

Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala

Romanian Journal for Multidimensional Education

ISSN: 2066 – 7329 (print), ISSN: 2067 – 9270 (electronic)

Covered in: Index Copernicus, Ideas RePeC, EconPapers, Socionet, Ulrich Pro Quest, Cabel, SSRN, Appreciative Inquiry Commons, Journalseek, Scipio, EBSCO, DOAJ

EU Legal Education in Romania: From Governmental Commitment to Academic Responsibility

Brindusa Camelia GOREA, Mugurel Minodor GOREA

Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala, 2013, Volume 5, Issue 1,
June, pp:161-197

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://revistaromaneasca.ro>

Published by:

Lumen Publishing House

On behalf of:

Lumen Research Center in Social and Humanistic Sciences

EU Legal Education in Romania: From Governmental Commitment to Academic Responsibility¹

Brindusa Camelia GOREA²
Mugurel Minodor GOREA³

Abstract

Our initial assumption in this research is that there are three levels of responsibility in order to obtain a solid, competitive EU legal education in Romania: the governmental educational policy level, the academic management discretion level and the responsibility of each and every law teacher. In addition, the non-academic education and the quality of the documentation sources are prime aspects of any educational research project, including EU legal education in a particular country. These three levels of responsibility and two additional components set the framework of our research.

Keywords: *Legal education, EU legal convergence, Academic responsibility*

¹ This research article is also published as a book chapter, in Valentino Cattelan (Editor), *Integration Through Legal Education. The Role of EU Legal Studies in Shaping the EU*, Bologna: Societa editrice il Mulino, 2012.

² Ph.D. Associated Professor at "Dimitrie Cantemir" University of Targu-Mures, Dean of the Law Faculty, 3-5 Bodoni Sandor Street, Targu-Mures, Romania, brindusagorea@yahoo.com;

³ Director of The Institute for Culture and Political Culture, 29 Tudor Vladimirescu Street, Targu-Mures, Romania, mugurgorea@yahoo.com.

1. EU legal convergence in Romania: from politics to legal education

In the last twenty years, Romania had a long quest from a centralized political system in the communist era to the ideal of democracy in the world. EU membership has been the main goal declared by every Romanian Government since the Revolution in December 1989. Although the diplomatic relationship between Bucharest and the European Union began in 1990, right after the revolution against the communist regime, Romania was the first country of Central and Eastern Europe having official relations with the European Community, as the treaty of 1974 included Romania in the Community's General System of Preferences.

Romania signed the Joining Agreement to EU in 1993. Romania was the third of the former communist countries from Eastern Europe submitting in 1995 the official application for membership after Hungary and Poland. During the 2000, Romania implemented several reforms to prepare for EU accession aimed to consolidate the national democratic system, institute the rule of law, acknowledge the respect of human rights, commit to individuals freedom of expression and to implement a free-market operational economy.

The Romanian Constitution of 1991 was amended and completed in 2003 by the Law No. 429/2003 referring to the revision of the Constitution. Article 11 (“International law and national law”) was modified to stipulate that “If Romania has to be a party by any treaty consisting of provisions contrary to the constitution in force, ratification is allowed only after Constitution revision” (paragraph 3). Moreover, a new article (148), entitled “Integration into the European Union” has been added to prepare Romania's accession to the constituent treaties of the European Union. One of the most important provision is the following (paragraph 2):

«As a result of the accession, both the provisions of the constituent treaties of the European Union and the other mandatory community regulations shall prevail over the opposite provisions of the national laws, in compliance with the provisions of the accession act.»

Finally, on January 1st 2007, Romania joined the European Union, along with Bulgaria. It was the latest expansion of the EU,

considered by the European Commission as part of the same wave (the fifth) i.e. enlargement of the European Union in 2004.

However, the political commitment of a Government is not enough for the full integration of any country. A stable and socially accepted EU policy has to be consented and sustained by each and all key factors of national jurisdictions, including law professors and law students.

In other words, legal education is essential to achieve the goal of a fully unified Europe. The role of academic studies is not just an informative one, but also a formative one.

2. Purpose of study

The main purpose of the present study is to provide an overall but detailed and toned view on the EU legal education process in Romania. Consequently the objectives of our study are:

1 to explain the ascension and development of EU legal studies in Romania, since 1990 to present days;

2 to track the key issues in the EU law curricular chosen by the Romanian main Academic Law Schools and the syllabus defined by EU law professors;

3 to find out if and how EU law academic education helps Romanian lawyers in their professional praxis;

4 to reveal which are the most influential documentation sources for Romanian lawyers and legal scholars, regarding EU law;

5 to draw some conclusions and provide some recommendations on the reforming the EU legal education in Romania.

3. Methodology of research

3.1. Sources of evidence

In order to reach these goals we used three main sources of evidence: (1) the Romanian instructional legislation; (2) a representative number of law curricula and EU law syllabus; (3) a research survey of Romanian students, EU law professors and legal practitioners.

(1) In order to clear up the legislative and institutional background of EU legal studies in Romania, we analyzed several relevant laws starting from the Romanian Constitution and the Law on

education to governmental regulations on legal specializations and law curriculum.

(2) We also conducted a comparison study of law curricula defined by six main Romanian Universities and extracted the most frequent issues from the EU Law syllabus of those law faculties. To be more precise, we studied six Law departments functioning within the following six Romanian Universities: "Dimitrie Cantemir" University of Târgu-Mureș, University of Bucharest, University of Craiova, "Al. I. Cuza" University of Iași, West University of Timișoara and "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu.

In this comparison study, we used public information, published on the official websites of each relevant institution or provided by assigned academics. We considered only "Law" specialty and full-time mode of study, and excluded disciplines not inherent to EU law branch (International public law, International relationships and organizations, European Human Rights Convention, EHRC Case Law etc.).

(3) In order to find out how the phenomenon of EU legal education is seen by the Romanian law students, EU law professors and legal practitioners, we also conducted a research survey. This sociological method of investigation consists in asking subjects to reply to several statements or questions from a questionnaire or interview.

Our methodology of work is following the rules of a social research. After defining the population subject of our research such as students, legal practitioners and EU law teachers, we got the consent of 216 willingly subjects forming our sampling group: 115 law students, 85 lawyers and 16 EU law teachers from all over the country and ask them to answer some questions, in a face to face or self-administrated survey. All the subjects were over 19 years old, 49 % males and 51 % females.

We prepared three different sets of questions for the three selected subjects. For students, we choose 5 questions, asking them to evaluate the significance of EU law and CJEU case-law for their future legal career and to describe how they use now or intend to use EU documentation sources. For legal practitioners (judges, prosecutors, lawyers and legal advisers) we choose a set of 6 open questions, intended to reveal their main areas of practical interest in EU law, the non-academic context in which they studied EU law and their

documentation sources in EU law matters. Finally, for EU law teachers we prepared interview guidelines, as an interview has the advantage of a more refined and toned survey technique and allows the respondents to give deep and free answers. We asked EU law teachers to identify the most important topics of courses and applications (including their arguments of such choices), to explain how they encourage the students to focus more on EU legal studies, what documentation sources they recommend to their students and what documentation sources they use etc. In order to conclude our researching survey, we also interviewed openly 5 of the most prestigious legal scholars and EU law specialists from Romania.

3.2. Conceptual framework and initial assumptions

Our first assumption based on this research is the existence of three levels of responsibility to grant a solid, competitive EU legal education in Romania: the level of governmental educational policy, the level of academic discretion and the responsibility of each and all law teachers.

The Romanian Constitution (§ 32 (6) – “Right to education”) warrants the autonomy of any university. Nevertheless, EU legal education – like any other form of public education – is, to some extent, under state’s control and command. The academic autonomy and discretion is not unconditional; universities have to follow the national policy of public education. Likewise, the academic teaching staff is following state decision and has to comply with state regulations. On the other hand, the teachers are subordinated to the universities in a lower extent being just their employees; regarding the way of teaching, they enjoy almost full discretion.

The three levels of responsibility can be also seen as the three responsible actors playing leading roles on the EU legal education scene: (1) the Romanian Government; (2) the Romanian Law schools; (3) the EU law teachers.

However, the scene itself is sustained by a framework consisting of EU legal theory and EU legal practice. We have considered the 3 *agents* of (EU legal) education but we cannot overlook the *reasons and aims*: providing (law) students with both cognitive and applicative skills. In order to operate with EU law, a law student should be able to

exploit proper documentation sources and obtain a certain degree of practical training.

To conclude, EU legal theory and EU legal practice are two additional factors which play a silent, but nevertheless significant role in EU legal education - not only in Romania, but in any legal education system. Therefore, we believe our study would be incomplete without considering the “theory and praxis coordinate”. This axis intercross unavoidable the ternary group of responsible factors in EU legal education, generating a five-pointed structure of EU legal education. This is our second assumption of the present study.

We have already emphasized the relationships between the three actors on EU legal education scene (the Government, law schools and EU law teachers). More relationships come into spotlight if we connect all these 5 key factors of EU legal education in Romania. E.g. documentation sources are essential for any EU law teacher when issuing the syllabus and practical training, being a recognized objective of academic learning.

The benefits of studying the 5 key factors of EU legal education not only individually but also in their mutual interaction are the third assumption of our paperwork.

4. Findings and Results

Starting from the above initial assumption, further on we are going to take a closer look on each of the 5 key factors, by themselves and in their mutual relationships.

First we are going to analyze the 3 levels of responsibility or the 3 agents of EU legal education in Romania: (1) the Government and its political commitment; (2) the universities and their responsibility as autonomous entities and (3) the EU law professors and their syllabus choices. Next we'll add to our study (4) the EU law documentation sources and (5) the coordinate of practical training in EU law.

4.1. Political/ governmental commitment in EU legal education

4.1.1. Legislative and institutional background

Although Romanian higher education institutions are independent, autonomous entities, the Romanian state imposes the

minimum standards to provide a certain quality of academic studies. In fact, EU legal academic education is only a part of a much wider educational system.

How is the politics or government acting as a responsibility factor regarding EU legal education?

First of all, the general frame of the educational system is set by the Romanian Constitution¹ and the organic law on education². Nevertheless, the kind of normative information subject of this study is to be found not in such general laws but in lower-ranking provisions like governmental and ministerial acts, emphasizing and interpreting the normative acts.

Moreover, in view of the academic education, in 2005 was established The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (RAQAHE)³, an autonomous public institution of national interest, mainly focusing on the external assessment of the Romanian higher education's quality, at both levels of study programs and institutional point of view. This body is acting like an interface between the governmental responsibility and the academic one.

The Romanian State also interferes with another key factor – EU law professors – issuing and conducting demanding procedures for the homologation of professors and the associated professors. For this matter, within the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, a consultant body was founded i.e. The National Council of Homologation for Titles, Diplomas and University Certificates (NCHTDUC).⁴

4.1.2. The structure of legal education system in Romania

Now, that we have outlined the legislative and institutional background of academic studies in Romania, let's take a closer look on how the Romanian legal education system is structured and what are the meaningful consequences to be drawn up for our study.

In 2006, the Romanian Government adopted a provision (no. 1175) defining a new structure of the bachelor's level, concordant with the principles of the Bologna process. Later on, this provision was subsequently improved by several normative acts as the Government's Decision no. 749/2009 or Government's Decision no. 631/2010, both referring on universities study domains and specialization.

Currently, the Romanian legal education at bachelor's level has three specializations: "Law", "Community Law" and "Public Order and Safety" (last one only as of 2009).

Although the Treaty of Lisbon gives to the EU a legal personality (Article 48) and the European Communities are no longer public law subjects (Article 1 par. 3), the Romanian legislator has not yet adjusted the way of speaking and continues to talk about a "community law" instead of the "EU law", at least in the regulations concerning legal education.

Talking about Community law it's not the real problem (as before 2007 we couldn't refer otherwise to the European law), but now, it is in our opinion the time for the Government to assume first of all the current terminology encouraging in this way other factors to update their language.

Disregarding these terminological issues, a Romanian Faculty of Law can provide three kinds of legal learning paths, all of them considered by law as general studies: "classical" Law, EU law and, recently, Public Order and Safety⁵. Of course, it is not *compulsory* for any Faculty of Law to offer all these three specializations. We wanted to know how the Romanian Legal Departments are using this opportunity so we analyzed the list of approved legal specializations. We found out that most of the Legal Departments are choosing the "Law" specialization, only.

4.1.3. Community law specialization at bachelor degree level

There are, according to the Nomenclature of accredited specializations or temporarily authorized to operate at the first stage of university-level studies, only two universities in Romania having as specialization the Community Law: „Babes Bolyai” University in Cluj Napoca and „Nicolae Titulescu” University in Bucharest.

For the first one, this specialization is no longer part of the educational provision for 2010-2011. In fact, this specialization is no longer found also in the above cited Government Decision no. 749/2009 subsequently modified by the Government Decision no. 631/2010.

For the second one, the University „Nicolae Titulescu” of Bucharest, the only one in Romania still offering the specialization of

Community Law within the Faculty of Law, in the academic year 2010 – 2011, only 23 students joined the specialty of Community Law compared to 678 enrolled at the specialty Law, i.e. less than 3.4%. Nationwide, this percentage drops dramatically because this is the only operational specialty of such kind.

However, it is to emphasize that several universities in Romania have as specialty the „Community law” at the level of master degree, which means that prospective students consider studying the European Law not as a general legal training, but as a professional specialization.

4.1.4. EU law courses required by specific standards

As aforementioned, even if universities enjoy academic autonomy, the state imposes a set of requirements designed to ensure the quality of higher education. Such requirements are related, as well, to the content of legal education.

Based on the Government decision no. 1175 / 2006, the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (RAQAHE) above stated, adopted a provision for Law specialization and Community Law specialization: «Specific standards in legal education». This regulation imposes to a student of «classical» Law to follow the courses of the European Community and Competition Law. Nevertheless, the courses of the European Competition Law we found in none of the examined curricula.

Since we talk about accredited faculties (by a procedure involving the control exercised by RAQAHE itself), we can deduce that it is an implicit amendment of the Standards, which are in fact quite old and aren't updated.

Since, (based on the above mentioned) we do not have the specialty of Community Law at the Bachelor degree level, we can't analyze this situation and will proceed to analyze the EU studies within the Law specialty.

We'll emphasize only that a hypothetical Community Law student shall follow twelve more specific courses: General Theory of European Community Law, Institutional Community Law, European Relations and Organizations, The European Development History, Community Business Law, Community Social Law, Community

Financial and Tax Law, EU Insurance Law, Intellectual Property Law, Community Environmental Law, Community Transport Law and Community Politics.

At this point, our recommendations for the Romanian government, as a responsible factor for EU legal education, are (1) to update the official terminology replacing the term “community law” with “EU law”; (2) to provide a number of governmental scholarship grant-in-aids, in order to encourage future students to choose EU legal studies (“Community Law” bachelor’s degree).

4.1.5. The role of academics in the state’s EU legal education policy

The influence of the government on law faculties in Romania is so obvious because the first has the means necessary to impose, in some respects, to the second.

More interesting is to analyze whether and to what extent influences the academics the state’s legal education policy, i.e. if academic environment plays any role in the Romanian state policy for education in EU law.

Unfortunately, in Romania there is still an amateurish atmosphere relative to discussion and political decisions at all levels and areas. The professionals which are not politically active are rarely consulted in taking these decisions.

In this context, we have to remark a study published in 2007, entitled *Standards of content and program framework for education in Law*⁶. The article is signed by three law professors coming from three Romanian universities and it’s the fruit of their concern to improve the quality of higher education and training respectively setting quality standards to grant an effective educational process.

4.2. Academic responsibility in EU legal education

4.2.1. University autonomy and discretion

The responsibility for an advanced EU legal education in Romania falls not only on the Government’s shoulders. After 50 years of Communism and other 20 years of searching our ways, the scientific boards of the Romanian universities have now the management at their discretion. It is up to them to make most curricular choices.

As previously mentioned, the Romanian Government imposes a number of compulsory courses for both law and Community law students. However, neither the Government nor other state authority tells the autonomous universities of Romania in which year of study should they offer these items, how many hours they should assign for courses and applications, how many ECTS (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System) credits⁷ a student can obtain by promoting the associated final exams and so on. Moreover, it's an independent decision of every Legal department to include more optional or facultative EU law related courses, such as History of the European Construction or Substantive Law of the European Union.

4.2.2. *Comparative study of the Romanian law curricula*

Based on the comparative study we conducted on the curricula published by the website of 6 legal departments⁸, we found out that:

1. All of the analyzed law departments include in their curriculum at least one general EU law discipline: one of them – 1 discipline as such, two departments have 2 EU law disciplines, two departments – 4 disciplines and one of the six has no less than 5 EU law disciplines. Please keep in mind that two of the six universities have the “European community law” studied in two semesters, which apparently doubles this discipline (“European community law I” and “European community law II”); the total number of EU law disciplines studied in the 6 law departments is, consequently, 18.

2. Most of the 18 courses are imposed (11), 6 are optional (the students can opt between 2 or 3 disciplines, but must choose one) and 1 is facultative (the students can follow it if they want but they don't have to).

3. Regarding the name of the courses, we found out they are far from being uniform. First of all, some are in the process of adopting the new correct terminology and have in their curricula both “European community law” and “EU law”. The remaining 4 law departments still have the old discipline's name (“European community law” or “Institutional community law”). Second of all, some choose to include in their curricula an additional number of EU law disciplines, not imposed by the “Law specific standards in legal education”: Business communitarian law, History of European construction, Substantive law

of the European Union, European construction, Social communitarian law, History of legal European thinking or Current issues of European integration.

4. The 18 disciplines are divided in all eight semesters, but mostly in the third, fourth or the fifth semester, i.e. the second or third year of study.

5. The evaluation form is mostly an exam, colloquies held only when the discipline is not imposed but optional or facultative. The ECTS credits number varies between 2 and 6, with an average of 5 ECTS credits.

Institution	Discipline's title	Semester of study	Evaluation: Exam (E) / Colloquy (C)	Discipline's regime Imposed (I) / Optional (O)	Facultative(F)	ECTS credits	Courses (C) and Applications (S) Hours / semester
Law Faculty, "Dimitrie Cantemir" University of Targu- Mures	1. European community law	3	E	I		3	28C+28 S
Law Faculty, University of Bucharest	1. European community law I / EU Law I	4	E	I		5	28C+28 S
	2. European community law II / EU Law II	5	E	I		5	28C+28 S
Law and Administrative Sciences Faculty, University of Craiova	1. Institutional communitarian law	3	E	I		4	28C+14 S
	2. Business communitarian law	5	E	I		3	28C+14 S

Law Faculty, "Al. I. Cuza" University of Iasi	1. Institutional communitarian law	2	E	I	5	28C+28 S
	2. European community law. General part	3	C	O	5	28C+28 S
	3. History of European Construction	3	C	O	5	28C+28 S
	4. Substantive Law of the European Union	5	C	O	5	28C+14 S
Law and Administrative Sciences Faculty, West University of Timisoara	1. Institutional communitarian law	2	E	I	6	42C+14 S
	2. European Construction	3	C	O	3	28C+ 0A
	3. Social communitarian law	7	C	O	3	28C+ 0A
	4. Business communitarian law	8	E	I	5	28C+14 S
"Simion Barnutiu" Law Faculty, "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu	1. History of European legal thinking	1	C	O	4	14C+14 S
	2. European community law I	3	E	I	3	28C+14 S
	3. European community law II	4	E	I	3	28C+28 S
	4. Current issues of European integration	5	C	F	2	14C+14 S
	5. Business communitarian law	7	E	I	4	28C+28 S

4.3. EU law professor's syllabus choices

4.3.1. EU law professor's discretion and responsibility

This third level speaks about the responsibility of the professor in choosing the content of his syllabus.

We have already learned that the assertion of state authorities to law departments to include some disciplines in their curricula. Likewise, the curriculum binds the professors in aspects like discipline's name, the semester of study or the total number of course / application hours.

However, law professors have much more discretion in defining their syllabus for the disciplines subject of the "EU law" concept. According to the RAQAHE Standards, the disciplines of study included in the curricula are consisting of syllabuses specifying the objectives of the discipline, the basic thematic content, the distribution of the number of lessons, seminar, and practice hours, by topics, student evaluation and a minimum bibliography.

In other words, EU law professors may choose freely the subjects of their courses and applications, they can decide how many hours to assign for each subject and they can select the compulsory bibliography for their students. Such discretion ought to be doubled by a great sense of responsibility.

From the interviews taken, we can state that EU law professors feel indeed responsible for their choices. We also asked a Romanian EU law official (the Second Secretary for the Permanent Representation of Romania to the European Union) for an interview and he told us that, in his opinion, the main problem is the quality of the professors: the standards imposed by the legislator cannot be followed if the professors are poorly trained.

Once again, the responsibility is shared between the EU law professors, the ministerial homologation body and the university which employs the professor and approves his EU law syllabus.

4.3.2. EU law syllabus analysis

From the comparative analysis of the six curricula we found out that the most frequent EU law courses' subjects are: EU history and communitarian development's principles; EU institutions' structure and activity; Sources of law and the European legal order; Judicial relations in the European Union; The single market and EU politics. The above subjects are included, under one name or another, in each of the 6 studied curricula and were indicated by all 16 interview respondents.

We've noticed as uncommon the following courses: *The national judge as communitarian judge* and *The Romanian lawyer's role in EU law enforcement* – at the University of Bucharest's Law School; *Intercommunications between Romania and EU* – at the University of Craiova's Law and Public Administration School; *Documentation sources on European matters* – at the Law Department of Iasi University; *Law's general principles and unwritten law as EU law sources* – at the University of Timisoara's Law Department.

«EU development and its perspectives» seems to be the main course subject in the 16 interviewed EU law professors' opinion. They think the only mean to avoid confusions is to understand the EU mechanisms, its procedures and its consequences. On the other hand, «EU politics and EU funding», as well as «EU competition law», although considered useful, were indicated in a less than 3% percentage.

According to the interview respondents, the 5 most important subject to be included in EU law syllabus are: EU development and its perspectives (16.43%); EU law and its relationship with internal law (12.86%); EU institutional law (12.86%); EU law sources (11.43%); EU decision making process (9.29%).

Regarding the practical application, EU law professors are convinced that most useful topics for their students should be: European Parliament and its work procedures (15.71%); CJEU case-law (15%); CJEU procedures (13.57%); European Commission's role in EU (12.14%); EU institutions' place, role and activity (12.14%).

4.3.3. Motivations for EU legal studies

Professor's responsibility lies not only in selecting the topics of courses and applications, but also in the way of making their students aware about the importance of EU law, and motivating them to study it.

How important is in the opinion of students to master EU law for their future legal career? According to their answers, it is: extremely important for 26.76%, very important for 54.93%, of medium importance for 16.9%, relatively unimportant for 0.1% and of minor importance for 1.4%.

Most of the professors agree that both «Understanding new perspectives» (35.71%) and «Practical significance: EU law became internal Law» (35.71%) are the main arguments they use to convince

their students. As an interesting subject, the possibility of being elected or to become an employee in EU institutions or bodies is considered as an important argument to the students for 14.29% of professors.

4.4. EU law documentation sources in Romania

4.4.1. EU legal theory: sources of documentation

This fourth factor describes the EU legal theory coordinate viewed as the source of documentation used by students, professors, law scientists and lawyers.

There is no doubt that the sources of documentation play a key role in the process of teaching and learning but also in practicing the EU law.

A significant part of any scientific research is prepared in universities. The scientific environment is the most reactive to conceptual and contextual changes and tends to be the spearhead in any given social activity's evolution. This also proves to be true in the case of the conceptual adjustment regarding the Treaty of Lisbon. Starting from May-June 2010, the former *Romanian Journal of Community Law* (issued in 2003) has changed its name, becoming the *Romanian Journal of European Law*. The editorial board explains the renaming decision by taking into account the new EU realities:

«Once in force the Treaty of Lisbon on 1 December 2009, the entire European life faces a new reality: the formal disappearance of the European Community and even the disappearance of the European Union known as the pillar-structured one. What we now have is a unique entity, with its own new soul and identity, distinct from all its past and carrying great promises for the future. (...) Consequently, the change of our Journal's name is not just a necessity; it is an obligation.»⁹

Moreover, most of the academic professors and scholars have already begun to adjust their language by replacing in their syllabus and publications the term of “Community law” with “EU law”.

Last but not least, the Romanian Academy itself established in 2008 a new research unit within the Legal Studies Institute: The Center for European Studies (CELS).

Before any inventory of the EU law documentation sources in Romania, we have to outline the general relationship with the three above mentioned decision-makers in EU legal education.

4.4.2. Governmental commitment in EU law documentation sources` development

An important role in translating and making accessible the EU documents in Romania was played by the European Institute of Romania (EIR), a public institution established under the Government Ordinance no.15/1998, subsequently amended and completed, approved by the Law no. 133/2009, functioning under the authority of the Government and coordinated by the Department for European Affairs.

EIR started its activity in January 2000 as an organization aiming to provide support to the Romanian decision-makers during the accession process of Romania to the European Union. EIR began its activity as a PHARE project, one of its objectives being to improve the access to Community law.

According to its official website, EIR takes credit for more than 180,000 pages of Community acquits (translated and revised from a linguistic and legal point of view) and over 27,000 validated terminological entries. EIR website also provides guidance about the formation of CELEX number, useful for obtaining EU legislation in the languages of the beneficiary countries, including Romanian from TAIEX legislative databases¹⁰.

Other state institutions offering online information on the EU legislation and key judgments of the Court of Justice of the European Communities and the Court of First Instance are: the High Court of Cassation and Justice (www.scj.ro), the Superior Council of Magistracy (www.csm1909.ro), the National Institute of Magistracy (www.inm-lex.ro) and the Romanian Ministry of Justice (www.just.ro). The latest also provides a user manual for sites of European legislation, which recommends, even using search engine like Google, AltaVista, Yahoo , in case of looking for a Community regulations without knowing its number.

In our opinion the process of understanding and interpretation of EU law could be encouraged more by the Government support in

issuing of books and magazines written in easy language, accessible even for lay in law areas, helping to understand in this way the significance of European law as internal law. In our opinion, such action is also the responsibility of the Government regarding documentary sources and represents an effective form of EU legal education in its widest sense.

Finally, we believe that not only the government influences the way of documentation concerning EU law, but also documentary sources should influence the governmental policy. We are having in mind at least treatises, university courses and studies published by prestigious experts in EU law, which shouldn't be ignored by the government when it comes to take decisions. An eloquent example could be the necessity to update the terminology by the Government, i.e. replace Community law with European Law, following in this way the example of the specialists.

4.4.3. Academic responsibility in EU legal documentation

The relationship between the sources of documentation and the academic responsible factor in EU legal education brings to our attention the matter of academic libraries. Related to the access to adequate learning resources, the Methodology for academic evaluation (elaborated by RAQAHE - The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and published on its website¹¹) states that:

«Higher education institution provides learning resources (textbooks, treatises, bibliographic references, readers, anthologies etc.) for each study program in the libraries, resource centers etc., in classic or electronic format, and free of charge. The library of any higher education institution must have, besides electronic access, an adequate number of volumes from Romania and abroad, and subscriptions to the main specialized journals from Romania and abroad for each discipline which defines a study program. Each library has a program and resources for acquiring books and journals. The ratio between the available learning resources and students is so established that each student has free access to any resource,

according to the objectives and requirements of the study programmers.»

However, the problem of university libraries does not entirely cover the relationship between the sources of documentation and the Romanian universities. The main part of EU legal learning resources are written by EU law professors based on the research work carried out in the faculties of law. In addition, specialty literature can influence curriculum choices of law faculties, preparing it, for example, to introduce also other EU legal courses besides those that are mandatory.

4.4.4. EU law professors` documentation sources

Naturally, the first idea that emerges regarding the relationship between documentary sources and EU law professors is that the Syllabus must include a minimal bibliography, possibly additional bibliography as recommendation to the students.

We also believe that the timeliness, complexity and depth of documentation sources used by any EU law professor play a major role in the process of setting up the Syllabus for these courses. Not the least, EU law Syllabus must always be updated, since its content is rapidly changing.

4.4.5. Inventory of EU law documentary sources and how are they used in Romania

Next, we will make an inventory of the existing/accessible sources of EU law documentation in Romania. Naturally, the prime source of documentation must be the Official Journal of the European Union, the authoritative source of EU law, published in all official languages of the European Union, including Romanian. Based on the questionnaires we applied, to this source of documentation apply the following:

- EU law teachers use The Official Journal of the European Union as a primary source of documentation in a 25.71% proportion;
- Law practitioners (judges, prosecutors, advocates and counselors) use it in a 14.41% proportion;
- 53.52% of law students believe it should be the prime source of documentation in their future of EU law practice.

Regarding the preponderancy of the documentation sources, we found out that:

- EU law professors: 80.95% of them consult the official website (eur-lex.europa.eu); 9.52% of them also use a search engine on the Internet (Google, Altavista, Yahoo, Lycos, AOL etc.); none of them subscribed to the hard copy or CD-ROM version of the Journal; 9.52% of them use another way to consult the Official Journal of the European.

- Lawyers (judges, prosecutors, advocates and counselors): 41.18% of them choose the official website (eur-lex.europa.eu); the same percentage also use a search engine on the Internet (Google, Altavista, Yahoo, Lycos, AOL etc.); none of them subscribed to the hard copy or CD-ROM version of the Journal; 17.65% of them said they don't need to consult the Official Journal of the European Union.

Another documentation source used frequently is the EU law treaties, monographs, scientific and university books. This kind of books is used in Romania as following:

- EU law professors use it in a 35.71% proportion;
- 39.12% of lawyers (judges, prosecutors, advocates and counselors) use it in proportion of 100%;
- 40.85% of law students believe it should be the prime source of documentation in their future EU legal practice.

The most frequently titles mentioned by judges, prosecutors, advocates and counselors using this source are:

- Augustin Fuerea – *Manualul Uniunii Europene*, Bucuresti, Universul Juridic, 2008 (indicated by 13.73% of Lawyers);
- Octavian Manolache – *Tratat de drept comunitar*⁴, Bucuresti, C.H.Beck, 2006 (indicated by 11.76% of Lawyers);
- Victor Duculescu – *Dreptul Uniunii Europene – tratat elementar*, Bucuresti, Lumina Lex, 2003 (indicated by 8.82% of Lawyers);
- Pierre Mathijsen – *Compendium on European law*, Rom. transl. *Compendiu de drept european*, Bucuresti, Club Europe, 2002 (indicated by 8.82% of lawyers).

The titles frequently mentioned by the Law professors using this source are:

- Stelian Scaunas - *Uniunea Europeana, constructie, reforma, institutii, drept*, Bucuresti, CH BECK, 2008 (indicated by 26.19%);
- Augustin Fuerea – *Drept Comunitar European, Partea Generala*, Bucuresti, All Beck, Bucuresti, 2003 (indicated by 14.29%);

- Francois-Xavier Priollaud, David Siritzky, *Le traite de Lisbonne. Commentaire, article par article, des nouveaux traites europeens*, Paris, La Documentation Francaise, 2008 (indicated by 11.90%);
- Ivan Daniela – *Recent consecrated decisions of EUCJ*, Bucuresti, CH Beck, 2007 (indicated by 9.52%);
- Gilles Ferreol (coord.), *Dictionarul Uniunii Europene*, Iasi, Polirom, 2001 (indicated by 9.52%).

Regarding journals, reviews and other periodical publications, we noted that:

- EU law teachers use it in proportion of 18.57%;
- 29.41% of lawyers (judges, prosecutors advocates and counselors) use it in proportion of 100%;
- Only 5.63% of law students believe it should be the prime source of documentation in their future EU law practice.

The most frequently mentioned publications by the respondents using it as primary source are: «Revista romana de drept european», indicated by 42.86% of EU law teachers and 16.67% of lawyers) and «Revista Dreptul», named by 17% of EU law teachers and 32.35% of lawyers).

An interesting detail: 19.2% of respondents replied they use to consult «The Romanian Journal of Communitarian Law». As this journal changed its name into «The Romanian Journal of European Law», such answer proves seldom consultation of this source, yet recognition of its scientific authority in EU Law.

At the question «Which is the primary EU law documentation source you would recommend to your students? Please explain your preference», the EU law professors replied as follows:

- The Official Journal of the European Union: 42.86%;
- Stelian Scaunas - *Uniunea Europeana, constructie, reforma, institutii, drept*, Bucuresti, CH BECK, 2008 (indicated by 26.19%);
- Other EU law treaties, monographs, scientific and university books: 19.05%;
- Electronic databases: 14.29%.

	EU Law professors	Legal practitioner	Law students
Official Journal of the European Union (www.eur-lex.europa.eu)	25.71%	14.41%	53.52%
EU law treaties, monographs, scientific and university books	35.71%	39.12%	40.85%
Journals, reviews and other periodical publications	18.57%	29.41%	5.63%
Internet (other websites that the official ones)	14.29%	7.06%	0%
Another documentation source (mass-media, databases etc.)	5.71%	10%	0%

4.5. EU practical legal training in Romania

4.5.1. Governmental regulations on students` legal praxis

Further on, we will analyze how involved are the Romanian authorities into the practical training, based on general provisions, trying to identify the specific legal rules for EU legal training.

In 2007, the Romanian Parliament adopted a law¹² regarding the praxis of pupils and students. According to the first article of the said law, the praxis is an activity performed by the pupils and students, in accordance with the curriculum, aiming to check the applicability of the theoretical knowledge, learned during the training program.

In other words, the role of the practical training is to strengthen the theoretical knowledge and train practitioner skills in order to apply it according to the specialization for which they train.

More details about the objectives of practical training, gives us a recent Order of the Minister of Administration and Interior regarding the organization and performance of specialized internship in units of students/master coming from civil institutions of higher educations:

«Practical training activities are to achieve the following general objectives:

- a) Documenting the practitioners with the areas of interest agreed with the supervising teacher
- b) Acquisition of specific work skills by activities performed with their practical training partner
- c) To familiarize practitioners with activities carried out by their practical training partner, in their field of interest
- d) Deepening the knowledge gathered from the materials of studying according to the yearly curricula
- e) Improvement of informative materials (newsletters, magazines, etc.)»

The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (RAQAHE) includes in the Methodology for academic evaluation some provisions about the practical training of students:

«Study programs are integrated with traineeships, placements and internships and student involvement in research projects. (...) The ratio between the teaching hours and other educational activities applies (i.e. seminars, laboratory activities, projects, traineeships etc.) must be of 1/1, with no more than +/-20 % allowed deviation. (...) In the curricula issued referring to the program of study for License, there should be a training of 2-3-weeks per year beginning with the second year of study including a certain time needed to prepare the diploma paperwork, during the final year of study.»

More details about practical training of law students should be provided by specific Standards issued by RAQAHE for this field. However, standards define only that students have to do their praxis relevant to their specialty in the eight semester (and optionally in the 1st – 3rd year of study), at courthouses, prosecutors` offices, lawyers, notaries, legal advice firms, agencies, city halls, Ministries` legal services etc.

As regards governmental directives, we can conclude that the Romanian legislator considers practical training compulsory not only for students but even for pupils and the real performance of such training is a condition for promotion.

4.5.2. *EU legal praxis in Romanian universities*

As afore stated, the regulation of the practical training is only general, without any stipulation about the incumbency of the practical training for each course theoretically studied.

The curriculum issued by faculties, the time of praxis, if the praxis is weekly or at the end of the semester or year of study, assessment forms and credits granted for any practical activity.

The choice of the authorities or judicial offices concluding the agreement of praxis for legal students remains also at the discretion of universities.

Fortunately, EU law praxis can be performed also during the hours assigned for seminars or practical application by interpretation exercises of legal texts, analysis of real decisions taken by the Court of the Justice, simulation of imaginary cases etc.

The time assigned by the institutions for training such as practical skills can be found in the curricula that provide not only the number of hours assigned for theoretical training but also the ones assigned for seminars and practical applications.

Comparing the curricula of the 6 faculties of Law considered and the 18 EU law courses identified, we can state that most of the law departments assign 28 course hours per semester (2 hours per week) and 14 or 28 application hours (1 or 2 hours per week). Nevertheless, one of the law departments has a discipline with 42 course hours per semester (3 hours per week) but other two disciplines with no application hours.

Based on this information, we can conclude that most of law faculties in Romania assign more theoretical hours to EU law courses than to practical exercises.

Our previous researches¹³ reveal also that Romanian legal students are not content with the practical knowledge they get during their academic studies.

The situation doesn't look better also on the practical training of EU law. Most of the interviewed students (81%) declared themselves as not prepared to invoke EU law provisions in a case. Moreover, 29% believe that they won't even deal with EU Law in their future carriers, but only with internal Romanian laws. 19.72% of them admit they never used a EU law documentation source.

It seems like the Romanian Legal Departments do not emphasize the importance of the EU legal training for a future lawyer acting on the EU territory. They consequently fail to provide enough practical training in the field.

As such practical knowledge is difficult if not impossible to be acquired by training at an EU authority, our recommendations to the faculties of law is to assign more hours of practical exercises in the curricula for EU law courses.

This recommendation concur with the opinion expressed in the interviews by professors and experts in EU law, according to which is “necessary to develop skills of understanding the EU law and interpretation focusing on EUCJ”, practical applications “help students to perceive objectively and directly the practical aspects required by the EU law” while both “the complicated institutional architecture of EU and the decision making processes are topics better understood by practical exercises and study cases”.

Of course, the most practical applications are those performed by the European bodies, where students have the opportunity to observe directly the enforcement mechanism of the EU law. Such opinion is sustained also by a distinguished professor in EU law from the Faculty of Political Sciences, International Relations and European Studies within the University “Lucian Blaga” from Sibiu, who revealed that the faculty organizes for the students every year visits to the European Parliament.

Consequently, our second recommendation to faculties of law related to EU law practical training is to try to organize regular practical trainings at EU institutions, at least for part of their students, chosen by a rigorous and transparent method of selection.

4.5.3. EU law professor's role in students' practical training

The practical training in EU law can be assessed also from the perspective of practical topics, applications, and teacher seminars set by the syllabus. See here the results of the comparative analysis of syllabus.

The findings of this analysis based on syllabus are gathered with the results obtained based on interviews of law professors. The main application / seminars / practical work topics to be included in the syllabus of the “EU Law” are, in the opinion of the interviewed

professors: European Parliament and its work procedures, CJEU case-law and CJEU procedures.

In order to assess the importance granted by law students to a study of EU law for their legal career, I first asked what is in their opinion more important for a lawyer acting in Romania to know in terms of EU law. 16.9% of the students replying to our survey think it's important to know only the Romanian legislation, 1.41% - solely the European Union legislation and 81.69% - Romanian legislation, EU legislation and the jurisprudence of the European Court of Justice (ECJ).

For the same purpose, we asked the students "How would you assess the importance of knowing the European Union law for your future legal career?". The replies were: 26.76% - the highest importance, 54.93% - quite important, 16.9% - medium importance; 0% - quite insignificant, and 1.41% - of minor importance.

However, even they all seem to understand the importance of EU law in their future career, only 28.17% admit they ever used a EU law documentation source by their own will, and 50.7% of them claim they used such sources only because their professor asked them to.

4.5.4. The efficiency of EU Law in the Romanian legal praxis

The fundamental evidence (maybe not the only one but in any case, the most important) of any graduate professional skills is the ability to have a job in the field they were prepared, namely a legal profession (or, possibly, related fields).¹⁴

On the other hand, it is important to mention that a lawyer's education is not complete once he or she obtains a bachelor degree. Most of the law graduates continue their study not only by master and sometimes doctoral courses, but also following a specialized professional school, like the Superior Institute for Judges, the National Training Institute of Lawyers or the National School of Political and Administrative Studies. These public schools have a major responsibility in making EU legal studies important, as it should be, for each and every European lawyer.

The National Institute for Magistrates (NIM)¹⁵ is a public entity under the coordination of the Superior Council of Magistracy. It provides initial training of judges and prosecutors, the continuous

professional training of acting judges and prosecutors, and any training according to law.

According to its Regulation, «NIM is not part of the national educational system and is not, therefore subject of any legislation governing certification of higher education institutions and recognition of graduation diplomas».

However, the courses and seminars organized by NIM play a major role in deepening the practical knowledge of magistrates.

The syllabus of NIM for Community law courses defines debates as a pedagogical method, case studies (real causes of the Court and imaginary cases). Each topic has binding case studies, so the practical component is very pronounced.

The NIM has also continuous training programs for magistrates (judges and prosecutors). As a recent example, the representatives of European judicial training institutions and schools took part at the conference on „Professional Training within the European space: Standards, Strategies, Programs, Trainers”, organized by the National Institute of Magistracy at Bucharest, on 22-23 November, 2010.

Moreover, Romanian judges and prosecutors can attend to additional courses and workshops by NIM like “Litigating European Union Law”, an introductory course organized by the European Law Academy (ERA), held at Trier, on 22-24 September 2010. The purpose of this course, addressing primarily to national legal practitioners, is to highlight the relevance of EU Law in the daily work of national lawyers and describe different types of proceedings before the European Union Courts (the Court of Justice, the General Court and the Civil Service Tribunal of the EU) in which a national practitioner is likely to get involved. Another example is the conference „Recent Trends in the Case Law of the European Courts: What Directions for the Future?”, organized by the European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA), held at Luxembourg, on 2-3 December 2010. The overall objective of this annual conference is to provide the participants (legal professionals within the public and private sector, judicial professionals, law enforcement officers, national civil servants and others involved in such issues of the European Union Law, academics, and others who are active or interested in EU legal issues in general, and in the main rule

provided by the European Courts in particular) with an overview of the current case law of the three European Union Courts emphasizing in particular bench mark decisions.

Not only judges and prosecutors may benefit from a specific form of practical training, but advocates too.

The National Institute for Advocates Training and Improvement acts under the authority of the Romanian Union of Attorneys and aims to train initially and continuously, form and improve attorneys' skills, in order to provide a qualified exercise of the right of defense and professional competence of attorneys.

Like NIM, the National Training Institute of Attorneys does not belong to the national educational system and is not subject of any authorization and accreditation procedures, provided by law.

The Institute organizes both courses i.e. forming of trainee attorney (attorney on probation) and performing respectively continuous professional forming of definitive (permanent) attorneys.

Talking about the initial training term, we need to point out that attorneys on probation have no obligation to follow the courses organized by the National Training Institute of Attorneys, they have the possibility to follow a classical form of training, i.e. to complete a two year professional training term ended with the examination for permanent attorney. Attorneys on probation who decide to follow the courses of the National Institute of Attorney Training will get the status of permanent attorney if promoting the graduation exam at the Institute. However, the courses for initial professional training do not include EU law, but only Civil law, Civil Procedure law, Criminal law, Criminal Procedure law, Family law, Labor and Social Security law, the Law relevant to the organization and praxis of the profession as attorney.

On the other side, if we talk about continuous professional training courses, the Institute organizes specialized seminars (discussions, debates) addressed to permanent attorneys. The topics of each seminar is defined considering the Guidance Program of continuous professional training published within the Program of continuous professional training for attorney from January 1, 2008 to January 1, 2011. The topics are from the following courses: Civil law, Civil Procedure law, Criminal Law, Criminal Procedure law, Family law, Commercial law, Labor law, the Law relevant to the organization and

praxis of the profession as attorney but also from the Communitarian law and European law of Human Rights.

For example, on June 26, 2010, the Institute is organizing a conference having as topic „Exercising the profession of attorney in Romania, a member state of the EU” while on the e-learning platform it is possible to follow the course „Access to justice according to the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights”.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

From the perspective of EU law, legal education in Romania gains new valences, approaches and new gateways.

Our research aims to track and describe the coordinates of EU legal education in Romania, starting from identifying the main responsible actors, without overlooking yet the reasons and purposes: to provide law students with both cognitive and applicative skills in EU law.

We suggested a five-pointed structure of EU legal education, which takes into account: (1) the political commitment of the Romanian Government; (2) the academic responsibility of Romanian Law schools; (3) the teaching choices of EU law teachers; (4) the EU legal theory and documentation sources and (5) EU legal practice in Romania.

This five-pointed structure helped us to spotlight not only the key factors involved in the EU legal education of Romania, but also their mutual interactions. Such relational perspective, combined with the quantitative and qualitative survey we made on primary sources (legislation, legal curricula, EU law syllabus, interviews and questionnaires) allowed us to draw some conclusions, summarized here below:

(1) Despite the constant interest of the Romanian Government into the European legal education, Romania still confronts with conceptual issues and unsystematic approach of EU law courses. In the regulations relevant to legal education, Romanian legislator has not yet adjusted the way of expression and continues to speak about “community law” instead of “EU law”.

(2) Disregarding this semantic oversight, the Romanian government issued “specific standards” for *EU law* specialization in law

schools, indicating a constant interest and support in this educational branch, at least as a level of declaration.

(3) Even if the law schools are allowed by instructional provisions to offer distinct *EU law* specialization, most of them choose the “traditional” *Law* as specialty as more desired by the potential students.

(4) *EU law* is more often requested by the Romanian law graduates as a master degree specialization, what makes us believe that EU legal studies are thought more as a form of professional specialization than a general form of legal training.

(5) Apart from a number of courses imposed by the Government, Romanian law schools have enough discretion to make the most of the curricular choices, so it’s up to them to define how many and what kind of EU law disciplines they include in the curricula, in which semester of study, how many hours they assign for courses and applications, the number of ECTS and so on.

(6) As the curriculum binds the EU law teacher in aspects like discipline’s name, the semester of study or the total number of course / application hours, he/she enjoys discretion in issuing the syllabus and may choose freely the topics of courses and applications, the number of hours assigned for each topic and the compulsory bibliography.

(7) Regarding the documentation sources of EU law, most of the law students consider the Official Journal of the European Union as major source. That seems to concur with the recommendation of EU law teachers to their students to use the Official Journal as primary source of documentation. On the other hand, EU law teachers and legal practitioners prefer to use more elaborated sources, like EU law treaties and EU law journals.

(8) 90% of Romanian law students consider EU legal training utmost important or very important for their future careers. However, 72 % of them admit not to be prepared to invoke EU law provisions in a legal case, indicating that Romanian law schools fail to provide enough EU legal practical knowledge.

(9) Fortunately, post-graduate legal studies like those provided by the National Institute for Magistrates or the National Training Institute of Attorneys, focus on the Community/EU law, especially on praxis.

As a general conclusion, the responsibility for a proper, competitive EU legal education in Romania is shared between duty of EU law teachers, the commitment of every law school and the political will of the Government. Each of these three key factors must concur to help law students in the effort to understand *what*, *how* and *why* to learn EU law. Finally, we can make some recommendations for the above three actors on the EU legal education scene, hoping that of such actions can benefit not only to law students, lawyers and other legal practitioners, but the whole Romanian society, serving to a healthy, harmonious and strong EU policy.

Therefore, our recommendations to the Romanian authorities are:

(1) To update the official terminology of all instructional provisions by the term of “EU law” instead of “community law”

(2) To grant several governmental scholarships in order to encourage potential law students to choose EU legal studies for bachelor’s degree;

(3) To encourage the EU legal education in the widest sense by books and magazines written in an easy language, accessible even for lay in law areas in order to understand the significance of European law as internal law.

(4) To be more receptive to the EU law and the opinion of legal education experts and to consult such professionals before taking important decisions.

Our recommendations to the Romanian faculties of Law are:

(1) To assign in their curricula more hours of practical exercises for EU law courses, following the example of non-academic training programs for judges, prosecutors or lawyers.

(2) To try to organize regular practical trainings for students within the EU institutions, bodies and agencies, or at least yearly visits to bodies like the European Parliament, the EU Court of Justice.

(3) To join international networks for EU legal studies and encourage students to enroll in visiting or exchanging programs for university studies.

Finally, our suggestions to any Romanian professor of EU law are:

(1) To find creative and interactive methods to make law students aware how important is EU law as internal law, mainly of the practical benefits for any lawyer's career;

(2) To encourage more the students to work independently with EU law provisions: access, understand the way of expression, interpret the meaning and figure out how to use it in actions and pleas;

(3) To help students to understand clearly and directly the practical aspects of the EU law, like the complex institutional architecture of EU as well as decision making process, by practical exercises and study of case;

(4) To encourage and expect active participation in class, e.g. by moot exercises – hypothetical problems, moot courts and decision-making games.

(5) To inoculate to students the idea of law in the widest sense and EU law in particular, is a social construction demanding critical thinking, contextual approach and sensitivity to other cultures and experiences.

Acknowledgement

This paper was previously published as a book chapter in: Valentino Cattelan (Editor), *Integration through Legal Education. The Role of EU Legal Studies in Shaping the EU*, Societa editrice il Mulino, Bologna, 2012. A sincere word of appreciation to Mr. Cattelan, for his efforts in promoting multi-cultural approach of legal education.

We would like to express our deep and sincere gratitude to those who kindly helped us in our researching survey and the comparison study of curricula: PhD Professor Teodor Bodoaşcă - Rector of “Dimitrie Cantemir” University of Targu-Mures, PhD Professor Stelian Scăunaş - “Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu, PhD Raluca Bercea - West University of Timișoara, PhD Augustina Dumitraşcu – University of Bucharest, Judge Maria Ristache and Judge Cornelia Dima – Court of Mures County.

Special thanks also to all faculties' members, students and lawyers participating to our survey and interviews.

We would also like to thank Mr. Gabriel Blaj, Second Secretary of Permanent Representation for Romania to the European Union for his most valuable comments and advices.

Bibliography

- Akbas, K., (2007) *A Frame For The Features of Legal Profession in Turkey*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Law and Society Association, TBA, Berlin, Germany (July 25, 2007). Available on: http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p177360_index.html. Accessed: 2008-10-10.
- Baias, F. A., Dănișor D. C., Vasilescu, P., (2007) *Standardele de conținut și programul cadru pentru domeniul Drept*, in «Analele Universității „Titu Maiorescu” din București, seria Drept», 2007, n. 4, pp. 138-156.
- Bobot, L., (2009) *Teaching Negotiation at the Faculty of Law of the Sorbonne University*, in «European Journal of Legal Education», 5, 2009, n. 1, pp. 13-20.
- Castro, P. C., *European Union Law - Facing the Constitutional and Governance Challenges in the Era of Globalization*. Available on http://www.umac.mo/JeanMonnet_Action/doc/course_courseSyllabus.pdf. Accessed: 2010-12-29.
- Commission of the European Communities, (2005) *Communication to the Spring European Council. Working Together for Growth and Jobs. A New Start for the Lisbon Strategy*, 2005, pp. 26-28. Available on: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/lexuriserv/site/en/com/2005/com2005_0024en01.pdf, Accessed: 2009-11-20.
- Djuvara, M., (1995) *Teoria generală a dreptului*, Bucharest, All.
- Gorea, B., ed., (2009) *World Theory and Practice in Conflict Mediation*, Zethus, Târgu-Mureș.
- Gorea, B., (2010) *Law Interpretation between Logic and Hermeneutics*, in «Israel Adult Education Association», edited by David Silvera, 2010. Available on <http://www.adultlearning.org.il>.
- Gorea, B., (2010) *The Legal Education, between Pragmatism and Academic Responsibility*, in *Research, Education and Development*, edited by Gheorghe Pop, Risoprint: Cluj-Napoca, pp. 57-64.
- Gorea, B. and Puha, E., (2009) *Filosofie, Justiție și Drept*, Zethus, Targu-Mures.

- Gorea B., Tomulețiu, E. A., Costin, M. D *et al.*, (2010) *Educating law students as good citizens. Is the Romanian legal education system ready to fulfill its social mission?*, in «Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences», Volume II, 2010, n. 2, pp. 2927-2931.
- Gorea, B., Tomulețiu, E. A., Puha, E. *et al.*, (2010) *Romanian Legal education at the Crossroads: Designing Responsible Law Curricula*, in «Proceedings of the 6th International Seminar on the Quality Management in Higher Education– QMHE 2010, Tulcea, Romania, 8th-9th July 2010», Book I, 2010, pp. 431-434.
- Government of Romania, *The National Plan of Development, 2007-2013*. Available on: http://eufinantare.info/Documente/Sinteza_PND2007_2013.pdf, Accessed: 2009-11-20.
- Hacimahmutoglu, S., (2008) *Effective Techniques for Teaching Anglo-American Legal System in Turkish Legal Education*, paper presented at «Effective Teaching Techniques about Other Cultures and Legal Systems», The General Assembly of International Association of Law Schools, 29-30 May 2008, Montreal, Canada.
- Ioan, P., Gorea, B., (2009) *Reforma justiției din România, în perspectiva analizei de tip semio-logic*, in «Analele științifice ale Institutului de Studii Europene „Ștefan Lupășcu” - Iași, seria Secvențe praxiologice», vol. VII, 2009, n. 1, Iași, Ștefan Lupășcu, pp. 5-24.
- Johnson, N., (2009) *Coming Out: Legal Education and the Wider World*, in «European Journal of Legal Education», 5, 2009, n. 1, pp. 42-46.
- Morar, A., Tomulețiu, E. A., Gorea, B. *et al.*, (2009) *A Model of Good Practice in Training of Trainers*, in «Annals of DAAAM for 2009 & Proceedings of the 20th International DAAAM Symposium», edited by B. Katalinic, Vienna, DAAAM International, 2009, pp. 1405-1406
- Puha, E., Gorea, B., (2009) *Current Evolution of Justice and Its Political Consequences*, in *Dimensions of Change at the Beginning of the XXIst Century*, edited by Gheorghe Pop, Risoprint, Cluj-Napoca, pp. 21-27.
- Puha, E., Gorea, B., (2009) *Understanding the Law: A Hermeneutic Approach*, in *Dimensions of Change at the Beginning of the XXIst Century*, edited by Gheorghe Pop, Risoprint, Cluj-Napoca, pp. 28-36.
- Slev, A. M., Gorea, B., Tomulețiu, E. A. (2010), *Reassessing approaches in teaching adults*, in «Proceedings of International Conference Job

- Relevant Learning: Foreign Language and Translation In High School, Moscow, 23-23 March 2010», 2010, pp. 467-470.
- Tomulețiu, E. A., Gorea, B., Morar, A. *et al.*, (2010) *Continuous Development in organizations – Romanian model*, in «Journal of US-China Public Administration - „From Knowledge to Wisdom” », vol. VII, 2010, n. 3, pp. 26-38.
- Tomulețiu, E. A., Pop-Lupu, A. M., Oroian, M. *et al.*, (2010) *Methodological Implications of the Diversity of Learning Styles in Higher Education Practice*, in «Proceedings of the 6th International Seminar on the Quality Management in Higher Education– QMHE 2010, Tulcea, Romania, 8th-9th July 2010», Book II, 2010, pp. 291-294.
- *** *From EC Law to EU law and from RRDC to RRDE* (editorial), in «Romanian Journal of European Law », 2010, n. 3, p. 15.

Endnotes:

- [1] The Constitution of Romania of 1991 was amended and completed by the Law No. 429/2003 on the revision of the Constitution of Romania, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, No. 758 of 29 October 2003, republished by the Legislative Council on the grounds of article 152 of the Constitution, with the updated denominations and the renumbered texts (Article 152 became, in the republished form, Article 156).
- [2] Education Law no.84/1995, republished with up-to-date modifications in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, No. 1 of 5 January 1996, regulates the organization and functioning of the national system of education, including higher and university education, post-graduated education and Master, scientific research within the universities, the structure of higher education institutions; university autonomy, the curriculum, university libraries, students and the improvement of professors' knowledge.
- [3] RAQAHE was founded by Government's Emergency Ordinance no. 75/2005 on Quality Assurance in Education, as approved with modifications through Law no. 87/2006, with further modifications. The Romanian name of this agency is «Agenția Română de Asigurare a Calității în Învățământul Superior» – ARACIS.

- [4] NCHTDUC was established by the Minister's Order no. 3904/2006. The Romanian name of this council is «Consiliul Național de Atestare a Titlurilor, Diplomelor și Certificatelor Universitare» – CNATDCU.
- [5] Public Order and Safety is really not a law specialization at all, but is considered as such by the Romanian educational authorities.
- [6] Flavius A. Baias, Dan-Claudiu Dănișor, Paul Vasilescu, *Standardele de conținut și programul cadru pentru domeniul Drept (Standards of content and program framework for education in Law)*, in «Analele Universității „Titu Maiorescu” din București, seria Drept», 2007, n. 4, pp. 138-156.
- [7] The Order of the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research no. 3617/16.03.2005 generalizes the application of European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System – ECTS in Romanian universities. ECTS was in place since 1998 but it was used mostly for the mobility schemes with the foreign partners. This new order stipulates a general use of ECTS which stimulates students in their mobility inside the same HEI and/or between programmes offered by various Romanian universities, similar to the mobility freedom promoted by ECTS across the borders of the country.
- [8] The six law departments we analyzed function within the following accredited Romanian Universities: "Dimitrie Cantemir" University of Târgu-Mureș, University of Bucharest, University of Craiova, "Al. I. Cuza" University of Iași, West University of Timișoara and "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu.
- [9] *From EC Law to EU law and from RRDC to RRDE* (editorial), in «Romanian Journal of European Law», 2010, n. 3, p. 15.
- [10] TAIEX is the Technical Assistance and Information Exchange instrument managed by the Directorate-General Enlargement of the European Commission, which supports partner countries with regard to the approximation, application and enforcement of EU legislation.
- [11] http://www.RAQAHE.ro/fileadmin/RAQAHE/Proceduri/Metodology_for_External_Evaluation.pdf

- [12] Law no. 258 / 2007, published in the Official Gazette of Romania, Part I, no. 493 of 24 July 2007.
- [13] Brîndușa Gorea, *The Legal Education, between Pragmatism and Academic Responsibility*, in *Research, Education and Development*, edited by Gheorghe Pop, Cluj-Napoca, Risoprint, 2010, pp. 57-64; B. Gorea, E. A. Tomulețiu, M. D. Costin *et al.*, *Educating law students as good citizens. Is the Romanian legal education system ready to fulfill its social mission?*, in «Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences», Volume II, 2010, n. 2, pp. 2927-2931; B. Gorea, E. A. Tomulețiu, E. Puha *et al.*, *Romanian Legal education at the Crossroads: Designing Responsible Law Curricula*, in «Proceedings of the 6th International Seminar on the Quality Management in Higher Education– QMHE 2010, Tulcea, Romania, 8th-9th July 2010», Book I, 2010, pp. 431-434.
- [14] F. A. Baias *et al.*, *Standardele de conținut și programul cadru pentru domeniul Drept*, pp. 140.
- [15] The National Institute for Magistrates was established and operates under the Law of the Judiciary no.304/2004, under the Law on the Statute of judges and prosecutors no.303/2004, under the Law on the Superior Council of Magistracy no.317/2004, as were amended and supplemented, and in accordance with its own provisions. The Romanian name of this institute is «Institutul Superior al Magistraturii» – INM.