

# STUDENT-FACULTY JOINT TEACHING COMMITTEE REPORT

Year 2024

Degree Program: .....

---

## Section A

### Analysis and proposals on management and use of results of student feedback on teaching.

If you have already examined the student feedback on teaching regarding courses held in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of the AY 2023-'24, please attach your analysis in the following box.

#### Sources of reference:

- ✓ Summary reports of student feedback on teaching (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester courses, AY 2023-'24).
- ✓ Internal procedure for analysis and follow-up of results of student surveys.
- ✓ Findings of actions and initiatives undertaken following any unsatisfactory results emerging from the surveys.
- ✓ Any observations and remarks collected from students.

#### Notes:

The Committee should take into consideration any critical aspects or specific areas of attention that may emerge from student feedback on 1st and 2nd semester courses – AY 2023-'24 (in particular: evaluation scores below the satisfaction threshold - which is currently fixed at the median value of 6 – for more than 1 item of the questionnaire; scores that highlight a strong worsening over time).

After any critical areas have been identified, it is important to check with the Director of each Program if corrective actions have been undertaken and if positive changes are visible (on the basis of the direct perceptions gathered by the Committee from students who attended the courses where changes have been implemented).

A concise outcome of this check for each critical situation must be included in the above section of the report, giving an opinion on the adequacy of the follow-up process (according to the internal procedure in use). If you think that one or more critical cases have not been addressed in the right way or that further analysis/interventions are necessary/advisable, please include them in the “Proposals for improvement” following section.

**Strengths or good practices related to the process of managing and using student evaluation feedback as applied in the Degree Program under consideration:**

**Proposals for improvement regarding the process of managing and using student feedback:**

**Notes:**

In relation to the evidence and considerations reported in the previous section, the situations that, in the opinion of the Committee, need further attention or actions to be undertaken should be highlighted here. Please note that it is not the task of the Committee to suggest or envisage the type of action to be carried out, but only to indicate the opportunity/need to intervene again or with more efficacy.

## Section B

**Analysis and proposals regarding teaching aids and materials, classrooms, labs, equipment, tools and support provided by the Faculty in relation to the achievement of the Degree Program’s learning objectives at the desired level.**

### Sources of reference:

- ✓ Summary reports of student feedback on teaching (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester courses, AY 2023-‘24): answers to items no. 5 “*The course material is adequate (useful/ complete) for the study of the course subject*” and 11 “*The instructor is available for clarifications and explanations (even remotely)*”.
- ✓ Summary report of graduating student feedback on the university experience (2022-2023 edition): answers to the section “Infrastructure”.
- ✓ Any observations and remarks collected from students.

Issues to be taken into consideration in this Section:

- Infrastructure equipment (classrooms, labs, library, study areas, etc.);
- Tools for supporting learning in terms of hardware and software (e.g. multimedia applications, licenses for software that can be downloaded for exercises, etc.);
- Teaching materials used in the courses (in terms of variety, completeness, degree of innovation and/or updates);
- Support provided by the Faculty (availability during office hours, assistance in producing the thesis, dealing with student remarks or requests).

**Main Strengths (or good practices) related to teaching aids and materials, classrooms, labs, equipment, tools and support provided by the Program’s Faculty:**

**Critical aspects regarding teaching aids and materials, classrooms, labs, equipment, tools and support provided by the Program’s Faculty (if recognizable, bearing in mind the need of the Degree Program and its learning objectives):**

### Notes:

Briefly list any critical aspects identified and the reasons why they deserve immediate attention by the Degree Program (and/or the University more generally). Corresponding improvement proposals should be indicated in the following section.

**Proposals for improvement regarding teaching aids and materials, classrooms, labs, equipment, tools and support provided by the Program's Faculty:**

**Section C – Analysis and proposals on the adequacy of methods used for assessing knowledge and skills acquired by students in relation to intended learning outcomes.**

**Sources of reference:**

- ✓ Profiles of the Degree Program’s compulsory courses (also available in the specific area of the University website).
- ✓ Summary reports of student feedback on teaching (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Semester courses, AY 2023-‘24): answers to items no. 8 “*The course has been carried out in accordance with the syllabus published on the website*”.
- ✓ Guidelines and instructions for completing the courses profile.

**Analysis of adequacy of the methods used for assessing student preparation (exams’ features and their consistency with the “Intended Learning Outcomes”):**

**Notes:**

An opinion must be expressed on the adequacy of the methods for assessing student preparation (exams and any other methods) adopted in the main courses that make up the Program curriculum. Adequacy is intended here as the “fitness to purpose” to ascertain/measure the knowledge and abilities expected at the end of a course. In short, the consistency between what is reported in the “Intended Learning Outcomes” section and in the “Assessment Methods” section for each course profile considered must be assessed.

**Analysis of the clarity and completeness of the information given on the methods used for assessing student preparation, with particular regard to the descriptions reported in the courses profiles:**

**Notes:**

The Committee should analyze the contents of each course profile, in order to check that the descriptions reported are sufficiently clear and consistent (with particular referral to the information reported in the “Intended Learning Outcomes” section and in the “Assessment Methods” section) and in line with the format currently in use.

**Main Strengths (or good practices) related to the methods used for assessing student preparation and/or to the clarity/completeness of the descriptions reported in the course profiles:**

**Proposals for improvement regarding the methods used for assessing student preparation and/or the clarity/completeness of the descriptions reported in the course profiles:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>The Committee suggests a review of the assessment methods adopted by the following courses (in order to ensure greater consistency with the intended learning outcomes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Course xy .....</li> </ul> | <p>The Committee suggests to improve the clarity and completeness of the descriptions reported in the online profiles of the following courses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Course xy.....</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

**Notes:**

Please point out in the appropriate boxes:

- the list of courses whose assessment methods, in your opinion, need to be reviewed in order to ensure greater consistency with the intended learning outcomes
- the list of courses whose profiles should be more in line with the indications provided with the new template (in terms of clarity and completeness of the descriptions), also pointing out the specific sections that require an adjustment)

## Section D

### Analysis and proposals on the completeness and effectiveness of the Program's Annual Monitoring and Periodic Review.

#### Sources of reference:

- ✓ Key performance indicators and Annual Monitoring Report of the Degree Program (2024 edition).
- ✓ Periodic Review Report of the Degree Program (last version, if available).
- ✓ Monitoring report of the actions defined on the Periodic Review Report (if available).

#### Observations and remarks on the appropriateness and completeness of the performance analysis included in the Program's Annual Monitoring Report as well as on the adequacy of the possible improvement actions defined:

#### Notes:

In particular, it should be verified whether the monitoring activity was carried out by examining the main findings emerging from the indicators made available (as well as by following the instructions provided by the QA Committee and included in the "introduction" of the monitoring report) and whether the analysis reported and the conclusion drawn can be considered appropriate and plausible.

In the event interventions or actions are called for aimed at addressing specific critical issues or improving performance deemed not fully satisfactory, an opinion must be provided on the adequacy of the proposed solutions with respect to the extent of the problems identified or the aspects indicated to be improved.

#### Observations and remarks on the completeness of the analysis included in the Program's Periodic Review Report (if available) as well as on the appropriateness and efficacy of the improvement goals defined:

**Notes:**

In particular, it should be verified whether the Periodic Review Report includes accurate analysis and considerations with reference to all the main "points of attention" provided for and whether goals and improvement actions have been defined consistently with the weaknesses emerging from the analysis carried out.

**Important:** In the event that at least 1 year has elapsed from the approval of the Periodic Review Report, it should also be verified whether the improvement actions planned have been implemented (or started) and if they have produced effective results (even partial, to the extent that they can be found). To this end, the Committee is encouraged to investigate with the Program Director which interventions have been carried out and with what visible outcome.

**Main Strengths (or good practices) related to the Program's Annual Monitoring and Periodic Review processes:**

**Proposals for improvement regarding the Program's Annual Monitoring and Periodic Review processes:**

**Notes:**

Any proposals for improvement must concern aspects of incompleteness and/or inadequacy identified in the previous sections with reference to the analysis carried out, the considerations reported and the goals/improvement actions defined in the Annual Monitoring Reports and the Periodic Review Report (if available).



## Section E

**Analysis and proposals on the actual availability and accuracy of information supplied by the SUA-CdS.**

### Sources of reference:

- ✓ SUA-CdS for the Quality section (sections A, B and C)
- ✓ University website (section 'Guides to the University')

### Observations and comments on the information in the SUA-CdS form:

### Notes:

Please evaluate whether the information in the SUA-CdS form is complete, clear, and up-to-date, and if it is consistent with the information on the university website in the 'Guides to the University' section. The information in the SUA-CdS should also be clear and understandable to students.

### Improvement suggestions:

### Notes:

In this section, please provide any suggestions for improving the completeness and clarity of the contents in the SUA-CdS form, and their consistency with the information on the university website (in the 'University Guides' section).

## **Section F**

### **Further Proposals for Improvement**

#### **Sources of reference:**

- ✓ Information and indications gathered autonomously by the CPDS' members.
- ✓ Summary Report of the Stakeholder Work-Table (if available).

#### **Issues considered and proposals for improvement:**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

#### **Note:**

If deemed appropriate, consider any additional aspects on which specific indications or suggestions may be addressed to the Program Directors and, potentially, to the academic governing bodies.

If the Program under control have been recently subject to a specific focus by the Stakeholder Work-Table, the Committee may write here observations and comments related to the findings emerging from that meeting (eg. regarding the level of satisfaction expressed for the Program and how well graduate profiles meet the changing needs of the job market).