



Methodology concerning the peer review in U.M.F. „Carol Davila”

Art. 1. The annual peer review is a necessary and compulsory phase within the process of evaluation and assurance of quality in education.

Art. 2. (1) The peer review is done for each calendar year, at the level of faculties, departments and disciplines, preferable in March.

Art. 2. (2) Each year, the Faculty Dean will appoint on a rotation basis the disciplines which do the peer review, such that all the professors run through the evaluation process at least once 3 years.

Art. 3. The peer review of professors is a process of “evaluation between equal persons” (peer-review type), by which a professor evaluates a peer who has the same position (as much as possible from the same discipline).

Art. 4. The peer review is organized by the head of discipline.

Art. 5. Before the beginning of the peer review, the head of discipline informs the professor on the fact that the purpose of this review is that of improving the quality, that no punitive matters will result and that the individual results remain at the level of discipline.

Art. 6 (1) The head of discipline will appoint the evaluated persons and the assessors.

(2) Upon the head of discipline decision, the process can be organized by ballot for the professors with the same didactic position.

Art. 7. The mutual assessment will be avoided (two professors evaluate themselves in the same year one the other).

Art. 8. If at the level of discipline / clinic, there is only one professor with a certain didactic position, the department director will appoint another professor, with the same position as the assessed one, from another discipline / clinic of the department.

Art. 9. The assessment will be done at least on the parameters from the instrument from annex 1.



Art. 10. This instrument can be completed depending on the specific and objectives of the discipline / clinic.

Art. 11. The peer review consists of assisting to at least one course / practical activity performed by the assessed professor and a subsequent peer discussion concerning the education and research activity of the assessed professor.

Art. 12. The assessor will fill in the instrument, marking the qualification which he / she considers accurate for the assessed colleague, both for the course and for the practical activity, if applicable and for each item from the instrument.

Art. 13. The assessor will present, in the section of open answers, an honest and constructive point of view concerning the improvement of the activity of assessed person, respectively the improvement of activity at the level of discipline.

Art. 14. All the assessment forms are submitted to the head of discipline.

Art. 15. Taking into account that the purpose of this assessment is the increase of the quality of didactic activity, the assessment forms are confidential, remain at the level of discipline and are attached to the file of the assessed professor.

Art. 16. The head of disciplines analyzes the peer review forms and drafts a short report concerning the synthesis of results (a report model is presented in annex 2).

Art. 17. The discipline report is sent to the department director each year until 1st April.

Art. 18. Based on the discipline reports, the department director drafts a short report of the peer review, which he / she sends to the deanship until the end of April each year.

Art. 19. Based on the results of the peer review, the measures necessary for the improvement of activity at the level of disciplines, departments and faculties are adopted.

Art. 20. This Methodology has been approved in the session of the Board of Directors of 14th April 2021 and in the session of the UMFCD Senate of 22nd April 2021.