UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

PRESIDIO DELLA QUALITÀ DI ATENEO

Guidelines for the Operation of Joint Staff-Student Committees (CPDS)

Procedural Notes

Update of the version approved on 28 September 2020

Update approved by the University Quality Assurance Board (PQA) at its meeting of 14 July 2025

Revision approved by the PQA at its online meeting of 21-22 October 2026

UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

Contents

INTRODUCTION 3

COMPOSITION AND TERM OF OFFICE 3

ORGANISATION OF CPDS ACTIVITIES 5

THE CPDS ANNUAL REPORT 6

CONVENING MEETINGS AND KEEPING MINUTES 9

CPDS INTERLOCUTORS 9

ACCESS TO OPIS REPORTS BY CPDS MEMBERS 10

ANNEX 1 - CPDS annual report template 11

ANNEX 2 - CPDS meeting minutes template 29

ANNEX 3 - CPDS annual report analysis grids (PQA and PQD) 30

ANNEX 4 - Examples of indicators that may be used by the CPDS 32

INTRODUCTION

The Joint Staff-Student Committee (CPDS) is provided for in Article 2, paragraph 2, point (g), of Law 240/2010, with the following tasks:

- i. monitoring the educational provision and the quality of teaching, as well as the services provided to students by professors and researchers;
- ii. identifying indicators for assessing the results of these activities;
- iii. issuing opinions on the activation and discontinuation of Degree Programmes.[1]

The ANVUR Guidelines of 8 August 2024 emphasise the role of the CPDS as the first and most immediate level of self-assessment, as it draws on direct experience of how Degree Programmes operate.[2]

The CPDS is the first internal evaluator of educational activities: it gathers and expresses direct experience of the life of Degree Programmes. Its distinctive feature is that evaluation functions are entrusted jointly to teaching staff and students; through their participation in the Committee, students have a tangible opportunity to contribute directly to improving teaching, its organisation and support services.

The CPDS has neither decision-making nor managerial responsibilities: it does not approve regulations, establish or discontinue Degree Programmes, and is not required to resolve issues itself. Its task is to ensure that identified issues - reported by students or teaching staff, or emerging from the CPDS's own analyses - reach the competent bodies and receive a response. To this end, the CPDS:

- ascertains that issues have been brought to the attention of the responsible bodies and organisational units;
- checks what follow-up has been provided and whether feasible measures have been adopted;
- reports on this in its annual report.

Particular attention is devoted to matters raised by student members, which constitute the CPDS's most distinctive contribution to the quality assurance (AQ) system.

COMPOSITION AND TERM OF OFFICE

The University of Parma provides for the establishment of a Joint Staff-Student Committee in each Department;[3] where appropriate, it may be divided into subcommittees, provided that equal numerical representation of students and teaching staff is ensured. The outcomes of these subcommittees' activities feed into the collective discussion and approval of the CPDS annual report.

The structure and composition of the Joint Committee are defined in accordance with University provisions (see Article 13 of the University Academic Regulations) and the Department's Organisational Regulations, ensuring equal representation of teaching staff and students and representation of the Department's Degree Programmes. The concerns of any Degree Programmes

1 Law No. 240 of 30 December 2010, Article 2, paragraph 2, point (g).

2 Guidelines for the Quality Assurance System in Universities, approved by ANVUR Resolution No. 189 of 8 August 2024, § 5.4, pp. 29-30.

3 The CPDS is referred to in the University Statute (Article 24), the General University Regulations (Article 23) and the University Academic Regulations (Article 13).

that are not represented must be gathered directly through hearings, collective activities or a designated student/staff contact person.

For Degree Programmes without student representation on the CPDS, the CPDS student member taking responsibility for this liaises with that Programme's student representatives on the relevant Council.

The CPDS is appointed by the Department Council;[4] its student members are selected by the student representatives elected to the Department Council.

Teaching staff members serve for four calendar years, renewable once only, whereas student members serve for two years, renewable, except in cases of early termination of office. The Committee is chaired by a tenured member of the teaching staff.

To ensure its independence, the following may not serve on the CPDS:

- Heads of Department;
- Chairs of Degree Programme Councils;
- Deputy Chairs of Degree Programme Councils;
- members of the Review Group and the Departmental Quality Assurance Board.

Incompatibilities are checked upon appointment and whenever the composition of the CPDS subsequently changes. Each member promptly notifies the Chair of any incompatibility that arises. In the event of resignation, loss of office or a newly arising incompatibility, the Chair informs the Head of Department so that the procedures required by University provisions can be undertaken. Where these circumstances concern the Chair, the Chair must notify the Head of Department so that the appropriate measures can be taken. Replacements are made while safeguarding equal representation and adequate representation of Degree Programmes, and must be promptly communicated by the Department to the University Quality Assurance Coordination Unit.

The composition of the CPDS must be published and kept up to date on the Department website. After each change in membership, the corresponding access permissions for OPIS reports and any other restricted-access repositories are also updated, in accordance with the dedicated section.

In its annual report, the CPDS provides evidence that its membership is complete and that it is duly constituted, specifying the appointment instrument, changes during the year, any vacant positions and the time taken to fill them (Annex 1, “Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, point 2).

Training and continuing professional development for CPDS members are provided through periodic meetings organised by the University Quality Assurance Board and the materials it makes available to them.

When student membership is renewed, the Chair arranges a handover to the new members (for example, through a dedicated meeting and the provision of the latest annual report and the year's minutes), so that the expertise acquired is not lost.

4 Refer to the latest Rector's Communication, Ref. No. 304102 of 3 December 2024.

ORGANISATION OF CPDS ACTIVITIES

The Joint Staff-Student Committee has the following tasks:[5]

- it monitors educational provision and the quality of teaching, as well as the services provided to students by professors and researchers within the Department;
- it identifies and monitors indicators relevant to the quality of teaching and student services, using those available at University and Degree Programme level, including the Annual Monitoring Form indicators, and proposing any justified additions. Its annual report specifies the indicators used, their sources, the reference period and the interpretation criteria, highlighting the main monitoring results and, where necessary, proposing improvements (see Annex 4 for a list of possible indicators that may be used by the CPDS);
- it issues opinions on the establishment, activation and discontinuation of Degree Programmes,[6] and on Degree Programme Academic Regulations;
- it analyses data and information concerning educational provision and the quality of teaching;
- it submits proposals to the Evaluation Board for improving the quality and effectiveness of teaching structures;
- it checks facilities and technical and technological teaching support, and reports any issues;
- it monitors the adequacy of course descriptions (syllabi), including through sample checks, as provided for in the University's Guidelines on Syllabi, without prejudice to Degree Programmes' responsibility for checking completion and publication;
- it interacts with student representatives, the Departmental Quality Assurance Board and quality assurance actors to gather and assess proposals relating to Quality Assurance and disseminate the University's quality policies among students;
- it communicates the outcomes of its work and of the handling of reported problems to the student body as a whole, encouraging participation in Quality Assurance processes (Article 13, paragraph 2, Legislative Decree 19/2012).

5 The tasks of the CPDS are defined, in particular, by Article 24 of the Statute, Article 13 of the University Academic Regulations and Section XI of the document on the Architecture of the University's Quality Assurance System.

6 CPDS opinions are advisory: they do not replace decisions by the competent bodies and must always be reasoned. For a proposed new Degree Programme (CdS), the CPDS assesses the documentation submitted and the outcomes of stakeholder consultations, and considers how the new Programme fits into the existing educational provision; where the Programme is interdepartmental, a joint examination with the CPDSs of the other Departments involved may be useful. In the case of discontinuation, the CPDS assesses the reasons given, the impact on the University's educational provision and the safeguards envisaged for students already enrolled. The opinion on consistency between credits and educational objectives (Article 12, paragraph 3, Ministerial Decree 270/2004) concerns the Programme as a whole and not the workload of individual courses.

THE CPDS ANNUAL REPORT

The CPDS prepares an annual report organised by Degree Programme, considering the educational provision as a whole and identifying any issues specific to individual Degree Programmes. It normally submits the report by 15 December each year (an internal deadline intended to ensure compliance with the statutory deadline of 31 December) to the Academic Senate,[7] the Coordinator of the Evaluation Board, the Coordinator of the University Quality Assurance Board, the Departmental Quality Assurance Board, the Head of Department and the Chairs of the Degree Programme Councils within the Department. The CPDS must monitor whether those Degree Programme Councils examine the proposals submitted to them and identify any improvement actions, documenting this in their minutes and relevant monitoring and review documents. Significant aspects of this process must be highlighted in Degree Programme Council minutes and Cyclical Review Reports (RRC).

The annual report is approved collectively by the CPDS. It is subsequently presented and discussed in the Department Council and the relevant Degree Programme Councils, which document their examination of the observations and the resulting decisions.

The annual report must be the outcome of a critical evaluation of Degree Programmes, with particular reference to the Annual Degree Programme Information Forms (SUA-CdS) for the Department's Programmes, the results of student opinion surveys, teaching delivery arrangements, and the methods and effectiveness of monitoring actions. With regard to student opinion surveys, the CPDS independently analyses the results, specifying the methodology and criteria used, taking account of the criteria adopted by the University, justifying any further investigation and comparing its assessments with the analyses conducted by Degree Programmes and the observations of the Evaluation Board. In particular, the CPDS must also take account of the observations concerning student opinion surveys on teaching (OPIS) included in the annual monitoring forms of the Department's Degree Programmes.

The report is based on independent analysis: it does not reproduce content already contained in the SUA-CdS, Annual Monitoring Forms (SMA), Cyclical Review Reports or Degree Programme minutes. Instead, it develops analyses and assessments of these documents, questionnaires and other opportunities to listen to students, gathering evidence and not limiting itself to questionnaire results.

Where data or documents are unavailable (e.g. a Cyclical Review Report not yet prepared for newly activated Degree Programmes, or the absence of an internship survey), the CPDS expressly states this and gives the reasons.

At the end of the process, the CPDS must undertake to monitor the improvement actions implemented by Degree Programmes to resolve each issue highlighted by the Review Group and by the CPDS itself.

The CPDS must also monitor, every four months, students' direct involvement and active participation in Degree Programme and Review Group activities.

The outcomes of this monitoring are recorded in meeting minutes and summarised in the annual report (Annex 1, “Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, point 8).

7 Article 13, paragraph 3, Legislative Decree 19/2012 of 27 January 2012.

Likewise, the CPDS ensures and documents the direct involvement and active participation of its own student members: attendance at meetings, observations and proposals recorded in the minutes, and participation in OPIS analysis and report drafting. It accounts for this in the annual report (Annex 1, “Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, point 7). Student representatives' participation in Degree Programme Councils and Review Groups is instead covered by the four-monthly monitoring referred to above (Annex 1, “Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, point 8).

In analysing each Degree Programme, the CPDS also monitors the following, reporting on them in a specific section of the report (Annex 1, “Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 9):

- actions implemented by the Degree Programme to increase students' participation in the “Good Practice” questionnaires;
- implementation of the Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations, prepared by the PQA;
- use of the “Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal” to analyse examination results and academic progress.

The Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations provide for the CPDS Chair to participate, at the end of each teaching period, in the examination of critical teaching evaluations together with the Chairs of Degree Programme Councils and the Head of Department. If this meeting has not been convened, or if the Degree Programme has adopted a different, documented and equally effective method of handling critical cases, the CPDS nevertheless obtains information from Degree Programme Chairs on the issues identified and how they were handled, and reports on this in its annual report (Annex 1, “General considerations on the organisation of the Department's teaching activities” section, point 1).

Finally, the CPDS reports to the PQA any good practices identified in Degree Programmes and any suggestions concerning the AQ system, in a dedicated section of the report (Annex 1, “Final checks and proposals” section, point 4).

For each Degree Programme, the report identifies the strengths and issues that have emerged, and formulates consistent, feasible and verifiable proposals for improvement. The CPDS checks the follow-up to its observations and assesses the effectiveness of the actions taken. Where effects cannot yet be assessed, it states the reasons and the expected date of the next check.

To be effective, proposals identify the recipient (Degree Programme, Department, University, Evaluation Board, University Quality Assurance Board), the suggested actions and, where possible, the timeframe and evidence to be used to verify implementation. The CPDS focuses primarily on problems that can be resolved at Degree Programme or Department level and avoids generic statements (e.g. “the actions undertaken are confirmed”, “the Review Report is correct and comprehensive”), always supporting its assessments with data and evidence.

Sources. In each section of the report, the CPDS indicates, in the “Sources actually used” field, the sources on which its analysis was actually based (documents, data, minutes, questionnaires, reports gathered directly); the “Documentary sources” list in the template is merely indicative.

Consistency between issues and proposals. Issues are numbered (C1, C2, …), and each

is matched by a suggestion with the same numbering (S1, S2, ...), specifying the recipient and, where possible, the timeframe and verification evidence. If no proposal is made for an issue, the reason is stated (e.g. action already under way, responsibility of another body).

The annual report must provide Chairs of Degree Programme Councils with concrete elements enabling them to propose and implement initiatives to improve teaching.

Annex 1 contains the annual report template, whose structure must be followed by all CPDSs: conformity with the template is one of the elements considered by the University Quality Assurance Board in analysing reports. The template aims to promote critical evaluation by CPDSs at the various stages of the educational and management process, helping Chairs of Degree Programme Councils to identify issues and the resulting corrective and/or improvement actions more precisely. However, the aspects to be considered in individual sections do not exhaust all the assessments that CPDSs may undertake; they may therefore introduce further considerations. The template also includes a summary table of issues and proposals and a table for checking the implementation of suggestions made in previous reports.

The summary table presents the outcomes of the evaluation conducted in the current year's report and the proposals formulated by the CPDS. It helps the Committee check consistency between analyses and proposals, facilitates their uptake by Degree Programmes and enables the Evaluation Board to read the findings more readily, without replacing examination of the report; it also forms the basis for checking the implementation of suggestions in the following year's report.

Annex 3 contains the grids used by the University Quality Assurance Board and the Departmental Quality Assurance Board to analyse CPDS reports, indicating the report section in which evidence of each element should be provided: the CPDS may also use these grids as a self-assessment tool before submission.

The CPDS works continuously throughout the year, on the basis of periodically scheduled activities. Monitoring activities, analyses conducted, student members' observations and proposals formulated must be adequately documented in meeting minutes.

Meetings are normally held at least once every four months, in line with the four-monthly monitoring referred to above. One possible distribution of activities over the year is as follows:

Period	Main CPDS activities (indicative schedule)
January - April	First four-monthly check of students' involvement in Degree Programmes and Review Groups; verification of the presentation and discussion of the report in Degree Programme and Department Councils and of the resulting planned actions; monitoring of second-semester course descriptions, including through sample checks.

Period	Main CPDS activities (indicative schedule)
May - August	Second four-monthly check; examination of the Evaluation Board's Annual Report on OPIS; verification of public information in the SUA-CdS and on Degree Programme websites; meetings with students and collection of reported concerns.
September - December	Third four-monthly check; independent analysis of OPIS and other available data (SMA, AlmaLaurea, Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal); verification of the monitoring required by the University Quality Assurance Board; drafting and collective approval of the report and submission by 15 December.

CONVENING MEETINGS AND KEEPING MINUTES

Meetings of the Joint Staff-Student Committee are normally convened by the Chair, who prepares the notice of meeting and the corresponding agenda, attaching all relevant documents. Minutes must be drawn up and published exclusively in the AVA Document Repository (under DEPARTMENT), as must the annual report; minutes and the report must not be published on the Department website (minutes template in Annex 2). The minutes document attendance, distinguishing between teaching staff and student members, observations and proposals made by students, and the outcomes of periodic monitoring.

CPDS INTERLOCUTORS

The CPDS liaises with various interlocutors, with different roles and tools:

Interlocutor	Relationship with the CPDS	Tools
Students	The CPDS gathers their observations and reports, and communicates the outcomes of its work and the handling of reported problems.	Classroom meetings, hearings, reporting channels, website (for communications and summaries of outcomes, not for publishing minutes and the report)
Degree Programmes and Department	Provide documentation; receive and discuss the report and plan follow-up actions, which the CPDS monitors.	Minutes, annual report, hearings with Degree Programme Chairs and the Head of Department; Quality Assurance Officers (RAQ) of individual Degree Programmes
University Quality Assurance Board	Provides guidelines and training; receives the report, analyses it using the grid in Annex 3 and collects good practices.	Annual report, meetings, guidelines
Evaluation Board and Academic Senate	Receive the report and proposals; the Evaluation Board also considers it during Degree Programme hearings.	Annual report, hearings
ANVUR	Examines reports, particularly during periodic accreditation visits.	Annual report

ACCESS TO OPIS REPORTS BY CPDS MEMBERS

In implementation of ANVUR's recommendation on the direct and unmediated involvement of students from individual Degree Programmes in the analysis of OPIS questionnaires, the University has granted all CPDS members access to the reports.

The CPDS Chair and any designated delegate are responsible for periodically updating the composition of the CPDS on a dedicated online platform and, consequently, its members' access to detailed results, promptly revoking access when their term of office ends.

Student members of the CPDS are duly informed by the Chair of the code of conduct and the confidentiality of information, and their access to the platform is disabled upon graduation.

UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

ANNEX 1 - CPDS ANNUAL REPORT TEMPLATE

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE JOINT STAFF-STUDENT COMMITTEE

Year

_____

Department of

_____

UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

COMPOSITION AND ORGANISATION OF THE JOINT STAFF-STUDENT COMMITTEE (CPDS)

1. List of Degree Programmes within the Department

Name of Bachelor's / Master's / Single-cycle Master's Degree Programme	Degree class	Location

2. Composition of the CPDS

Appointment instrument (date of the Department Council meeting): .....

	Surname and first name	Function/Role	Degree Programme of affiliation/enrolment
Teaching staff		Chair	
Teaching staff		Secretary	
Teaching staff		Member	
Teaching staff		Member	
Students		Student	
Students		Student	
Students		Student	
Students		Student	

Is the CPDS membership complete and is the Committee duly constituted? ☐ Yes ☐ No - vacant positions and replacements in progress: .....

Changes in membership during the year (date of resolution): .....

Incompatibility check carried out on: .....

Degree Programmes not represented among student members and methods used to gather their concerns (hearings, designated student contact person, etc.): .....

3. Any subdivision into Subcommittees and functions performed

	Surname and first name	Subcommittee functions
Subcommittee 1		
Subcommittee 2		

4. Schedule of meetings

	Date	Activities
Meeting 1		
Meeting 2		
Meeting 3		

For each meeting, indicate in the “Activities” column the main topics discussed, the members present (teaching staff/students), and the reference to the minutes published in the AVA Document Repository. Meetings must cover the entire year (at least one in each four-month period). (text to be deleted in the final version)

5. Documentary sources consulted

Document
SUA-CdS form
Annual Monitoring Form
Cyclical Review Report
Evaluation Board's Annual Report
AlmaLaurea data on graduates' profiles and employment status
Teaching evaluation questionnaires
University Quality Assurance Board minutes
Evaluation Board's Annual Report on OPIS
Course descriptions (syllabi)
Results of the “Good Practice” questionnaires
Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations
Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal
Observations and reports gathered directly from students
Degree Programme Academic Regulations
Reports by Degree Programme Quality Assurance Officers (RAQ)
Questionnaires independently prepared by the CPDS
Any other document considered useful or further information independently collected

Tick the documents actually consulted; the sources used for each analysis must be indicated in the individual sections. (text to be deleted in the final version)

6. Website

Indicate the page on the Department website showing the composition of the CPDS. Please note that the composition of the CPDS must be published (and kept up to date) on the Department website, whereas CPDS minutes and the report must be published in the AVA Document Repository under DEPARTMENT. (text to be deleted in the final version)

https:// …….

7. CPDS working arrangements

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- brief description of how CPDS work is organised for the preparation of the annual report;
- any issues identified (composition; low participation; adequacy of members' training; timing; etc.);
- direct involvement and active participation of student members in CPDS activities: attendance at meetings, observations and proposals made, participation in OPIS analysis and report drafting;
- initiatives to make the CPDS known to students and gather their opinions and proposals (e.g. representatives meeting students in classrooms, visiting a sample of courses each semester);
- members' training and handover when student membership is renewed;
- methods for gathering observations/reports from students outside the CPDS, in addition to student opinion surveys (OPIS);
- description of the methodology and metrics (quantitative and/or qualitative) used to analyse OPIS data;
- methods for communicating the results of CPDS work to the student body as a whole;
- brief description of any other CPDS activities apart from those connected with the annual report.

Description
Insert text

Issues
Insert text[8]

8. Four-monthly monitoring of students' involvement in Degree Programme and Review Group activities

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- for each four-month period and each Degree Programme, report the evidence collected (attendance of student representatives at Degree Programme Councils and Review Groups, contributions recorded in minutes, involvement in drafting the SMA and RRC) and the CPDS's assessment;
- indicate the CPDS meetings and minutes in which monitoring was carried out.

Degree Programme	First four-month period	Second four-month period	Third four-month period	CPDS assessment

8 If problems have emerged:
- prepare a brief list;
- indicate how attempts were made to resolve them;
- indicate whether the actions taken have been effective or when their effectiveness can be expected to be assessed.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ORGANISATION OF THE DEPARTMENT'S TEACHING ACTIVITIES

This part must be common to all Degree Programmes in the Department, following collective analysis. (text to be deleted in the final version)

Instructions for completing the sections on services.

Analyses distinguish the level responsible for the service (University, Department or Degree Programme) and refer to sections already completed for shared aspects, highlighting the specific implications for the Degree Programme. (text to be deleted in the final version)

1. Management processes for the quality assurance (AQ) of the Department's teaching

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- has the Department defined management processes for teaching AQ?
- in which documents are they defined? Are the documents available on the Department website?
- are the main processes, objectives and responsibilities identified? (e.g. entrance tests; tutoring; guidance; timetable management; classroom management; etc.)
- is the document reviewed and continuously updated?
- was the CPDS Chair invited at the end of each teaching period to examine critical teaching evaluations (Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations)? What issues emerged and how were they handled? If no invitation was issued, how did the CPDS obtain the information? Did the Degree Programme adopt a different, documented and equally effective method of handling critical cases?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- Quality Assurance Management System document for the Department's Degree Programme(s);
- Degree Programme website;
- Department website.

2. Support services provided by the Department

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- has the Department implemented a process for managing the organisation of student services?
- are student administration offices, teaching administration offices, teaching quality managers, etc. adequate for the needs of Degree Programmes?
- are the academic calendar, class timetable and examination schedule made available sufficiently in advance? Are they observed or are there frequent changes? Are they well organised?
- are pre-entry guidance activities provided? If so, are they effective? (excluding those organised at University level)
- are guidance and tutoring activities provided during students' studies? If so, are they effective? (excluding those organised at University level)
- is assistance provided for study periods outside the University (internships and placements)? If so, is it effective? (excluding assistance organised at University level)
- is assistance provided for international student mobility (Erasmus, etc.)? If so, is it effective? (excluding assistance organised at University level)
- are initiatives provided to support the transition to employment (excluding those organised at University level)?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- Department website;
- academic calendar, class timetable and examination schedule;
- Department Council minutes.

3. Support services provided by the University

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- are pre-entry and exit guidance, tutoring, external internship services, international mobility services, placement services, IT services, etc. adequate for Degree Programme needs?
- are student administration offices well organised and suited to the needs of Degree Programmes?
- have issues emerged in University-managed services (from “Good Practice” questionnaire results, OPIS or students' reports)? Have they been reported to the competent offices, and with what outcome?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- results of the “Good Practice” questionnaires;
- observations and reports gathered by the CPDS from students.

4. Departmental analysis of the CPDS annual report

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- does the Department collectively examine and discuss the CPDS report, documenting this in minutes (for example, during a dedicated Council meeting)? (N.B. The Department is not required to approve the CPDS Report.)
- does the Department plan improvement actions on the basis of the issues highlighted by the CPDS?
- does the Department adequately monitor (and report on) these activities?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- Department Council minutes.

5. Analysis of classrooms, laboratories, facilities and materials used by Degree Programmes

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- are the classrooms and laboratories used for lectures and practical classes appropriate to the type of teaching activity?
- are facilities and resources supporting teaching (libraries, study rooms, computer rooms, teaching aids) adequate?
- are facilities, teaching materials and services accessible and also suited to the needs of students with disabilities, specific learning disorders (DSA), or other specific needs?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- SUA-CdS - Quality section - Section B “Student experience”: Field B4 “Classrooms, Laboratories and Computer Rooms, Study Rooms and Libraries”; Field B6 “Student opinions”.

ANALYSIS AND PROPOSALS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF DEGREE PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES

This part must be repeated for each Degree Programme (text to be deleted in the final version)

Bachelor's / Master's / Single-cycle Master's Degree Programme in ……..

1. Quality of the overall organisation of the Degree Programme

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- has the Degree Programme implemented a process for managing its overall organisation?
- are collective activities devoted to revising study pathways and/or coordinating teaching across courses?
- are collective activities devoted to checking the overall study workload during the reference period (semester, etc.), rationalising timetables, and scheduling examinations and support activities?
- are student representatives within the Degree Programme directly involved and actively participating in its activities? What evidence is available (attendance, contributions and proposals recorded in minutes)?
- in the absence of student representatives on the Degree Programme Council, what initiatives have been adopted to ensure that students' views are nevertheless heard?
- is the information published on the Degree Programme website complete, up to date, consistent and readily accessible, particularly as regards admission, the curriculum, courses, examinations, services and contacts?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- Degree Programme Council minutes;
- Degree Programme website.

2. Quality of the organisation of student services

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- has the Degree Programme implemented a process for managing the organisation of student services?
- are pre-entry guidance activities provided (in addition to University and Department activities)? If so, are they effective?
- are guidance and tutoring activities provided during students' studies (in addition to University and Department activities)? If so, are they effective?
- is assistance provided for study periods outside the University (internships and placements) (in addition to University and Department assistance)? If so, is it effective? (waiting times, quality of support from offices, etc.)
- is assistance provided for international student mobility (Erasmus, etc.) (in addition to University and Department assistance)? If so, is it effective? (waiting times, quality of support from offices, etc.)
- are initiatives provided to support the transition to employment (in addition to University and Department initiatives)?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- SUA-CdS, Field B5.

3. Consistency of teaching delivery with academic and professional profiles and Stakeholder needs

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- does the Degree Programme's educational design adequately take account of cultural, scientific and social needs and the needs of the economic and productive system?
- are academic and professional profiles, associated functions and competences, and employment opportunities clearly and consistently defined?
- are the intended learning outcomes consistent with the academic and professional profiles and with the competences the Degree Programme intends to develop?
- are stakeholder consultations adequate, representative, periodic, and used to improve the educational design?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- SUA-CdS;
- minutes of Stakeholder consultations;
- Advisory Committee documents;
- sector studies;
- AlmaLaurea data on graduates' employment status;
- questionnaires administered to institutions and organisations hosting internships;
- Cyclical Review Report;
- Degree Programme Council minutes.

4. Consistency of teaching delivery with the educational design and with the information stated in the SUA-CdS

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- is the knowledge required or recommended for entry clearly identified, described and publicised?
- for Bachelor's and Single-cycle Master's Degree Programmes: are methods for identifying any gaps in initial preparation defined and publicised? Are initiatives implemented to fulfil Additional Learning Requirements (OFA)?
- for Master's Degree Programmes: are the curricular admission requirements defined, publicised and checked? Is the adequacy of candidates' preparation assessed?
- has the Degree Programme established and does it apply an effective process for checking consistency between the content described in individual course descriptions and the learning outcomes expressed in the SUA-CdS learning areas?
- has the Degree Programme established an effective process for checking that individual course descriptions are completed and that their content is consistent with the programmes actually covered in class?

- are course descriptions made available sufficiently in advance?
- has the Degree Programme established an effective process for checking consistency between the teaching methods, tools and materials described in individual course descriptions and the learning outcomes expressed in the SUA-CdS Learning Areas?
- have meetings with Stakeholders (e.g. the Advisory Committee) been adequately documented?
- have the results of questionnaires completed by organisations hosting curricular internships been adequately analysed?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- SUA-CdS;
- Degree Programme website;
- Degree Programme Council minutes.

5. Analysis of the validity of methods for assessing students' acquired knowledge and skills in relation to intended learning outcomes

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- does the Degree Programme have a system of rules and conduct guidelines for carrying out interim and final assessments?
- are assessment methods clearly described in course descriptions (syllabi) and expressly communicated to students during classes?
- are the assessment methods adopted for individual courses appropriate for determining whether intended learning outcomes have been achieved (practical, continuous, final and oral assessments)?
- does the Degree Programme analyse assessment results (e.g. percentage of students passing among those taking the examination and/or distribution of marks awarded) and determine follow-up actions where necessary?
- does the Degree Programme use the Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal to identify courses with problematic outcomes (e.g. low pass rates, long times to pass)? How frequently, and what actions have resulted? (monitoring outcomes are reported under point 9).

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- Degree Programme website;
- SUA-CdS - Quality section - Section B “Student experience”: Field B3 “Staff responsible for courses” (course programmes and staff CVs);
- Degree Programme Council minutes;
- Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal.

6. Analysis of the management and use of questionnaire results concerning students' opinions on teaching (OPIS), curricular internships and satisfaction among graduating students

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- what strengths and issues emerge from the CPDS's independent OPIS analysis, and how do they compare with the Degree Programme's findings?
- have student members of the CPDS had direct access to OPIS reports and participated in their analysis?
- does the Degree Programme analyse the results of questionnaires surveying students' opinions on teaching? How?
- are the arrangements for publicising and sharing the analyses based on these results adequate?
- has the Degree Programme included an evaluation of student opinion questionnaires in the Annual Monitoring Form (SMA)?
- when preparing the Annual Monitoring Form, did the Degree Programme take account of the observations in the Evaluation Board's (NdV) “Annual Report on OPIS”, submitted in April?
- does the Degree Programme address the main problems highlighted by students' opinions by implementing corrective actions? Does it apply the Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations, prepared by the University Quality Assurance Board? (monitoring outcomes are reported under point 9)
- does the Degree Programme encourage students to complete the “Good Practice” questionnaires? (actions and their outcomes are reported under point 9)
- how are issues emerging from OPIS results analysed and handled, in accordance with the criteria adopted by the University and any criteria explicitly stated by the CPDS?
- does the analysis consider the number of responses, survey coverage, trends over time and any limitations on data comparability?
- does the Degree Programme report to students on teaching evaluation results and the actions taken?
- to what extent are disaggregated results (at individual course level) disseminated, and how are they discussed in collective bodies?
- does the Degree Programme have procedures for handling student complaints and ensure that they are easily accessible to students?
- are the results of surveys of students' satisfaction with

internship activities adequately analysed and taken into account? (if not analysed, state the reason)

- are the results of surveys of graduating students' satisfaction and graduates' employment adequately analysed and taken into account? (ALMALAUREA surveys) (if not analysed, state the reason)

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Explicit references should be made to issues reported and comments made by students concerning individual courses or teaching activities. (text to be deleted in the final version)

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- SUA-CdS - Quality section - Section B “Student experience”: Field B6 “Student opinions”;
- Annual Monitoring Form;
- Evaluation Board's report on teaching evaluation;
- Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations;
- results of the “Good Practice” questionnaires;
- Degree Programme Council minutes.

7. Analysis and proposals concerning teaching materials and aids

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- do the teaching materials made available correspond to the course programme, and are they consistent with educational objectives and the study workload expressed in university credits (CFU)?
- where courses are delivered in parallel groups, are the programmes homogeneous and the examination methods comparable?
- if teaching was delivered in blended or distance mode, was the learning experience satisfactory (in the classroom and/or remotely)?
- are teaching methods (lectures, practical classes, laboratories, tutorials, supplementary activities) appropriate to the level of learning students are expected to achieve?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- Degree Programme website;
- University educational provision website;
- course descriptions (syllabi) and OPIS results.

8. Analysis of Degree Programme review activities

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- has the Degree Programme Review Group organised its work effectively (timing, number of meetings, collective nature of activities, discussion of documents in the Degree Programme Council, etc.)?
- are student representatives within the Review Group directly involved and actively participating in its activities? What evidence is available (attendance, contributions to drafting the SMA and RRC)?
- with regard to the SMA:
  - describe how the CPDS verified the adequacy of the Degree Programme's analysis of indicators in the SMA, specifying which data update was used;
  - are the main problems highlighted by the SMA indicators considered most significant for the Degree Programme identified?
  - are the causes of the problems identified analysed adequately and in depth?
  - have plausible solutions to the problems identified been found (appropriate to their scale and compatible with available resources and the responsibilities assigned to the Degree Programme Chair)?
  - has the Degree Programme commented on the SMA indicators in the July or October release of the current year?
  - has the Degree Programme implemented corrective measures for the issues identified in the previous year's SMA? Is there documentary evidence (Degree Programme Council minutes, RAQ reports, monitoring tables)? What results have they produced?
  - are study pathways, examination results and graduates' employment outcomes analysed and monitored, including comparisons with Degree Programmes in the same degree class nationally or within the geographical area?
- with regard to the RRC:
  - are the main problems highlighted by the data and documents analysed identified?
  - are the causes of the problems identified analysed adequately and in depth?
  - have plausible solutions to the problems identified been found (appropriate to their scale and compatible with available resources and the responsibilities assigned to the Degree Programme Chair)?
  - is there evidence that students' and graduates' observations have been collected and duly considered?
  - is there documentation of the activities undertaken (e.g. Degree Programme Council minutes, tables monitoring progress with activities, etc.) and of the results achieved?
  - where the Cyclical Review Report is unavailable (e.g. newly activated Degree

Programmes), does the CPDS independently comment on the SMA indicators and check the implementation status of corrective actions already planned?

- with regard to the CPDS report:
  - does the Degree Programme collectively examine and discuss the CPDS Report, documenting this in the minutes (for example, during a dedicated Council meeting)?
  - does the Degree Programme plan improvement actions on the basis of the issues highlighted by the CPDS?
  - does the Degree Programme adequately monitor (and report on) these activities?

Analysis of the situation
Insert text

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- Degree Programme Council minutes;
- SUA-CdS;
- RRC.

9. Specific monitoring required by the Quality Assurance Board

Aspects to consider: (text to be deleted in the final version)

- "Good Practice" questionnaires: what actions has the Degree Programme implemented to increase student participation? With what results compared with the previous year?
- Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations: has the Degree Programme identified critical cases according to University Quality Assurance Board criteria and applied the prescribed procedure or a different, documented and equally effective method? With what outcomes?
- Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal: does the Degree Programme use it to analyse examination results and academic progress? How frequently, and what actions have resulted?

Monitoring	Actions implemented by the Degree Programme	Documentary evidence	CPDS assessment
"Good Practice" questionnaires			
Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations			

Monitoring	Actions implemented by the Degree Programme	Documentary evidence	CPDS assessment
Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal			

Issues (C1, C2, …)
Insert text

Suggestions (S1, S2, … corresponding to the issues)
Insert text

Sources actually used
Insert text

Documentary sources:

- results of the “Good Practice” questionnaires;
- Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations and Degree Programme Council minutes documenting their implementation;
- Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal.

FINAL CHECKS AND PROPOSALS

This part concludes the report and is common to the Department; the summary table contains a block for each Degree Programme. (text to be deleted in the final version)

1. Summary table of issues and proposals in the report for the year _____

The table summarises the issues identified and the proposals formulated by the CPDS in the current year's report. It includes only elements already analysed and substantiated in the text, without introducing new assessments, and refers for each item to the template section and numbering used in the text (e.g. “Degree Programme part, point 6 - C2/S2”). Complete one block for General considerations on the organisation of the Department and one block for each Degree Programme, listing issues in order of priority. A row is not required for every section: include only sections in which issues or aspects requiring improvement have emerged. Approximately 20 words per entry. The table is a summary of CPDS proposals, not an operational plan for the Degree Programme: actions, actors, timeframes, evidence, implementation status and effectiveness will be checked the following year in the implementation verification table, for which this summary provides the basis. (text to be deleted in the final version)

General considerations on the organisation of the Department's teaching activities

Template section (issue/proposal no.)	Issue or aspect requiring improvement	CPDS proposal	Recipient

Degree Programme in .....

Template section (issue/proposal no.)	Issue or aspect requiring improvement	CPDS proposal	Recipient

Block to be repeated for each Degree Programme. (text to be deleted in the final version)

2. Verification of the implementation of suggestions made by the CPDS in the report for the year _____ and in earlier reports for issues that remain unresolved

Completion notes: this refers to the year preceding that of the report; for unresolved issues, also refer to earlier reports. The table checks the follow-up to previous observations: for each suggestion, taken from the summary table of the relevant report, indicate actions, actors and timeframes, documentary evidence, implementation status and effectiveness. (text to be deleted in the final version)

Suggestion/observation in the CPDS report	Actions implemented or planned	Actors and timeframe	Documentary evidence	Progress status	Outcome of effectiveness check

In the “Actions implemented or planned” column, indicate, where possible, the reasons for any planned actions that have not been implemented. Add a row for each suggestion/observation. (text to be deleted in the final version)

3. Proposals to the Evaluation Board

Completion notes: this section should briefly formulate and justify any proposals to be submitted to the Evaluation Board to improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching structures, educational provision and student services, including in relation to learning outcomes, students' employment prospects and personal and professional development, and the needs of the economic and productive system. Proposals must be based on adequately documented issues, highlighting the aspects on which further investigation or intervention by the Evaluation Board is considered appropriate within its remit. Particular attention should be paid to problems

that are cross-cutting or have not been adequately resolved at Degree Programme or Department level. (text to be deleted in the final version)

4. Reports and good practices for the Quality Assurance Board

Completion notes: in this section, the CPDS reports to the University Quality Assurance Board good practices identified in Degree Programmes and the Department that merit dissemination throughout the University, and any suggestions concerning the AQ system and the tools provided (guidelines, data, templates, training). Cross-cutting problems requiring University-level intervention may also be reported. (text to be deleted in the final version)

	Description	Degree Programme / organisational unit concerned and evidence
Good practices identified		
Suggestions for the PQA (guidelines, data, templates, training)		
Cross-cutting problems requiring University intervention		

ANNEX 2 - CPDS MEETING MINUTES TEMPLATE

DEPARTMENT OF _____

On __/__/____, at _____, at _____, the Joint Staff-Student Committee of the Department of _____ met with the following agenda:

1) Communications

2) ……..

3) Any other business

The following members are present: (list teaching staff and student members separately; indicate apologies for absence)

_____

The Chair opens the meeting at ___ .

During the meeting ….

(The following instructions in italics are to be deleted in the final version)

Summary of the discussion

Briefly report the matters examined, the main observations and any issues identified.

Contribution of student members

Document observations and proposals made by students and how they were considered in the discussion.

Periodic monitoring

Where included on the agenda, document the outcomes of the four-monthly monitoring of students' involvement in Degree Programme and Review Group activities and of the follow-up provided by Degree Programmes to CPDS proposals.

Outcomes and decisions

Report conclusions, any opinions, proposals and decisions adopted. Where relevant, specify recipients, subsequent steps and expected timeframes. If a vote is taken, state its outcome, including any abstentions and dissenting positions.

The Chair declares the meeting closed at ___ .

Parma, _____

The Secretary _____	The Chair _____

UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

ANNEX 3 - CPDS ANNUAL REPORT ANALYSIS GRIDS (PQA AND PQD)

3a - University Quality Assurance Board grid

The University Quality Assurance Board analyses CPDS annual reports using the following grid. Each question identifies the section of the template (Annex 1) in which evidence should be provided: the CPDS may use the grid as a checklist before approving and submitting the report.

No.	PQA grid question	Where evidence is provided in the report	Checked
1	Is the CPDS membership complete and is the Committee duly constituted?	“Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, points 2-3	☐
2	Is there evidence of students' direct involvement and active participation in CPDS activities? (N.B.: expressly indicated in the ANVUR AVA3 Guidelines, as well as by the NdV)	“Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, point 7; meeting minutes (Annex 2)	☐
3	Are CPDS activities sufficiently documented (details of meetings, meeting minutes, etc.)?	“Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, points 4 and 6; minutes in the AVA Document Repository	☐
4	Are there assessments and analyses of problems specific to individual Degree Programmes? (N.B.: expressly indicated in the ANVUR AVA3 Guidelines)	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, points 1-9	☐
5	Have issues been identified on the basis of the analyses conducted?	“Issues” boxes; “Final checks and proposals” section, point 1	☐
6	Have proposals for improvement been made?	“Suggestions” boxes; “Final checks and proposals” section, points 1 and 3	☐
7	Is there evidence of monitoring of students' direct involvement and active participation in Degree Programme and Review Group activities? (N.B.: expressly indicated in the ANVUR AVA3 Guidelines, as well as by the NdV)	“Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, point 8; “Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, points 1 and 8	☐
8	Have problems been identified concerning support services managed by the University?	“General considerations on the organisation of the Department's teaching activities” section, point 3	☐
9	Have good practices or suggestions for the PQA been indicated?	“Final checks and proposals” section, point 4	☐
10	Is there monitoring of actions implemented by Degree Programmes to increase students' participation in the Good Practice questionnaires?	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 9 (and point 6)	☐
11	Is there monitoring of the implementation of the Guidelines to support Chairs of Degree Programme Councils in managing critical teaching evaluations?	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 9 (and point 6)	☐
12	Is there monitoring of the use of the Student Academic Progress Analysis Portal?	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 9 (and point 5)	☐
13	Overall, does the report conform to the template prescribed by the PQA?	Entire report (Annex 1)	☐

3b - Departmental Quality Assurance Board (PQD) grid

The PQD analyses the CPDS report using the following grid. For each area it checks: whether the CPDS assessed the aspect and on what information it based its assessment; whether issues were identified on the basis of the analyses conducted; whether proposals for improvement were formulated; and whether the proposals are consistent with the issues identified. For the area concerning SMA forms, it also considers whether the CPDS checked that Degree Programmes implemented effective corrective measures in response to the issues identified in the previous year's SMA and commented on the SMA indicators; for the area concerning OPIS, it also checks whether the CPDS independently analysed the results and whether students had direct access to the questionnaires.

No.	PQD grid area	Where evidence is provided in the report	Checked
1	Management processes for the quality assurance (AQ) of Departmental teaching and support services	“General considerations on the organisation of the Department's teaching activities” section, points 1-3	☐
2	Analysis and proposals concerning teaching materials and aids, laboratories, classrooms and equipment, in relation to achieving learning objectives at the desired level	“General considerations on the organisation of the Department's teaching activities” section, point 5; Degree Programme part, point 7	☐
3	Quality of the overall organisation of the Degree Programme	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 1	☐
4	Quality of the organisation of student services	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 2	☐
5	Consistency of teaching delivery with what is planned in the SUA-CdS and indicated by Stakeholders	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, points 3-4	☐
6	Analysis of Annual Monitoring Forms	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 8	☐
7	Analysis of the validity of methods for assessing students' acquired knowledge and skills in relation to intended learning outcomes	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 5	☐
8	Analysis of the management and use of questionnaire results concerning students' opinions on teaching (OPIS), curricular internships and satisfaction among graduating students	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 6	☐
9	Analysis of Degree Programme review activities	“Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 8	☐
10	Initiatives supporting the internationalisation of teaching	“General considerations on the organisation of the Department's teaching activities” section, points 2-3; “Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 2 (aspects concerning international mobility)	☐
11	Initiatives implemented to improve student involvement	“Composition and organisation of the CPDS” section, point 8; Degree Programme part, points 1 and 8	☐

ANNEX 4 - EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS THAT MAY BE USED BY THE CPDS

The examples below are indicative and do not constitute a list to be applied in full to all Degree Programmes. The CPDS selects indicators relevant to the aspects examined and the issues requiring further investigation, prioritising data already available. For locally developed indicators, it specifies the calculation methods and the scope of observation. Results are interpreted taking account of trends over time, the amount of data and, where available and appropriate, comparisons with comparable contexts; the analysis is supplemented by student members' observations.

Area	Examples of indicators that may be used	Sources and links to the template
Students' opinions on teaching	Percentage of positive responses to OPIS questions selected in relation to the aspect requiring further investigation; number of courses with persistent issues in successive surveys, applying explicitly stated criteria and taking data comparability into account.	OPIS reports and University criteria for “critical cases”; “Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 6, which already requires independent CPDS analysis and attention to the number of responses, coverage and trends over time.
Timely progression through study programmes	iC13, concerning credits (CFU) earned in the first year in relation to those prescribed; iC14, concerning progression to the second year in the same Degree Programme; iC02, concerning the proportion of graduates completing their degree within the normal duration of the Programme.	SMA; concrete examples of indicators to consider in the analysis of review activities, provided for in the “Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 8. The designations are taken from the documentation on ANVUR indicators.
Information on courses and learning assessments	Percentage of course descriptions examined that clearly state learning outcomes and assessment methods; percentage of descriptions available within the prescribed timeframe. Specify whether all descriptions or a sample were checked.	Syllabi, Degree Programme website and findings of the checks conducted; “Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, points 4 and 5, which already consider completion, timeliness, consistency of content and clarity of examination methods.
Student services	Level of user satisfaction with the services surveyed; waiting times for internship activation or mobility assistance, where already recorded.	Available survey results and data provided by services. Analyses should refer to the responsible level (University, Department or Degree Programme), avoiding duplication. For internships and mobility, the template already refers to waiting times and the quality of support.
Graduating students' satisfaction and internship quality	Percentage of graduating students who are satisfied overall with the Degree Programme; percentage of positive assessments of the internship experience, distinguishing students' assessments from those of host organisations.	AlmaLaurea and internship questionnaires; “Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 6 and, for feedback from host organisations, point 4.
Follow-up to CPDS observations	Proportion of proposals to which the Degree Programme has provided a documented response, including reasons for non-acceptance; proportion of actions completed out of those due within the period considered. Completion of actions must be distinguished from verification of their effectiveness.	Degree Programme Council minutes and monitoring documents; “Analysis and proposals for the management of Degree Programme activities” section, point 8, and general guidance on follow-up to proposals in the previous report.