Institutional Evaluation Programme

Performance in Research, Performance in Teaching – Quality, Diversity, and Innovation in Romanian Universities Project

University of Arts George Enescu Iaşi

EVALUATION REPORT

March 2013

Team:
Philippe Rousseau, Chair
John Butler
Kotryna Peilakauskaite
Terhi Nokkala, Team
Coordinator

Table of contents

1.   Introduction

This report is the result of the evaluation of University of Arts George Enescu Iaşi. The evaluation took place in 2012-2013 in the framework of the project "Performance in Research, Performance in Teaching – Quality, Diversity, and Innovation in Romanian Universities", which aims at strengthening core elements of Romanian universities, such as their autonomy and administrative competences, by improving their quality assurance and management proficiency.

The evaluations are taking place within the context of major reforms in the Romanian higher education system, and specifically in accordance with the provisions of the 2011 Law on Education and the various related normative acts.

While the institutional evaluations are taking place in the context of an overall reform, each university is assessed by an independent IEP team, using the IEP methodology described below.

1.1.   The Institutional Evaluation Programme

The Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) is an independent membership service of the European University Association (EUA) that offers evaluations to support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture. The IEP is a full member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and is listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR).

The distinctive features of the Institutional Evaluation Programme are:
- A strong emphasis on the self-evaluation phase
- A European perspective
- A peer-review approach
- A support to improvement

The focus of the IEP is the institution as a whole and not the individual study programmes or units. It focuses upon:
- decision-making processes and institutional structures and effectiveness of strategic management;
- relevance of internal quality processes and the degree to which their outcomes are used in decision-making and strategic management as well as perceived gaps in these internal mechanisms.

The evaluation is guided by four key questions, which are based on a "fitness for (and of) purpose" approach:
- What is the institution trying to do?
- How is the institution trying to do it?
- How does it know it works?
- How does the institution change in order to improve?

1.2. University of Arts George Enescu Iaşi's profile

The operational environment of higher education in Romania has experienced many changes in the recent years. The new education law, which came into force in 2011, granted universities more autonomy, whilst renewing the governance and organisational structures of universities. The leadership of all Romanian universities has changed since the new law. Additionally, all Romanian universities have been grouped into three categories as 1) advanced research and teaching-based universities, 2) teaching and scientific research-based universities or teaching and art-based universities and 3) teaching-based universities. All study programmes have been also evaluated and assigned into categories from A to E based on their resources and performance. In this categorisation of Romanian universities, The University of Arts George Enescu (UAGE) belongs to the second group – research, teaching and artistic creation universities. Two of its fields of study have received rating A, and one a rating B.

The University of Arts George Enescu (UAGE) is the only arts university in Romania that brings together music, drama and visual arts. UAGE traces its history back to the establishment of schools of music and arts in the 1860s. In its current form as a comprehensive arts university, UAGE has existed since the 1990s. Internally, the university has undergone several structural changes. The latest of these took place only in 2012, when the university reorganised its academic units into three faculties – the faculty of performance, composition and theoretical musical studies, the faculty of acting and the faculty of visual arts and design – as well as a series of pedagogical training and service units in the Pedagogical Institute. The deans of two of the new faculties were only selected in autumn 2012. The Rector, Atena Elena Simionescu, has been in her post since spring 2012.

The university is located in Iaşi, the second largest city in Romania, in the Moldova region in the north-eastern part of the country. The location gives a specific flair to this large student city, both to its cultural life as well as to the university, which considers the cooperation with institutes in Moldova an important strategic direction. The region has distinctive cultural features, as well as shared features with the rest of the country and, moreover, is part of a distinct transborder region also including Republic of Moldova and southern Ukraine.

The university's mission, as defined in the Self-Evaluation Report, is as follows:

"The mission of the University of Arts "George Enescu" Iaşi, a university with lifelong tradition and prestige among vocational institutions, is to mould and cultivate talent, character and personalities, to train specialists (artists or theorists) able to offer people genuine culture, and to maintain a rich artistic and research activity that enables the progress of Romanian art and culture adapted to the international social and cultural context."

The university operates in a challenging economic and political environment. Whilst the educational law of 2011 mandates university autonomy, it also describes the governance structures for the university and the financial regulations and numerous national quality assurance regulations that constrain the university scope for manoeuvre. The legislation has also continuously been changed and adapted in recent years. This, together with the financial and economic crisis, the resulting budget cuts imposed on the higher education sector in the recent past and the fluctuating political situation make the operational environment of the

university extremely volatile. The future demographic challenges faced by Romania as well as the horizon of higher education changing from national to international, mandate the university to rethink its strategy and operations.

1.3. The evaluation process

The self-evaluation process was undertaken by a Self-Evaluation Group (SEG) established by the university. The SEG comprised the following people representing the faculties and units of the university:

- Mr. Doru Albu, Professor PhD, Vice-Rector for Teaching and Quality in Education – Chairperson of SEG;
- Mr. Aurelian Bălăiță, Assistant Professor PhD – Vice-Rector for Research;
- Mr. Florin Grigoraş, Assistant Professor PhD – Vice-Rector for International relations, Academic Image and Student affairs;
- Ms. Eugenia Maria Paşca, Assistant Professor PhD – Director of the Institute for Counselling and Training in Psychology and Pedagogy (CTPP);
- Ms. Cornelia Brustureanu, Lecturer PhD – Vice-Dean for Teaching, the Faculty of Visual Arts and Design (FVAD);
- Mr. Ion Urdeş, Lecturer PhD – representative of the Faculty of Music Performance, Composition and Theoretical Musical Studies (FMPCTMS);
- Mrs. Raluca Bujoreanu – Huţanu, Assistant Professor PhD – Dean of the Faculty of Acting (FT);
- Mr. Ciprian Ion, Assistant professor PhD – Head of Department, FMPCTMS

The self-evaluation report of UAGE, together with the appendices, was sent to the evaluation team on 7 November 2012. The visits of the evaluation team to Iaşi took place from 5 to 6 December 2012 and from 27 February to 1 March 2013, respectively. In between the visits the University of Arts George Enescu Iaşi provided the evaluation team with some additional documentation.

The evaluation team (hereinafter named the team) consisted of:

- Prof. Philippe Rousseau, Former Rector, University Charles de Gaulle - Lille 3, France, team chair
- Prof. John Butler, Professor of Art, Birmingham City University, United Kingdom
- Kotryna Peilakauskaite, Student, Vilnius University, Lithuania
- Dr Terhi Nokkala, Research Fellow, University of Jyväskylä, Finland, team coordinator

The team would like to offer the following observations concerning the self-evaluation process and report.

- There was no student representative in the self-evaluation group, which the IEP team considered somewhat puzzling. The students were, however, at least in some departments, consulted in a more informal manner.

- The staff of the various departments of the institution were asked to provide data on their activities and research and artistic production for the purposes of the self-evaluation report.

- Some had also engaged in discussions at departmental level regarding the content of the self-evaluation report.

- The self-evaluation report had been widely circulated amongst the university community.

The self-evaluation report itself is a largely descriptive document, which offers a lot of information about the intentions of the university. It would have benefitted, however, from a more critical self-evaluation of the actual situation and from additional data to substantiate statements made in the report.

The impression of the team is that because the university has gone through several evaluations of a different nature over the recent past, the IEP exercise has been somewhat new for the university, and in some occasions, its specific character had not at first been fully understood. As a result, the potential of the self-evaluation process has partially been obscured by a more accountability-driven approach. However, the benefit of the previous evaluations has been that the university has had to develop an internal information system for collecting the output data, which is also used for preparing the next strategic plan of the university.

This report is based on knowledge, which the review team gained during two visits to the university and from written materials: the self-evaluation report and some additional materials prepared by the university on request. However, there are some limitations in this form of assessment. The report of the review team is dependent on what they have been told and have seen during the visits. In some cases they heard conflicting statements reflecting the uneven perception in various parts of the institution of a fast-changing situation.

The team would like to thank the Rector Simionescu, her team, the self-evaluation group and the entire university community for the cordial reception and candid and constructive discussions throughout the entire evaluation process. Also the logistical support provided by the UEFISCDI liaisons Alexandra Roman and Virgil Brumaru, as well as help of the interpreter Lucia Petrescu was invaluable for the work of the IEP team.

2.   Governance and institutional decision-making

2.1 Norms, values, mission, goals: What is the institution trying to do?

According to the self-evaluation report, the university wants to make full use of the autonomy granted to it by the legislation of Romania to establish and fulfil its mission, described above. To do this, the university has put in place an institutional strategy, organisational structures and governing bodies, as well as procedures for preparing budgets and quality assurance.

2.2 Governance or activities: How is the institution trying to do it?

Institutional governance

The institutional governance and management of UAGE comprises a legislative, executive and administrative branch.

In the legislative branch, the highest decision-making body of the university is the Senate, which comprises the elected representatives of departments as well as student representatives from each of the faculties (students hold 25% of the seats). The Senate also has specific committees, which are responsible for the further development of the university policies in the areas of quality, research and internationalisation.

Management of the university is the task of the executive branch, headed by the rector and Administrative Council, comprising the three vice-rectors, the deans, the director of the pedagogical institute and the head of administration. The Administrative Council also has student representation. Additionally, the university has specific commissions for quality, ethics, research and international relations, to develop and supervise the implementation of university policies at the institutional level.

At faculty level, the highest decision-making bodies are the Faculty Councils, comprising the deans, vice-deans, heads of department, elected representatives of departments and representatives of students, who hold 25% of the seats. At the departmental level there are Teachers Councils, but students are not formally represented in the departmental level administration. Faculties have great autonomy, within the guidelines and regulations of the ministry, to develop their strategy, research and artistic activities and educational processes.

UAGE uses a bottom-up process for preparing its strategy: the departments and faculties suggest their own priorities for the Strategic Plan, the Administrative Council prepares the plan and the Senate accepts and adopts it. The rector and her team are currently working on a new strategy for 2013-2017. An annual operational plan is prepared for the central level and for each of the faculties, focusing on the annual routines but also including some new initiatives.

As part of its Strategic Plan, the university reorganised its faculty structure in 2012, regrouping within a single faculty of performance, composition and theoretical musical studies all the musical departments and turning the old department of acting into a new faculty of acting.

Funding and resources

The trend of university funding has been falling in the past years and since 2008 the university's disposable income has decreased by almost 30%, largely due to the declining public funding. The university receives the majority of its funding from the Ministry, as a lump sum (basic and additional funding) based on the number of students and cost-coefficients per courses. The university allocates to the faculties their budget on the same basis, with specific allocations for salaries, operational costs etc. in accordance with the annual performance contract signed by the university and the Ministry. The university thus has a limited autonomy in making decisions concerning the allocation of funding to different tasks and faculties, although it does have the ability to top-slice from the faculty budgets in order to collect strategic funding. The overall number of teaching staff in the university is restricted by the Ministry and there are strict limits for hiring people on permanent contracts.

Additionally the universities receive funding from the student fees and external projects, as well as earmarked funding from the Ministry for capital investments, student scholarships, etc. The faculties may keep any additional funding they acquire through research or artistic

projects. The budget plan is developed incrementally based on the previous year's budget and estimated student numbers per faculty, with potential new aspirations added to the plan and submitted for the Ministry for consideration. Once the Ministry has approved the draft budget based on the final student numbers at the start of the budget year, the UAGE Senate finally approves the budget.

The university has prepared for the declining student population caused by demographic change by decreasing study places in recent years. The student numbers have decreased by about 10% over this period. The university is planning to establish English language programmes to attract international students, as a way of compensating for declining home student numbers. The decline of student numbers has so far been relatively slow, due to the inertia that was formed in student access during the communist time, which meant many students were only able to access the university in later life. Once this reserve is spent, the demographic trends and the challenging labour markets may spell dire consequences for the university, unless it is able to efficiently respond to the demands created by the changing world of work.

Similarly, the staff numbers have somewhat declined, with the number of professors experiencing a steep decline. This can be explained by the simultaneous trends of older staff retiring and the national moratorium on hiring and promotions encountered by all Romanian universities between 2009 and 2011. However, in autumn 2012 the university was given a permission to finally open a competition for some teaching positions, which allowed the promotion of some of the teaching staff. Pedagogical training, which is required for career promotions by the national regulations, is largely based on teachers' independent study, for which materials are provided. The national criteria for competitions for teaching positions are adapted by the university.

One of the greatest preoccupations of UAGE has been and still is the upgrading and maintenance of its buildings and infrastructure, on which the university has made great progress in the past 15 years. The university headquarters operates within the same premises as the Iaşi Philharmonic Orchestra, one of its most significant external partners. The premises are owned by the Episcopal of Iaşi, and the tenancy of the university is conditional on maintaining it and upgrading the premises. The university currently owns only one building, which hosts the Faculty of Music Performance, Composition and Theoretical Musical Studies and the Faculty of Acting, also the Pedagogical Institute; it has rent-free access to others in exchange for maintaining them. The specific needs of artistic activities, most notably music education, are another reason for the university's great preoccupation with infrastructure. The team understands that the university faces a constant shortage of space, most notably of practice studios for music students, but also for example spaces for students to spend free periods between classes.

2.3 Monitoring: How does the institution know it works?

The university collects annual reports for the various parts of its activities. The faculties and research centres collect data from the activities of their staff and prepare annual reports for the university for this purpose. The reports are adopted by the university Senate. The final accounts of university expenditure are also adopted by the Senate. The university also employs an internal auditor who monitors the legality of the accounting procedures.

2.4 Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

The unique position and opportunity of UAGE lies in the combination of the three fields of music, theatre and visual arts. However, currently the mission of the university is formulated on a very general level which fails to truly set the university apart. UAGE has started a strategy process but the university currently lacks clearly identified strategic goals.

In order to help UAGE to improve its strategic management capacity the team would like to offer the following observations and recommendations.

The university has several strengths in terms of its governance, structure and resources. These include the following:

- The university has taken the first steps towards a better strategic management capacity by introducing the division of work between the governing structures.

- The introduction of more logical faculty structure has clarified the disciplinary task division within the university, and helped theatre to have a profile as equal to other artistic fields.

- The university has trustworthy and consensual, if largely informal, relations among all key constituents, which are likely to enable the university to make strategic decisions in a constructive manner.

Nevertheless, the team would like to point out that the following weaknesses need to be addressed in order for the university to successfully face its challenges:

- The strategy and operation of the university does not reflect its uniqueness as the only arts university in Romania that combines the three fields of arts. This prevents the university from making full use of this richness.

- There seems to be little connection between strategy and operational decisions, especially relating to budget and human resources, without which any strategy is necessarily void.

- Although, formally, the students have strong representation in the Senate, Administrative Council and faculty councils, this does not seem to be replicated at the level of departments, which often take the decisions closest to the everyday life and studies of the students and initiate, in a bottom-up process, the planning of new study programmes. Similarly, the lack of student representation in the self-evaluation group indicates that the engagement of students in university governance is still inconsistent and they are not viewed as equal partners. The team heard some reports, however, of UAGE trying to engage students more in the shared processes of the university, e.g. encouraging them to form associations that can take a stand on behalf of students.

The team offers the following **recommendations** for the university to consider:

◦ We urge the university's leadership and community to take clear ownership of the identity and direction of the university beyond what the Ministry dictates.

◦ Redefine mission, goals and priorities of the university, and operationalise them as activities with appropriate indicators and budget. Monitor these regularly and take remedial action if necessary.

◦ Rethink the balance between the needs of the university and the faculties, within the limits of national regulations. Whilst a bottom-up process is important for the establishment of a feeling of a shared purpose, the entire university also needs to have a clear direction, which requires the university's leadership to take on comprehensive responsibility.

◦ Clarify the responsibilities between legislative, executive and administrative bodies. Although the process has already started, it is still at an early stage. The Senate and its committees must take a more proactive part in formulating the strategy, monitoring its implementation and controlling the Quality Assurance system.

◦ The possibilities of the university to flourish and develop are inevitably linked to the stability of its financial resources. In a situation where the public budgets are constrained, we recommend that the university establishes relevant structures dedicated to identifying and pursuing new external funding sources, involving alumni and committed external stakeholders.

3.   Teaching and learning

3.1 Norms, values, mission, goals: What is the institution trying to do?

The university currently offers education in three domains, music, acting and visual arts. It perceives that having these three domains gives it a unique selling point in Romania, as it enables the combination of knowledge and expertise from the different fields to develop larger scale, multidisciplinary artistic productions. The university also wants to develop a new programme in scenography, which would stimulate the collaboration between the three existing domains. In terms of the educational process, the university recognises the need to adapt to the current economic and societal situation, and wants to expand its lifelong learning offer.

3.2 Governance or activities: How is the institution trying to do it?

Despite the goal of making use of the three artistic domains, there seems to be little cross-fertilisation, multidisciplinarity and formal academic activity between the fields. For example, there are no shared courses or electives, and all three domains offer courses independently. However, PhD students can have supervisors from two of the faculties and engage in interdisciplinary research.

The university has adopted the three cycles of the Bologna Process, and offers 18 programmes at Bachelor level (seven in music, three in theatre, eight in visual arts), nine at Masters level (three in music, one in theatre, five in visual arts) and six at PhD level (a scientific PhD programme and a professional PhD programme in each domain).

The student staff ratio of the university is 7.82:1 which is very good. The teaching groups have a maximum of 20 students, and as the student population is diminishing the university may move to even smaller teaching groups. Some fields like music also require one-to-one tutoring. The university engages students from Bachelor level onward to practical artistic and research-related projects, which the team considers as excellent practice. The university has also piloted the elaboration of learning outcomes for Bachelor, Master and PhD levels in some fields. It seems to the team, however, that the teachers are not adequately trained to teach in terms of learning outcomes, and the students are not consistently informed about the expected learning outcomes and the related assessment criteria for their studies.

- The university offers teachers' pedagogical training both at Bachelor and Master level. The students of the university have a possibility to either complete the teacher's pedagogical training concurrent with their Bachelor, Master or PhD studies, or enrol on a specific postgraduate course on pedagogical training. A Bachelor level pedagogical degree gives the qualification required of teachers at primary and lower secondary levels, whereas a Master level qualification is required for teaching at upper secondary level. Additionally the university offers professional development courses and compulsory continuing education courses for teachers.

Over the years, the university has tailored its educational offer to correspond more closely to the professional market needs. Whereas in the 1990s the offer was focused on artistic activities, in recent years the university has added courses e.g. on welding, glass, ceramics and fashion. Nevertheless, many of the students met by the team voiced their concern about their future employment possibilities in the current economic climate. To respond to changing labour markets, the university offers career guidance for the students. This activity, which previously was a separate, mainly voluntary entity, was included as one of the departments of the pedagogical institute in 2012, but it is still run on voluntary basis. The teachers of the pedagogical institute volunteer as career councillors. It seems that not all students are well-informed about the existence of this service and that the service itself is under-resourced.

3.3 Monitoring: How does the institution know it works?

The university has a Quality Assurance Manual which includes elements of a teaching and learning policy. Additionally each teacher is asked to make an annual teaching plan. The Quality Assurance Committee has a procedure for evaluating new programmes before they are proposed to ARACIS for accreditation. This includes, for example, an appraisal of the labour market relevance. The team was also told of an evaluation process for existing programmes, but it did not receive enough information about this to judge its efficiency.

3.4 Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

The team would like to point out the following significant strengths vis-à-vis the university's teaching and learning.

- UAGE has taken genuine steps to implement the Bologna Process, including the introduction of the doctoral programmes in all artistic fields and the definition, in some fields, of the learning outcomes in all three levels, Bachelor, Master and PhD.

- The team was told that the quality of teaching at UAGE is widely recognised in the region and more significantly in Romania. This is exemplified by the rating of all of its educational fields in the two highest categories by ARACIS.

- The university has a very good staff to student ratio, which enables a unique and convivial learning atmosphere, greatly appreciated by students and staff of the institution.

- The teachers met by the team are positive about their opportunities for self-development and feel that they are supported by their senior colleagues in the endeavour to develop in their professions and progress in their career.

- The university has made real progress in solving the challenging material circumstances it faces. The scope of its facilities and infrastructure has increased considerably over the course of 15 years.

However, the university also has some **weaknesses** that should be addressed.

- The implementation of the Bologna Process is not yet pervasive across all the fields of the university, or all the elements of the process itself. For example, the learning outcomes are not yet consistently linked to student assessment and the assessment of student workload through ECTS.

- It is the perception of the team that the university, perhaps due to the high level of independence of the three faculties, lacks a framework for identifying and spreading best practice in teaching and learning across the university, which may mean that some excellent innovations do not reach all study fields.

- The team has not encountered comprehensive evidence that the university would have a systematic way of evaluating the quality of programmes on an annual basis. This seems to be done in a more intuitive manner, which does not offer the best possible information for the university to take remedial measures or strategic decisions. Similarly, without systematic data collection and analytical accountancy, the university does not have the tools to analyse the cost and viability of new programmes.

Recommendations

- We recommend that the university makes better use of the potential offered by the three fields of study by developing integrated interdisciplinary programmes and implementing them across the university.

- Whilst there already are, on an informal basis, some examples of students taking courses from other programmes besides their own, we recommend the university to enable flexible study across programmes and fields on a more formal basis.

- The university could consider making use of an invited committee comprising external experts to evaluate the quality of programmes and ensure they are of international standard.

- The university should also continue and expand the work it has already started in some fields with defining the expected learning outcomes for

different levels of study. The university may make use of different arts subject descriptors for learning outcomes developed by organisations such as the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA), of which the UAGE is a member (http://www.elia-artschools.org.). It is important for the university to own the process and adapt the indicators to the specific needs of UAGE and its students.

4. Research and artistic production

4.1 Norms, values, mission, goals: What is the institution trying to do?

According to the self-evaluation report, "the university's research policy focuses on national and European directions of development, whose priority areas are: to create new knowledge, to increase competitiveness and promote excellence, and to implement research outcomes. The main goal of the "George Enescu" University of the Arts of Iaşi is to become a nationally and internationally recognised pool of excellence. Each faculty has adopted a medium- and long-term scientific research plan approved by the Faculty Council, based on which the university's overall research policy has been established."

4.2 Governance or activities: How is the institution trying to do it?

Whilst research is a fairly new activity for UAGE, the university has taken first steps to institutionalise this as one of its main activities. The university has significant merits in the field of artistic production, which is inseparable from the research function in the context of arts.

The university defined a new research strategy in February 2013 emphasising the importance of human resources, research infrastructure, national and international partnerships as well as research management and the application/valorisation of research results for the benefit of the university's visibility. The strategy does not, however, operationalise the stated goals, define priority areas or link resources to them. The research and artistic creation is coordinated by the executive research commission (titled Council for Scientific Research and Artistic Creation, CSRAC), comprising representatives of all the faculties of the university. Similarly, there is a Research Committee in the Senate.

The university hosts six research centres: The Science of Music; The Art of Acting Performance – Study and Creativity; Artistic Aesthetics and Creativity; CreArt – Conservation, Restoration and Applied Art; The Centre for Intercultural Studies and Research and The Centre for Medieval Studies "Vasile Drăguţ". It also participates in a few international research projects e.g. under the 7th Framework programme. Students are included in research and artistic projects from early stages of their studies.

Staging artistic events, such as exhibitions, symposia, concerts and theatrical productions is an important part of the university activity. Some staff members met by the team voiced an opinion that the Ministry funding model is not able to take into account the difference between scientific research and artistic creation and its specific requirements.

4.3 Monitoring: How does the institution know it works?

The university collects data about the research, including different types of publications, and artistic production of the teachers as part of the annual reporting process. Research is also a meriting factor in career progression.

4.4 Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

The team has recognised the following strengths and weaknesses in the research domain.

Strengths

- Whilst research is a fairly new activity, it is part of the mission of the university mandated by the Ministry and the university has shown a clear willingness to formalise research as one of its key activities. In the first instance, UAGE has taken steps to put research structures in place by introducing the Senate Commission for Research and the Executive Research Commission, as well as introducing the research centres, and PhD programmes in all faculties.

- The team finds the strong connection between research, teaching and learning at all three cycles specifically commendable. This is demonstrated through the inclusion of students into research and artistic projects from early on.

- Taking into account research and artistic production in the assessment of staff indicates the institutionalisation of research activity.

- The university has demonstrated evidence of high quality publications, exhibitions and performances, and it has a good track record of PhD completions.

Weaknesses

- The university lacks a clear and operationalised research strategy and priorities at the university level. Without these, the university cannot effectively allocate resources to strengthening the research activity.

- The institutional organisation of research is not fully developed. It seems to the team that the university lacks guidelines, procedures and indicators to effectively monitor and evaluate research quality and output.

- Additionally there are few support services for research available at the institutional level to help staff identify potential funding sources, prepare projects and apply for grants.

In light of these strengths and weaknesses, the team would like to offer the following recommendations for the university to consider.

- The university should formulate a clearer research strategy with goals and priorities, as well as implement indicators and assessment practise for research in order to systematise research activity in UAGE.

- ◦ Implement support structures for research to help teachers identify funding sources, plan projects and apply for grants. Even if establishing a fully blown research support office appears to be difficult in the context of the current economic constraints, the university should pursue that goal and consider levying an overhead for the research projects funded from external sources to cover the costs, or pooling resources with another university in Iaşi to do this.

- ◦ UAGE is uniquely positioned amongst Romanian arts universities due to its comprehensive profile with three fields of arts. The university should take a more systematic approach to interdisciplinary research in order to seize new funding opportunities.

- ◦ The university could also consider inviting external, international experts to help UAGE to achieve its set objectives for research.

5. Service to society

5.1 Norms, values, mission, goals: What is the institution trying to do?

The city of Iaşi is traditionally the rich cultural centre of the region, with several important cultural institutions located in the city. The university maintains close collaboration with these institutions. According to the self-evaluation report, service to society is embedded in the mission of the university through its education, research and artistic activity function: "A major objective of the University of Arts "George Enescu" Iaşi is its involvement in helping to disseminate Romanian culture on a regional and national level. Our university's collaborations with cultural institutions, economic partners as well as local and regional authorities represent important elements in developing academic-related activities. Their implication is a major part of developing study programmes by permanently collaborating to set up specific cultural events."

5.2 Governance or activities: How is the institution trying to do it?

The university maintains significant collaboration with the "Moldova" Philharmonic Orchestra located in Iaşi. Many of its musicians are also teachers of the university, and the orchestra hires the graduates and students of the university. The university also collaborates with the orchestra in bringing in visiting musicians. Other significant partners include the German Cultural Centre, the French Cultural Centre, the National Opera House and National Theatre "Vasile Alecsandri", the museum complex "Bucovina" and the Children's Palace, which offers a wide variety of arts courses for children.

In the current economic situation, the traditionally strong cultural institutions, which have formed a significant part of the labour market, now face the same financial restrictions as the university itself, and consequently have diminished their employment opportunities, whilst new ones had not yet perhaps emerged. This poses great challenges for the employment of the UAGE graduates, and in order to remedy the situation, the university has established a career counselling service, which, due to the economic constraints is operating on a voluntary basis.

The university is currently working on launching a new website, including a new English language website to better inform various stakeholders, partners and prospective students of the university's activities and to improve its visibility.

5.3 Monitoring: How does the institution know it works?

The university has implemented a graduate survey to gauge their employment situation and opinions about the skills required of them in the labour markets. Similarly the university engages in informal dialogue with employers about their perspective on its students' skills.

The stakeholders met by the team were in general very happy with the quality of the students, as well as the openness of the university regarding collaboration. However, relations are formed through working on shared projects at faculty or departmental level, rather than through systematic structured cooperation at institutional level.

5.4 Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

The university has considerable strengths, as well as some weaknesses in the area of service to society.

Strengths

- The university has demonstrated consistent long-standing engagement and collaboration with major stakeholders and partners in the city and region.

- It is making an efficient use of scarce resources by pooling them with local collaborators, such as the Philharmonic Orchestra, to bring in visiting artists and teachers.

- The university is strongly involved in the "local" cultural scene, which stretches beyond the immediate surroundings of the city of Iaşi.

- According to the external stakeholders met by the IEP team, the skills of the UAGE graduates are appreciated by local labour markets despite the economic challenges.

Weaknesses

- It seems to the team that the university needs to be more responsive to the changing labour markets and cultural space. Whilst the first steps have been taken to introduce new courses with greater labour market potential, this process is far from complete. For example in the field of music education sound technicians, tuning engineers or pop musicians might offer new possibilities. The potential of entrepreneurship is also as of yet untapped.

- Whilst informal collaboration with external stakeholders is active, the university lacks formal structure for stakeholder collaboration on a regular basis, which would allow the better harnessing of stakeholder expertise to the development of the university and its overall strategy.

- Whilst the university already has a graduate survey, it is not regularly implemented, nor is it able to provide longitudinal data about graduate employment.

The team would like to offer the following recommendations:

- ◦ The university could consider establishing a Stakeholder Council to make better use of their expertise and include them in the process of defining the university strategy.

- ◦ Similarly, the university should broaden the scope of collaboration beyond the immediate region and neighbouring countries, to include leading artistic institutions in Europe, building on its established links in Germany and ERASMUS partners further afield. Also, it has the scientific, artistic and educational resources to find European or transnational commercial, industrial or cultural partners beyond the limits of their region, taking advantage of a network of artists and friendly stakeholders.

- ◦ The university should adopt a more systematic approach to analyse the changing labour market needs and student employability. For example, establishing an alumni database and implementing a regular survey every few years may help the university to better keep track of the graduate employment and employability requirements.

6.   Quality culture

6.1 Norms, values, mission, goals: What is the institution trying to do?

Quality culture is an overarching concept that pertains to all aspects of an academic institution. In the UAGE's self-evaluation report, the following, quality-related strategic goals are specifically mentioned:

- ◦ "ensure a standard of excellence in training and education, artistic activities and academic research" and

- ◦ "ensure academic quality"

6.2 Governance or activities: How is the institution trying to do it?

The overall governance of quality is the responsibility of the vice-rectors of education and research. Together with relevant Senate Committees for Quality Assurance and Research, and the respective executive branch commissions (Committee for Quality Assurance and Assessment, Council for Scientific Research and Artistic Creation), they are responsible for the quality assurance in the university. The Quality Assurance Commission elaborates the quality assurance plan outlining the university's goals vis-à-vis quality assurance, which is adopted by the Senate, and whose execution is supervised by the Rectorate. There is also a Quality Assurance Committee in each of the faculties.

It is the impression of the team that the university is largely dependent on the ARACIS regulations in quality assurance. The quality process was defined by the national authorities in 2007-2008, which, for instance, places deans at the centre of the quality assurance process. The ARACIS sets many of the standards for the three educational domains, including number of teachers per student, minimum facilities, and how many hours of each type of classes the students are to receive, even though in the past year the university has acquired some more

flexibility in introducing new classes according to student demand. The university is familiar with the European Standards and Guidelines, which were presented by ARACIS in an annual meeting. They exist also in Romanian and are available on the UAGE website.

The university is also a member of both the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA) and the European Association of Conservatoires (AEC) and is hoping to learn from their procedures in terms of quality and descriptors, as well as from foreign universities with which UAGE collaborates.

6.3 Monitoring: How does the institution know it works?

The university collects feedback from students concerning their learning experience both in the classes they take at the university, as well as for those students doing teacher training practice in schools, for their experience in the school. The results are collated at faculty level. The deans receive the otherwise non-public results and are responsible for making necessary changes. However, the team did not receive evidence that this practice of collecting student feedback is systematic; some students indicated that not all students fill, or indeed, receive, the questionnaires. Nevertheless, students also gave examples of cases where student feedback has led to tangible changes. The feedback from students, the annual self-assessments by teachers on their education, research and artistic activities and the annual reports from departments and other units are used to develop an annual quality assurance report which, according to the new procedure, should from now on be studied by the executive commission on Quality Assurance and the Administrative Council before being passed on with propositions for changes to the Senate Commission on Quality Assurance and submitted to the approbation of the Senate. However, the team has not received information about what type of data is specifically collected for the quality assurance process.

It is the impression of the team that much of the quality culture at the university seems to be based on the informal connections and networks, as well as close and cordial relationships amongst staff and students, enabled by the small size of the university. Similarly, teachers are able to point out informally if they see any potential problems, which can then be fixed.

6.4 Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

Whilst the university has strengths regarding its quality culture, the team also identified several problems, which require addressing.

Strengths

- ◦ The university is aware of the importance of quality enhancement, and has recently established institutional structures for determining the quality assurance policies and processes. These structures and processes being very new, they are not yet fully functional across the institution.

- ◦ The university has taken positive steps towards quality assurance practices, such as the annual collection of student feedback and the self-assessment of teachers' activities. There is also evidence that this has enabled the faculties to respond to the problems identified by students.

Weaknesses

◦ However, the quality culture and quality assurance systems are not consistently embedded across the university.

◦ There seems to be an over-emphasis on compliancy to ministry and ARACIS standards and ranking, rather than a formative evaluation of the university activities for the improvement of the university.

◦ There is a partially missing feedback-loop from data collection for quality assurance practises to actual quality improvement at university level. This may be due to the short history of such practices.

◦ There is no systematic training available for teachers on pedagogy, quality assurance and how these are related to the education, research-related, artistic and management procedures of the university.

In order to build on the university's strengths and remedy the weaknesses the team would like to offer the following recommendations.

◦ The university leadership and community should take responsibility for developing a comprehensive quality culture, which does not build solely on the externally mandated quantitative quality indicators. As part of this process, the university should create quality indicators arising from its own needs and strategic priorities and monitor those systematically in order to be able to make changes in their primary processes if need arises.

◦ The university should pursue further development of quality assurance practices at all levels of the institution, as well as develop an annual quality process for all programmes.

◦ The university should systematically involve students and stakeholders in all quality assurance procedures

7. Internationalisation

7.1 Norms, values, mission, goals: What is the institution trying to do?

According to its mission, the university wants to operate as a recognised and respected member of the national, European and international higher education community. Due to the demographic change and declining Romanian student population, internationalisation is one of the key goals of the university: "In perspective, the University of Arts "George Enescu" Iaşi aims at increasing its national and international reputation by starting study programmes taught in international languages, thus attracting talented Romanians as well as foreigners to study at our university and, at the same time, by further training our staff to meet the demands of an internationally competitive higher education."

The university wants to increase its international appeal and student population especially through attracting foreign students from Moldova and Ukraine, as well as offering education to students coming from Romanian expatriate or mixed families. In order to do this, the university wants to establish degree programmes taught in English, using teachers also from

abroad. The English language programmes were previously not allowed by law, but have now been made possible. However, the university does not yet have accredited programmes in foreign languages.

7.2 Governance or activities: How is the institution trying to do it?

The university has offered Erasmus exchange programmes since 1997 and their number has grown significantly in the past 15 years. The university shows active outgoing student and teacher mobility in the context of the Erasmus programme, but the incoming exchange is not balanced. The university maintains a broad spectrum of Erasmus bilateral exchange agreements to enable the students to work with specific foreign teachers, even though there may be long periods at which a particular agreement is not active.

The university also has some foreign degree students, amongst whom the students coming from Moldova form a majority. The university receives state funding also for Moldovan students, whilst other potential foreign students must fund their studies by paying tuition fees, which are determined by the Ministry.

Although the university makes good use of visiting artists and musicians as guest teachers for Master classes etc., the financial situation restricts the number of visitors the university is able to invite. The university does collaborate with external partners such as the Philharmonic Orchestra in inviting foreign visitors. The university had also made use of the experiences of other universities in Iaşi, and tried to educate the staff to make use of the opportunities of internationalisation. Many of the younger staff have benefitted from Erasmus periods abroad.

7.3 Monitoring: How does the institution know it works?

The university has recently established an Internationalisation Committee in the Senate whose task is to monitor the international activities in the university. Additionally, the International Support Office comprises not only permanent staff but also each faculty has its own representative keeping in touch with the international office and disseminating information about internationalisation opportunities in their faculties. The international office collects information about internationalisation activities, the Senate committee analyses the data and proposes changes to internationalisation policies, which are adopted by the entire Senate.

Students and staff who participate in an Erasmus exchange, as well as visiting foreign experts are a valuable means for the university to get information about international trends and procedures in other universities.

7.4 Strategic management and capacity for change: How does the institution change in order to improve?

The team would like to offer its observation about the strengths and weaknesses of UAGE in the domain of internationalisation.

Strengths

- The university is aware of the importance of international environment in artistic creation, research and education and strives to increase the institution's international networks and internationalisation at home.

- The university has significant experience of European staff and student mobility programmes, as well as an active outgoing mobility.

◦ The university also has a well-established international office at university level, with contacts also in faculties. This facilitates the dissemination of information for the entire university community and effective data collection about internationalisation activities.

Weaknesses

◦ Despite the significance of internationalisation for the university strategy, it is the impression of the team that the university lacks a clearly focused strategy for internationalising the institution. There are no specific priorities for international activities or partner institutions.

◦ Whilst the international office seems to work well in disseminating information about mobility opportunities, there is little support available for generating income from international sources especially for research purposes.

In light of these strengths and weaknesses the team would like to make the following recommendations.

◦ The university should define a comprehensive internationalisation strategy with explicit priorities and linked resources.

◦ The university should also consider establishing a strategic network of partner institutions to widen and stabilise the international horizon of the university. In this context, the university could also review and if necessary, revise, all international agreements to maximise their strategic potential.

◦ There is also a need for the university to implement better guidance and support structures for international income generation taking advantage of the expertise of the afore mentioned network of international strategic partner institutions.

8. Conclusion

The team would like to conclude that the University of Arts George Enescu is a good arts university with solid educational programmes at all three levels and a good national reputation. Its position as the only arts university in Romania encompassing music, theatre and visual arts gives it unique opportunities to evolve into a comprehensive and innovative centre of arts education, research and creation in its region and wider context. The staff of UAGE is competent, dedicated and highly appreciated by the students, and the university counts many highly respected artists amongst staff and alumni. The university has active collaboration with the local community and it demonstrates willingness to change in the face of the new challenges it faces.

However, the team also recognises the following overall constraints for the thriving of the university. The mission of the university is formulated on a very general level and it fails to truly set the university apart. UAGE has started a strategy process but the university currently

lacks clearly identified strategic goals. Due to the insufficient integration between the three fields, the university is not able to make full use of the opportunities presented by interdisciplinarity. Only a more integrated university will be able to thrive in the new operational context.

The University of Arts George Enescu operates in a challenging economic, legislative and political environment, which requires considerable self-reflection and effort to better analyse its actual situation, including a lucid SWOT analysis, clarifying its mission and strategic goals in the new context, improving its functionality and enhancing its quality culture. Based on the material received and visits conducted during the evaluation process, the team is convinced that the university has all the tools to do this. The team is confident that UAGE will achieve its objectives and the recognition the university duly deserves.

The team would like to take this opportunity to thank the university once again for its welcoming, open, and constructive attitude during the evaluation and to wish the university best success in achieving its goals.

The recommendations of the team are summarised here.

Governance

- We urge the university's leadership and community to take clear ownership of the identity and direction of the university beyond what the Ministry dictates.

- Redefine mission, goals and priorities of the university, and operationalise them as activities, with appropriate indicators and budget. Monitor these regularly and take remedial action if necessary.

- Rethink the balance between the needs of the university and the faculties within the limits of national regulations. Whilst a bottom-up process is important for the establishment of a feeling of a shared purpose, the entire university also needs to have a clear direction, which requires the university's leadership to take comprehensive responsibility.

- Clarify the responsibilities between legislative, executive and administrative bodies. Although the process has already started, it is still at an early stage. The Senate and its committees must play a more proactive role in formulating the strategy, monitoring its implementation and controlling the Quality Assurance system.

- The possibilities of the university to flourish and develop are inevitably linked to the stability of its financial resources. In a situation where pubic budgets are restricted, we recommend that the university establishes relevant structures dedicated to identifying and pursuing new external funding sources, involving alumni and committed external stakeholders.

Teaching and learning

◦ We recommend that the university makes better use of the potential offered by the three fields of study by developing integrated interdisciplinary programmes and implementing them across the university.

◦ Whilst there already are, on an informal basis, some examples of students taking courses from other programmes besides their own, we recommend the university to enable flexible study across programmes and fields on a more formal accredited and non-accredited basis.

◦ The university could consider making use of an invited committee comprising external experts to evaluate the quality of programmes and ensure they are of an international standard.

◦ The university should also continue and expand the work it has already started in some fields with defining the expected learning outcomes for different levels of study. The university may wish to make use of different arts subject descriptors for learning outcomes developed by organisations such as the European League of Institutes of the Arts (ELIA), of which UAGE is a member (http://www.elia-artschools.org.). It is important for the university to own the process and adapt the indicators to the specific needs of UAGE and its students.

Research and artistic production

◦ The university should formulate a clearer research strategy with goals and priorities, as well as implement indicators and assessment practice for research in order to systematise research activity in UAGE.

◦ Implement support structures for research to help teachers identify funding sources, plan projects and apply for grants. Even if establishing a fully blown research support office appear to be difficult in the context of the current economic constraints, the university should pursue that goal and consider levying an overhead for the research projects funded from external sources to cover the costs, or pooling resources with another university in Iaşi to do this.

◦ UAGE is uniquely positioned amongst Romanian arts universities due to its comprehensive profile with three fields of arts. The university should take a more systematic approach to interdisciplinary research in order to seize new funding opportunities.

◦ The university could also consider inviting external, international experts to help UAGE to achieve its set objectives for research.

Service to society

◦ The university could consider establishing a Stakeholder Council to make better use of their expertise and include them in the process of defining the university strategy.

◦ Similarly, the university should broaden the scope of collaboration beyond the immediate region and neighbouring countries, to include leading artistic institutions in Europe, building on its established links in Germany and ERASMUS partners further afield. Also, it has the scientific, artistic and educational resources to find European or transnational commercial, industrial or cultural partners beyond the limits of their region, taking advantage of a network of artists and friendly stakeholders.

◦ The university should adopt a more systematic approach to analyse the changing labour market needs and student employability. For example, establishing an alumni database and implementing a regular survey every few years may help the university to better keep track of the graduate employment and employability requirements.

Quality culture

◦ The university leadership and community should take responsibility for development of a comprehensive quality culture, which does not build solely on the externally mandated quantitative quality indicators. As part of this process, the university should create quality indicators arising from its own needs and strategic priorities and monitor those systematically in order to be able to make changes in their primary processes if need arises.

◦ The university should pursue further development of quality assurance practices at all levels of the institution, as well as develop an annual quality process for all programmes.

◦ The university should systematically involve students and stakeholders in all quality assurance procedures

Internationalisation

◦ The university should define a comprehensive internationalisation strategy with explicit priorities and linked resources.

◦ The university should also consider establishing a strategic network of partner institutions to widen and stabilise the international horizon of the university. In this context, the university could also review and if necessary, revise, all international agreements to maximise their strategic potential.

◦ There is also a need for the university to implement better guidance and support structures for international income generation taking advantage of the expertise of the aforementioned network of international strategic partner institutions.

9. Annex

This annex lists all the people met by the IEP team during the two visits to UAGE. The list shows the names, titles and functions as provided by the university during the meetings, and have not been edited by the Team.

First visit

Rector
Prof. univ. Dr Atena Elena Simionescu

Self-evaluation steering group
Mr Doru Albu, Professor PhD – Vice-Rector for Teaching and Quality in Education – Chairperson of SEG
Mr Aurelian Bălăiţă, Assistant Professor PhD – Vice-Rector for Research
Mr Florin Grigoraş, Assistant Professor PhD – Vice-Rector for International Relations, Academic Image and Student Affairs
Ms Eugenia Maria Paşca, Assistant Professor PhD – Director of the Institute for Counselling and Training in Psychology and Pedagogy (CTPP)
Ms Cornelia Brustureanu, Lecturer PhD – Vice-Dean for Teaching, the Faculty of Visual Arts and Design (FVAD)
Mr Ion Urdeş, Lecturer PhD – representative of the Faculty of Music Performance, Composition and Theoretical Musical Studies (FMPCTMS)
Mrs Raluca Bujoreanu – Huţanu, Assistant Professor PhD – Dean of the Faculty of Acting (FT)
Mr Ciprian Ion, Assistant Professor PhD – Head of Department, FMPCTMS

The Vice-Rectors
Mr Doru Albu, Professor PhD – Vice-Rector for Teaching and Quality in Education – Chairperson of SEG
Mr Aurelian Bălăiţă, Assistant Professor PhD – Vice-Rector for Research
Mr Florin Grigoraş, Assistant Professor PhD – Vice-Rector for International Relations, Academic Image and Student Affairs

Faculty of Visual Arts and Design

Dean and Vice-Deans
Prof. univ. Dr Maria Urmă
Conf. Univ. Dr Ilie Bostan
Conf. Univ. Dr Cornelia Brustureanu

Academic staff representatives
Conf. Dr Valentin Sava, Department Director
lector. Dr Cristian Ungureanu
Conf. Dr Matei Bejenaru
 asistent Dr George Sorin Purcaru

Conf. Dr Jeni Pralea, department director
Conf. Dr Tudor Patrascu
Lecturer Dr Modesta Lupaşcu
Conf. Dr Gabriela Benescu
Lecturer Dr Octaviana Marincaş
Conf. Dr. Carmen Solomonea, department director
Lecturer Dr Cătălin Gheorghe
Lecturer Dr Cristian Nae
Conf. Dr Miruna Haşegan

Students

Pricop Ciprian, An II Foto Video
Maftei Alexandru Florin, An II Foto Video
Roibu Tiberiu, An II Design
Bordeanu Alina, An I Master Design
Dumbravă Vladimir an III Design
Boroş Adelina Design III
Roman Ana Maria, Master II Modă Design Vestimentar
Soreanu Cătălin, Doctor and AV An I
Adăscăliţei Laura, An II Master Grafică
Corduneanu Ruxandra, An II Master Grafică
Stefănel Bejenaru Alexandru, An II Master Grafică

Faculty of Musical Interpretation, Composition and Musical Theory

Dean and Vice-Deans
Prof.univ.Dr Laura Vasiliu
Conf.univ.Dr Anico Berindan
Prof.univ.Dr Romeo Cozma

Academic staff representatives
Prof.univ.Dr Gheorghe Duţică
Conf.univ.Dr Elena Ovănescu
Conf.univ.Dr Aurelia Simion
Conf.univ.Dr Ion Ciprian
Conf.univ.Dr Carmen Chelaru
Conf.univ.Dr Paula Ciochină
Conf.univ.Dr Dumitru Iosub
Lect.univ.Dr Diana Andron
Lect.univ.Dr Ioan Diaconu
Lect.univ.Dr George Dumitriu
Lect.univ.Dr Raluca Dobre-Ioniţă
Lect.univ.Dr Ion Urdeş
Lect.univ.Dr Ioana Stănescu
Lect.univ.Dr Luminiţa Rotaru-Constantinovici

Lect.univ.Dr Daniel Dragomirescu
Lect.univ.Dr Luminiţa Ciobanu
Assistant.univ. Cristina Misievici

Students
Albu Laura, an 3, vioară
Constantinovici Despina, an 4, pian
Grosu Alexandru, an 3, canto
Vizitiu Maria, an 3 flaut
Lupu Georgiana- Mădălina, an IV, Muzicologie
Vilcu G. Ionuţ, an I Master
Iosub Olga, an 3, canto
Honciuc Alexandra, an 4, vioară
Bondoc Alina, Master

External partners
Cristina Rădulescu – Teatru Naţional Iaşi
Dana Louise Barna – Colegiul Naţionla de Artă „Octav Băncilă" Iaşi – Manager
Irina Florian – Inspector Muzică, Teatru Coregrafie – ISJ Iaşi
Dumitru Cristescu – Inspector Arte Vizuale – ISJ Iaşi
Constantin Şerban- Palatul Copiilor Iaşi – Manager
Nicoleta Amariţei - Colegiul Naţionla de Artă „Octav Băncilă" Iaşi – Asistent Manager
Constantin Tofan – Preşedintele UAP Iaşi
Stela Fodor –Palas Iaşi
Lăcrămioara Stratulat – Director Complexul Muzeal "Moldova" Iaşi
Oltiţa Cântec – Teatru Luceafărul Iaşi
Carmen Chelaru – Filarmonica Iaşi
Daniela Vlad - Radio Iaşi
Radu Răileanu - Editura Polirom Iaşi
Piticariu Adrian – Tipografia Policolor Iaşi
Lucian Alexandrov – Firma Luno SRL Iaşi

The Institute of Psychopedagogical Training and Counselling

Director
Associate Prof. Dr. Eugenia Maria Paşca

Academic staff representatives
Lect. PhD. Mihaela Lupu
Lect. PhD. Dorina Iuşcă
Assist. Doctoral Candidate Ana Maria Aprotosoaiei Iftimi
Associate Prof. PhD. Elena Ovănescu
Associate Prof. PhD. Paula Ciochină
Lect. PhD. Diaconu Ioan

Students

Bolnavu Tudor – absolvent –assist. candidate Doctoral - Violine
Jora Gheorghe Daniel – postgraduate student- level II– Music Education
Mucea George Toderica - postgraduate student - level II – Music Education
Carp căs. Pulhac Anca Mihaela - postgraduate student- level II - Canto
Ignat Mihaela- postgraduate student - level II – Music Education
Vîlcu Ionuţ- postgraduate student - level II – Music Education
Apostol Aristidi Cristian - postgraduate student - level II – Music Education
Moroşanu Ana Maria- postgraduate student - level II – Acting
Popa Bogdan- postgraduate student - level II – Design
Haraga Ioana- postgraduate student - level II – Painting
Dascălu Mădălina - level II –first year- Violin
Andronic Alina- level II – first year - Piano
Iuşcă Ioana Georgiana - level II – first year - Puppets
Străjeru Ludovic Marian -- level II- first year - Conducting
Ciorăscu Cătălina - level II-second year - Composition
Bedrulea Ioana Cristina- level II- second year - Painting
Iosub Olga -- level I- third year - Canto
Şerban Ancuţa Iuliana-- level I- third year - Music Education
Damian Cezara Alexandra-- level I- third year - Puppets
Severin Alina Maricela-- level I- third year – Puppets
Boz Lăcrămioara - level I-- third year – Ceramic

Second visit

Pro-Vice -Rector for Research
Mr Aurelian Bălăiţă, Assistant Professor PhD

Senate President and representatives
Conf univ Dr Ligia Magda SFICLEA (Visual Arts and Design, Design) – President
Lecturer univ.Dr George Dumitriu – Quality (Music, Musical Interpretation)
Lecturer univ. Dr Cătălin Gheorghe – Research (Visual Arts and Design, History and Theory of Arts)
Lecturer univ. Dr Luminiţa Constantinovici – Int. Rel. (Music, Musical Interpretation)
Conf. univ. Dr Anico Berindan – Students (Music, Musical Interpretation)
Conf. univ. Dr Elena Ovănescu – Budget, finances (Music, Musical Interpretation)
Conf. univ. Dr Dragoş Pătraşcu – Research (Visual Arts and Design, Fine Arts, Graphics)
Conf. univ. Dr Mihaela Werner – Quality (Theatre)
Conf. univ. Dr Octavian Jighirgiu – Int. Rel. (Theatre)

Senate student representative and Student's Association
Olga Iosub – (Music)
Nicolae Panainte – (Visual Arts and Design)

Faculty of Acting

Dean and Vice-Dean
Reader PhD Raluca Bujoreanu-Huţanu
Prof. PhD Emil Coşeru

Academic staff representatives
Prof. PhD Rusu Anca
Reader PhD Zaharia Dorel
Teaching assistant Ciofu Anca
Teaching assistant Petcu Ioana
Junior teaching assistant Bilic Laura

Students
MSc II-nd yr – Cosmina Rusu – Student's representative in the Senate
Stud. Anul III A - Dumitru Florescu
Stud. Anul II P - Cezara Damian
Stud. Anul II T- Caterina Ursu
Stud. Anul II R – Bogdan Pălie
Stud. Anul I R – Dumitriana Condurache

Research centre CReART

Prof. Dr Jenö Bartos, director CReART, doctoral adviser
Prof. Dr Maria Urmă, dean
Conf. Dr Carmen Solomonea
Conf. Dr Cornelia Bordaşiu
Lecturer Dr Octaviana Marincaş
Lecturer Dr Bogdan Ungurean
Lecturer Dr Bogdan Gavrilean
Asistent. drd. Dan Acostioaei
Conf. Dr Miruna Haşegan
Conf. Dr Cornelia Brustureanu
Assistant Dr Cristina Hâţescu
Preparator drd. Raluca Minea

Chairs of the University Commissions

Ethics Commission
Prof univ Dr Tiberiu Vlad – UAGE representative (Visual Arts and Design, Theory – Anatomy)

Quality Assessment and Assurance Committee (QAAC)
Prof univ dr Doru Albu – pro vice-rector for education and quality
Lect univ dr Octaviana Marincaş - Chair (Faculty of Visual Arts and Design)

International Relations
Conf univ Dr Florin Grigoraş – Pro-Vice-Rector, Head of the International Relations Office

Assist Dr Oana Nae – Faculty of Visual Arts and Design representative
Eng. Felicia Balan - International Relations secretary

Research Council
Conf univ Dr Aurelian Bălăiţă – Pro Vice-Rector for Research

Central administration and support services

Eng. Dumitru Spătaru - Administrative Director,
Eng. Ovidiu Panait – Head of Administrative Department
Mr Ioan Băduleţ – Library, chief librarian
Ms Mihaela Holban – Administration,
Ms Adriana Bujor - Human Resources
Ms Livia Brumă - Financial Director
Ms Mirela Stefănescu - Rector's secretary