# 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. 18**
*la Hotărârea Consiliului ARACIS nr. 318/H/22.10.2026*

Anexa 18.1

| DATE DE IDENTIFICARE | |
|---|---|
| Instituţia de învăţământ superior/organizaţia furnizoare de educaţie | Universitatea Politehnica Timişoara |
| Şcoala(ile) doctorală(e) | Școala Doctorală de Studii Inginerești |
| Domeniul de studii universitare de doctorat (DSUD) | *Calculatoare şi tehnologia informaţiei* |
| Procedura/procesul de evaluare externă a calităţii educaţiei | Menținerea acreditării |

**DECIZIA**

**Descrierea pe scurt a procesului de luare a deciziei**

Raportul de evaluare externă (REE) a fost analizat în ședința Comisiei permanente de specialitate Științe Inginerești 2 (CPS_C11) din 25.09.2026, propunerea de decizie fiind consemnată în PV nr. **4827/25.09.2026.** 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**
*(se indică cifrele care stau la baza luării deciziei Consiliului ARACIS)*

| Domeniul | Standarde Î / N | Indicatori de performanţă Î / PÎ / N |
|---|---|---|
| A | **Î:** S.A.1.1, S.A.1.2., S.A.2.1., S.A.2.2., S.A.3.1., S.A.3.2., S.A.4.1.<br>**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<br>**PÎ:**<br>**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.<br>**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.5.1.2, 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<br>**PÎ:**<br>**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<br>**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<br>**PÎ:** I.P.B.5.1.1<br>**N:** I.P.C.4.1.1. |

**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:*

- *32 indicatori: 30 sunt îndepliniți, 2 parțial îndepliniți și 0 neîndepliniți*
- *26 standarde: 26 sunt îndeplinite, 0 neîndeplinite,*

*și, astfel, prin aplicarea art. 63 din Metodologie decide că **standardele sunt ÎNDEPLINITE** 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 MAC of Doctoral Study Domain

| | |
|---|---|
| Higher Education Institution/Education Provider Organization: | Politehnica University Timișoara |
| Doctoral School: | Doctoral School of Engineering Studies of IOSUD-UPT |
| Doctoral Domain: | Computers and Information Technology |
| The objective of the external evaluation: | Maintaining accreditation |

## Members of the ARACIS Evaluation Panel

| No. | Last Name and First Name | Team role | Signature |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Prof. dr. eng. Răzvan Victor Rughiniș | Expert evaluator | |
| 2. | Prof. dr. Gábor Kiss | International expert | |
| 3. | Mr. Bogdan Marius Negrea | PhD student evaluator | |

## I. Introduction

- This report concerned the periodic external evaluation for maintaining accreditation of the Computers and Information Technology doctoral study domain at Politehnica University Timișoara. It covered the 2021–2025 evidence period and the on-site visit of 31 August–1 September 2026. The panel comprised Prof. dr. eng. Răzvan Victor Rughiniș, expert evaluator, Prof. dr. Gábor Kiss, international expert, and Mr. Bogdan Marius Negrea, PhD student evaluator.
- Politehnica University Timișoara (UPT) was a public technical university whose Institution Organising Doctoral Studies (IOSUD) organised doctoral education through the Doctoral School of Engineering Studies. The Senate, the Council for University Doctoral Studies (CSUD), the Doctoral School Council and institutional quality-assurance bodies exercised the governance, academic and monitoring functions defined by national law and university regulations. The University's mission combined advanced education, research, innovation and engagement with the economic and professional environment of Timișoara and the wider region.
- The Computers and Information Technology domain was supported principally by the Faculty of Automation and Computers and its research structures. Since the 2021 evaluation, UPT revised its doctoral regulation, expanded supervisory capacity and documented implementation of most earlier recommendations. At the reference date of the internal evaluation report (IER), the best-supported counts were 21 total supervisors, 17 active supervisors and 98 doctoral students: 73 in the standard study period, nine in extension and 16 under Law no. 49/2013. The confirmed current roster also comprised 21 supervisors; later student records reported 101 and 102 at different reference dates. Improvement needs remained in doctoral-domain feedback reporting and in supplementing documentation for the advanced university training programme (PPUA) with doctoral-level learning outcomes aligned with European Qualifications Framework (EQF) level 8.

## II. Methods used

- The panel analysed the internal evaluation report (IER) and annexes, the doctoral regulations and contracts, individual PPUA and research-programme forms, supervisor and doctoral-student lists, publication and thesis records, infrastructure information, satisfaction and teaching-evaluation reports, ethics and similarity documents, mobility evidence, the 2021 external report, the 2025 progress report, and the current ARACIS and national regulatory framework.
- During the on-site visit, the panel inspected teaching, research and student-support facilities and met the University and IOSUD management, the IER and quality-assurance teams, doctoral supervisors, doctoral students, graduates, employers and research partners, Ethics Commission representatives and administrative staff. The closing meeting consolidated the evidence and the principal recommendations.
- The panel triangulated statements in the IER against the documentary record, primary records, public webpages and quantitative cross-checks. Particular attention was

given to supervisor and student headcounts, supervision loads, the four-year 240-ECTS curriculum, doctoral subject sheets, learning outcomes and their assessment, internationalisation, teaching feedback, database consistency and public transparency.

## 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<br>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. |

✓ The Doctoral School of Engineering Studies, CSUD and the Computers and Information Technology domain operated under the IOSUD-UPT regulation, the doctoral-school regulation and Senate-approved procedures for admission, supervision, doctoral training, ethics, interruption, extension and completion. Responsibilities and decision-making levels were identifiable, and the regulatory documents were periodically revised, including the 2024 IOSUD regulation. The organisation therefore provided an adequate and functional framework for delivering the domain (IER, pp. 10–13).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

| Standard S.A.1.2. Stakeholder engagement<br>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. |

✓ Doctoral supervisors and doctoral students participated in the CSUD and the Doctoral School Council, and their views were collected through council debates, satisfaction questionnaires and consultations with graduates, employers and research partners. The minutes and survey summaries showed that these views informed revisions of regulations and operational practices. Stakeholder participation was thus embedded in the adoption and review process rather than limited to formal representation (IER, pp. 13–14).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

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

| Standard S.A.2.1. Material resources<br>The HEI owns adequate movable and immovable assets to enable it to carry out the study programme/domain. | |
|---|---|
| Indicator<br>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. |

✓ UPT legally owned the teaching, research, administrative, library, accommodation and student-service premises used by the domain. Doctoral students had access to equipped laboratories, computing and communication infrastructure, scientific databases and university-wide support facilities. The premises visited and the inventory supplied for the domain were suitable for advanced research and included institutional provisions for access by persons with disabilities (IER, pp. 14–15).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

| Standard S.A.2.2. Management of material resources<br>The organisational components manage the movable and immovable assets used for the evaluated study programme/domain in an optimal, sustainable manner. | |
|---|---|
| Indicator<br>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. |

✓ The University applied central procedures for asset management, maintenance, occupational safety and investment planning. Equipment and spaces used by doctoral students were maintained through institutional and project resources, while the documented acquisitions and upgrades preserved access to current computing platforms, specialised laboratories and library services. The available evidence and the inspected facilities supported the conclusion that movable and immovable assets were kept in conditions appropriate for study, research and work (IER, pp. 15–16).

**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<br>The HEI has the required human resources to organise and deliver the evaluated study programme/domain. | |
|---|---|
| Indicator<br>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. |

✓ At the IER reference date, 21 doctoral supervisors were affiliated: 10 tenured, five associate and six without employment contracts; nine held habilitation certificates. Seventeen were active, supervising at least one of 98 registered doctoral students; 15 supervised students in the standard period or extension, while Vladimir Crețu and Ștefan Holban supervised only students recorded under Law no. 49/2013. The students comprised 73 in the standard study period, nine in extension

and 16 under Law no. 49/2013. Nineteen supervisors met the applicable minimum standards. Ionel Jian did not meet them and Nicolae Robu had not submitted evidence; neither had an employment contract or doctoral students. The confirmed current roster remained 21, with Lucian-Adrian Prodan replacing Daniela-Elena Popescu after her 2025 disaffiliation; the best-supported active-supervisor estimate remained 17. The centraliser recorded 16 students for Marius Marcu (12 in the standard period, three in extension and one under Law no. 49/2013) and 15 for Călin-Adrian Popa (all in the standard period). Law no. 133/2026 postponed application of the statutory ceiling of eight students, exceptionally 12, until 2030–2031; during the transitional period, the University Senate determines the applicable supervision load. The applicable transitional rules were therefore identifiable; a brief clarification in university-level documents would improve transparency concerning how doctoral-supervision loads are determined and published during this period (IER, pp. 8, 16–17; supervisor centraliser; Law no. 133/2026; IOSUD-UPT regulation, Art. 14).

✓ **Recommendation: Clarify in university-level documents the procedure and rules for determining and publishing doctoral-supervision loads during the transitional period.**

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

✓ UPT supported staff development through habilitation, research projects, mobility, conference participation, training and institutional incentives for indexed publications. Three habilitation orders were documented during 2021–2025, including Lucian-Adrian Prodan's in 2025; nine members of the current 21-person roster held habilitation certificates. The evidence also included financed participation in scientific events and publication awards. These mechanisms strengthened supervisory capacity and the scientific profile of the domain (IER, pp. 8, 17–18; university clarification).

**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. |
|---|---|

✓ Recruitment, promotion, habilitation and affiliation were governed by published national and university procedures, with eligibility conditions, evaluation criteria, competition committees and results made transparent. The files showed that appointments and affiliations followed the required approvals by the competent academic bodies. No evidence indicated departures from the legal or institutional recruitment framework (IER, pp. 18–19).

**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. |

✓ The domain used the Virtual Campus, institutional e-mail, electronic admission and student platforms, digital library access, similarity-checking systems and electronic research-reporting tools. These services supported communication, access to learning materials, admission, academic records, research integrity and administrative workflows. Their range and regular use improved access to services for students, staff and external beneficiaries (IER, pp. 19–20).

**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. |

✓ The current doctoral programme comprised four years and 240 ECTS: 30 ECTS in the advanced university training programme (PPUA) and 210 ECTS in the individual scientific research programme. Contracts for the 2023 and subsequent cohorts stated a four-year normal duration, whereas the 2021 and 2022 contracts retained the three-year duration applicable to those cohorts. In the first year, each doctoral student's approved Annex 1 individualised the 30-ECTS PPUA through the 15-ECTS Academic Ethics and Integrity course and 15 ECTS of specialised master's-level or tutorial subjects selected for the research topic; the programme then comprised a research project, three research reports, dissemination activities and the doctoral thesis. This structure integrated learning, research and evaluation experiences leading to the level-8 qualification (IER, pp. 20–22; doctoral study contracts and PPUA plans).

**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). |

✓ The programme aimed at level-8 research competences in advanced computing and information technology, including problem formulation, original investigation, rigorous communication and

* 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.

responsible innovation. The institutional level-8 procedure related knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy to research-intensive occupational profiles, while individual research topics reflected current professional and scientific fields. The connection with ESCO and occupational requirements was present at programme level; the formulation of subject-level doctoral outcomes is assessed separately under I.P.B.5.1.1 (IER, pp. 22–25).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

| Standard S.B.3.1 Principles<br>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. |

✓ Learning was individualised through the doctoral supervisor, a guidance and academic integrity committee, the personal PPUA plan and the research programme. Tutorial or previously untaken master's subjects were selected according to each thesis topic; doctoral students presented a research project and periodic reports and received feedback from the supervisor and committee. The forms and discussions confirmed an interactive, research-based and student-centred approach rather than a uniform taught curriculum (IER, pp. 25–27).

**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. |
|---|---|

✓ UPT provided Erasmus opportunities, inter-university cooperation and institutional or project funding for mobility, conferences and research dissemination. The evidence included a seven-day Erasmus+ Blended Intensive Programme at the University of Warsaw in 2024–2025, alongside numerous doctoral presentations at international scientific events during 2021–2025. These arrangements gave doctoral students practical opportunities for physical or virtual academic mobility (IER, p. 27; mobility records).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

| Standard S.B.3.2. Fairness<br>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 |

✓ Admission, supervision and access to resources were governed by equal-opportunity rules, and doctoral students received individual study paths, academic guidance, counselling and disability support. The flexible choice of tutorial subjects and research milestones accommodated different research profiles and learning needs. The regulations did not impose discriminatory conditions and included institutional support mechanisms for students requiring adjustments (IER, pp. 27–28).

**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<br>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. |

✓ Doctoral students had access to specialised laboratories, high-performance computing and software, the UPT library and electronic databases, the Virtual Campus, accommodation, counselling and administrative services. Access was granted according to individual research needs and extended through supervisors' laboratories and research projects. Institutional accessibility measures covered students with disabilities. The range and relevance of the resources supported doctoral learning and research in the evaluated domain (IER, pp. 28–30).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

## Criterion B.5. Learning outcomes

| Standard S.B.5.1. Definition and evaluation<br>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. |

✓ UPT defined learning outcomes at EQF level 8 at doctoral-domain and programme level in terms of knowledge, skills, responsibility and autonomy. The approved individual PPUA plans specified each student's subjects, credits, teaching staff and workload. However, the PPUA relied largely on master's-level subject sheets. Although these syllabi stated competences, objectives, content, assessment methods and minimum performance standards, they did not consistently formulate subject-level learning outcomes appropriate to doctoral study and EQF level 8. The expected doctoral-level learning results were therefore not described with sufficient consistency in the advanced training component (IER, pp. 22–25, 30–31; curricula, subject sheets and individual PPUA plans).

✓ Recommendation: For subjects included in the PPUA, progressively supplement the existing subject sheets with doctoral-level learning outcomes aligned with EQF level 8 and link those outcomes to course content.

**The indicator is partially fulfilled.**

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

✓ Achievement was assessed through PPUA examinations, the scientific research project, three research reports, annual progress evaluation and the public defence of the thesis. The specialised master's and tutorial subjects were assessed through completed examination records, while the applicable master's subject sheets specified assessment methods, weights and minimum performance standards. The Academic Ethics and Integrity course was assessed by interactive oral examination before a two-member committee, based on the doctoral research project, a scientific paper, oral presentation and questions. Each examiner awarded a grade; the records stated the final numerical grade and qualification on the scale Fail 1–4.99, Sufficient 5–6.99, Good 7–8.49 and

Very Good 8.50–10, with 5 as the minimum passing grade. The syllabus described the assessment method but did not itself state this scale and pass threshold or map particular outcomes to assessment tasks. Annex 2, annual-evaluation and research-programme records documented achievement throughout the programme and at completion (IER, pp. 31–32; PPUA plans and examination records, annual-evaluation and research-programme records).

✓ Recommendation: Once the doctoral-level learning outcomes are stated, identify which assessment components verify each outcome and include the existing grading scale and minimum passing requirement in the relevant PPUA documentation.

**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<br>The admission procedures and principles ensure access to higher education. | |
|---|---|
| Indicator I.P.B.7.1.1 | The organisational component applies the admission procedures. |

✓ The annual doctoral admission procedure, places, themes, supervisors, timetable, eligibility conditions and examination arrangements were approved and published. Applications were submitted through the institutional platform and assessed by formally appointed committees using the announced criteria. The admission information and records demonstrated consistent application of the institutional procedure (IER, pp. 32–33).

**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. |
|---|---|

✓ Admission rules applied common, published criteria and equal-opportunity provisions. The University provided information, counselling, fee and scholarship arrangements and reasonable accommodation for candidates with disabilities or special educational needs. The process contained mechanisms to prevent discrimination and to support access for candidates at social or educational risk (IER, pp. 33–34).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

| Standard S.B.7.2. Academic journey of students<br>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. |

✓ Doctoral contracts and addenda, the IOSUD regulation and the approved individual plans governed rights, duties, supervision, progress assessment, interruption, extension, transfer and completion. Progress was documented through PPUA results, the research project, research reports and annual monitoring. The files showed that the domain applied these rules throughout the doctoral journey (IER, pp. 34–36).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

### Criterion B.8. Internationalisation process

| Standard S.B.8.1. Internationalisation<br>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. |

✓ The domain participated in international projects and academic networks, financed doctoral presentations abroad, involved foreign specialists in thesis assessment and provided Erasmus opportunities. Records for 2022–2025 documented conference, symposium, seminar and workshop participation. One Computers and Information Technology doctoral student, Andrei-Ionuț Mohuț, completed a seven-day Erasmus+ Blended Intensive Programme at the University of Warsaw in 2024–2025. No active international cotutelle and no longer-term research placement were documented for the domain. The evidence nevertheless demonstrated recurrent international cooperation and mobility appropriate to the indicator (IER, p. 36; mobility and cotutelle records).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

### Criterion B.9. Scientific research results

| Standard S.B.9.1 Scientific research in the education process<br>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. |

✓ Doctoral learning was organised around scientific investigation: each student developed a research project, presented periodic research reports, disseminated results and incorporated original findings into the thesis. Tutorial subjects were selected in direct relation to thesis topics, and supervisors' projects and laboratories provided the research environment. The programme therefore used research processes and results as the principal means of attaining its intended advanced competences (IER, pp. 36–37).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

| Standard S.B.9.2. Scientific research pertaining to the objectives of the study programme<br>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. |

✓ The domain documented 130 publications produced by 21 graduates whose theses were defended in 2021–2025, an average of 6.2 outputs per graduate, together with indexed articles, conference papers, awards and project results. Twenty-one theses were defended during the period and none was rejected. The publication and reviewer records demonstrated national and international visibility and appropriate scientific use of the doctoral research results (IER, pp. 9, 30, 37–38).

**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<br>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 |

✓ UPT applied institution-wide quality assurance, programme-monitoring, ethics, teaching-evaluation and doctoral-progress procedures. The domain used surveys, annual reports, council review, similarity checks and external evaluation follow-up. Revisions of doctoral regulations and the documented response to the 2021 recommendations showed that these procedures produced identifiable improvements in organisation, integrity safeguards and stakeholder consultation (IER, pp. 38–39).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

| Standard S.C.1.2. Stakeholder engagement<br>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. |

✓ Doctoral students and supervisors were represented in governance structures and contributed through surveys and council discussions. Graduates, employers, research partners and external members of guidance and academic integrity committees provided additional input on programme relevance and research practice. The records showed that feedback was considered in quality procedures and in the adjustment of institutional rules and support measures (IER, pp. 39–40).

**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<br>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. |

✓ The University Ethics Commission operated under a Senate-approved regulation and published its composition, procedures and activity information. It handled cases independently within the legal framework and was supported by ethics education, similarity screening and thesis-integrity procedures. UPT had also adopted and published Senate-approved recommendations on the responsible use of AI tools, expressly covering doctoral theses, disclosure and citation, critical verification, confidential and personal data, and assessment. The evidence did not indicate

interference by other university structures or persons in the Commission's decisions (IER, pp. 40–41; Senate Decision no. 85/25.05.2023).

**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<br>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. |

✓ The University and Doctoral School periodically monitored doctoral regulations, student progress, research outputs, satisfaction, staffing and completion. Internal evaluation, annual reporting, council decisions and the 2025 progress evaluation documented systematic review and corrective action. The 2025 progress report recorded all 2021 recommendations as implemented except the recommendation concerning the information system; that improvement need was separately addressed under C.5.1.1 (IER, pp. 41–42; 2025 progress evaluation report).

**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. |
|---|---|

✓ Doctoral students and supervisors participated in CSUD and Doctoral School governance, while employers, graduates, research partners and external specialists contributed through consultations, project cooperation and guidance committees. Their participation supplied academic and professional perspectives to the monitoring and review processes. Employer consultations, research partnerships and industry-linked doctoral activity reflected close links with Timişoara's active economic environment. The available minutes, committee compositions and consultation evidence substantiated stakeholder involvement (IER, p. 42).

**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<br>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. |

✓ UPT had a Senate-approved procedure for student evaluation of teaching twice in each academic year. The supplied 2024–2025 first-semester statistical report recorded 1,239 questionnaires and 211 evaluated subjects for the Faculty of Automation and Computers, but did not provide a doctoral-domain analysis of results, conclusions or follow-up actions. A separate PPUA satisfaction survey was distributed in December 2023 to 22 doctoral students and received four responses (18.18%); the ratings were mainly positive and included a suggestion concerning doctoral-student access to the student.upt.ro platform. UPT reported review by the relevant doctoral governance directors, but the evidence did not demonstrate a dated analysis of the biannual teacher-evaluation results for the Computers and Information Technology doctoral domain (IER, pp. 42–43; teaching-evaluation report; survey invitation, questionnaires and satisfaction report).

✓ Recommendation: Add a short, dated Computers and Information Technology doctoral-domain annex to the existing biannual teaching-evaluation report, summarising participation, results, review and any follow-up actions.

**The indicator is partially fulfilled.**

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

| Standard S.C.5.1. Databases<br>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. |

✓ UPT systematically collected and analysed doctoral data through admission, student-record, Virtual Campus, research-reporting and quality-assurance systems and used them in internal reports. The best-supported status-disaggregated estimate was 73 students in the standard four-year study period and 98 doctoral students in total at the IER reference date; the remainder comprised nine students in extension and 16 under Law no. 49/2013. The infrastructure presentation dated 11 February 2026 and the current published list referred to 101 and 102 total students, respectively, at later reference dates. These differences were consistent with a dynamic register, although reference dates and status scopes were not stated uniformly across the sources. Data collection and analysis were operational (IER, pp. 43–44; supervisor centraliser; infrastructure presentation; published 2025–2026 list).

**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<br>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. |

✓ UPT published doctoral regulations, admission information, student forms, annual evaluation criteria and results, supervisors and research themes, doctoral-student lists and thesis-defence announcements. The central UPT doctoral page, the Faculty of Automation and Computers page and the Computers and Information Technology doctoral page were not fully synchronised in their presentation of the current programme structure and supervisory roster. The relevant PPUA subjects and syllabi, evaluation forms and results were available online but remained distributed across several institutional pages. Public access was sufficient for the indicator, although incomplete synchronisation and dispersed organisation reduced findability and clarity (IER, p. 44; current UPT, faculty and doctoral-domain pages; university clarification).

✓ Recommendation: Synchronise the central UPT, faculty and Computers and Information Technology doctoral pages and maintain a clearly signposted doctoral-domain entry point linking the current programme structure, supervisory roster, PPUA subjects and syllabi, evaluation forms and published results.

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

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

✓ The Senate, Administration Council, CSUD and Doctoral School used defined competences and recorded decisions in minutes, regulations and published resolutions. Governance membership, rules and relevant decisions were accessible through institutional pages, and the approvals were traceable to the competent body. These arrangements supported transparent decision-making for the evaluated domain (IER, p. 45).

**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<br>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. |

✓ The Computers and Information Technology domain underwent the 2021 periodic external evaluation, submitted a progress report assessed in 2025 and prepared the current internal evaluation and evidence set for the 2026 maintaining-accreditation procedure. The University gave the panel access to the requested documents and organised the on-site programme with the relevant stakeholders. The external evaluation obligations were therefore observed (IER, p. 45).

**The indicator is fulfilled.**

## IV. SWOT Analysis

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Strengths**:<br>• coherent multi-level doctoral governance and updated institutional regulations;<br>• 21 affiliated supervisors, 17 active at the IER reference date, covering the principal research directions in Computers and Information Technology, including nine with habilitation certificates;<br>• a clear current four-year, 240-ECTS individual pathway linking advanced training and doctoral research;<br>• doctoral-domain and programme-level learning outcomes defined at EQF level 8;<br>• documented progression through PPUA examinations, a research project, three research reports, annual evaluation and thesis defence;<br>• strong research performance: 21 theses defended in 2021–2025, none rejected during national validation, and 130 publications documented for the graduates;<br>• five domain research laboratories, extensive computing and data-centre infrastructure, digital services and scientific- | INTERNAL FACTORS | **Weaknesses**:<br>• the PPUA relied largely on master's-level syllabi that did not consistently state learning outcomes appropriate to doctoral study and EQF level 8;<br>• the Academic Ethics and Integrity syllabus did not state the existing grading scale, pass threshold or explicit outcome-to-assessment links;<br>• limited doctoral-domain reporting of biannual teaching-evaluation results and follow-up actions;<br>• a 2023 PPUA satisfaction exercise had four responses from 22 invitees and no documented formal action plan;<br>• official doctoral information was distributed across central UPT, faculty and doctoral-domain pages that were not fully synchronised;<br>• no active cotutelle in the Computers and Information Technology domain and only one seven-day Erasmus+ Blended Intensive Programme mobility, with no longer-term research placement |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| information resources;<br>• strong university-industry links within Timișoara's active industrial and technology ecosystem;<br>• active research projects, international dissemination, foreign thesis reviewers and institutional ethics and responsible-AI safeguards. | | documented; |
| SWOT analysis | | |
| **Opportunities**:<br>• use the 2025 ARACIS standards to supplement PPUA documentation with doctoral-level learning outcomes aligned with EQF level 8 and link them to content and assessment;<br>• convert the existing teaching-evaluation process into a short, dated doctoral-domain results and actions report;<br>• synchronise the central UPT, faculty and Computers and Information Technology doctoral pages and use the existing doctoral-domain page as the single entry point for current curricula, syllabi, evaluation records, supervisors and students;<br>• expand research placements and cotutelle arrangements through Erasmus+, bilateral agreements and existing international project networks;<br>• capitalise on local companies' interest in professionally oriented doctorates and industry-supported projects within Timișoara's technology and innovation ecosystem;<br>• use the laboratories, computing infrastructure and major projects to attract international candidates, researchers and competitive funding.<br>• capitalise on UPT's geographical position to access cross-border research and doctoral-training funding;<br>• align Article 14 of the IOSUD-UPT regulation with Law no. 133/2026, publish the transitional supervision maximum and use it to support balanced allocation and succession planning. | EXTERNAL FACTORS | **Threats**:<br>• increasing national and international competition for strong doctoral candidates and qualified supervisors;<br>• rapid technological change and the continuing cost of renewing advanced computing, laboratory and cybersecurity infrastructure;<br>• cybersecurity, confidentiality and personal-data risks associated with increasingly integrated digital and AI-supported workflows;<br>• frequent regulatory and quality-assurance changes may challenge the timely updating of contracts, curricula, procedures and public information. |

## 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** | |
| 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. | **F** | |
| 4. | I.P.A.2.2.1 The movable and immovable assets are properly maintained to ensure optimal conditions for studying, living and research, as well as for work. | **F** | |
| 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** | Clarify in university-level documents the procedure and rules for determining and publishing doctoral-supervision loads during the transitional period. |
| 6. | I.P.A.3.1.2 The HEI ensures professional and personal development for its staff. | **F** | |
| 7. | I.P.A.3.2.1 Recruitment procedures comply with the provisions of the law, and are established and carried out transparently. | **F** | |
| 8. | I.P.A.4.1.1 The organisational component uses IT tools in its own procedures, to improve access and provide good quality services for the members of its own community and the indirect beneficiaries of education. | **F** | |
| DOMAIN B. Educational efficacy | | | |
| 9. | I.P.B.1.1.1 The study programme is developed and structured according to the expected | **F** | |

| No. | Performance Indicator | Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF) | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 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. | | |
| 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. | **F** | |
| 13. | I.P.B.3.2.1 The organisational component provides fair opportunities for students, in line with their potential and aspirations, taking into account the diversity of learning styles and abilities. | **F** | |
| 14. | I.P.B.4.1.1 The organisational component provides students, including those with special educational needs/disabilities, with access to resources and services designed to support the learning process, adequate for the individual learning needs, the study domain, the study cycle, and the form of organisation of the study programme. | **F** | |
| 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. | **PF** | For subjects included in the PPUA, progressively supplement the existing subject sheets with doctoral-level learning outcomes aligned with EQF level 8 and link those outcomes to course content. |
| 16. | I.P.B.5.1.2 Achievement of the learning outcomes is checked in ongoing examinations and study completion exams. | **F** | Once the doctoral-level learning outcomes are stated, identify which assessment components verify each outcome and include the existing grading scale and minimum passing requirement in the relevant PPUA documentation. |
| 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 | **F** | |

| No. | Performance Indicator | Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF) | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|
| | establishing of support measures to ensure access of vulnerable groups at social and educational risk, including candidates with special educational needs and/or disabilities. | | |
| 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. | **F** | |
| 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** | |
| 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** | |
| | 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** | |
| 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** | |
| 25. | I.P.C.2.2.2. The academic ethics commission operates based on the regulation approved by the University Senate, and performs actions that are compliant with the law, independently from any other structure or person in the higher education institution. | **F** | |
| 26. | I.P.C.3.1.1 The organisational component consistently applies the procedures, and proves their impact on quality assurance. | **F** | |
| 27. | I.P.C.3.1.2 Members of its own community and other stakeholders are involved in the procedure implementation process. | **F** | |
| 28. | I.P.C.4.1.1 The organisational component analyses the results of the students' biannual evaluation of teachers. | **PF** | Add a short, dated Computers and Information Technology doctoral-domain annex to the existing biannual teaching-evaluation report, summarising participation, results, review and any follow-up actions. |
| 29. | I.P.C.5.1.1 The organisational component systematically collects and analyses data | **F** | |

| No. | Performance Indicator | Extent to which it was fulfilled (F/PF/UF) | Recommendations |
|---|---|---|---|
| | required for the internal quality assurance process. | | |
| 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** | Synchronise the central UPT, faculty and Computers and Information Technology doctoral pages and maintain a clearly signposted doctoral-domain entry point linking the current programme structure, supervisory roster, PPUA subjects and syllabi, evaluation forms and published results. |
| 31. | I.P.C.6.1.2 The organisational component ensures transparent decision-making processes. | **F** | |
| 32. | I.P.C.8.1.1 The organisational component carries out the procedures pertaining to the external quality evaluation process, aiming to organise the evaluated study programme as provided by the law. | **F** | |

Summary Table of Performance Indicators – Degree of Fulfillment

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

*The recommendations focused on the limited number of issues that materially affected consistency, transparency or regulatory alignment.*
*Thirty-two performance indicators were evaluated: 30 were fulfilled, two were partially fulfilled and none was unfulfilled.*

## VI. Conclusions

*The evaluation identified a mature doctoral domain with adequate governance, qualified supervisors, substantial research activity, relevant infrastructure and a coherent current four-year, 240-ECTS research pathway. The two partially fulfilled indicators concerned (i) reliance on predominantly master's-level PPUA syllabi that did not consistently state learning outcomes appropriate to doctoral study and EQF level 8, and (ii) the absence of a documented doctoral-domain analysis of biannual teacher-evaluation results. Improvement needs also remained in grading documentation and the synchronisation and organisation of domain-specific public information; these were addressed through proportionate recommendations.*

***The panel assessed 30 indicators as fulfilled, two as partially fulfilled and none as unfulfilled. The two partial findings represented 6.3% of all indicators and were in Domains B and C; the thresholds for a finding that the standards were not fulfilled were therefore not reached. The evidence supported continuation of the accredited status, accompanied by monitored implementation of the recommendations.***

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

a) accreditation* (AC)/maintaining accreditation (MAC);
b) conditional maintaining of the provisional authorisation to operate* (CMPA)/conditional maintaining of accreditation (CMAC);
c) non-accreditation* (NAC)/withdrawal of the accreditation (WAC).

**The evaluation panel adopted the decision: maintaining accreditation (MAC).**

## VII. Annexes

*Annex 1 - List of documents consulted in addition to the Internal Evaluation Report (IER)*

1. IOSUD-UPT Regulation on the organisation and conduct of doctoral studies, 2024 edition.
2. Framework Regulation on doctoral studies, approved by Order of the Minister of Education no. 3020/2024.
3. Regulation on the organisation and conduct of admission to doctoral studies for the 2025 session.
4. IOSUD-UPT procedure for the analysis and approval of doctoral research topics, together with the decisions approving the topics for 2021-2025.
5. Doctoral study contract templates and the record of contracts used for doctoral students in the domain.
6. Central record of doctoral supervisors and doctoral students in the Computers and Information Technology domain.
7. Central record concerning doctoral supervisors' fulfilment of the applicable CNATDCU minimum standards.
8. Record of doctoral students enrolled in the domain during 2021-2025.
9. List of subjects included in the Advanced University Training Programme (PPUA).
10. Subject sheet for Academic Ethics and Integrity in Doctoral Scientific Research, academic year 2024-2025.
11. Curricula of relevant master's programmes and subject sheets used to define individual PPUA pathways.

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

12. Individual Advanced University Training Programme plan - Annex 1.
13. Record of results obtained in the PPUA - Annex 2.
14. Individual scientific research programme - Annex 3.
15. Documentation for doctoral research reports - Annex 4.
16. Criteria for the annual evaluation of doctoral students and the doctoral-activity reporting template.
17. Template minutes for the evaluation of activity within the scientific research programme.
18. Record of doctoral theses defended during 2021-2025.
19. List of doctoral thesis titles and record of defended theses, including the reviewers serving on doctoral committees.
20. List of scientific publications produced by doctoral students and graduates during 2021-2025.
21. Central record of the scientific visibility of doctoral supervisors and of the domain.
22. Presentation of the research infrastructure available to the Computers and Information Technology domain.
23. Record of doctoral guidance committees for 2021-2025.
24. Central record of conference participation, mobility, publication awards and publications.
25. Report on doctoral-student satisfaction with the Advanced University Training Programme.
26. Similarity reports for a sample of doctoral theses.
27. Procedure for student evaluation of teaching and the published teaching-evaluation report for the first semester of academic year 2024-2025.
28. Regulation on the organisation and operation of the University Ethics Commission and the UPT Code of Ethics and University Deontology.
29. IOSUD-UPT procedure for defining learning outcomes at level 8 of the European Qualifications Framework.
30. ARACIS Guide for the evaluation of doctoral study domains and the applicable standards and indicators.
31. External evaluation report for the Computers and Information Technology domain, 2021.
32. Progress report on the implementation of the recommendations from the previous external evaluation, evaluated in 2025.

*Annex 2 - On-site visit schedule, 31 August-1 September 2026.*

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

Instituția de învățământ superior/Organizația furnizoare de educație/ Higher Education Institution / Education Provider Organization: Universitatea Politehnica Timişoara / Politehnica University Timişoara
Şcoala doctorală/ Doctoral School: Şcoala Doctorală de studii inginereşti IOSUD-UPT / Doctoral School of Engineering Studies of IOSUD-UPT
Domeniul de doctorat/ Doctoral Domain: Calculatoare şi Tehnologia Informației / Computers and Information Technology
Obiectivul evaluării externe/ The objective of the external evaluation: *(autorizare de funcționare provizorie/acreditare/menținerea acreditării domeniului de doctorat) Menținerea acreditării domeniului de doctorat*
Perioada vizitei de evaluare/ The evaluation period: 31.08-01.09.2026

Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/Evaluation panel:

| Nr./No. | Numele şi prenumele/ Last Name and First Name | Calitatea/Team role |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Prof.dr.ing. Rughiniș Răzvan | Membru - Cadru didactic RNE |
| 2. | Prof. dr. Kiss Gábor | Membru - Evaluator internațional RNE-I |
| 3. | Mr. Bogdan Marius Negrea | Membru - Student doctorand RNE-S |

Reprezentantul IÎS/OFE:

| Nr./No. | Numele şi prenumele/Last Name and First Name | Calitatea/Team role |
|---|---|---|
| *1.* | Prof.dr.ing. Dorin Lelea | Persoană de contact/Contact person |
| | | |
| | | |

| Intervalul orar/ *Hour* | Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities* | Participanţi/ *Participants* | Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Luni / Monday, 31.08.2026 | | | |
| 08:30-09:00 | 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:**<br>UPT Electro Building, room A110 |
| 09:00-09:50 | 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*<br>- Reprezentanţi ai conducerii componentei organizatorice aferente domeniului de studii de doctorat evaluat/ *Representatives of the management of the organisational component*<br>- Persoana de contact/ *Contact person* | Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location:**<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:<br>Rector UPT<br>Representatives of the management of the organisational component<br><br>Prof.dr.ing. Dorin Lelea |
| 10:00-10:50 | 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*<br>- Echipa care a realizat REI/ *Team that has drafted the IER* | Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location:**<br>UPT Electro Building, room A110<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ List of participants attending the meeting:<br>Members of the team that drafted the IER<br><br>Prof.dr.ing. Dorin Lelea |

| Intervalul orar/ *Hour* | Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities* | Participanţi/ *Participants* | Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 10:50-11:00 | Pauză/ *Break* | | |
| 11:00-11:50 | Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi 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*<br>- Reprezentanţi ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calităţii/ *Representatives of quality assurance organisational structures* | Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location:**<br>UPT Electro Building, room A110<br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:<br>- ... |
| 12:00-12:50 | 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*<br>- Cadre didactice conducători de doctorat/ *Teaching staff who are PhD supervisors* | Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location:**<br>UPT Electro Building, room A110<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:<br>PhD supervisors in Computers and Information Technology |
| 13:00-14:00 | Pauză de prânz/ *Lunch* | | |
| 14:00-15:50 | Vizitarea bazei materiale/ *Visiting the material resources* | - Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*<br>- Reprezentanţi ai instituţiei sau Academiei Române, după caz/ *Representatives of the HEI or the Romanian Academy, as applicable* | Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location:**<br>UPT Electro Building, room A110<br>R&D Labs of the CTI Department<br>UPT and DCTI Datacenters<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**: |

| Intervalul orar/ *Hour* | Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities* | Participanți/ *Participants* | Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants* |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Representatives responsible for material resources and IT infrastructure<br><br>Representatives of the R&D laboratories |
| 16:00-16:50 | Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **absolvenți**[*],[†] ai DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with alumni[‡] of the DSUD* | - Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*<br>- Absolvenți ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ *Graduates* | Sala/Locația/ **Room/Location:**<br>UPT Electro Building, room A110<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**::<br>Alumni of CTI PhD programs |
| 17:00-17:50 | 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*<br>- Angajatori/ *Employers* | Sala/Locația/ **Room/Location:**<br>UPT Electro Building, room A110<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:<br>Representatives of companies and employers in the CTI field. |

[*] Se va evita invitarea absolvenților care sunt angajați ai IÎS sau ai OFE, după caz.
[†] Nu este obligatorie în cazul autorizării domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat
[‡] Avoid inviting alumni who are also staff of the HEI or members of the Romanian Academy, as applicable.
[§] 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* |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| Marţi / Tuesday, 01.09.2026 | | | |
| 8:00 - 8:30 | **Întâlnirea tehnică** a comisiei de experți evaluatori (Activitate în colaborare pentru clarificarea aspectelor prezentate în REI)/ *Technical meeting of the expert evaluation panel (Collaborative activity for clarifying the aspects presented in the Internal Evaluation Report - IER)* | - Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* | Sala/Locația/ **Room/Location:** UPT Electro Building, room A110 |
| 8:30 - 9:20 | Întâlnirea comisiei de experți în evaluarea externă a calității cu **studenţi** * **doctoranzi** din cadrul DSUD/ *Meeting of the external quality evaluation experts' panel with doctoral students of the DSUD* | - Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*<br>- Studenți doctoranzi/ *Doctoral students* | Sala/Locația/ **Room/Location:** UPT Electro Building, room A110<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:<br>PhD students in the CTI field |
| 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*<br>- Responsabilii centrelor/laboratoarelor de cercetare/ *Staff in charge with research centres/laboratories* | Sala/Locația/ **Room/Location:** UPT Electro Building, room A110<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:: |

* Nu este obligatorie în cazul autorizării domeniilor de studii universitare de doctorat/ It is not mandatory in the case of authorization of doctoral university study domain.

| Intervalul orar/ *Hour* | Activităţi de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities* | Participanţi/ *Participants* | Locaţie/*Location* /Listă participanţi/*List of Participants* |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Representatives of the R&D laboratories |
| 10:30 - 11:20 | 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*<br>- Membri ai Comisiei de etică universitară/ *Members of the University Ethics Committee* | Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location:**<br>UPT Electro Building, room A110<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ **List of participants attending the meeting**:<br>- Members of the University Ethics Committee |
| 11:30-12:20 | Întâlnirea comisiei de experţi în evaluarea externă a calităţii 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* | - Comisia de experţi evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members*<br>- Reprezentanţi ai conducerii / reprezentanţi ai CEAC / reprezentanţi ai structurilor organizatorice în domeniul asigurării calităţii/ *Representatives of the management / representatives of the CEAC / representatives of the quality assurance organisational structures* | Sala/Locaţia/ **Room/Location:**<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ List of participants attending the meeting:<br>Reprezentant DAC / DAC representative |

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

| Intervalul orar/ *Hour* | Activități de evaluare/ *Evaluation activities* | Participanți/ *Participants* | Locație/*Location* /Listă participanți/*List of Participants* |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *of the CEAC / representatives of quality assurance organisational structures* | - Persoana de contact/ *Contact person* | Reprezentant CEAC / CEAC representative |
| 12:30-13:00 | Finalizarea activităților de evaluare/ *Completion of evaluation activities* | - Comisia de experți evaluatori ai ARACIS/ *Panel members* | Sala/Locația/ **Room/Location:** A110 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 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*<br>- Reprezentanți ai conducerii și ai domeniului de studii evaluat/ *Representatives of the management*<br>- Persoana de contact/ *Contact person* | Sala/Locația/ **Room/Location:** UPT Electro Building, room A110<br><br>Lista persoanelor care vor participa la întâlnire/ List of participants attending the meeting:<br>Representatives of the management of the organisational component<br><br>Prof.dr.ing. Dorin Lelea |
| 13:30-14:20 | Pauză de prânz/ ***Lunch*** | | |

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. ing. RUGHINIŞ Răzvan Victor | |
| Prof. dr. ing. LELEA Dorin | |