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 experţi 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 ședință, 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 Agenţiei Române de Asigurare a Calităţii în Învăţământul 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 și de Compartimentul Tehnologia Informației.

Prof. univ. dr. ing. Cristian-Vasile DOICIN
Președinte

Daniela Cristina GHIȚULICĂ
Director general

Carmen MIRIAN
Director Direcţia Asigurarea Calităţii

Cristina-Vasilica ICOCIU
Director Direcția Juridică, Cooperare, Comunicare și Formare

Consilier juridic

NR. 318/H/22.10.2026

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

Anexa 13.6

DATE DE IDENTIFICARE	
Instituţia de învăţământ superior/organizaţia furnizoare de educaţie	Universitatea din Oradea
Şcoala(ile) doctorală(e)	Științe Inginerești
Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD)	*Silvicultură*
Procedura/procesul de evaluare externă a calităţii educaţiei	Acreditare

DECIZIA

Descrierea pe scurt a procesului de luare a deciziei

Raportul de evaluare externă (REE) a fost analizat în ședința Comisiei permanente de specialitate Științe Agricole, Silvice și Medicină Veterinară (CPS_C9) din 02.10.2026, propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV nr. 5026 /02.10.2026.
Propunerea de decizie a fost analizată de către Departamentul de evaluare Studii Universitare (DESU), opinia DESU fiind consemnată în PV nr. 5321/20.10.2026.

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

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.2.2.1, I.P.A.3.1.1, I.P.A.3.2.1, I.P.A.4.1.1 PÎ: I.P.A.2.1.1 N: -
B	**Î:** S.B.1.1., S.B.2.1., S.B.3.1., S.B.4.1., S.B.5.1., S.B.7.1., S.B.7.2. N: -	**Î:** I.P.B.1.1.1., I.P.B.2.1.2, I.P.B.3.1.1, 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 PÎ-: N: -
C	**Î:** S.C.3.1, S.C.8.1 N: -	**Î:** I.P.C.3.1.1, I.P.C.3.1.2, I.P.C.8.1.1 PÎ:- N:-

Motivarea deciziei

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

- *Total indicatori: 18 sunt îndepliniți, 1 parțial îndeplinit și 0 neîndeplinit*
- *Total standarde: 16 sunt îndeplinite, 0 neîndeplinite,*

*și, astfel, prin aplicarea art. 63 din Metodologie decide că **standardele sunt ÎNDEPLINITE.***

Decizia	Acreditare

The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education



External Evaluation Report (REE) for the procedure for obtaining an accreditation* (AC) of Doctoral Study Domain

Higher Education Institution/Education Provider Organization:	University of Oradea
Doctoral School:	Engineering Sciences
Doctoral Domain:	Forestry
The objective of the external evaluation:	Accreditation* (AC)

Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

No.	Last Name and First Name	Team role	Signature
1.	CURTU Alexandru Lucian	Expert evaluator	
2.	PICHLER Viliam	International Expert	
3.	VARODI Sânziana Maria	PhD Student Evaluator	

I. Introduction

- The External Evaluation Report (REE) was drafted within the accreditation procedure for the doctoral study domain Forestry at IOSUD – University of Oradea, in accordance with Law no. 199/2023 on Higher Education, Government Decision no. 962/2024 regarding external quality assurance, and the ARACIS Guide for the evaluation of doctoral study domains. The evaluation panel assessed the institutional capacity, educational effectiveness, and quality management mechanisms supporting the establishment and operation of this new doctoral field. As the doctoral domain Forestry has not previously undergone external evaluation, the present assessment focuses on institutional preparedness, human resources, research infrastructure, and compliance with national standards.
- The type of evaluation was accreditation and the period covered by the evaluation was 2025-2026, which corresponds to the preparation and submission of the Internal Evaluation Report. The membership of the external quality experts' panel consisted of: prof. dr. Alexandru Lucian Curtu, prof. dr. Viliam Pichler and doctoral student Sânziana Maria VARODI.
- IOSUD – University of Oradea is accredited to organize doctoral university studies in 21 doctoral fields, structured within 7 doctoral schools. It operates based on national legislation and internal regulations governing doctoral studies, quality assurance, ethics, and academic integrity. The Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD) coordinates doctoral activities institutionally, while each doctoral school manages its own fields through dedicated councils, supervisors, and administrative structures. IOSUD ensures compliance with ARACIS standards, transparent governance, and alignment with institutional strategic objectives.
- The doctoral study domain Forestry is established within the Doctoral School of Engineering Sciences and reflects the University of Oradea's strategic commitment to expanding research in agricultural and forest sciences. The domain builds upon the university's expertise in forestry higher education (existing BSc and MSc degree study programs), supported by specialized laboratories, and partnerships with forestry institutions and companies. As a newly proposed doctoral field, Forestry has no previous external evaluations; therefore, the current assessment focuses on the institutional capacity to initiate and sustain doctoral studies, the qualifications of the academic staff, the adequacy of research infrastructure, and the alignment of the proposed curriculum with national and international scientific priorities.

II. Methods used

- The external evaluation process was grounded in a comprehensive review of the Internal Evaluation Report (IER) prepared by IOSUD – University of Oradea for the doctoral study domain Forestry, together with all annexes and supporting materials referenced therein. The panel examined institutional regulations, strategic documents, doctoral school procedures, curricula, staff CVs, laboratory descriptions, and evidence of quality assurance mechanisms. Additional materials provided during the

preparation phase - such as analysis of the state of facts (which was not done in the IER), proposed research directions and doctoral topics - were also analysed to verify compliance with national legislation and ARACIS standards. The evaluation considered both documentary evidence and the coherence between institutional policies, operational procedures, and the proposed doctoral activities.

- The on-site visit took place at the University of Oradea on July 27–28, 2026 and included direct observation of the facilities used for doctoral studies in Forestry. The panel visited teaching and research facilities of the Faculty of Environmental Protection, including laboratories, field research facilities, and administrative offices. Meetings were held with representatives of the university leadership, the Council for Doctoral Studies (CSUD), the Doctoral School Council, the three doctoral supervisors proposed for the field, quality assurance officers, ethics committee members, and administrative staff. Discussions also involved stakeholders from the forestry sector and environmental agencies, providing insight into the relevance and applicability of the proposed research directions. The visit allowed the panel to verify the functionality of the infrastructure, the availability of resources, and the institutional readiness to support doctoral activities.
- The evaluation process relied on information obtained from multiple sources, including on-site discussions, institutional data, and direct observations. The panel assessed the alignment between strategic objectives, human resources, research capacity, and the expected outcomes of the doctoral field. Cross-checking of evidence ensured consistency between the IER, on-site findings, and ARACIS requirements.

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

DOMAIN A. Institutional capacity

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

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

IOSUD – University of Oradea ensures the organisation and delivery of the doctoral field Forestry through clearly defined institutional structures and a management system grounded in updated regulations and operational procedures. The Regulation on the Organisation and Conduct of Doctoral Studies (Senate Decision no. 11/26.09.2024) establishes the framework for doctoral activities, complemented by methodologies for admission, election of Doctoral School Councils, recognition of doctoral degrees obtained abroad, and procedures for academic integrity. All regulations are publicly available on the institutional website

https://doctorat.uoradea.ro/ro/documente/reglementari, ensuring transparency and accessibility. The Doctoral School of Engineering Sciences convenes regularly, with documented meetings addressing academic, administrative, and quality assurance matters. Prevention of academic fraud is ensured through the University Code of Ethics and mandatory anti-plagiarism verification of all doctoral theses.

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

The institutional framework is coherent, functional, and aligned with national legislation. The existence of updated regulations, documented decision-making processes, and transparent governance structures demonstrates that the organisational components operate effectively.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

The Doctoral School of Engineering Sciences periodically reviews its regulations based on consultations with academic staff, doctoral students, and external stakeholders. Doctoral students' requests are processed by the CSUD Secretariat and discussed within the Doctoral School Council. An annual Report on Doctoral Students' Needs and Satisfaction is produced https://cloud.uoradea.ro/index.php/s/XbkeyJ9EYRmEKK8, providing structured feedback that informs revisions of methodologies and procedures. Stakeholder input is integrated through formal channels, ensuring participatory governance.

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

The evidence confirms that stakeholder opinions are systematically collected and incorporated into regulatory updates. The existence of formal feedback mechanisms and documented decision-making processes demonstrates compliance with ARACIS requirements.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

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.

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

Indicator I.P.A.2.1.1	The HEI legally owns venues for the related education, research and administrative processes, as well as for services for students, doctoral students and trainees, thus providing an enabling environment for living and studying, including for disabled persons. Optimal venues are also provided for activities of the staff. Such venues are adequately equipped.

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  The University of Oradea owns and manages 45 buildings dedicated to teaching, research, and administrative activities. The educational infrastructure includes classrooms, laboratories, and seminar rooms. The University Library provides 7,800 sqm of space, 640 reading seats, and access to major international databases (ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, ProQuest, Scopus, Web of Science) through ANELIS PLUS. Accessibility facilities for persons with disabilities are available in the Central Library and student dormitories. For the Forestry field, the Department of Forestry and Forest Engineering provides six specialised laboratories equipped through institutional investments, including the DigitalUO project.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  The institution provides adequate spaces for teaching activities and student services, and the areas dedicated to the Forestry domain were clearly identified. However, with respect to equipment supporting advanced research activities — considering the mission of the University of Oradea — the current laboratory infrastructure for the Forestry domain is still in an early stage of development and requires further development.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations: Further develop the research laboratories to ensure optimal conditions for advanced, doctoral-level research in forestry

The indicator is: partially fulfilled.

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ The University of Oradea maintains its infrastructure through periodic inspections, cleaning, and technical servicing. Spaces used for doctoral studies - seminar rooms, supervisors' offices, laboratories, and library facilities - are kept in good condition. The Forestry field benefits from two accredited research centres within the Faculty of Environmental Protection, whose facilities are regularly maintained and equipped to support research activities.

Research centres, https://www.uoradea.ro/managementul-cercetarii/entitati-de-cercetare/

- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  Maintenance procedures are clearly documented and consistently applied. The infrastructure supporting the Forestry field is functional, relatively modern, and well managed.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  The three proposed doctoral supervisors meet the applicable CNATDCU standards, as demonstrated by the individual verification records reviewed by the panel. Collectively, they have published more than 45 WoS-indexed papers and received more than 300 citations. The advanced training programme is delivered by qualified professors and associate professors with expertise aligned to the curriculum. Two additional staff members are expected to obtain habilitation soon, ensuring the sustainability of the team and contributing to its future development and further diversification.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  The human resources available are suitable and compliant with national standards. Supervisors demonstrate scientific performance. However, the team is small for building a solid research environment.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations: Increase the number of doctoral supervisors with diverse expertise across the main subfields of forestry, in order to strengthen the scientific coverage and sustainability of the doctoral domain.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.

Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators_DSUD)

Standard S.A.3.2. Recruitment procedures

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  The University of Oradea organizes competitions for teaching and research positions in accordance with national legislation. Vacancies are published in the Official Gazette and on the university's website. All positions are included in departmental staffing plans and are accessible to eligible candidates without discrimination.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  Recruitment procedures are transparent, legally compliant, and publicly accessible.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion A.4. Digitalisation of institutional processes

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
  The University of Oradea employs digital platforms for administrative procedures, communication, and academic management. Doctoral students access information through the IOSUD portal, institutional email, and online request systems. Anti-plagiarism verification is conducted using the iThenticate/Sistemantiplagiat.ro platform, recognised by CNATDCU. Digital tools support transparency, efficiency, and academic integrity.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  Digital tools are effectively integrated into administrative and academic processes, enhancing accessibility and service quality. Eduroam (education roaming) a secure, global Wi-Fi network service for doctoral students, researchers, and staff in universities and research institutes is not available. It lets you connect to the internet at any member school or campus worldwide using your own university username and password, completely free of charge.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations: Analyse the feasibility and benefits of integrating the institution into Eduroam, the secure international Wi-Fi roaming network, thereby improving digital access and mobility services for doctoral students, researchers, and staff.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy

Criterion B.1. Content and relevance of study programmes

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  The doctoral study programme in Forestry is structured according to national legislation and internal procedures governing curriculum development. The curriculum includes the Advanced University Training Programme (AUP), consisting of compulsory subjects (Scientific Research Methodology, Ethics and Academic Integrity, Artificial Intelligence in Engineering) and optional Forestry-specific modules. Doctoral students must obtain 30 transferable credits through the AUP. The scientific research programme is organised into three progress reports, followed by evaluation by the guidance committee and public defence. The curriculum specifies professional and transversal competences, expected learning outcomes, thematic content, and assessment methods.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  The curriculum is coherent and aligned with the expected learning outcomes. The structure of the AUP is adequate. Overall, the programme meets ARACIS requirements, and refinement of the optional pathways strengthen alignment with doctoral research directions.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations: The doctoral domain is encouraged to analyse the opportunity of introducing a course on Advanced Statistics in Forestry, with a view to enhancing research design and data-analysis skills.

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  The curriculum was developed in accordance with the Operational Procedure for ensuring qualification level 8. Expected learning outcomes are explicitly stated and correlated with professional competences relevant to forestry occupations. Competences are detailed in the subject sheets and aligned with ESCO descriptors.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled

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

The correlation between learning outcomes and occupational competences is generally well established. By explicitly defining professional, transversal, and discipline-specific competences, the curriculum demonstrates clear alignment with the occupational profile associated with the qualification.

Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

Teaching staff set to employ interactive methods, encourage active participation, and support individual research development. Doctoral students may benefit from personalised supervision, access to laboratories. The curriculum includes activities that promote autonomy, critical thinking, and scientific inquiry.

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

Student-centred learning will be implemented, but the degree of consistency may vary across curriculum.

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

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

✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples

✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.

Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.

Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

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

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  Doctoral students have access to laboratories, research centres, the University Library, digital databases, and field research facilities. The university provides support services such as counselling, administrative assistance, and facilities adapted for persons with disabilities.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  Access to resources is adequate and general services exist, including facilities for students with disabilities.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.5. Learning outcomes

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  Learning outcomes are clearly described in the curriculum and subject sheets. They specify knowledge, skills, and competences expected from doctoral students, aligned with qualification level 8.

- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  Descriptions are in general clear and comprehensive. Subject sheets articulate how learning outcomes relate to doctoral research activities.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  Learning outcomes are assessed through examinations and scientific progress reports, evaluation by the guidance committee, and final public defence. Assessment criteria are defined in the syllabuses and doctoral regulations.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  Assessment procedures are appropriate and aligned with teaching and learning requirements.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  Admission procedures follow national legislation and internal regulations https://www.uoradea.ro/display32710 . Admission is open to all eligible candidates, with measures ensuring equal opportunities.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  Admission procedures are publicly available and cover different categories of candidates.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

Admission is open to all eligible candidates, with measures ensuring equal opportunities. Candidates with disabilities benefit from institutional support.

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

Equity principles are respected. Documentation indicate measures for underrepresented groups.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data

Regulations governing doctoral studies are applied consistently. Doctoral students follow structured research plans, progress evaluations, and supervision procedures.

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

The academic path is regulated and monitored. Deviations from research plans are managed.

- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

Criterion B.8. Internationalisation process

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

Criterion B.9. Scientific research results

Standard S.B.9.1 Scientific research in the education process Scientific research activities support students in achieving the learning outcomes.

Indicator I.P.B.9.1.1	Learning based on scientific investigation and research results support and are capitalised upon in achieving the learning outcomes envisaged through the study programme.

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

Standard S.B.9.2. Scientific research pertaining to the objectives of the study programme
The organisational component carries out scientific research activities aligned with the objectives of the evaluated study programme.

Indicator I.P.B.9.2.1	The results of scientific research are visible at national and international level in that scientific domain, and capitalised upon in an adequate manner.

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

DOMAIN C. Quality management

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

Standard S.C.1.1. Application
Adequately implemented strategic directions, actions, and procedures

Indicator I.P.C.1.1.1	The organisational component consistently carries out actions and applies procedures, proving their impact on improving the quality of education at the level of the study programme

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

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

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

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

Standard S.C.3.1. Procedures and implementation of procedures The HEI has procedures for initiating, monitoring, and periodically reviewing the study programmes and domains and the performed activities, and applies them systematically.

Indicator I.P.C.3.1.1	The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  IOSUD – University of Oradea has established clear procedures for initiating, monitoring, and periodically reviewing doctoral study domains. These procedures are defined in institutional regulations and operational guidelines, and they are applied consistently across doctoral schools. The Forestry doctoral field can benefit from these mechanisms through structured monitoring of doctoral activities, periodic evaluation of progress reports, and regular meetings of the Doctoral School Council. Documentation provided in the Internal Evaluation Report confirms that procedures are implemented in a systematic manner.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  The evidence indicates that procedures are applied consistently and support the quality assurance process. While the Forestry field is newly established, the institutional mechanisms already in place provide a solid foundation for continuous improvement.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  The implementation of quality assurance procedures involves teaching staff, doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, and administrative personnel. Feedback from doctoral students is collected through annual satisfaction reports, while supervisors contribute to monitoring and reviewing academic activities. Stakeholder involvement is reflected in consultations held during regulatory updates and in the functioning of the Doctoral School Council.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  Stakeholder involvement is evident and contributes positively to the implementation of procedures. The Forestry field benefits from this participatory approach, and the documentation could further emphasise how external stakeholders (e.g., forestry institutions, employers) are engaged in the review process.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled.

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

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

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

- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators_DSUD)

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

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators_DSUD)

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

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data (documents preferably included through links in the body of the IER)
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators_DSUD)

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

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

- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations

The indicator is: fulfilled / partially fulfilled / unfulfilled.
Not applicable (see Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators_DSUD)

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

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

- ✓ Presentation of the state of facts, supported by documents and data
  IOSUD – University of Oradea complies with national legislation regarding external quality evaluation. The institution prepared the Internal Evaluation Report for the Forestry doctoral field, provided all required documentation, and facilitated the evaluation process. Administrative structures ensured timely submission of materials and coordinated communication with ARACIS.
- ✓ Analysis of the state of facts, in relation with the state of facts acknowledged from documents and considering the analysed performance indicator, to justify judgement on the extent to which the indicator was fulfilled
  The institution demonstrates compliance with external evaluation requirements. Procedures were carried out efficiently, reflecting a well-organised institutional approach. Missing analytical elements of the IER were subsequently clarified through discussions conducted during the evaluation procedure. The submitted version of the Internal Evaluation Report did not fully follow the ARACIS guidelines, as the sections *Presentation of the state of facts* and *Analysis of the state of facts* were not presented as separate sections.
- ✓ Aspects that constitute best practice examples
- ✓ Recommendations: Ensure full compliance with the ARACIS guidelines when writing future internal evaluation report(s).

The indicator is: fulfilled.

IV. SWOT Analysis

Strengths:		Weaknesses:
✓ Good cooperation with regional economic environment; ✓ Good pool of candidates who graduate from their master's degree programs; ✓ Good connection with research laboratories from	INTERNAL FACTORS ↑	✓ Small number of PhD supervisors; ✓ Low international visibility; ✓ Limited research infrastructure.

related fields of study.		

SWOT analysis

Opportunities: ✓ EU Green Alliance of European Universities is good platform for increasing scientific cooperation; ✓ Applying (for funding) through research calls (e.g. Interreg).	EXTERNAL FACTORS	**Threats:** ✓ Expected lack of government grants allocated to Forestry domain within the university; ✓ Limited funding for research.

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) (NA-not applicable)	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	
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	
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.	PF	Further develop the laboratory infrastructure to ensure optimal conditions for advanced, doctoral-level research in forestry
4.	I.P.A.2.2.1 The movable and immovable assets are properly maintained to ensure	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF) (NA-not applicable)	Recommendations
	optimal conditions for studying, living and research, as well as for work.		
5.	I.P.A.3.1.1 The human resources of the organisational component are suitable to perform the activities pertaining to the evaluated study programme/domain. The teaching staff has the required qualifications and professional competences to teach the subject matters assigned to them in the job list.	F	Increase the number of doctoral supervisors with diverse expertise across the main subfields of forestry, in order to strengthen the scientific coverage and sustainability of the doctoral domain
6.	I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff.	NA	
7.	I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently.	F	
8.	I.P.A.4.1.1 The organisational component uses IT tools in its own procedures, to improve access and provide good quality services for the members of its own community and the indirect beneficiaries of education.	F	Analyse the feasibility and benefits of integrating the institution into Eduroam, the secure international Wi-Fi roaming network, thereby improving digital access and mobility services for doctoral students, researchers, and staff
DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy			
9.	I.P.B.1.1.1 The study programme is developed and structured according to the expected learning outcomes, and organised based on transferable study credits. It includes all learning, teaching, practical training, research and evaluation experiences, which, together, lead to a higher education qualification.	F	The doctoral domain is encouraged to analyse the opportunity of introducing a course on Advanced Statistics in Forestry, with a view to enhancing research design and data-analysis skills.
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	
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	
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.	NA	
13.	I.P.B.3.2.1 The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students, in line with their potential and aspirations, taking into account the diversity of learning styles and abilities.	NA	
14.	I.P.B.4.1.1 The organisational component provides students, including those with special	F	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF) (NA-not applicable)	Recommendations
	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.		
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	
16.	**I.P.B.5.1.2** Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams.	F	
17.	**I.P.B.7.1.1** The organisational component applies the admission procedures.	F	
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	
19.	**I.P.B.7.2.1** The organisational component applies the regulations concerning the students' professional activity.	F	
20.	**I.P.B.8.1.1** The organisational component carries out international cooperation actions supporting mobility of the members of its own community and collaboration in academic and research activities.	NA	
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.	NA	
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.	NA	
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.	NA	
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.	NA	

No.	Performance Indicator	Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF) (NA-not applicable)	Recommendations
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.	NA	
26.	**I.P.C.3.1.1** The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance.	F	
27.	**I.P.C.3.1.2** Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process.	F	
28.	**I.P.C.4.1.1** The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers.	NA	
29.	**I.P.C.5.1.1** The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data required for the internal quality assurance process.	NA	
30.	**I.P.C.6.1.1** The organisational component ensures publication and access to information of public interest regarding the evaluated study programme.	NA	
31.	**I.P.C.6.1.2** The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes.	NA	
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	Ensure full compliance with the ARACIS guidelines when writing future internal evaluation report(s).

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfilment

Evaluation Domain	Number of Performance Indicators		
	Fulfilled	Partially fulfilled	Unfulfilled
Domain A. Institutional capacity	6	1	0
Domain B. Educational efficacy	9	0	0
Domain C. Quality management	3	0	0
Total	18	1	0

Note: Thirteen additional indicators were classified as not applicable: one in Domain A, five in Domain B and seven in Domain C (Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD)

As a general recommendation: the existing opportunities for regional (including cross-border) and interdisciplinary research projects should be further leveraged to enhance the scientific visibility and collaborative capacity of the doctoral domain.

18 out of 19 performance indicators were fulfilled. One indicator was partially fulfilled. Special attention should be paid to the recommendations made for 5 out of 19 indicators, among them three from Domain A. The remaining 13 indicators were not applicable to this procedure (Annex no. 1 – Standards and indicators _ DSUD).

VI. Conclusions

The external evaluation of the doctoral study domain Forestry at IOSUD – University of Oradea confirms that the institutional, educational, and quality management mechanisms are adequately established and functional for the accreditation procedure. The organisational structures operate based on clear and updated regulations. The proposed curriculum is coherent, aligned with qualification level 8, and supported by relevant learning and teaching activities. Quality assurance procedures are established and applied at IOSUD and Doctoral School level and provide an appropriate framework for the future operation of the Forestry doctoral domain. ***Specific research infrastructure, human resources and research activities should be improved in the next years.***
The overall evidence demonstrates that ***the doctoral domain Forestry meets the ARACIS standards required for accreditation (AC)****. The institutional commitment to continuous improvement, together with the existing academic and research potential, provides a good foundation for the development of the doctoral field.*

Following the completion of the accreditation [*] *procedure, the decision of the evaluation panel is* accreditation* (AC).

VII. Annexes

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

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

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

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

Şcoala doctorală/ Doctoral School: Doctoral School of Engineering Sciences

Domeniul de doctorat/ Doctoral Domain: Forestry

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

Perioada vizitei de evaluare/ The evaluation period: *27-28 iulie 2026.*

Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/Evaluation panel:

Nr./No.	Numele şi prenumele/ Last Name and First Name	Calitatea/Team role
2.	*CURTU Alexandru Lucian*	*Membru - Cadru didactic RNE*
3.	*PICHLER Viliam*	*Membru - Evaluator internațional RNE-I*
4.	*VARODI Sânziana Maria*	*Membru - Student doctorand RNE-S*

Reprezentantul IÎS/OFE:

Nr./No.	Numele şi prenumele/ Last Name and First Name	Calitatea/Team role
1.	*T.A.I.*	*Persoană de contact/Contact person*

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
Luni/ *Monday*, 27.07.2026			
09:00-10:00	Discuţii tehnice în cadrul comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii/ *Technical discussions within the expert committee for external quality evaluation*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: 2.02, Facultatea de Protectia Mediului, str. Gen Magheru 26**
10:00-10:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **reprezentanţii conducerii componentei organizatorice**/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the representatives of the management of the organisational component*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanţi ai conducerii componentei organizatorice aferente domeniului de studii de doctorat evaluat/ *Representatives of the management of the organisational component* - Persoana de contact/ *Contact person*	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: 2.02** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - Prof. univ. dr. Director CSUD - Prof. univ. dr. domeniul Ştiinţe Inginereşti - Prof. univ. dr. Persoana de contact
10:50-11:00	Pauză/ *Break*		
11:00-11:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi evaluatori în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **echipa care a realizat raportul de evaluare internă (REI)**/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the team that has drafted the internal evaluation report*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Echipa care a realizat REI/ *Team that has drafted the IER*	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: 2.02** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - Prof. univ. dr. Persoana de contact, director de departament - Prof. univ. dr. membru echipa REI - Conf. univ. dr. membru echipa REI
11:50-13:00	Pauză de prânz/ *Lunch*		

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
13:00-14:00	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **personalul didactic** implicat în activităţile din cadrul DSUD/ ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with the teaching staff involved in the activities within the DSUD***	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Cadre didactice conducători de doctorat/ ***Teaching staff who are PhD supervisors***	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: 2.02** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:: - Prof. univ. dr. conducător de doctorat/ PhD supervisor - Prof. univ. dr. conducător de doctorat/ PhD supervisor - Conf. univ. dr. conducător de doctorat/ PhD supervisor
14:00-14:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **potenţiali angajatori** ai absolvenţilor DSUD/ ***Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with potential employers[1] of the DSUD alumni***	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members*** - Angajatori/ ***Employers***	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: 2.02** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - ing. director - ing., Inspector Şef - ing., director Oradea - ing., Şeful Ocolului Silvic - ing., director Bihor - ing., director -ing.,Şeful Ocolului Silvic
14:50-15:00	Pauză/ ***Break***		
15:00 - 15:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare** / ***Meeting of the external quality***	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ ***Panel members***	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: : 2.02** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:

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

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
	evaluation experts' panel with the staff in charge with the research centres/laboratories	- Responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare/ *Staff in charge with research centres/laboratories*	- Prof. univ. dr] prodecan responsabil cercetare, Comisia pentru Etică a Cercetării Ştiinţifice pe Facultatea de Protecţia Mediului - Consiliul Cercetării Ştiinţifice - Prof. univ. dr. Director centru cercetare CCIB -Conf.dr.ing. Responsabi Centru de Cercetare Transfer Tehnologic (CTT)
16:00-18:00	Vizitarea bazei materiale/ *Visiting the material resources*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanţi ai instituţiei sau Academiei Române, după caz/ *Representatives of the HEI or the Romanian Academy, as applicable*	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location:** -Centru de cercetare Interdisciplinar Bioeconomie – Statiunea Pomicolă de cercetare -Laboratoare Biochimie; Botanică; Topografie, Teledetecţie şi G.I.S.; Protecţia pădurilor şi amenajarea pădurilor; Modelare, simulare, tehnici CAD în inginerie; Exploatarea pădurilor si prelucrarea primară a lemnului, Centrele de cercetare ale UO. -Centru de Transfer Tehnologic CTT-UO Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - Prof. univ. dr. Prorector - Prof. univ. dr. prodecan responsabil cercetare - Prof. univ. dr. Director centru cercetare interdisciplinar CCIB

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
			-responsabili laboratoare conform anexei 12 din REI. - Conf.dr.ing. Responsabi Centru de Cercetare Transfer Tehnologic (CTT)
Marţi/ *Tuesday*, 28.07.2026			
8:30 - 9:00	**Întâlnirea tehnică** a comisiei de experţi 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 experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: 2.02**
09:00 - 09:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu **reprezentanţi ai CEAC şi reprezentanţi ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calităţii**[2]/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with representatives of the CEAC / representatives of quality assurance organisational structures*	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - reprezentanţi ai CEAC şi reprezentanţi ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calităţii/ *Representatives of the CEAC and representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures* - Persoana de contact/ *Contact person*	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: 2.02** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: - Prof. univ. dr. prorector responsabil cu Managementul Calităţii şi Administrativ - Prof. univ. dr. Director al DAC (Departamentul pentru Asigurarea Calităţii) - Prof. univ. dr. Persoana de contact
09:50- 10:00-	Pauză/ *Break*		
10:00 - 10:50	Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii cu membri ai **Comisiei de etică**	- Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location: 2.02** Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the**

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

Intervalul orar/ *Hour*	Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities*	Participanţi/ *Participants*	Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants*
	universitară/ *Meeting of the experts panel with members of the University Ethics Committee*	- Membri ai Comisiei de etică universitară/ *Members of the University Ethics Committee*	meeting:: - Prof. univ. dr. președintele Comisiei de Etică și Deontologie Universitară - Prof. univ. dr. prodecan responsabil cercetare, Comisia pentru Etică a Cercetării Științifice pe Facultatea de Protecţia Mediului - Consiliul Cercetării Științifice
11:00 - 11:50	Finalizarea activităților de evaluare/ *Completion of evaluation activities*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*	Sala/Locația/ Room/Location: 2.02
12:00-13:00	Întâlnirea membrilor comisiei de experți evaluatori cu reprezentanții conducerii IÎS sau a OFE, după caz și ai conducerii componentei organizatorice pentru comunicarea concluziilor procesului de evaluare/ *Meeting of the members of the expert evaluators' panel with representatives of the management of the HEI or the EP, as applicable, and management of the organisational component, to communicate the conclusions of the evaluation process*	- Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* - Reprezentanți ai conducerii și ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ *Representatives of the management* - Persoana de coct*/ Contact person*	Sala/Locația/ Room/Location: 2.02 Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ List of participants attending the meeting: - Prof. univ. dr. prorector - Prof. univ. Dr Director CSUD - Prof. univ. drresponsabil Științe Inginerești - Prof. univ. dr. Științe Inginerești - Prof. univ. dr. Persoana de contact

If deemed necessary, and depending on the type of doctoral program being evaluated, additional meetings may also take place, for example with representatives of:

- departments providing IT support, for instance regarding the organization of online activities
- departments for international relations and student mobility
- the Counseling and Career Guidance Center, etc.

Prepared by,
Prof. Dr. Alexandru Lucian CURTU