after previous evaluation demonstrates that monitoring and review lead to concrete quality improvements rather than remaining a formal exercise.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The linkage between annual curriculum review, the individual doctoral study plan and the documented closure of previous external-evaluation recommendations is a strong quality-assurance practice.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** According to the IER (pp. 7, 9-10 and 41), programme initiation and review involve the Doctoral School Council, Faculty Council, Institute for Doctoral Studies and CSUD, Administrative Council and Senate Curriculum Committee. The School Council includes doctoral-student and external members, while all supervisors and student representatives were consulted during the 2025 revision of the Statute. The Director also reports regular consultations with employers, field specialists from Romania and abroad, master's students and potential doctoral candidates, whose views inform curriculum and policy proposals submitted to the Council.
- ✓ **Analysis:** Internal stakeholder involvement is structurally embedded and extends across all approval levels. External consultation is relevant and addresses both academic and labour-market perspectives. Nevertheless, the IER presents these external consultations mainly in narrative form and does not systematically document the traceability from a stakeholder proposal to the resulting decision or action.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The multi-level approval route, combined with formal student representation and external membership in the Doctoral School Council, creates a broad and balanced participation framework.

Recommendations: Introduce an annual stakeholder consultation register and a feedback-to-decision matrix recording the consultation date, stakeholder category and institutional independence, issues raised, decision taken, responsible body and implementation status; employers and alumni should be included systematically.

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:** At institutional level, the IER (pp. 39-42) documents management evaluation, peer evaluation, annual doctoral-stage evaluation and annual evaluation of auxiliary teaching and non-teaching staff, with reports prepared by the Qualitas Centre. For the Doctoral School, the 2023-2024 survey had an 8.6% response rate among 58 doctoral students and an average score of 3.36/5; in 2024-2025, the response rate fell to 3.6% among 57 doctoral students, while the average score increased to 3.65/5. The IER explicitly states that formal anonymous evaluation of doctoral-level disciplines through AcademicInfo is not yet operational and that feedback on the teaching benefit is currently collected only informally.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The university has appropriate procedures and the Doctoral School has analysed the satisfaction data available to it. However, the indicator specifically requires analysis of students' semester-based evaluation of teachers. Because doctoral courses are not yet fully included in AcademicInfo and participation in the available doctoral survey is extremely low, the evidence is neither complete nor sufficiently representative. Only partial fulfilment can therefore be confirmed.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The item-level analysis of survey results, explicit reporting of response rates and comparison with the UBB average demonstrate a constructive and transparent use of the data that are available.

Recommendations: Before the next semester, register every doctoral course and responsible teacher in AcademicInfo and conduct anonymous evaluation after each semester. Adopt a communication and reminder plan, a realistic minimum participation target, aggregation rules that protect anonymity in small cohorts, and an annual field-level report documenting results, corrective actions, responsibilities and follow-up. It is recommended that the Doctoral School extend the implementation of the Methodology for the Allocation of Doctoral Places across the entire doctoral field, using it as an additional instrument for assessing the performance of doctoral supervisors.

The indicator is: partially fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The IER (pp. 43-44) identifies three integrated information systems supporting quality assurance: ManageAsist for administrative and managerial data, AcademicInfo for curricula, enrolment, grades, student requests, course evaluation and graduate employment, and the UBB Academic/Research Activity Management system for research and artistic outputs. These applications generate reports at individual, department, faculty and university levels. The Doctoral School Director may access evaluation results for analysis by the Council, while annual supervisor reports and the methodology for distributing doctoral places also provide performance data.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The university-level data infrastructure is integrated, regularly updated and capable of supporting academic, administrative and research quality processes. At doctoral-field level, however, the IER itself notes the need for stronger specific internal-evaluation methodologies and annual performance requirements. The data are available and used, but their analysis remains dispersed across systems and procedures rather than consolidated in a single field-level monitoring framework.
- ✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples:** The complementary use of integrated academic, administrative, financial and research databases, with differentiated access rights and multi-level reporting, is a strong institutional practice.

Recommendations: Create an annual quality dashboard for the Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral field, integrating at least admissions, progression and completion, research and artistic outputs, mobility, evaluation response rates and satisfaction, graduate employment, ethics or complaints data and follow-up actions. Define data owners, update frequency, access rights and annual review by the Doctoral School Council.

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:** According to the IER (p. 44), UBB disseminates public-interest information through its official website, the Communication and Public Relations Directorate, press releases, public-information channels and faculty websites. The dedicated Doctoral School website publishes information on doctoral supervisors and their scientific or artistic activity, doctoral students, graduates, curricula, syllabi, regulations and other legislative and administrative documents relevant to the evaluated field.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The scope of information made available covers the principal academic, administrative and regulatory elements needed by candidates, doctoral students and other stakeholders. The dedicated public website provides direct access to field-specific information. The SWOT observation that online visibility remains too traditional concerns communication reach and promotion rather than the availability of public-interest information required by this indicator.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The concentration of regulatory documents, curricular information, supervisor profiles, student and alumni information, and scientific or artistic outputs on a dedicated Doctoral School portal supports transparent access through a single institutional point.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The IER (pp. 9 and 44) shows that decision-making is governed by the UBB Charter and the Statute of the Doctoral School. Council decisions are adopted by open or secret vote, recorded and archived. Public framework documents, methodologies and decisions are accessible through INFOUBB, the Institute for Doctoral Studies website, the Doctoral School website and the public repositories of Senate decisions and Administrative Council decisions. Relevant decisions and procedural changes are also communicated to supervisors and doctoral students through dedicated institutional channels.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The decision-making process is rule-based, multi-level, representative and documented. Student and external-member participation in the School Council strengthens transparency at the point where decisions are prepared and adopted, while public repositories and institutional communication channels provide access to the resulting regulatory and administrative information.
- ✓ **Best practice examples:** The combination of public decision repositories at university level with targeted communication to the doctoral community provides both formal transparency and operational accessibility.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ **Presentation of the state of facts:** The IER (pp. 45-48) documents repeated participation in external evaluation: UBB received the ARACIS rating "High Degree of Confidence" in 2009, 2014 and 2020, while the doctoral fields were externally evaluated in 2021 and underwent interim evaluation in 2024-2025. The IER states that the recommendations from 2021 were implemented and provides a follow-up table linking identified weaknesses, measures and fulfilment status. The approved timetable for the 7-8 September 2026 accreditation-maintenance visit includes dedicated meetings with the management, the IER drafting team, supervisors, employers, research-centre representatives, quality-assurance structures, the University Ethics Committee, doctoral students and alumni, as well as the visit to material resources.
- ✓ **Analysis:** The evidence demonstrates consistent compliance with external-evaluation obligations, timely preparation of the current procedure and systematic use of previous findings. The documented closure of recommendations and the broad stakeholder access planned for the visit support both legal compliance and the substantive purpose of external quality evaluation.
- ✓ **Aspects that constitute best practice examples:** The recommendation-follow-up matrix, complemented by a visit schedule that gives evaluators access to all major stakeholder groups and resources, is a strong example of transparent preparation and institutional responsiveness.

Recommendations: n/a

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths:		Weaknesses:
✓ Coherent multi-level governance, with doctoral-student and external-member participation. ✓ Highly qualified supervisors combining recognised scholarly, artistic and professional expertise. ✓ Well-structured curriculum with compulsory ethics and research methodology and relevant optional	INTERNAL FACTORS	✓ Temporary relocation has affected material assets and continuity of specialised spaces. ✓ Accessibility at the Burebista premises is not evidenced by a complete audit and time-bound remediation plan. ✓ Formal anonymous evaluation of doctoral courses is not yet operational in

courses. ✓ Individualised, student-centred supervision connected to teaching, research and artistic practice. ✓ Multilingual and multicultural environment in Romanian, Hungarian and English. ✓ Strong completion and integrity record, with 19 defences in 2022-2025, all validated. ✓ Active internationalisation and visible outputs through mobility, cotutelle, grants, journals and digital archives.		AcademicInfo. ✓ Doctoral-student survey response rates are too low for robust conclusions (8.6% and 3.6%). ✓ Field-level quality monitoring remains fragmented and lacks a consolidated annual dashboard. ✓ Employer and alumni consultation is insufficiently systematic and traceable. ✓ Succession risks and limited dynamic online visibility require medium-term action.
SWOT analysis		
Opportunities: ✓ Completion of the restored premises and theatre studio can modernise research and artistic infrastructure. ✓ EUTOPIA, Erasmus+ and cotutelle can expand joint supervision, co-teaching and mobility. ✓ DLA and practice-based research can deepen partnerships with theatres, festivals and cultural organisations. ✓ Faculty journals and digital archives can strengthen international and open dissemination. ✓ AI, digital performance and research ethics can form a distinctive	EXTERNAL FACTORS	**Threats:** ✓ Strong national competition and demographic decline may reduce the candidate pool. ✓ Unstable funding for vocational fields may constrain research, mobility and artistic creation. ✓ Reduced doctoral incentives in performing-arts institutions may weaken demand. ✓ Legislative volatility and administrative burden may delay strategic initiatives. ✓ Prolonged renovation or relocation may affect access, safety and

development niche. ✓ Recruitment or co-option of younger and international supervisors can secure disciplinary renewal. ✓ Alumni and established practitioners can support recruitment, mentoring, employability and knowledge transfer.		equipment condition. ✓ Retirements without timely replacement may create supervision and expertise gaps. ✓ Sectoral precarity, weak research infrastructure and rapid AI change may limit valorisation and raise integrity risks.

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

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
DOMAIN A. Institutional capacity			
1.	I.P.A.1.1.1 For delivering the study programme/domain, the HEI has adequate organisational components and an adequate management system, which operate based on methodologies, regulations and procedures that are periodically reviewed as required by law.	F	n/a
2.	I.P.A.1.2.1 The opinions of the faculty and department members, of the subsidiary or extension and of other stakeholders are considered in the process of adopting and revising methodologies, regulations and implementation procedures.	F	The Doctoral School should extend and document consultations with graduates, employers and relevant cultural or professional organisations, particularly when revising procedures concerning artistic research, employability and professional competences.
3.	I.P.A.2.1.1 The HEI legally owns venues for the related education, research and administrative processes, as well as for services for students, doctoral students and trainees, thus providing an enabling environment for living and studying, including for disabled persons. Optimal venues are also provided for activities of the staff. Such venues are adequately equipped.	F	n/a
4.	I.P.A.2.2.1 The movable and immovable assets are properly maintained to ensure optimal conditions for studying, living and research, as well as for work.	F	n/a
5.	I.P.A.3.1.1 The human resources of the organisational component are suitable to perform the activities pertaining to the evaluated study programme/domain. The	F	It is recommended that the Doctoral School develop a medium-term succession and recruitment plan to

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	teaching staff has the required qualifications and professional competences to teach the subject matters assigned to them in the job list.		ensure continuity in the main research and artistic areas of the doctoral field.
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	F	n/a
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	n/a
8.	I.P.A.4.1.1 The organisational component uses IT tools in its own procedures, to improve access and provide good quality services for the members of its own community and the indirect beneficiaries of education.	F	The organisational component should continue to monitor the usability, accessibility and interoperability of its digital services, including the consistency of information across platforms and the needs of international candidates. Feedback from doctoral students and staff could further support service improvement.
DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy			
9.	I.P.B.1.1.1 The study programme is developed and structured according to the expected learning outcomes, and organised based on transferable study credits. It includes all learning, teaching, practical training, research and evaluation experiences, which, together, lead to a higher education qualification.	F	n/a
10.	I.P.B.2.1.2 The expected learning outcomes are correlated with the competences required by those occupations, according to the occupational standards and/or the European Skills, Competences and Occupations (ESCO).	F	By the next annual curriculum review, prepare and approve a programme-level matrix linking each expected learning outcome to the relevant ESCO competences, the curricular or research activities through which it is developed, and the assessment evidence used to verify achievement. The matrix should avoid an extensive list of targeted occupations and should instead identify only one or two research-oriented professional profiles that are genuinely relevant to the doctoral programme.
11.	I.P.B.3.1.1 The organisational component ensures implementation of the student-centred learning in the curriculum and through the teaching strategies used in the learning and teaching activities and experiences.	F	n/a
12.	I.P.B.3.1.2 The organisational component ensures opportunities for students to participate in academic mobility programmes organised in person and/or virtually.	F	n/a
13.	I.P.B.3.2.1 The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students, in line with their potential and aspirations, taking into	F	It is recommended that the Doctoral School's annual reports include clear, evidence-based information on the procedures used to identify doctoral

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
	account the diversity of learning styles and abilities.		candidates' diverse learning needs and individual abilities, the support measures implemented in response, and relevant monitoring indicators or outcomes. This should complement the School's established monitoring of gender and linguistic equity.
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.	PF	Complete a formal accessibility audit of the Burebista Street premises and adopt a time-bound remediation plan covering the entrance and circulation routes, lifts or equivalent access, adapted sanitary facilities, signage, emergency evacuation, rehearsal and production spaces, and alternative arrangements until all essential spaces are accessible.
15.	I.P.B.5.1.1 Learning outcomes are adequately described, and they support understanding of the students' and teachers' expectations regarding the content of the subject matters in the curriculum.	F	n/a
16.	I.P.B.5.1.2 Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	n/a
17.	I.P.B.7.1.1 The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	n/a
18.	I.P.B.7.1.2 Admission in higher education study programmes complies with the principles of fairness and equal opportunities, and with the establishing of support measures to ensure access of vulnerable groups at social and educational risk, including candidates with special educational needs and/or disabilities.	F	For every admission session, publish an accessible notice specifying the contact point, request procedure and deadlines for reasonable accommodations, the types of support available at registration and examination, and the appeal route; retain anonymised evidence of requests and solutions for annual quality monitoring.
19.	I.P.B.7.2.1 The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	n/a
20.	I.P.B.8.1.1 The organisational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.	F	In line with the views expressed by doctoral supervisors during the evaluation, it is recommended that the Doctoral School identify and implement feasible mechanisms for attracting internationally recognised academics and researchers to affiliate with the School. Such mechanisms may include visiting professorships, co-supervision and cotutelle arrangements, short-term teaching or research appointments, and participation in doctoral committees, thereby broadening the international

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			academic network and strengthening the international dimension of doctoral supervision and research.
21.	I.P.B.9.1.1 Learning based on scientific investigation and research results support and are capitalised upon in achieving the learning outcomes envisaged through the study programme.	F	n/a
22.	I.P.B.9.2.1 The results of scientific research are visible at national and international level in that scientific domain, and capitalised upon in an adequate manner.	F	n/a
DOMAIN C. Quality management			
23.	I.P.C.1.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	Starting with the 2026-2027 academic year, adopt an annual quality assurance plan for the Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral field, with indicators, baselines, targets, responsibilities, deadlines, evidence sources and a year-end implementation report approved by the Doctoral School Council.
24.	I.P.C.1.2.1 The opinions of the members of its own community and of other stakeholders are taken into account in the procedure implementation process.	F	n/a
25.	I.P.C.2.2.2. The academic ethics commission operates based on the regulation approved by the University Senate, and performs actions that are compliant with the law, independently from any other structure or person in the higher education institution.	F	n/a
26.	I.P.C.3.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	n/a
27.	I.P.C.3.1.2 Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	F	Introduce an annual stakeholder consultation register and a feedback-to-decision matrix recording the consultation date, stakeholder category and institutional independence, issues raised, decision taken, responsible body and implementation status; employers and alumni should be included systematically.
28.	I.P.C.4.1.1 The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	PF	Before the next semester, register every doctoral course and responsible teacher in AcademicInfo and conduct anonymous evaluation after each semester. Adopt a communication and reminder plan, a realistic minimum participation target, aggregation rules that protect anonymity in small cohorts,

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF)	Recommendations
			and an annual field-level report documenting results, corrective actions, responsibilities and follow-up. It is recommended that the Doctoral School extend the implementation of the Methodology for the Allocation of Doctoral Places across the entire doctoral field, using it as an additional instrument for assessing the performance of doctoral supervisors.
29.	**I.P.C.5.1.1** The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	F	Create an annual quality dashboard for the Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral field, integrating at least admissions, progression and completion, research and artistic outputs, mobility, evaluation response rates and satisfaction, graduate employment, ethics or complaints data and follow-up actions. Define data owners, update frequency, access rights and annual review by the Doctoral School Council.
30.	**I.P.C.6.1.1** The organisational component ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.	F	
31.	**I.P.C.6.1.2** The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	F	n/a
32.	**I.P.C.8.1.1** The organisational component carries out the procedures pertaining to the external quality evaluation process, aiming to organise the evaluated study programme as provided by the law.	F	n/a

Summary Table of Performance Indicators - Degree of Fulfillment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity	8	0	0
Domain B. Educational efficacy	13	1	0
Domain C. Quality management	9	1	0
Total	**30**	**2**	**0**

Overall assessment of performance indicators

Across the three evaluation domains, 32 performance indicators were analysed: 30 were assessed as fulfilled, 2 as partially fulfilled, and none as unfulfilled. Domain A records 8 fulfilled indicators; Domain B records 13 fulfilled and 1 partially fulfilled indicator; Domain C records 9 fulfilled and 1 partially fulfilled

indicator. The partial findings concern I.P.B.4.1.1, regarding fully demonstrated physical accessibility at the Burebista premises, and I.P.C.4.1.1, regarding formal anonymous evaluation of doctoral teaching and representative participation.

Priority follow-up
No additional recommendations are introduced beyond those formulated under the individual indicators. For coherent implementation, the following cross-cutting actions should be treated as priorities during the next internal monitoring cycle:
• Complete the accessibility audit and implement a documented, time-bound remediation plan for all essential doctoral, rehearsal and production spaces.
• Operationalise anonymous semester evaluation of every doctoral course in AcademicInfo and adopt measures to obtain representative response rates.
• Use an annual doctoral-field quality dashboard and action plan covering progression, completion, outputs, mobility, satisfaction, employment, ethics and follow-up.
• Implement the medium-term succession and recruitment plan while preserving disciplinary, artistic and linguistic balance within the supervisory team.
• Document employer, alumni and doctoral-student consultation and consolidate a clear bilingual digital entry point for regulations, services and opportunities.
Progress should be reviewed annually by the Doctoral School Council and recorded in a concise implementation and follow-up report.

VI. Conclusions

A number of important aspects noted during the evaluation are reiterated here, and general conclusions are made about the quality of education delivered within the evaluated doctoral study domain

The evaluated doctoral study field has a coherent institutional framework, a clear academic and artistic identity and adequate capacity to organise doctoral education. Governance is integrated into the IOSUD and Faculty structures, with doctoral-student and external-member participation, transparent regulations and functioning academic, administrative and digital support mechanisms.

Educational effectiveness is supported by a curriculum that combines ethics, research methodology, specialised optional courses, individual supervision, annual progress assessment, research and artistic creation. The multilingual environment, international mobility and cotutelle opportunities, strong publication and artistic dissemination, indexed journals and research projects provide a convincing doctoral learning environment. The completion record and the absence of documented academic-integrity problems in the theses defended since the previous evaluation further support the positive assessment.

a) *Proposed decision:* maintaining accreditation (MAC);

The proposal is substantiated by the fact that 30 of the 32 analysed performance indicators are fulfilled, only two are partially fulfilled, and no indicator is unfulfilled. The partial findings are specific and remediable and do not call into question the legality, academic viability, human-resource adequacy, research capacity or overall educational quality of the field.

The first partial finding concerns documented physical accessibility and adaptation of the temporary premises. The second concerns the absence, at present, of a fully operational and sufficiently representative system for anonymous evaluation of doctoral teaching. Both matters should be addressed through the time-bound measures specified in the indicator-level recommendations.

The institution has demonstrated the capacity to respond to previous external-evaluation recommendations, including improved use of doctoral research funding, increased mobility and international activity, stronger dissemination and the introduction of compulsory ethics training. This record supports confidence that the remaining recommendations can be implemented through the normal internal quality-assurance and monitoring cycle.

Accordingly, the quality of education delivered within the Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral study field supports maintaining accreditation, with documented annual follow-up on accessibility, doctoral-course evaluation, quality data integration, stakeholder consultation and human-resource succession.

VII. Annexes

Annex 1. Timetable of the external quality evaluation visit, 7-8 September 2026.
Annex 2. List of documents reviewed

- *Internal Evaluation Report for maintaining accreditation, Theatre and Performing Arts doctoral study field, registration no. 3468/11.03.2026.*
- *Evaluation worksheets and documentary analyses for Domains A, B and C.*
- *UBB Charter, IOSUD/ISD regulations and the regulations governing doctoral studies.*
- *Statute of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film, Council structure and relevant decisions.*
- *Curricula, course syllabi, staffing list, annexes concerning doctoral candidates and individual study documentation.*
- *Admission methodology, doctoral-study contract framework and information on student rights and academic progression.*
- *Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, Ethics Committee regulation and academic-integrity documentation.*
- *Quality Assurance Policy, UBB Strategic Plan 2024-2029, Qualitas reports and doctoral-student evaluation reports for 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.*
- *Evidence concerning mobility, cotutelle, research projects, publications, artistic outputs, thesis completion and dissemination.*
- *Previous ARACIS evaluation and progress-monitoring documents, including the matrix of recommendations and implemented measures.*
- *Public information available through UBB, ISD and Doctoral School websites and relevant digital platforms.*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
Luni/ *Monday*, 07.09.2026			
12:00-12:30	Discuţii tehnice în cadrul comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii/ *Technical discussions within the expert committee for external quality evaluation*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film
12:30-13:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **reprezentanţii conducerii componentei organizatorice/** *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the representatives of the management of the organisational component*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanţi ai conducerii componentei organizatorice aferente domeniului de studii de doctorat evaluat/ *Representatives of the management of the organisational component* - Persoana de contact/ *Contact person*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - dir. of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film - member of the Council of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film, Theatre and Performing Arts domain
13:20-13:30	Pauză/ *Break*		
13:30-14:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi evaluatori în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă (REI)/** *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the team that has drafted the internal evaluation report*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Echipa care a realizat REI/ *Team that has drafted the IER*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film - dir. of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film - secretary of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film
14:20-14:30	Pauză/ *Break*		
14:30-16:30	Vizitarea bazei materiale/ *Visiting the material resources*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanţi ai instituţiei sau Academiei Române, după caz/ *Representatives of the HEI or the Romanian Academy, as applicable*	
16:30-17:30	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **personalul didactic** implicat în activităţile din cadrul DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the teaching staff involved in the activities within the DSUD*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Cadre didactice conducători de doctorat/ *Teaching staff who are PhD supervisors*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - Prof. univ. dr. L.P.-T. - Prof. univ. dr. M.B. - Conf. univ. dr. A.H.

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
17:30-17:45	Pauză/ *Break*		
17:45-18:45	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **angajatori** ai absolvenților DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with employers of the DSUD alumni*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Angajatori/ *Employers*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film - artistic director, Lucian Blaga National Theatre Cluj - Maidan Creation Centre - persoană desemnată din partea Teatrului Maghiar de Stat, Cluj
Marţi/ *Tuesday*, 08.09.2026			
9:00 - 9:30	**Întâlnirea tehnică** a comisiei de experți evaluatori (Activitate în colaborare pentru clarificarea aspectelor prezentate în REI)/ *Technical meeting of the expert evaluation panel (Collaborative activity for clarifying the aspects presented in the Internal Evaluation Report - IER)*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film
9:30 - 10:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare** / *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the staff in charge with the research centres/laboratories*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare/ *Staff in charge with research centres/laboratories*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - Janovics Research Center
10:20 - 10:30	Pauză/ *Break*		
10:30 - 11:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - dir. of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
		Representatives of quality assurance organisational structures	- vice-dean of the Faculty of Theatre and Film
11:20 - 11:30	Pauză/ *Break*		
11:30 - 12:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu reprezentanţi ai **structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calităţii/** *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanţi ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calităţii/ *Representatives of quality assurance organisational structures*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - dir. of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film - vice-dean of the Faculty of Theatre and Film
12:30- 13:30	Pauză de prânz/ *Lunch*		
13:30 - 14:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu membri ai **Comisiei de etică universitară/** *Meeting of the experts panel with members of the University Ethics Committee*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Membri ai Comisiei de etică universitară/ *Members of the University Ethics Committee*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - Conf. univ. dr. B. I. J.
14:20- 14:30-	Pauză/ *Break*		
14:30- 15:20	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **studenţi doctoranzi** din cadrul DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with doctoral students of the DSUD*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Studenţi doctoranzi/ *Doctoral students*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: 4 students - 2nd year 2 students - 3rd year
15:20- 16:00-	Întâlnire tehnică a comisiei de experţi evaluatori/ *Technical meeting of the expert evaluation panel*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru şi Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
16:00-16:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **absolvenţi,** ai DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with alumni of the DSUD*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Absolvenți ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ *Graduates*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru și Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - 6 alumni
16:50-17:00-	Pauză/ *Break*		
17:00-17:30	Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **reprezentanţi ai conducerii componentei organizatorice/persoana de contact/reprezentanţi ai CEAC/reprezentanţi ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calităţii/** *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the organisational component / contact person / representatives of the CEAC / representatives of quality assurance organisational structures*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanți ai conducerii / reprezentanți ai CEAC / reprezentanți ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calității/ *Representatives of the management / representatives of the CEAC / representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures* - Persoana de contact/ *Contact person*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru și Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - vice-dean of the Faculty of Theatre and Film
17:30 - 18:00	Finalizarea activităților de evaluare/ *Completion of evaluation activities*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru și Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film
18:00-19:00	Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții conducerii IÎS sau a OFE, după caz și ai conducerii componentei organizatorice pentru comunicarea concluziilor procesului de evaluare/ *Meeting of the members of the expert evaluators' panel with representatives of the management of the HEI or the EP, as applicable, and management of the organisational component, to communicate the conclusions of the evaluation process*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanți ai conducerii și ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ *Representatives of the management* - Persoana de contact/ *Contact person*	Sala de Consiliu, Facultatea de Teatru și Film/ Council Room, Faculty of Theatre and Film Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - dir. of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film - dean of the Faculty of Theatre and Film - member of the Council of the Doctoral School of Theatre and Film, Theatre and Performing Arts domain