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Abstract

Our paper begins with a brief and comparative analysis of the courses taught at the main universities of Romania in the History Faculties (focusing specifically on archaeology). The main types of courses and their teaching methods are reviewed and shown in the analytic chart of each course. Further on, the need for archaeology on the labour market is analysed, identifying the inadequacies between the theoretical and practical aspects of future archaeologists. The authors propose the necessity of implementing non-formal courses in order to support the Romanian educational system by supplementing and adapting it to the current needs of history graduates specialized in archaeology. Firstly, the alternatives to institutionalized classical teaching for undergraduate and graduate programmes are presented, and secondly, the implementation of continuous training programmes for those who graduated and want to specialize in certain fields of archaeology.
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I. Introduction

As it has happened in the rest of Romanian society, education and research have been subjected to ongoing restructuring; unfortunately, what resulted is not fully what was expected. As proven by the history of Romanian education and research after December 1989, most of the implemented changes were aimed at forms and not at the essence of the issues; thus, the changes in the Law of Education since 1995 have been focused on the methodology or on the titling of national examinations, on the structure of school or academic years, on the distribution of participants to national tests, or on the duration of mandatory education. They also aimed to change the law regarding the quality of education: contents of curricula in schools, measures for the periodical testing of the students, requirements for teachers (higher education degrees for those teaching in elementary schools or an MA or MSc for the teachers teaching in secondary schools – the latter never materialised).

The direct intervention of politics in Romanian education and research caused a decrease of quality standards with the issue of the Government’s Emergency Ordinance no. 92/2012, the most controversial of which being the possibility of organising special Baccalaureate sessions, the possibility for Rectors to also act as members of Parliament or to be party leaders, the possibility for University Senates to establish a number of PhD students tutored by a professor larger than 8 – or the possibility of tutoring PhD part-time students.

Although the first Law of National Education issued after December 1989 (Law no. 84/1995) mentions, among the goals of Romanian education, the development of skills and competences in students, the general structure of education outlined there still focused on acquiring and reproducing information. In this context, the present study discusses the opportunity of alternative educational programmes in the field of archaeology that complete the academic offer by developing competences demanded by the specific labour market.

II. Nationalism and Conservatism: ARACIS Standards in History, Specialisation “Archaeology”

If we compare current legislation with current demands in the labour market for archaeologists in Romania, we notice a set of inconsistencies in both the students’ training and their absorption into the labour market. As for the programmes that train future archaeologists, there are several shortcomings:

- many segments of the educational programmes (bachelor’s or master’s) have not been reformed and are still subject to standards and procedures from the 1990s;
- “Academic” disciplines share more of a curriculum than “practical” ones;
- the contents of some programmes have not adapted to the demands of the labour market (some are obsolete or even useless);
- the concept of “interdisciplinarity” is improperly used – many courses introduce parallel “pluri-disciplinary” topics with no inter-connexion or intertwining of information, data, methods, etc.;
- a lack of courses focused on new scientific standards that introduce modern techniques and technologies.

1 Examples of law changes under the general concept “reform”: Law no. 84/1995; Law no. 268/2003; Law no. 87/2006; GEO no. 75/2005; Law no. 87/2006; GEO no. 92/2012; GEO no. 94/2014.
2 Law no. 1/2011.
3 Changes of art. 78, par. 5, Law no. 1/2011.
4 Repeal of art. 215, Law no. 1/2011.
5 Changes of art. 167, par. 2, Law no. 1/2011.
6 Changes of art. 140, par. 4, Law no 1/2011.
7 ARACIS - Agenţia Română de Asigurare a Calităţii în Învăţământul Superior / The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.
Though the rules for organising bachelor’s or master’s programmes are relatively recent (GD no. 88/2005) – stipulating that the standards specific to the subject of History developed by the Romanian Agency for Quality Insurance in Higher Education (ARACIS) ask universities to teach a larger number of fundamental disciplines representing 60-80% of the total credits. This covers most of the curriculum and turns programmes into encyclopaedic ones based on information rather than on developing competences or practical skills. Aside from these mandatory disciplines, the standards also stipulate the presence of some elective disciplines which introduce specialty courses; these represent 20-40% of the total number of credits.

Archaeology, however, is seen as a specialisation of the fundamental field of History. In Romania, from a didactic point of view, a bachelor’s programme majoring in Archaeology supposes a common core of disciplines related to History in addition to courses specific to the major Archaeology, i.e. 35 mandatory fundamental disciplines.

If we examine the list of mandatory disciplines, we see that 25 of these common core courses are also common to the specialisations History, Art History, Archives, and Museology:

1. Introduction to History of the Antique World;
2. Introduction to Romanian Antique History;
3. General Prehistory;
4. Introduction to History and Its Auxiliary Sciences;
5. Introduction to the History of the Medieval World;
6. Introduction to Romanian Medieval History;
7. History of Byzantium;
8. Introduction to Modern World History;
9. Introduction to Modern Romanian History;
10. General and Romanian Historiography;
11. Art History and Theory;
12. Introduction to World History in the Twentieth Century;
13. Introduction to the History of Romanians in the Twentieth Century;
14. History of European Integration;
15.-18. Special courses and seminars of World and Romanian History (4 semesters);
19. Information Theory;
20-23. Languages (4 semesters);
24-25. Specialty practical work (2 semesters);
For the specialisation in Archaeology, the following 10 disciplines are necessary (i.e. mandatory):
26. Introduction to Archaeology;
27. Latin;
28. The Era of Great Migrations;
29. Latin and Latin Epigraphy;
30. Latin Epigraphy;
31. Cultural Anthropology and Ethno-archaeology;
32. History and Archaeology of Ancient Christianity;
33. Archaeology of the Middle Ages;
34. Social and Funerary Archaeology;
35. Archaeology and History of the Black Sea Area during the Hellenistic and Roman Eras.

Analysing the topics of the courses for the specialisation in Archaeology, we see that, statistically, special and complementary courses share 38% of the total courses, i.e. the lion’s share. This part of the curriculum consists of courses on ancient history (23%) and medieval history (15%), followed by

8 GD no. 88/2005, art. 2, par. 4, “all universities from both public and private higher education will reform the curricula of accredited and/or provisionally authorised specialisations with a view to ensure acquisition of knowledge and development of competences for the subject area and to implement student-focused education”
9 With such sub-fields as History, Art History, Archaeology, Archives, and Museology.
courses on recent history (8%) (Fig. 1a). What defines future archaeologists are both courses on ancient and medieval history as well as practical or methodological courses. However, a closer look shows that there are imbalances in the curriculum. If Roman and post-Roman periods are “privileged” (due to the introduction of extra courses in Latin and Latin Epigraphy), the same is not valid for the other eras. Prehistory, for example, is only studied within general courses; only one course is dedicated to this period. The same is also true in the case of the Middle Ages, with only a single specific course of archaeology of this period. What is most striking is the lack of mandatory courses in Dacian archaeology or civilisation (it is studied only within elective courses).

Archaeology is a specialisation in which practical skills and competences should prevail given the nature of fieldwork and documentation. From a didactic point of view, we see that mandatory bachelor’s courses focus mainly on information; their share of the mandatory curriculum is 78%.

The two other categories of courses, namely practical courses and methodology courses, share 11% each of the total courses (Fig. 1b).

![Fig. 1 Percentage share of mandatory courses stipulated in the Standards Specific to the field History, specialization Archaeology, based on course topics (a) and on teaching methods (b)](image)

A thorough analysis of the Specific Standards shows that, de facto, in Romania, archaeological techniques and methodologies are studied at the bachelor’s level only in courses such as Introduction to Archaeology and through courses dedicated to chronological stages or to related fields (such as General Prehistory, Archaeology of the Middle Ages, Social and Funerary Archaeology, etc.). The preference for encyclopaedic development of students proves to be detrimental to practical education in this specialisation that, in turn, could be considered a subject area of its own given its complex, pluridisciplinary character.

As we have seen, a curriculum overloaded with an unjustified number of mandatory courses leaves no room for diversity and the students have no right to choose. This creates a discrepancy between European standards (i.e. the Bologna system) based on transferrable credits characterised by diversity

---

10 DF3, p. 6; the course in General Prehistory, which needs to cover general topics on prehistory in different parts of the world, aims at understanding general and specific features of each prehistoric era.

11 The Specific Standards represents minimum benchmarks as mandatory requirements for authorization/accreditation processes of undergraduate study programmes and in institutional level in the higher education system in Romania.
and mobility and Romanian standards (the ARACIS system) based on a lack of flexibility and the imposition of mandatory courses. We cannot but notice that European standards have been adopted in an “original” way; they have overlapped the credit system and Romanian model without any real reform or restructuring of the priorities of disciplines depending on the final qualification of the graduate.12

III. Role of Universities: From Central Institutions to University autonomy

In Romania, only the second cycle master’s (MA programmes) allows more flexibility; university autonomy has managed to promote a few diverse, competitive courses. Master’s programmes, free of methodological restrictions as far as the topic of the courses is concerned, are nonetheless subject to certain factors that can affect their interdisciplinary character. Some of these factors are:

- the personality of the programme director and the school to whom he/she belongs;
- the availability and the openness towards new ideas, methods and techniques on the part of the teaching staff;
- existing equipment and financial support from the University;
- flexibility in educational institutions which allow graduates on the labour market to gain employment experience (practical work, traineeships, internships);
- optimisation of course topics and corroboration with European ones.

In general, master’s programmes dedicated to archaeology in Romanian institutions of higher education offer a diverse field of specialties,13 but in most cases they are influenced by one or more of the factors mentioned above.

Reviewing the educational offer of the master’s programmes at the main Romanian universities, we can see that the character of the courses14 is somehow balanced between the two categories previously analysed: the prevalence of practical courses (80%) at the West University of Timisoara and the prevalence of theoretical academic courses (75%) at the “Lucian Blaga” University from Sibiu (Fig. 2).

There is no ideal “recipe” either for the organisation of Master programmes nor for Romanian archaeological education. However, as noted by other researchers,15 by simulating the reform and by

---

12 In fact, all this points to the inheritance of a “nationalistic” system of teaching history in Romanian higher education coming from the Communist era and following the encyclopaedic academic path and the mandatory ad integrum teaching of Romanian history. This kind of thinking (within the Ministry of Education and within fora competent in ensuring the quality of higher education such as ARACIS) did not allow the separation of History into chronological sub-fields such as those existing in some European countries where there are 4 categories of programmes: Archaeology and Prehistory, Classical Studies, Medieval and Modern History, and Contemporary History and Political Science.

13 We could document the following master’s programmes from the points of view of their names and curricula: Archaeology, Civilisation and Ancient Art (“Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University from Iași); Cultural Interferences in Prehistory and Antiquity (University of Bucharest); Archaeology and Classical Studies (Babeş-Bolyai” University from Cluj-Napoca); Central and South-Eastern Europe in the 1st Millenium of the Christian Era (“Lucian Blaga” University from Sibiu); Interdisciplinary Archaeological Research (“1 Decembrie 1918” University from Alba Iulia); Archaeology and Environment in the Context of Sustainable Development (West University from Timișoara). To these master’s programmes, we could add other programmes on the protection, conservation or valorisation of the heritage whose focus is on post-archaeological research stages.

14 We have identified two categories such as practical courses and methodological courses or informative courses. The statistics only cover those programmes whose curricula are available on the university’s websites.

preserving the classical forms of Romanian academic (and post-graduate) education, the field of archaeology will:

- Be achieved in form alone, not in essence, broadening the gap between Romanian and Western or even Balkan archaeological research;
- Maintain inter- and pluri-disciplinary research at the same level because most archaeological research (whether completed or currently being carried out) does not rely on interdisciplinary teams but rather on the punctual “gathering” of specialists depending on specific needs (there are no permanent complex teams)\(^\text{16}\);
- Broaden the gap between archaeologists and specialists from fields related to archaeological research. Romanian methodologies do not allow for common training in archaeology, but rather each professional category follows its own educational structure with several random fields occasionally intersecting under a common denominator.

![Course classification of master’s degree programs in archaeology based on their nature](image)

**Fig. 2.** Course classification of master’s degree programs in archaeology based on their nature

It is clear that university autonomy has neither been understood nor applied properly due to the great diversity of master’s programmes in archaeology in Romania. The differences concern course types, course content, course load per semester, teaching techniques, and evaluation methods. There are programmes that focus only on certain epochs, ignoring other ones entirely (for example, the Dacian and Roman Classical archaeology specific to the School of Cluj-Napoca), while others focus on certain techniques (usually Classical) ignoring modern ones, or reflecting certain schools of thought and ignoring the complexity and importance of others.

Administratively, in most cases university autonomy lacks transparency. Many Romanian universities do not provide free access to the content of their programmes (such as the curricula or description of the discipline) or to the teaching staff’s CVs.

Equally surprising is the gap between:

- The title of the programme and its curriculum (for instance, a vague title with no link to the teaching goals or the diploma to be awarded);
- The curriculum and the course (course type, ratio between course hours and seminar hours, number of credits, useless courses);
- The courses and their contents (obsolete, redundant, or incompatible with the requirements of the profession).

Renewing and diversifying the contents of the programmes, flexibility and dynamism are desiderata that have not been reached completely. This has occurred due to the lack of an analysis of the labour market as well as oversight regarding the standards of quality of the graduates from an entrepreneur’s perspective (in this case, archaeological institutions).

IV. The Career of the Archaeologist

As for career opportunities and the prospect of being employed on the labour market, Specific Standards stipulate priorities for the study programme 7.9 Archaeology: first, training teachers for secondary and tertiary education; second, training field archaeologists; third, training academic research assistants; and fourth, training researchers, experts, and curators.

Comparing the stipulations that illustrate conflicts between competences, demands of the labour market and current legislation, we find the following issues:

1. The encyclopaedic character of the mandatory courses and the specificity of the optional and elective courses focus on professional training but leave no room for applied training. Since an archaeologist is expected to have highly specialised technical and practical competences, we ask ourselves why train archaeologists for academia when their place is in the field or in a laboratory. In practice, archaeologists are employed to fulfil many different roles, such as jobs in archaeological discharge, different evaluations, diagnoses, data analyses and processing, management of archaeological heritage, etc.;

2. Research assistants, researchers and experts are, in our opinion, the same face of the archaeological profession, needing both theoretical and practical knowledge rather than four distinct categories of specialists. According to the legislation of the Ministry of Culture, an archaeologist needs to undergo a long process of specialisation in order to become an expert – from debutant archaeologist to specialist and then, after getting a PhD, an expert archaeologist after his/her candidature file is analysed by the National Commission of Archaeology

3. Specialising as a curator (as well as other concentrations in the field of history), is a matter of complex professional training that supposes skills and knowledge on the management, protection and promotion of the heritage in addition to specialised training (for instance, in art, archaeology, modern or contemporary history, ethnography, etc.).

Putting aside the incoherence of the legislation of different ministries patronising the institutions which train future archaeologists and problems with the organisation and functioning of the profession, we would like to analyse the real opportunities of the labour market in the field of archaeology, a market characterised by dysfunctions that limit the absorption of new graduates.

In the last decade, the paradigm of Romanian archaeological research has changed substantially by the adoption of new archaeological practices, largely the result of new legislation for the protection of archaeological heritage; this has resulted in an exponential increase of preventive and salvation works. Analysing the last 15 years, we have identified some facts specific to Romanian archaeological research, mostly concerning the quantitative differences between systematic research and salvation or preventative works. If the years from 2000 to 2004, were predominated by the traditional (programmatic) type of research – following clear goals established particularly by site officials –

17 Order no. 2494/2010 for the approval of the methodology regarding the licensing of specialised staff in archaeological research and his/her registration in the Archaeologists’ Register.
18 GO no. 43/2000; Law no. 258/2006; Order no. 2071/30.06.2000.
from 2005 onward, Romanian archaeology turned towards preventive and salvation archaeology. Nowadays, it relies mostly on this type of excavation\(^{19}\) as it is seen as the only source of income (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3. Quantitative evolution of systematic and rescue archaeological excavations in Romania between 2000 and 2014 (data from the online system ACERA)

Inveterate underfunding of Romanian fundamental research\(^{20}\) makes archaeology’s turn towards preventive or salvation research projects a natural one; in recent years, it has turned into a true “industry”. Even so, archaeology cannot provide stable jobs because of negative economic or legislative factors\(^{21}\). Regarding archaeological education, the development of this niche domain (preventive and salvation research becoming the main funding source of Romanian archaeological research), specialised staff needs training correlated with scientific requirements for salvation digging. In this respect, we can identify competences and skills necessary for a good excavation technician or archaeologist that should be acquired during academic training and later during continuous training (Table 1). Given the encyclopaedism of the bachelor’s programmes and the shortcomings of the master’s programmes in Archaeology mentioned above, a possible alternative to the development of

\(^{19}\) Unfortunately, the number of systematic excavations diminished and reached only 84 archaeological sites in 2014 while there were 250-300 such sites at the beginning of the 2000s. We also see that after 2005 the salvation excavations dominated the scene (there were 200 such sites), turning into a normal practice of protecting archaeological heritage.

\(^{20}\) In Romania, the research has three categories as following: Fundamental Research, Applied research, and Experimental Research. The Fundamental research refers to experimental and theoretical works performed for the purpose of acquiring new knowledge on the phenomena bases and observable facts without providing an application or a special use.

\(^{21}\) In accordance with current legislation, O.M.C.P no. 2562/2010 and O.M.C.P.N no. 2178/2011, archaeological research can be carried out only by habilitated public institutions alone; commercial firms are not allowed to do that type of research. On the other hand, employing staff from institutions licensed to carry out archaeological research (for instance, museums, universities and research institutes) is difficult because of chronic underfunding. According to Law no. 339/2015, for 2016 the budget of the Ministry of Culture and of the Ministry of National Education and Research represents 0.1% and 3.7% of the GDP, respectively due to laws that asked for a ratio of 7:1 retirees to employees. GEO no. 34/2009 operated until 2013 when it was repealed by GEO no. 77/2013. The lack of affiliation of specialised staff to public institutions habilitated to organise archaeological research makes registering in the Archaeologists’ Register useless because practicing this profession is limited (this contradicts Law no. 53/2003 republished and altered). See for details Corina Borș, *Protejarea patrimoniului arheologic din România. Despre situri și monumente arheologice din perspectiva evoluției cadrului legislativ în context european* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Mega, 2014), 143-147.
competences and practical skills in students could be non-formal educational practices in which transmitting knowledge is done through direct interaction of the student with modern research equipment, study trips, interactive seminars, workshops or some combination of the above.

Table 1. Minimal professional competences necessary for a digging technician/archaeologist (apud http://www.archaeologyskills.co.uk/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Primary competences (Bachelor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly using hand tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly drawing sections, areas and cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly taking photos in situ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding pre- and post-deposition processes at a site in relation to data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding the formation process of a site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stratigraphic excavation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly planning the digging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly collecting, recording and storing artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly drawing profiles and digging plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contextually recording data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowing and applying safety measures on the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Secondary competences (Master)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using Total Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using geophysical prospection equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using GIS and processing space data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly recording geomorphologic (landscape) data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing environmental data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly carrying out an archaeological survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly processing artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly excavating tombs and preparing skeletons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properly collecting and archiving site data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Tertiary competences (PhD and continuous education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing reports and technical articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing drawings and photos digitally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disseminating information to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowing and understanding relevant legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transferrable knowledge (methods and techniques from other disciplines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data interpretation skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Non-formal Education – A Case Study: The Fall School for MSc and PhD Students at Valea Alunului, Hunedoara County, Romania

The concept of “non-formal education” appeared at the end of the 1960s to complete formal education in schools and universities. Specialists have long debated the role and value of non-formal education, but L.S. Vygotsky and Sylvia Scribner\textsuperscript{22} were the first to claim that the process through which we learn most things in life is non-formal, citing the example of learning a foreign language.

Non-formal education is done through activities rather than courses, and it usually takes place outside educational institutions. The value of non-formal education was gradually acknowledged and UNESCO defines it as follows: “Depending on the country context, non-formal education may cover educational programmes designed to impart adult literacy, basic education for out-of-school children, life skills, work skills and general knowledge. Non-formal education programmes do not necessarily follow the “ladder” system may have a differing duration and may or may not confer certification of the learning achieved. Non-formal education activities provide out-of-school [students] access to structured learning, reinforce their self-esteem and help them find ways to contribute to their

communities. In some cases, their activities may serve as a ‘bridge’ to help out-of-school [students] improve their academic skills to the point where they can re-enter the formal school system”23.

For the specialisation in Archaeology, the best-known and applied methods of non-formal education are:

- An archaeology club, coordinated by a teaching staff but with activities adapted for the students: presentations of reviews, presentations of annual activities on school-sites, initiation in scientific presentations with limited topics;
- Periodic workshops at different institutions (i.e. museums) based on protocols of cooperation with theme debates and focused group activities;
- Themed and study trips.

The case study on alternative activities we present below refers to summer/fall schools for master’s and PhD students that combine interactive seminars (namely, presentations of methods and techniques applied to case studies) with applications in the field (experiments in the open air, visits to archaeological sites and museums). All activities were carried out in non-formal locations such as museums, boarding houses, camps, etc.

The Fall School for master’s and PhD students at Valea Alunului,24 Hunedoara County, Romania, is organised by the Study Centre of the Dacica Foundation,25 it takes place in the first half of October at the boarding house of the Foundation in the Valea Alunului Village, Commune of Boșorod, Hunedoara County, Romania.

The goal of this School is to provide PhD students with a place of meeting and debate and the opportunity to meet specialists from different universities and learn modern approaches in the field. It also aims to be an opportunity to study “live” history in the most important sites and monuments in the area.

The School has three main components: a package of courses and workshops given by academics or researchers, a scientific event for the PhD students, and finally study trips to local sites and monuments from the Dacian, Roman, and Medieval eras.

Accommodation, food, local transport, as well as activity expenses are supported by the organisers. On the average, there are 12 places for the students, two of which are reserved for PhD Students from the Republic of Moldova, and registration can be done online.

The activities of the Fall School usually start with a one-day trip to Ancient and Medieval archaeological sites in Hațegului County; the next 1-2 days are dedicated to the different courses given by invited professors or researchers. The topics discussed vary in nature, being diverse, general or focused on case studies; however, all of them are inter-disciplinary and deliberate on current (modern or prospective) issues in PowerPoint presentations, Prezi presentations, or videos.

In order to encourage dialogue and active dissemination, the program inserts student presentation sessions alternating with the guest lectures, depending on the schedule; if courses are in the morning, then student presentations are in the afternoon, or vice versa. Students thus can present their own research and documentation for their master’s dissertation or PhD thesis. Presentations are debated, analysed, criticised and evaluated by both students and the teaching staff and researchers in this situation.

Usually, there follows another themed trip combining practical work in the field (UAV flights, geophysical prospects, land surveys, etc.) coordinated by a professor/researcher.

The alternation between the days dedicated to the study and the days dedicated to trips and other activities in the field creates a unique, flexible, and relaxing framework – a novel teaching strategy with spectacular results.

---


The Fall School ends with two more days of time spent in the laboratory, at seminars or student presentations, as well as with a final trip, usually to museums in Transylvania or to open archaeological sites in the area.

Each student is evaluated and rewarded with a participation diploma and the last evening is dedicated to concluding remarks and to socialisation (namely, a bonfire).

Fig. 4. Chart of non-formal activities undertaken within the Fall School of Alunului Valley for M.A and PhD students in Ancient History and Archaeology

VI. Conclusions

Non-formal activities are a viable alternative to traditional courses. They are successful in all countries and in all fields. Even where the educational system is strongly anchored in the realities of the labour market, the beneficial effects of non-formal activities add value deepening and exemplifying ideas acquired at universities. This speaks to the necessity of implementing such alternative methods in Romanian higher education where administrative and essential reforms in universities seem without end and students ask for higher and higher standards.

Competences required by the labour market refer to knowledge, skills, and attitudes equally. If universities seem to limit only to transferring knowledge and are not ready yet to provide skills and attitudes, they need to be developed through alternative activities available to all teachers. This does not need top-down reforms or laws and decrees, but only personal involvement, the identification of responsible institutions or people who love history and archaeology, a little marketing and lots of passion.
Students nowadays love to get involved and assume roles. They do not praise theoretical knowledge but practical skills that they can use in their career and in their life. Students want to participate, to travel, to be proactive, and to experience rather than to strictly memorise. This is the paradigm of the present and he who does not consider it is swimming against the current.

The Romanian school of archaeology nowadays must make a decision: Should it modernise or should it be tributary to classical values that have consecrated it? Should it get involved or should it just ignore European values? In any case, if reforms are only mimed and not implemented, the quality of Romanian archaeological education will continue to degrade. However, if there is a minimal alternative to the policy of the forms without substance in education, and if it can be supported by passionate, enthusiastic, voluntary and enterprising people, it deserves being exploited without formalism.
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Law no. 87/2006 for approval of GEO no.75/2005 regarding quality assurance of education.


O.M.C.P no. 2562/2010 approving the procedure for granting licenses for archaeological research
O.M.C.P.N no. 2178/2011 amending and supplementing the procedure for granting licenses for archaeological research approved by O.M.C.P no. 2562/2010.

Order no. 2071/30.06.2000 Regulation on the organization of archaeological excavations in Romania

Order no. 2494/2010 for the approval of the Methodology regarding the licensing of specialised staff in archaeological research and his/her registration in the Archaeologists’ Register.


