



## **FACULTY OF VETERINARY MEDICINE**

### **Banat's University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine "King Michael I of Romania" from Timisoara**



#### **Revisitation Self Evaluation Report for the European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education**

**Timisoara February 2022**



ROMÂNIA  
MINISTERUL EDUCAȚIEI

UNIVERSITATEA DE ȘTIINȚE AGRICOLE ȘI MEDICINĂ VETERINARĂ A BANATULUI  
„REGELE MIHAI I AL ROMÂNIEI”  
DIN TIMIȘOARA



## The Re-visitation Self-Evaluation Report (RSER)

### Contents of the RSER

Introduction	2
1. Correction of Major Deficiencies	4
2. Correction of Minor Deficiencies	10
3. ESEVT Indicators	12
4. Addendum	13
5. Annex	14

This Re-visitation Self-Evaluation Report has been prepared on the basis of ESEVT SOP 2019 din 30 May 2019 (amended in December 2020) as amended in September 2021 and "Exceptional rules for ESEVT Visitations planned in 2022 considering the extraordinary circumstances linked to the COVID-19 pandemic", Approved by ExCom on 14 December 2021.

## Introduction

The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine from Timisoara is part of the Banat's University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine "King Michael I of Romania". The University has six Faculties offering a full educational programme : Bachelor's degree, Master's degree and PhD.

The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine from Timisoara was established as a public institution based on the Decision of the Council of Ministers no. 428 from May, 23<sup>rd</sup> 1962.

The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine underwent continuous development, after Romania's entry into the EU, we were able to benefit from European development funds as well.

New teaching and research laboratories with a modern research infrastructure were developed using the POSCCE grant – Development of research infrastructure, education and veterinary medicine and innovative technologies services for RO 05 – DIEST MVT-RO05, grant with non-reimbursable financing worth over 10 million euros.

Also, the faculty is strongly anchored to European values, being an EAEVE member. In October 2014 the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Banat University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Timisoara, Romania was revisited to evaluate the progress done in solving the major deficiencies identified in the first visit in 2010.

The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Banat University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Timisoara is classified after re visitation (Stage 1) as holding the status of: APPROVAL.

In February 2020, the Faculty was visited by the EAEVE Commission for accreditation based on the SOP Zagreb 2019. The Evaluation result, based on the ESEVT Visitation of our Establishment on 24 – 28 February 2020 was **NON-ACCREDITATION**.

EAEVE Visitation occurred from the 24<sup>th</sup> to the 28<sup>rd</sup> of February, 2020. During the Visitation, the Visiting Team identified several areas worthy of praise (i.e. Commendations), e.g.:

- Strong commitment of staff to the education of veterinary students
- Enthusiastic students with a real commitment to learning
- Excellent rapport between students and staff
- Alumni proud of the Faculty and actively willing to provide training opportunities to students
- Exposure of students to research and also active involvement in research
- The spacious and modern facilities at the VTH
- Excellent hospitalization facilities for dogs and cats
- The VADA and the ROSE programmes
- Small working groups
- Fresh carcasses for anatomy dissection
- Excellent microscopes in Histology
- Live camera feed system in large animal surgery
- QA Culture:
  - *Interaction between the QA groups at the University level, Establishment level and departmental level*
  - *Excellent analysis of student feedback on staff and courses as well as learning environments*
  - *Detailed information about learning outcomes and assessment.*

On the other hand, the Visitation Team has also identified four items of non-compliance with the ESEVT Standards (i.e. Major Deficiency). The ECOVE, who met on 17 June 2020, concluded that the following four **Major Deficiencies** were identified:

1. Non-compliance with Substandard 3.1.4. because students do not consistently participate in herd health visits to carry out herd health investigations culminating in an integrated farm report;
2. Non-compliance with Substandard 4.1 because of inadequate biosecurity and biosafety;
3. Non-compliance with Substandard 4.2 because of the surgery units of the small animals VTH being non-operational due to construction problems;
4. Non-compliance with Substandard 4.9 because biosafety manuals are often not present both in laboratories and clinical facilities, and there is insufficient information on biosafety requirements.

The Visitation team has also identified one area of concern (i.e. **Minor Deficiencies**):

1. Partial compliance with Substandard 2.1 because of insufficient evidence of available funding to carry out essential maintenance work in the companion animal surgery complex within the VTH;
2. Partial compliance with Substandard 4.4 because the new surgery units for small animals at the VTH are not operational. This issue is also addressed at Substandard 4.2.
3. Partial compliance with Substandard 4.6 because the hospitalization in the isolation facilities is not performed according to adequate, standardized protocols.
4. Partial compliance with Substandard 4.7 because herd health management is not delivered under academic supervision at the farm level;
5. Partial compliance with Substandard 5.4 because of non-optimal case recording;
6. Partial compliance with Substandard 8.5 because the logbook does not sufficiently cover both the academic oversight of this practice as well as an indication where the different skills should be learned or acquired.

In accordance with the European System of Evaluation of Veterinary Training (ESEVT) and based on the educational requirements of the Directive 2005/36/EC as amended by Directive 2013/55/EU, the status of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine from the Banat's University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine from Timisoara is **NON-ACCREDITED**.

After to the last visit, the Faculty staff and administration of University make the changes for done in solving each of the 4 Major deficiencies to cover the all the mentioned in the 2020 report of visit. Also, in parallel the Faculty staff implemented measures to remedy all the minor deficiencies.

# 1. Correction of Major Deficiencies

## 1. 1. Correction of Major Deficiencies 1

1.1. Major Deficiency 1: „**Non-compliance with Substandard 3.1.4. because students do not consistently participate in herd health visits to carry out herd health investigations culminating in an integrated farm report**”

### 1.1.1. Factual information

Following the ECOVE report on the outcome of the EAEVE visit, the Faculty Council analyzed how to remedy this major deficiency, reported by the visiting team.

We specify that to acquire the knowledge regarding herd health management, all students make study visits in the animal farms, visits provided within the compulsory disciplines and which are supervised by the teachers. In addition, students which are interested can choose within the elective disciplines, to benefit from the hours for the deepening of herd health management within the Module of Farm Animals (which are supervised by the teachers) provided in the year VI (semester XII), as well as during the extramural practice carried out in animal farms.

The Faculty Council has decided, following the analysis carried out, to improve the use of the results of farm visits and to remedy this major deficiency. The document named “Farm-visit report file” (Annex) was composed and implemented as a working tool during the visits to the farms by the students supervised by a teacher.

This document must be used by all disciplines which visit farms with students. To maximize the benefits of the farm visit, students supervised by the teaching staff must complete the document with all the specified requirements. At the end of the farm visit the teaching staff discusses and analyzes with students the practical implementation modalities of the collected and retrieved data in the “Analysis report of the visited farm”. These analyses aim to integrate all aspects of animal production and veterinary health issues reported during each farm visit. In this way, students are thus more consistently trained in herd health management issues.

As a result of these visits and exercises, students will learn and understand the principles of monitoring livestock health and management, epidemiological surveillance programs, health certification of the herd analysis, animal production management, and control of existing diseases.

The course program of the subject the ‘Clinical lectures in animal species’ includes practical classes on farms, where students will be able to observe and examine healthy and sick farm animals. During their stay on the farms, students will also acquire practical skills under the supervision of teachers. The acquisition of practical skills by students on farms will be linked to the herd's veterinary service. At present, students have unlimited access to cattle and sheep on university farms.

Regarding the use of pigs in practical training, VEE, due to the African swine fever in Romania, we currently have a problem, which is to be solved. The University has a project with our partner Smithfield Farms (a multinational company from Timiș County, which fattens over 1 million pigs annually in these areas), for the modernization in the future, in the University farm, of two shelters for 500 pigs, the students will have unlimited access in those new pigs’ shelters.

Apart from the source of didactic animals, some discipline organizes visits to farms where students can observe/examine patients in their natural environment and train skills. The pandemic COVID-19 has greatly influenced the access to farm animals, resulting in the temporarily presence of students on site, and, in some situation, the owners were afraid of opening their facilities for students. However, we estimate that the step-by-step improvement of the pandemic situation will lead to the significantly enhancement of this shortcoming.

### 1.1.2. Comments

We consider that by being aware of the existence of this deficiency, the measures ordered so far by VEE have given results, so is resolved this deficiency.

## 1. 2. Correction of Major Deficiencies 2

### 1.2. Major Deficiency 2: „**Non-compliance with Substandard 4.1 because of inadequate biosecurity and biosafety**”

#### 1.2.1. Factual information

Following the first visit of the European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education (EAEVE) experts in our Establishment, on 24-28 February, 2020, “Non-compliance with Substandard 4.1 because of inadequate biosecurity and biosafety” with the European Committee on Veterinary Education (ECOVE) standards, as major deficiencies, have been highlighted.

To address this concern, a Biosecurity Working Group (BWG) was established at the level of each Department of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine Timișoara (FVMT) having as main task to elaborate standards for managing biological risk in the veterinary laboratory and animal facilities within the frameworks of all the intramural (laboratory, clinics, veterinary teaching hospital) and extramural (farm or food science practical works) teaching activities. The established standards aimed to (i) prevent introduction of infectious agents, (ii) controlling their spread within populations of facilities, and (iii) containment or disinfection of infectious materials in teaching areas where live or dead animals, animal products or biological samples are found.

As a first step, a deep analysis of the existent infrastructure, working procedures and the available educational resources in each of the designed physical teaching facilities of FVMT was performed, in direct correlation with the implemented operational policies and procedures in these. The analysis of the existent hygienic practices designed to prevent occurrences of infectious diseases was carried out in agreement with all relevant legislation established by competent authorities (e.g. biosafety and biosecurity standards by the World Organization for Animal Health available at: [https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Health\\_standards/tahm/1.01.04\\_BIOSAFETY\\_BIOSECURITY.pdf](https://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Health_standards/tahm/1.01.04_BIOSAFETY_BIOSECURITY.pdf)) or proposed in Biosecurity SOPs applied by EAEVE accredited veterinary Establishments. In addition, in the context of the pandemic COVID-19, the BWG tried to exercise an advisory capacity on the teaching livestock farms or food processing units providing recommendations for the improvement of the already implemented biosecurity and biosafety measures at their level.

Next, the BWG, in order to demonstrate a clear commitment for the delivery of biosecurity and biosafety, proposed improvements for the FVMT infrastructure and highlighted gaps of the inadequate implementation of biosecurity and biosafety regulations at the level of several facilities (e.g. necropsy room, teaching farm for cattle), as have been pointed out in the final first visiting report by the EAEVE experts. The raised concerns were individually presented in a series of meetings between BWG members and teaching activity coordinators of each physical facilities of FVMT, and strategies to address these shortcomings have been established within a step-by-step approach.

Subsequently, in order to develop a biosafety culture within the FVMT, a writing biosecurity standard operating procedure (SOPs) have been elaborated by the BWG group members in collaboration with the teaching activity coordinators for each physical facility. The

resulted SOPs procedures for each working place (laboratories, clinics, veterinary teaching hospital, farms or food science units) were centralized, systematically ordered and reunited resulting in the elaboration of the biosafety and biosecurity manual of the FVMT.

To ensure the proper operation of SOPs procedure, conceived for each physical facility, massive investments for the improvement of the existent infrastructure and actions to implement adequate biosecurity and biosafety regulations have been achieved. These include, the setting up of new spaces (e.g. sanitary filter in the teaching farm for cattle), endowment with eye washers of working spaces depending on the risk, displaying the biosecurity signs, delimitation of a distinct areas within the facilities using demarcation lines with different colors on the floor, the availability of the biosafety manual in each practical teaching unit along with a shortened version of the cautions and indications for biosafety requirements.

In addition, based on the enhancing of education and awareness towards nosocomial and zoonotic risks, special emphasizes was given by implementation and perpetuation of a biosafety culture within the student and academic community (e.g. students wearing special personal protective equipment consistently, regularly hand washing and sanitizing, minimize unnecessary contacts with patients, appropriate disposal of infectious materials, implementation of general hygiene and cleaning protocols for the environment including contaminated surfaces) in order to prevent disease transmission from patients to people working or present in the FVMT and vice-versa, and between patients.

For proper functionality and program surveillance of the implemented biosecurity system, the Biosecurity Commission (BC) of the FVMT has been established. The main attributions and responsibilities of this structure are the year-by-year correct implementation of SOPs at the level of each physical facilities of FVMT (e.g. scheduled controls of hygiene in the laboratories, clinics teaching hospitals and isolation units) and periodic update of the Biosecurity SOPs in agreement with new governmental laws.

### 1.2.2. Comments

In our opinion, presently, the implemented biosecurity guidelines and protocols are in place on all sites, properly working in agreement with the imposed ECOVE standards, leading to significant improvements of the highlighted major deficiency no. 2 in the Final visitation report.

### 1. 3. Correction of Major Deficiencies 3

#### 1.3. Major Deficiency 3: „**Non-compliance with Substandard 4.2 because of the surgery units of the small animals VTH being non-operational due to construction problems**”

##### 1.3.1. Factual information

In order to address the major deficiencies existing in the space allocated to Small Animals Surgery, noted during the visit by EAEVE experts, the University requested and received funding approval from the state budget. The budget for the year 2020 provided the amounts necessary to solve the existing construction problems in the space allocated to Small Animals Surgery of Faculty of Veterinary Medicine Timisoara. Once the funding was received, all of the construction problems have been remedied. Therefore, after the reception of the repair works, the spaces were returned to the discipline of Small Animals Surgery. Presently, all the surgeries on small animals are performed in the newly renovated operational spaces. All the activities in those spaces are carried out to the best standards, both for students and patients.

##### 1.3.2. Comments

The major deficiency concerning the non-operational status of the surgery units of the small animals VTH has been solved due to the financial support received by the University from the state budget and through the measures ordered by VEE for the operationalization of these spaces.

### 1. 4. Correction of Major Deficiencies 4

#### 1.4. Major Deficiency 4: „**Non-compliance with Substandard 4.9 because biosafety manuals are often not present both in laboratories and clinical facilities, and there is insufficient information on biosafety requirements**”

##### 1.4.1. Factual information

Following the visit of EAEVE (The European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education) team of experts, one of the major deficiencies (non-compliance with ESEVT standards) found by the visiting team and also included in the Final Report, as issued by ECOVE (European Committee on Veterinary Education) on the 17<sup>th</sup> of June 2020, was related to the biosafety manual. Two non-compliance aspects of the biosecurity manual were highlighted: one regarding the content of the manual (*“insufficient information on biosafety requirements”*) and one regarding its distribution and availability in all biological risk areas (*“biosafety manuals are often not present both in laboratories and clinical facilities”*).

In order to correct the non-compliant aspects, several work steps have been established:

- The biological risk areas were identified, at the level of each department within the faculty;
- A Biosecurity Working Group (BWG) was established, consisting of specialists to cover specific aspects of biosecurity in various areas of teaching and research activities: laboratory, practical work, preclinical and clinical activities (both intramural and extramural), visits to herds units, visits to slaughterhouses and related units, research.
- Standard biosecurity operating procedures (SOPs) have been developed for different specific activities or groups of activities. These have been compiled in the **Biosecurity**



**Manual of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, 2022 edition.** The elaboration of the Biosecurity Manual was based on the following references: The Biosecurity Manual of University Veterinary Clinics Timișoara (2019); Internal Work Safety Regulations, specific to each laboratory / clinic, regarding biological, chemical and physical risks (that are presented to students at the beginning of each semester); National and European legislation; Manuals and Standards of representative organizations such as OIE, WHO; Rules of Good Practice for laboratories and clinics, and Manuals developed by other Establishments for Veterinary Education with experience in this field (e.g. Biosecurity SOPs applied to the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Liège University 2019).

In fact, the current Biosafety Manual of FMV Timisoara includes an updated variant of Biosafety Manual of 2019 (chapter 1) and, additionally, 14 new chapters (chapters 2-15) detailing the biosafety requirements in different biological risk areas:

- Ruminant biosecurity SOP
- Equine biosecurity SOP
- Biosecurity SOP applied in pig farms
- Biosecurity SOP applied in poultry farms
- Biosecurity SOP in hygiene, technology and food of animal origin control - practical extramural activities
- Biosecurity SOP in CVU clinical laboratories
- Anatomy and pathological anatomy biosecurity SOP
- Biosecurity SOP in the teaching laboratories of FMV
- Biosecurity SOP in FMV research laboratories
- Biobase – Experimental Units biosecurity SOP
- Biosecurity SOP in infectious and parasitic zoonoses
- Biosecurity SOP in the transport of persons and animals
- Measures for organizing and carrying out CVU activity during the emergency period generated by the COVID 19 pandemic

In the context of the COVID 19 pandemic, SOP for the organization of activities at the Banat's University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Timisoara in epidemiological safety conditions for the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 virus infection (ed 1. Rev 4/ 29.10.2021), was included as an annex to the biosecurity manual.

The Biosecurity Manual of FMVT was included in the BUASVM Quality System, being approved by CEAC (Commission for Quality Evaluation and Assurance) and by the BUASVMT Senate. This aims to ensure sustained quality improvement, updated standards in biosafety and biosecurity and to promote a biosecurity culture at organizational level. The Biosecurity Commission (BC) of the FVMT is responsible for completing the current edition of the manual and for continuously maintaining the procedures in accordance with the legislation and the challenges of reality. The BC Commission has also responsibilities in the implementation of the biosecurity SOPs and in the development of a biosafety and biosecurity educational program for all actors of the FVMT.

The 2022 edition of the Biosecurity Manual of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, was posted on the FMVT website and on the university website. The multiplication of the biosecurity manual was done by Agroprint Publishing, in order to ensure its availability in printed version in all areas of biological risk within FMVT.

#### 1.4.2. Comments

Presently, the biosecurity/biosafety manual, including the SOPs, is present both in laboratories and clinical facilities, including sufficient security and safety instructions for students and persons working in the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine from Timisoara.

## 2. Correction of Minor Deficiencies

The Visitation team has also identified one area of concern (i.e. **Minor Deficiencies**):

### 2. 1. Correction of Minor Deficiencies 1

2.1. Minor Deficiencies 1: Partial compliance with Substandard 2.1 because of insufficient evidence of available funding to carry out essential maintenance work in the companion animal surgery complex within the VTH;

#### 2.1.1. Factual information

Starting with the last year, the funding of clinical disciplines is available. There are amounts which covers, both additional remuneration of the teaching staff, as well as the essential maintenance work in all these clinical disciplines including the Small Animal Surgery complex within the VTH. The proposed budget could be improved starting of each calendaristic year, according to the received cash flow by these disciplines.

### 2. 2. Correction of Minor Deficiencies 2

2. 2. Partial compliance with Substandard 4.4 because the new surgery units for small animals at the VTH are not operational. This issue is also addressed at Substandard 4.2.

#### 2.2.1. Factual information

Presently, the new Small Animals Surgery units are fully operational. The University has been deeply implicated in timely solving of these problems.

### 2. 3. Correction of Minor Deficiencies 3

2. 3. Partial compliance with Substandard 4.6 because the hospitalization in the isolation facilities is not performed according to adequate, standardized protocols.

#### 2.3.1. Factual information

Regarding the hospitalization in the isolation facilities, to resolve these deficiencies, all of the mentioned weak points in the Visitation Report were identified by the Biosecurity Working Group together with the responsible teaching staff. Next, the proposed solutions were discussed in the FVM Council, to choose the optimal ones in order to ensure both the functionality and biosecurity in that area.

The elaborated standardized working protocols for these facilities are mentioned in the Biosecurity Manual of the FVMT, in such a way to contribute to the training of students and to the operationalization of hospitalization in the isolation facilities.

## 2. 4. Correction of Minor Deficiencies 4

2.4. Partial compliance with Substandard 4.7 because herd health management is not delivered under academic supervision at the farm level;

### 2.4.1. Factual information

To remedy the deficiency "herd health management is not delivered under academic supervision at the farm level" the measures which have been implemented require that all visits to animal farms must supervise by an academic staff.

In each visit program, the students will complete the supplementary document „Analysis report of the visited farm”.

The accompanying teacher discusses and analyzes practical aspects implementation with students of the data collected in the “Analysis report of the visited farm” at the end of the visit to farms.

## 2. 5. Correction of Minor Deficiencies 5

2.5. Partial compliance with Substandard 5.4 because of non-optimal case recording;

### 2.5.1. Factual information

A new case recording system (ATLAS vet CLINIC - GAMA IT) has been implemented and presently is fully operational (<https://usamvbt.atlasvet.ro/>).

## 2. 6. Correction of Minor Deficiencies 6

2.6. Partial compliance with Substandard 8.5 because the logbook does not sufficiently cover both the academic oversight of this practice as well as an indication where the different skills should be learned or acquired.

### 2.6.1. Factual information

To address the deficiencies related by the student’s logbook, several practical skills have been identified at the level of each discipline group that students must acquire either intramural or extramural practical activities. After acquiring the skills mentioned in the logbook, the student must ask the teaching staff or the official veterinarian to confirm by signature the fact that he/she has accumulated that competence.

During the practical exam, the academic staff, represented by the practical tutor, verifies the acquisition of the skills mentioned in the logbook and monitors the student's progress, based on recorded and signed outputs in the logbook.

Students who didn’t cover all the mentioned skills in the logbook are warned for timely recovery of them, in order to avoid the full recognition of all the practical skills, that is considered a compulsory condition to be promoted to a superior academic level.

### 3. ESEVT Indicators

Pandemic has influenced the number of patients and in consequence the indicators. There were periods of time when our clinics were opened as emergency only (March-September 2020). It has resulted in the decrease in the number of patients.

Calculated Indicators from raw data		Establishment values	Median values <sup>1</sup>	Minimal values <sup>2</sup>	Balance <sup>3</sup>
<b>I1</b>	n° of FTE academic staff involved in veterinary training / n° of undergraduate students	0.081	0.15	0.13	-0.045
<b>I2</b>	n° of FTE veterinarians involved in veterinary training / n° of students graduating annually	0.606	0.84	0.63	-0.024
<b>I3</b>	n° of FTE support staff involved in veterinary training / n° of students graduating annually	0.339	0.88	0.54	-0.201
<b>I4</b>	n° of hours of practical (non-clinical) training	1258.000	953.50	700.59	557.410
<b>I5</b>	n° of hours of clinical training	1170.000	941.58	704.80	465.200
<b>I6</b>	n° of hours of FSQ & VPH training	668.000	293.50	191.80	476.200
<b>I7</b>	n° of hours of extra-mural practical training in FSQ & VPH	74.000	75.00	31.80	42.200
<b>I8</b>	n° of companion animal patients seen intra-murally / n° of students graduating annually	43.881	62.31	43.58	0.301
<b>I9</b>	n° of ruminant and pig patients seen intra-murally / n° of students graduating annually	4.628	2.49	0.89	3.738
<b>I10</b>	n° of equine patients seen intra-murally / n° of students graduating annually	1.638	4.16	1.53	0.108
<b>I11</b>	n° of rabbit, rodent, bird and exotic seen intra-murally / n° of students graduating annually	1.601	3.11	1.16	0.441
<b>I12</b>	n° of companion animal patients seen extra-murally / n° of students graduating annually	0.000	5.06	0.43	-0.430
<b>I13</b>	n° of individual ruminants and pig patients seen extra-murally / n° of students graduating annually	23.408	16.26	8.85	14.558
<b>I14</b>	n° of equine patients seen extra-murally / n° of students graduating annually	2.390	1.80	0.62	1.770
<b>I15</b>	n° of visits to ruminant and pig herds / n° of students graduating annually	0.583	1.29	0.54	0.043
<b>I16</b>	n° of visits of poultry and farmed rabbit units / n° of students graduating annually	0.083	0.11	0.04	0.038
<b>I17</b>	n° of companion animal necropsies / n° of students graduating annually	1.491	2.11	1.40	0.091
<b>I18</b>	n° of ruminant and pig necropsies / n° of students graduating annually	1.917	1.36	0.90	1.017
<b>I19</b>	n° of equine necropsies / n° of students graduating annually	0.101	0.18	0.10	0.001
<b>I20</b>	n° of rabbit, rodent, bird and exotic pet necropsies / n° of students graduating annually	2.037	2.65	0.88	1.157
<b>I21*</b>	n° of FTE specialised veterinarians involved in veterinary training / n° of students graduating	0.252	0.27	0.06	0.192
<b>I22*</b>	n° of PhD graduating annually / n° of students graduating annually	0.032	0.15	0.07	-0.038
<sup>1</sup>	Median values defined by data from Establishments with Accreditation/Approval status in May 2019				
<sup>2</sup>	Recommended minimal values calculated as the 20th percentile of data from Establishments with Accreditation/Approval status in May 2019				
<sup>3</sup>	A negative balance indicates that the Indicator is below the recommended minimal value				
*	Indicators used only for statistical purpose				

#### **4. Addendum**

During the pandemic COVID-19, the presence of students in the university was as follows:

After the establishment of the state of emergency in Romania (March 16, 2020) in the second semester of the academic year 2019-2020, the students did not have access to VEE, until October 1, 2020.

Students had access to VEE in the academic year 2020-2021, the first semester, for seven weeks per semester. In the first seven weeks were present students of the years I, IV, and VI, and in the next seven weeks were students of the years II, III, and V, alternatively.

Students had access to VEE in the academic year 2020-2021, the second semester, for seven weeks per semester. In the first seven weeks were present students of the years I, IV, and VI, and in the next seven weeks were students of the years II, III, and V, alternatively.

Students had access to VEE in the academic year 2021-2022, the first semester, for seven weeks per semester. In the first seven weeks were present students of the years I, IV, and VI, and in the next seven weeks were students of the years II, III, and V, alternatively.

All Veterinary Medicine students will be present at VEE starting with the second semester of the academic year 2021-2022.

Students followed strict sanitary rules.

## 5. Annex

### Faculty of Veterinary Medicine from Timisoara

Teacher .....

Date of visit .....

Group of study .....

Year of study .....

### FARM-VISIT REPORT FILE

#### 1. General data about the farm:

Curt. No.	Considered objective	Relevant information
1.	Farm owner (name and surname)	
2.	Farm address (city / postal code)	/
3.	Holding code	
4.	Holding type: Non professional	
5.	Professional	
6.	Type A	
7.	Animal species/breed	
8.	Total livestock count	
9.	Physical size ( <i>ha, sqm, staff</i> ), conventional farm size ( <i>UVM, UVM/ha, ULA</i> ) <sup>1</sup>	___ ha, ___ sqm, ___ UVM, ___ UVM/ha, ___ number of employees ___ (ULA).
10.	Level of productive specialization (proportions of branches of activity of the farm in gross margin)	milk <input type="checkbox"/> meat <input type="checkbox"/> mixed <input type="checkbox"/> diversified <input type="checkbox"/>
11.	<b>Herd structure</b>	
	<i>Breeding herd</i> , of which:	
	recently calved	
	Pregnant	
	Males	
	<i>Youth categories</i>	
	Reproduction youth (12-18 months for cattle)	
	Developing Youth (6-12 months for cattle)	
	Suckling and weaned group (0-6 months for cattle)	
	<i>Culled animals</i>	
	other categories	
12.	<b>Farming system</b>	traditional <input type="checkbox"/> family <input type="checkbox"/> industrial <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Level of farming</i>	extensive <input type="checkbox"/> semi-intensive <input type="checkbox"/> intensive <input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup> AWU (annual work unit) will be considered as the European margin of 1800 working hours / year (225 days of labour, with a daily workload of 8 hours)

	<i>Production integration</i>	Individual-consumption <input type="checkbox"/> closed-circuit <input type="checkbox"/> specialization <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Technological processes</i>	manual <input type="checkbox"/> mechanized <input type="checkbox"/> automated <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Herd quality</i>	local breeds <input type="checkbox"/> improved <input type="checkbox"/> specialized <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Husbandry system</i>	Permanent confinement <input type="checkbox"/> free <input type="checkbox"/> seasonally differentiated <input type="checkbox"/> seasonally undifferentiated <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Types of shelters</i>	closed <input type="checkbox"/> semi-open <input type="checkbox"/> <i>free range</i> <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Use of the fodder base</i>	Local pasture/spontaneous flora <input type="checkbox"/> Specialized fodder base (cereals, silage, alfalfa, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> F.B. mixed <input type="checkbox"/>
13.	<b>Feeding technology</b>	_____ kg dry matter/animal, ____% protein/kg SU _____% cellulose / kg SU, ____% NDF / kg SU ____ kg annual intake of concentrates/animals
	<i>Administration technique</i>	Portions <input type="checkbox"/> AFU <input type="checkbox"/> <i>ad libitum</i> <input type="checkbox"/> restricted <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Feeding system</i>	seasonally differentiated <input type="checkbox"/> feed from deposits – mono-diet <input type="checkbox"/> feed from deposits – multi-diet <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Body condition of animals</i>	emaciated <input type="checkbox"/> low weight <input type="checkbox"/> normal <input type="checkbox"/> fat <input type="checkbox"/> obese <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>The impact of feed in productions</i>	ratio W/P, urea
14.	<b>Milking technology –</b> <i>Frequency and the method of control/sampling of milk</i>	individual (periodic/diversified COP) <input type="checkbox"/> daily (milking robot) <input type="checkbox"/> collection (can/tank) <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Milking hygiene</i>	TVC from tank <input type="checkbox"/> Udder hygiene scoring <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Milk Storage conditions</i>	____ °C in tank, ____ °C hours of cooling time at 4C
	<i>The functionality of the milking device</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> mammary sphincter score
	<i>Subclinical mastitis detection</i>	CMT <input type="checkbox"/> COP <input type="checkbox"/> NCS <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Diagnostics of mastitis</i>	clinical <input type="checkbox"/> microbiological <input type="checkbox"/> antibiogram <input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Clinical mastitis</i>	____% monthly prevalence ____% annual prevalence
15.	<b>Breeding management and technology</b>	
	Age of introduction into the breeding category	scheduled <input type="checkbox"/> unscheduled <input type="checkbox"/>
	Calving programming	seasonal <input type="checkbox"/> divided <input type="checkbox"/> unscheduled <input type="checkbox"/>
	Breeding technique	Natural mating <input type="checkbox"/> insemination <input type="checkbox"/> biotechniques <input type="checkbox"/> (ET/MOET)
	Reproductive disorders	
16.	<b>Compulsory sanitary-veterinary actions</b>	
17.	Mandatory vaccinations	- -



		-
18.	Necessity vaccinations	- - -
19.	Internal antiparasitic treatments	- - -
20.	External antiparasitic treatments	- - -
21.	SICCT test	
22.	Blood collection metabolic screening	
23.	Blood collections serological screening	
24.	<b>Commonly diagnosed pathologies</b>	
25.	metabolic	
26.	internal	
27.	parasitic	
28.	infectious	
29.	surgical	
30.	reproductive	
31.	mammary	
32.	Foot-related	
33.		
34.		
35.	Exams performed	- - -
36.	Applied treatments	- - -

**2. Specific data identified during the farm visit:**

General problems identified, over time on the farm:

.....  
.....  
.....

Specific problems identified on the farm at the time of visit:

.....  
.....  
.....

Recommendations to improve the general problems identified at the time of visit:

.....  
.....  
.....

Recommendations to improve the specific problems identified at the time of visit:

.....  
.....  
.....