

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

Guidelines for the activities and the compilation of the Annual Report of the Students-Professors Joint Committee (CPDS)

Index

- 1. Guidelines for the activities of the Students-Professors Joint Committee (CPDS)**
 - 1.a Composition of the Students-Professors Joint Committee**
 - 1.b Tasks and responsibilities of the Students-Professors Joint Committee**
- 2. Guidelines for the compilation of the annual report of the Students-Professors Joint Committee**
 - 2.a Characteristics and purposes of the Annual Report**
 - 2.b Operating procedures**
 - 2.c Indications for compilation**

Annex 1: Summary of the documents to be consulted for monitoring the Degree Courses

Annex 2: Documentation and reference legislation

Annex 3: Quality Requirements for the accreditation of the Degree Courses

1. GUIDELINES FOR THE ACTIVITIES OF THE STUDENTS-PROFESSORS JOINT COMMITTEE (CPDS)

1.a Composition of the Students-Professors Joint Committee

The Students-Professors Joint Committee (CPDS) is a body responsible for the monitoring and the evaluation of the university's teaching and educational processes and is composed of a share of students and professors in equal numbers, for a total of not less than 4 members. The establishment of the CPDS is referred to in art. 2 paragraph g) of Law 240/2010 on the organization of universities. The Regulations of the Teaching and Research Structures provide for the presence of a CPDS in each faculty and in each Department that is not related to a faculty. In the case of a faculty, the Committee is composed of 4 professors and 4 students; in the case of a department, the composition is referred to in a department regulation and includes at least 4 members.

The students members are elected by the students of the Degree Courses belonging to the structure, while the professors are elected by the Board. The professors members choose a contact person internally, who convenes and chairs the CPDS meetings, takes care of the relations with the reference structure, the Evaluation Unit and the Academic Quality Assurance.

Due to the assessment role played by the CPDS, the Academic Quality Assurance recommends that the Members of the Students-Professors Joint Committee are not part of the Group Review/ Quality Assurance Management Groups of the Degree Course that report to it and are not the Rector, the Director of Department and Coordinators of the Degree Courses.

The CPDS can hold meetings electronically and is validly constituted with the participation of half plus one of the members.

1.b Tasks and responsibilities of the Students-Professors Joint Committee

The CPDS monitors and evaluates the Degree Courses relating to the structure to which

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

the CPDS belongs. The role played by the CPDS is part of the R2 requirement of the M.D 6/2019: *the university has an effective quality assurance system, able to monitor the functioning of the Degree Courses (R2.a) and to ascertain that processes and results are periodically self-assessed and evaluated (R2.b)*

The CPDS issues an opinion on the activation and suppression of the Degree Courses, as well as on the consistency between the credits assigned to the educational activities and the specific educational objectives programmed by the Degree Course, in the event of changes made to the regulation and/or internal articulation of the educational path.

In addition, the CPDS is competent to carry out monitoring activities of the educational offer and the quality of teaching as well as of the students service activities performed by professors and researchers; to identify indicators for the evaluation of their results. In particular, the CPDS have the task of:

- making proposals to the reference structures of the Degree Courses and to the Evaluation Unit for the improvement of the quality and effectiveness of the educational structures;
- dissemination of university quality policies towards students;
- monitoring of indicators that measure the degree of achievement of educational objectives at the level of individual structures.

With regard to these tasks, the CPDS annually evaluates the curricula projects and draws up a report with its considerations. The CPDS draws up a report for each Degree Course of competence: the report provides the reference structure, the Degree Courses, the University QA structures.

CPDS activities require an informed participation of all the components and a frequent connection with the Coordinators of the Degree Courses and with the students. In particular, it is important that the CPDS has direct contacts with students of all the reference Degree Courses. It is appropriate that the CPDS provide for continuous activities throughout the year and at least quarterly meetings which are documented by reports on the nature and results of the performed activities and analysis.

2. GUIDELINES FOR THE COMPILATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE STUDENTS-PROFESSORS JOINT COMMITTEE

2.a Characteristics and purposes of the Annual Report

Art. 2 paragraph g) of Law 240/2010 provides that the CPDS draws up an Annual Report. This report takes into consideration the overall educational offer of the Degree Courses that refer to the Faculty / Department to which the CPDS belongs, with particular reference to the results of the survey on the students' opinion, indicating any specific critical elements to the individual Degree Courses and making proposals for improvement. The guidelines of the National Agency for the Evaluation of the University System and Research (ANVUR) for the accreditation of offices and Degree Courses (10 August 2017) provide indications on the contents of the annual report.

Drawing on the SUA (*Scheda Unica Annuale* – Annual Single Sheet) of the Degree Course and the documentation made available by the Coordinator of the Degree Course, on the results of the surveys on the students' opinions, on the data relating to the

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

indicators and other possible sources, as well as **on the basis of the elements that emerged through their analysis**, the CPDS takes into consideration the following aspects:

- the contents of the Degree Course, in order to ensure its updating in the light of the most recent research conducted in the disciplines represented in it;
- the changing needs of society;
- students' workload, progression and completion times;
- the effectiveness of the methods of verifying the results achieved by the students;
- students' needs and expectations and the satisfaction they expressed towards the Degree Course;
- the learning environment, the support services and their suitability for performing the Degree Course activities.

The CPDS assesses whether¹:

- a) the questionnaires relating to student satisfaction are effectively analyzed, used, disseminated;
- b) teaching materials and aids, laboratories, classrooms, equipment, are adequate in relation to the achievement of learning objectives at the desired level;
- c) the methods for assessing the knowledge and skills acquired by students are valid and effective in relation to the expected learning outcomes;
- d) the internal monitoring activity performed by the Degree Course is effective;
- e) the information provided in the public parts of the SUA of the Degree Course is actually available and correct;
- f) other sources, proposals for plausible and achievable improvement actions arise from the analysis of the problems that emerged from the Degree Course Review Reports and that their effectiveness is adequately monitored;
- g) the Degree Course has examined the previous report of the CPDS, listening to the indications or providing its own reasons and proposals;
- h) the Degree Course has followed the indications of the Evaluation Unit and the AQA, or has provided effective reasons otherwise

The CPDS makes proposals for improvement.

- i) The ANVUR recommends that the involvement of the students of the individual Degree Course be direct and not mediated by representatives from other Degree Courses. It is recommended to document how the CPDS worked to this end.
- j) The report, detailed for each Degree Course, allows to inform the reference structure of the Degree Course and the University structures on the evaluation expressed by the CPDS; it provides valuable indications on the state of achievement of the quality requirements and allows the intervention lines to be defined more effectively. In particular, the Degree Course reference structure and

¹ Annex 3 and 4 briefly mention the Requirements established by the legislation and by the Evaluation Unit, in addition to the indicators at the bottom of the Monitoring Sheet and Ministerial Decree 6/2019, on the basis of which the Degree Courses must be evaluated.

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

the university ensure that processes and results are periodically self-assessed and effectively evaluated in the Degree Course. In addition, the report provides CPDS with a tool to inform about the nature and results of its initiatives, with particular attention to those dedicated to meeting and dialogue with students.

The Annual Report is approved by the CPDS and is illustrated and discussed in the Department Council / Faculty Council.

2.b Operating procedures

The AQA takes care of the transmission of reports to the Evaluation Unit, to the governing bodies (according to Legislative Decree of 27/01/2012 Art. 13, paragraph 1,2,3,4) and the publication on the website of the AQA (according to Doc. AVA B.2.3.2, D.1) by 31 December of each year, while by January 31 of each year the report must be uploaded on the CINECA portal – SUA of the Degree Course form by the AQA.

2.c Indications for compilation

The report is drawn up on Word files prepared by the University, with separate files for each Degree Course.

The relationship is made up of

- an introduction, in a Word file, with general information (to be completed only once)
- a specific report for each study course of competence, in separate Word files.

The report is approved by the CPDS and must be sent to the AQA email address:

University quality office silvia.sbardella@unicamillus.org

Please send the word files **WITHOUT CHANGING** their header, internal structure and name.

The contact person / coordinator of the CPDS is required to send a copy

- of the specific Degree Course Annual Report to the Degree Course Coordinator.

The facsimile consists of two parts:

- I. an introduction, to be completed in a single copy, containing general information and with the function of report of CPDS activities
- II. a specific form, to be completed for each Degree Course

I. The introduction: general information (fileCPC2019_pagina_iniziale.doc)

It is completed only once.

It is necessary to enter:

1. The names of the Students-Professors Joint Committee (CPDS) components;
2. The number of components required by the Regulations (to check if the CPDS is complete)

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

3. The name of the Contact person / Coordinator of the CPDS;
4. Reporting of the CPDS activities (this part serves as a base of documents when visiting the Commission of Evaluation Experts (CEV) for periodic accreditation purposes):

- dates of the meetings (possibly electronically) of the CPDS, and in particular of the final meeting for the preparation of the Report in question;
- brief indication of the motivation of the meetings;
- any undertaken initiatives;
- the total number of meeting hours dedicated to the analysis of the Survey on students by the CPDS for the purposes of the 2019 Report (data required in the Annual Report of the Evaluation Unit). The hours are counted from November 2018 to the end of October 2019.

ii. Form for the Report of a single course of study (specific files with the name of the Degree Course)

In this form, the class and the name of the Degree Course appear at the top of the CPDS Department / Faculty.

The questions indicated by ANVUR, denoted by the letters A-F, are also reported. For each of them (except question A), we ask you to briefly indicate the strengths and objectives and operational indications for improving the course of study.

The various questions are listed below, indicating reference data and documents (in addition to the analysis and information received independently by the CPDS) and providing indications on the elements to be considered. Information on how to access the documentation is collected in Annex 1 to this document.

A) Analysis and proposals regarding management and use of questionnaires relating to student satisfaction

a) Main critical points detected (in descending order of criticality)

b) Identified lines of action (max 1000 characters, spaces included)

Reference data and documents: SUA (Framework B6, B7), training, analysis and dissemination activities reported by the Degree Course Coordinator or operated by the CPDS, data of the survey on the opinion of attending students: (in particular, the question relating to overall satisfaction) and related analysis carried out by the Evaluation Unit and by the AQA, Degree Course site (also taking into consideration the site on the University's educational offer), Profile of the graduates for the graduating questionnaires and Occupational condition of insertion in the world of work, information on meetings with interested parties provided by the Coordinator and on the internship activities, analysis and initiatives carried out by the CPDS.

Elements to consider

- are the methods of reporting on the methods and timing of the survey effective?
- evaluating the degree of coverage of the courses and the results of the collection of students' opinions, taking into account:
 - relationship between courses taught and assessed courses;
 - number of completed questionnaires and number of expected questionnaires based on the number of members;

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

- the results of the survey for each question posed to the students;
- are the results of the survey of the opinions of students, undergraduates and graduates adequately analyzed and considered?
- Are credit and visibility granted by the Degree Course to the overall considerations of the CPDS (and of the other QA bodies)?

The comment must include:

- a clear illustration of the situation and the level of student satisfaction with the didactic activities for each Degree Course;
- the contextualization of the data emerged with respect to the specific organizational and didactic realities of the Degree Course;
- the highlighting of critical issues in common with other examined degree programs (for example courses relating to the same class / teaching area) through a brief and concise comparison between them and in relation to the average of the University or with related Degree Courses.

In terms of the use of the survey, the CPDS is urged to evaluate the degree of dissemination of the results both among the students and between the faculty and non-teaching staff of the Faculty (discussions in collegiate sessions, publication on institutional website etc.) and the possible use of the results for the adoption of reward mechanisms.

B) Analysis and proposals relating to teaching materials and aids, laboratories, classrooms, equipment, in relation to the achievement of learning objectives at the desired level

Reference documents and data: SUA of Degree Courses framework B3, B4, B6, activities reported by the Degree Course Coordinator or autonomous activities of the CPDS, survey on the opinions of attending students (question relating to classrooms, laboratories and equipment; did the professor/s stimulate/motivate interest in the discipline by exposing the topics clearly? Is the teaching material (indicated and / or provided) adequate for the study of teaching?), site of the Degree Course.

Elements to consider

- Is there consistency between the content / methods / teaching tools described in the individual course sheets and the learning outcomes reported in section A4.b of the SUA of the Degree Course?
- In the courses provided in parallel channels, is the homogeneity of the programs and evaluation methods ensured?
- In the courses divided into modules or which involve the presence of co-tutors or tutors, is coordination adequately taken care of?
- Are the teaching methods adopted (lectures, exercises, workshops, supplementary activities, ...) appropriate for the learning objectives?
- Are the teaching materials suitable for the content of the courses?
- Are the classrooms and laboratories where lessons and exercises are held suitable for the type of teaching activity?
- Are the professors adequate, in terms of number and qualification, to the needs of the Degree Course?

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

- Any information / training activities on teaching methods, which involved course teachers
- Are support and tutoring activities adequately insured?

C) Analysis and proposals in relation to the validity of the methods of ascertaining the knowledge and skills acquired by students in relation to the expected learning outcomes

Reference data and documents: Survey on students attending in particular the following questions:

- Is the overall study load of the courses officially scheduled in the reference period acceptable?
- Is the overall organization of the courses officially scheduled in the reference period acceptable?
- Is the organization of the exams (dates, exam methods, etc.) acceptable in the reference period?

SUA (Framework B1a, B2.a, B2.b, B2.c, B3, B6)

Elements to consider

- Does the Degree Course provide indications regarding the performance of the intermediate and final verification and carry out an analysis of the results?
- The methods of learning assessments are indicated in the individual course sheets and are they adequate and consistent with the learning results to be ascertained?
- Are the methods of ascertaining the knowledge foreseen by the degree course adequate to verify the knowledge acquired by the students in relation to the expected learning outcomes?
- Are the programs of the individual courses described in sufficient detail in order to be able to assess the adequacy of the methods of assessing knowledge?
- Is there consistency between the contents of the exam and the educational objectives of the course?

D) Analysis and proposals relating to the completeness and effectiveness of the annual monitoring and cyclical review

Reference data and documents: SUA of the Degree Course (Framework C1, C2, C3, D2, D3), Monitoring Sheet, recent Review Reports, Indicators on student careers

Elements to consider

- Did the Degree Course monitor the implementation of the planned improvement interventions (or did it provide an analysis of the reasons that prevented its implementation)?
- Did the Degree Course start a reflection on the effectiveness of the intervention for the purposes of the objectives set in the annual monitoring and in the cyclical review?
- The Degree Course
 - did it verify and discuss its educational objectives by analyzing the opportunity for a revision of the courses? In particular, did it verify the consistency between the teaching

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

contents / methods / tools described in the individual course sheets and the learning outcomes reported in section A4.b of the SUA? Did it verify the consistency between the programs of the individual courses and the knowledge and skills that the degree course intends to develop in the graduate?

- did it ensure didactic coordination between the courses?
- did it manage the rationalization of timetables, the temporal distribution of exams and support activities?
- did it guarantee to students the opportunity to provide observations and indications relating to the training course or its organization?
- The degree course verified and discussed its educational objectives with interested parties in recent times, and made information on this analysis available on the institutional website. In particular, contacts taken, comments received should be disclosed.

E) Analysis and proposals about the actual availability and correctness of the information provided in the public parts of the SUA (i.e. the Quality sections Quality A, B, C)

Reference data and documents: SUA, documentation provided by the Degree Course Coordinator, institutional website of the Degree Course

Elements to consider

In addition to the correctness and completeness of the data, please also check their accessibility. In particular, the students who are members of the CPDS are invited to provide their comments on the effectiveness of the choices made in the publication. We also invite you to check the correspondence between the courses and professors listed in the 'Courses' section and the information on the institutional website.

F) Further suggestions for improvement

In this field, the CPDS can suggest improvement initiatives also on topics not previously indicated.

Annex 1. Documents and data to be analyzed for the individual Degree Course:

- **SUA Degree Course 2019:** the access credential for the portal <http://ava.miur.it/> is provided to the contact person. The public part, also from previous academic years, is available on <http://www.universitaly.it/index.php/cercacorsi/universita>.
- **Annual Monitoring Sheet** drawn up in September 2019, including data made available by ANVUR-CINECA. These sheets provide the value of the indicators relating to the students' career based on the data held by ANVUR: it therefore corresponds to the image that ANVUR has of our degree courses. The comparison with other universities in Italy indicates various critical points. The documentation provided by ANVUR is made available to clarify the sources and definitions used.
- The aggregate data of the **questionnaires for the survey on student opinion (including data on the questionnaires of attending and non-attending students).**

In this regard, it is useful to refer to

- the report of the Evaluation Unit relating to the 2017-2018 survey:

ACADEMIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

- 2019 Annual Report of the Evaluation Unit

Annex 2. Reference documents:

- M.D. 6/2019;
- ANVUR guidelines for periodic accreditation of the office and degree courses (differentiated for Degree Courses in conventional mode and Degree Courses in telematic mode);

Annex 3. Quality Requirements of Degree Courses defined by ANVUR-Miur

The Ministerial Decree 6/2019, in line with the ANVUR Guidelines for the accreditation of the offices and the Degree Courses of 10 August 2017, provided indications on the quality requirements that the Degree Courses must fulfill, for the purpose of periodic accreditation; these requirements were collected under the name of **Requirement R3** (attachment C of M.D. 6/2019) and divided into four indicators R3.A, R3.B, R3.C, R3.D.² The Decree also defines additional indicators (Annex E).

Requirement R3 intends to verify the consistency of the objectives identified in the planning of the Degree Courses with the cultural, scientific and social needs, with attention to the peculiar characteristics of the degree courses. It also verifies the availability of adequate teaching resources, staff and services, the monitoring of results and the strategies adopted for the purpose of correction and improvement and student-centered learning.

There are four indicators:

- *R3.A. indicator* The Degree Course clearly defines the cultural and professional profiles of the person who intends to train and proposes educational activities consistent with them.
- *R3.B. indicator* The Degree Course promotes student-centered teaching, encourages the use of updated and flexible methodologies and correctly ascertains the skills acquired.
- *R3.C. indicator* The Degree Course has an adequate supply of teaching and technical-administrative staff, uses facilities suitable for teaching needs and offers functional and accessible services to students.
- *R3.D. indicator* The Degree Course is able to recognize the critical aspects and the room for improvement of its educational organization and to define consequent interventions.

The Degree Courses mainly or entirely remotely are required to meet additional requirements (paragraph 6.2.1 in the ANVUR Guidelines).

² For international study courses of types a (inter-university courses with foreign universities, which provide for the release of the joint, double or multiple degree) and c (degree courses with the participation of Italian universities and selected for community co-financing in the field of the Community program "Erasmus plus 2014 - 2020 key centralized action 1") in table K, reference is made to the provisions of the Joint Approach to accreditation adopted by the EHEA Ministers in 2015.