

Guidelines for the preparation of the Annual Report of the Faculty-Student Joint Committees

(Approved by the Quality Assurance Unit on 23 October 2023)

Contents

Faculty-Student Joint Committees.....	2
SECTION 1: GENERAL PART	6
1.1 Presentation of Courses of Study (CdS).....	6
1.2 Composition and organisational arrangements of the Faculty-Student Joint Committee (CPDS).....	6
SECTION 2: IN-DEPTH STUDY OF INDIVIDUAL COURSES OF STUDY.....	8
SECTION 3: FINAL OVERALL ASSESSMENTS.....	15

Faculty-Student Joint Committees

The establishment of the Faculty-Student Joint Committee (CPDS) is provided for in Law No. 240 of 30 December 2010, (*Regulations on the organisation of universities, academic staff, and recruitment, as well as delegation to the Government to improve the quality and efficiency of the university system*), in Article 2(2)(g).

"

Establishment in each department, or in each of the structures referred to in points (c) or (e) (Schools or other educational coordination structures), at no additional cost to the public finance, of a Faculty-Student Joint Committee, responsible for:

- *carrying out activities to monitor the educational offer, teaching quality and student service activities by professors and researchers.*
- *identifying indicators to assess their results.*
- *formulating opinions on the activation and discontinuation of courses of study.*

Participation in the Joint Committee referred to in this letter does not entail any remuneration, emoluments, allowances, or reimbursement of expenses.

"

Article 13 "*Annual report of Faculty-Student Joint Committees*" of Legislative Decree No. 19 of 27 January 2012 outlines their main functions.

"

1. The Faculty-Student Joint Committees, provided for in Article 2, paragraph 2, letter g), of Law No. 240 of 30 December 2010, draw up an annual report containing proposals to the internal assessment unit for improving the quality and effectiveness of the educational facilities, also in relation to the learning outcomes achieved, in relation to employment prospects, personal and professional development, as well as to the needs of the economic and production system.
2. Proposals are drawn up after monitoring the competence indicators referred to in Article 12 (4) and on the basis of questionnaires or interviews with students, preceded by a broad dissemination activity of the university's quality policies, so as to make students informed and aware of the quality system adopted by the university.
3. The report of the Faculty-Student Joint Committee is submitted to the internal assessment committee and the academic senate by 31 December each year.
4. The implementation of this Article shall not result in new or increased burdens on public finance.

"

As required by the above-mentioned regulations, the *Guidelines for the quality assurance system in universities* that were adopted¹ by ANVUR as part of the construction of the AVA System (Self-Assessment - Assessment - Accreditation) provide for the Faculty-Student Joint Committees to be established by each department or school, or in any case by a coordination centre. The same guidelines call for universities to adopt regulatory and organisational solutions aimed at fostering the presence in the joint committees of an adequate number of courses of study, with reference to student representatives, to contribute effectively to the improvement of the educational offer. To directly receive the requests of the students attending various classes, the CPDS shall act with hearings or other forms of collective activities, or through the identification of a student contact person with whom to interact.

¹ latest version approved by Board Resolution No. 26 of 13 February 2023

CPDS are regulated by Article No. 26 of the University of Pisa Statute.

"

1. A Faculty-Student Joint Committee is established in interdepartmental schools.
2. A Faculty-Student Joint Committee is established in the departments, subject to paragraph 3.
3. Departments belonging to a school may propose not to set up their own Joint Committee and to assign its competences, subject to a resolution of the Academic Senate, to the school's Joint Committee.
4. The Faculty-Student Joint Committee is established in the courses of study.
5. The councils of the courses of study's Council, on the basis of the principle of good performance according to criteria of economy, efficiency and effectiveness, may propose to the Academic Senate that the competences of the course joint Committee be assigned to the departmental Joint Committee. The Academic Senate decides on the matter after consulting the department/s involved. The procedures for implementing the above are governed by the University General Regulations.
6. The Joint Committee referred to in the preceding paragraphs is made up of an equal number of faculty members and student representatives in the relevant Council.
7. In the case of an aggregate council, the Joint Committee consists of student representatives in the council and an equal number of faculty members.
8. The faculty members of the Joint Committee are the President of the school in the case referred to in paragraph 1, the Director of the department in the case referred to in paragraph 2, the President of the course Council in the cases referred to in paragraphs 4 and 7, or a delegate of the same, acting as Chairman of the Committee.
9. The tasks of the Joint Committee are to:
 - a. monitor the educational offer and the quality of teaching, as well as the service provided to students by the teaching staff.
 - b. identify indicators for evaluating the results of the above activities.
 - c. provide opinions on the activation and discontinuation of courses of study within its remit.
 - d. provide opinions on regulations and programmes of study within its remit.
 - e. provide opinions on the consistency between the objectives of educational activities and the university credits allocated to them.
 - e.bis provide opinions on the consistency between the objectives of educational activities and the specific learning goals of the course of study.
- 9.bis Departmental or school Joint Committee draws up the annual report on the progress of educational activities on the basis of the monitoring referred to in Article 34(1)(e).

"

It should be noted that the University of Pisa expressly provides for the establishment of Joint Committees in the courses of study, unless the course Councils decide to delegate their powers to the departmental CPDS, subject to a resolution of the Academic Senate.

The tasks of the course of study's Joint Committee are well defined and differ from those that ANVUR reserves for the department/school CPDS, because the former refers to a single course and the latter to several courses of study belonging to the department/school. Among other things, in some areas of our university the activity conducted in the course of study is analysed and monitored mainly by the individual Joint Committee of the course of study, which plays a highly proactive role.

Our university believes that, instead of duplicating or being considered as somehow disruptive elements in the performance of the department/school CPDS, they can be valorised as statutory bodies aimed at strengthening the participation of the students in their courses of study, as well as at promoting comparison between the courses of study and the CPDS of the departments/schools.

It is useful to recall that to best fulfil its role, the CPDS must:

- carry out systematic and documented activity throughout the year.
- have full availability of the data and in particular the results of the questionnaires filled in by the students, also in a disaggregated form².
- dealing with the educational offer with assessments and proposals whose implementation is to be monitored, verifying their progress and real effectiveness.

The departmental/school CPDS must also:

- draw up the Department/School Annual Report set out for each course of study, analysing the performance of its individual courses, including those with decentralised sites. If deemed appropriate, it may also make use of documents or outcomes of hearings made by the course of study Joint Committee.
- play an independent role with respect to the courses of study, providing indications, suggestions, and proposals for action with a view to facilitating the task of the bodies when preparing any changes to the regulations or rules.

Regarding the composition of departmental/school CPDSs, it would be advisable to exclude the course presidents from the faculty members, thus avoiding the *assessed/assessor* ambivalence.

In order to ensure that the work of the CPDS is systematic, it is recommended that periods of vacancy in the body be avoided and therefore that appointment arrangements be made as soon as the members are identified. It is also recommended that decisions be taken in a forum where the parity of the two components is verified, especially on those occasions when the CPDS extends the participation of its meetings to outsiders.

The Quality Assurance Unit, whose tasks under the AVA Model 3³ include the preparation of common tools for QA, proposes an outline of the Annual Report that is intended to be a common model to facilitate the work of the department/school CPDS.

The outline of the Report, annexed to these guidelines, consists of three sections.

- Section 1 - General part: list of the courses of study, including those with a decentralised location, and description of the composition and organisational arrangements of the CPDS.
- Section 2 - Insight into individual courses of study: this consists of boxes A to F, which make up the framework of the model proposed by ANVUR and already present in the previous model.
- Section 3 - Final overall evaluations: general assessments and analyses, broken down into strengths and areas for improvement, for each course of study are reported.

The content of Section 2 of the outline report must be replicated for the analysis of each course of study belonging to the department/school.

² See *Guidelines for the Analysis and Dissemination of Results and Resulting Improvement Actions* (approved by the SA in Resolution No. 232/2017 and the BoD in Resolution No. 407/2017).

³ See *Guidelines for the quality assurance system in universities* (approved by resolution of the ANVUR Governing Council no. 26 of 13 February 2023).

For each of the boxes in Section 2, the Quality Assurance Unit found it useful to suggest a comprehensive list of documentary sources that can be used for the analysis and assessment of the item. A list of aspects to be considered in support of the analysis has also been included.

Each box in Section 2 contains a field dedicated to the CPDS's proposals for improvement, in which the corrective actions to be implemented by the course of study to overcome the critical issues identified must be detailed.

As regards the method of delivery, indicated in the accompanying note that the Quality Assurance Unit sends annually to Department Directors, it should be noted that the CPDS Report, if countersigned by the Director and sent at the same time as the resolution of approval by the Department Council, replaces the overall report on education that is the responsibility of the Directors, pursuant to Article 22, c. 2 of the University Educational Regulations.

It is not a good practice to send the report accompanied by an emergency measure; should the deadline for the delivery of the report not allow for its approval at a Council meeting, it is important that the Council, at the earliest possible meeting, not only ratifies the emergency measure, but also discusses the results of the report.

SECTION 1: GENERAL PART

1.1 Presentation of Courses of Study (CdS)

List of CdS⁴

Type of CdS	Name of CdS	CdS class

Approval of the Faculty-Student Joint Committee report (*indicate resolution number and date of the Department/School Council meeting*): _____

1.2 Composition and organisational arrangements of the Faculty-Student Joint Committee (CPDS)

Composition of the CPDS⁵

Faculty members	Student members

Resolution approving the appointment of the CPDS (indicate resolution number and date of the Department/School Council meeting): _____

⁴ If significant, please write additional information on the CdS assessed (e.g. location if decentralised, language if different from Italian, double class, joint/double degree awarded if any, etc.)

⁵ If significant, also report in the chart any changes in the composition of the CPDS

The CPDS met on the following dates⁶:

Date	Brief summary of the topics discussed in the meetings
dd/mm/yyyy	
dd/mm/yyyy	
dd/mm/yyyy	
dd/mm/yyyy	

Organisation of the work of the CPDS in drafting the report (*e.g. in person/remote meetings, possible division into subgroups, way of collecting observations/feedback from other parties involved*)

⁶ Reporting also the sessions not specifically dedicated to the preparation of the report makes the continuity of the activities more evident.

It is recommended to report briefly but precisely on any critical points encountered, in line with the analysis carried out in the previous academic year, and to verify, providing documentary evidence, whether and how the CdS has taken into account the proposals and suggestions made by the Department/School CPDS in the previous report and the status of implementation of the proposed corrective actions.

Proposals for improvement of the CPDS:

It is recommended to identify any corrective actions for overcoming the critical elements revealed in the analysis section. These actions should be concrete and clearly detailed in relation to the time frame and responsible parties for implementation.

BOX B: Is the educational activity, teaching materials and aids, laboratories, classrooms and equipment effective in achieving the learning objectives?

Documentary sources

- ✓ Framework A4.a (*Specific training objectives of the course and description of the training course*) of the (Single Annual Form) SUA-CdS.
- ✓ Student opinion survey on the education provided.
- ✓ Student opinion survey on the organisation, facilities, and traineeship.
- ✓ *Post-examination* questionnaire (*only if the school participated in the experiment*).
- ✓ AlmaLaurea survey on the profile of undergraduates.
- ✓ Quadri B6 (*Student Opinion*) and B7 (*Graduate Opinion*) of the (Single Annual Form) SUA-CdS.
- ✓ Entry, Academic carrier and exit data (ref. Unipistat portal).

Analysis and assessment of the CPDS:

Aspects to be considered:

- Checking whether the analysis of the results of the student opinion survey on the education provided explicitly the classes/modules that obtained average answers of less than 2.5 in some of the questionnaire's questions; with regard to the latter, check the reasons and the effective take-over by the CdS President.

- Analysing both the organisation and facilities questionnaire and questions B5_AF⁸ and B3⁹ of the questionnaire for the student opinion survey on the education provided.
- Analysing the results of the section on traineeships of the organisation and facilities questionnaire if relevant for the CdS.

It is recommended to report briefly but precisely on any critical points encountered, in line with the analysis carried out in the previous academic year, and to verify, providing documentary evidence, whether and how the Cos has taken into account the proposals and suggestions made by the Department/School CPDS in the previous report and the status of implementation of the proposed corrective actions.

Proposals for improvement of the CPDS:

It is recommended to identify any corrective actions for overcoming the critical elements revealed in the analysis section. These actions should be concrete and clearly detailed in relation to the time frame and responsible parties for implementation.

BOX C: Do the examination methods make it possible to correctly ascertain the achievement of the expected learning outcomes?

Documentary sources

- ✓ Framework A4.a (*Specific training objectives of the course and description of the training course*) of the (Single Annual Form) SUA-CdS.
- ✓ Framework A4.b (*Knowledge and understanding and ability to apply knowledge and understanding*) of the (Single Annual Form) SUA- CdS.
- ✓ Framework A4.c (*Autonomy of judgement, Communication skills, Learning skills*) of the (Single Annual Form) SUA-CdS.
- ✓ Framework B1 (*Description of the training course and assessment methods*) of the (Single Annual Form) SUA-CdS.
- ✓ Student opinion survey on education provided.
- ✓ *Post-examination* questionnaire (*only if the school participated in the experiment*)
- ✓ Valutami Portal (<https://esami.unipi.it/>)
- ✓ Lesson registers.

Analysis and assessment of the CPDS:

⁸ Were the classrooms in which the lessons were held adequate? (Could you see, hear, find available seat?)

⁹ Are the teaching materials (suggested and available) adequate for the study of the subject?

Aspects to be considered:

- Checking the number of courses for which there is a programme published on the “Valutami” portal.
- Analysing whether individual course programmes refer to methods for assessing knowledge/skills/approach (Dublin descriptors).
- Examining whether the teaching programmes are consistent with the learning objectives in the (Single Annual Form) SUA-CdS.
- Assessing the coherence between the content of teaching programme and what is stated in the lesson plan.

It is recommended to report briefly but precisely on any critical points encountered, in line with the analysis carried out in the previous academic year, and to verify, providing documentary evidence, whether and how the CdS has taken into account the proposals and suggestions made by the Department/School CPDS in the previous report and the status of implementation of the proposed corrective actions.

Proposals for improvement of the CPDS:

It is recommended to identify any corrective actions for overcoming the critical elements revealed in the analysis section. These actions should be concrete and clearly detailed in relation to the time frame and responsible parties for implementation.

BOX D: Do the annual review in the annual monitoring forms (SMA) result in effective corrective actions on Course of Study?

Documentary sources

- ✓ Annual Monitoring Form (SMA) of the CdS including ANVUR Indicators.
- ✓ Any other review documents drawn up by the CdS.
- ✓ Entry, Academic career, and Exit Data (ref. Unipistat portal).
- ✓ Results of AlmaLaurea occupational surveys.
- ✓ Framework D4 (*Annual Review*) of the (Single Annual Form) SUA-CdS.

Analysis and evaluation of the CPDS:

Aspects to be considered:

- Assessing whether the CdS complied with the Quality Assurance Unit guidelines for the drafting of the SMA form.
- Verifying that in the commentary to the SMA form, the CdS has chosen all useful indicators to recognise its potential and delineate areas for improvement.
- Assessing whether the Cos proposed effective corrective actions in the SMA form, with regard to the formulation and analysis of the potential causes of the critical issues raised.

It is recommended to report briefly but precisely on any critical points encountered, in line with the analysis carried out in the previous academic year, and to verify, providing documentary evidence, whether and how the Cos has taken into account the proposals and suggestions made by the Department/School CPDS in the previous report and the status of implementation of the proposed corrective actions.

Proposals for improvement of the CPDS:

It is recommended to identify any corrective actions to be implemented to overcome the critical elements revealed in the analysis section. These actions should be concrete and clearly detailed in relation to the time frame and responsible parties for implementation.

BOX E: Is the quantitative and qualitative information of the CdS available in a proper and complete way, in order to allow broad consultation by the parties involved?

Documentary sources

- ✓ University webpage on educational offer (<https://www.unipi.it/index.php/lauree>).
- ✓ (Single Annual Form) SUA-CdS.
- ✓ Internet page dedicated to the course of study.

Analysis and evaluation of the CPDS:

Aspects to be considered:

- Checking that the information on the CdS is available in the Didactics section of the department's website.
- Ensuring that the information on the CdS given in the Quality section of the department's website is complete and up-to-date.
- Check that the information given is correct and clear for effective guidance.
- Check that the information available in the different public sources is consistent with each other.

It is recommended to report briefly but precisely on any critical points encountered, in line with the analysis carried out in the previous academic year, and to verify, providing documentary evidence, whether and how the CdS has taken into account the proposals and suggestions made by the Department/School CPDS in the previous report and the status of implementation of the proposed corrective actions.

Proposals for improvement of the CPDS:

It is recommended to identify any corrective actions for overcoming the critical elements revealed in the analysis section. These actions should be concrete and clearly detailed in relation to the time frame and the responsible parties for implementation.

BOX F: Further proposals for improvement

Documentary sources

- ✓ ...
- ✓ ...

Analysis and evaluation of the CPDS:

Aspects to be considered:

- Report any additional evaluations beyond those included in Framework A to E that are considered relevant to the continuous improvement process of the Course of Study.

It is recommended to report briefly but precisely on any critical points encountered, in line with the analysis carried out in the previous academic year and to verify, by providing documentary evidence, whether and how the CdS has taken into account the proposals and suggestions made by the Department/School CPDS in the previous report and the status of implementation of the proposed corrective measures.

Proposals for improvement of the CPDS:

It is recommended to identify any corrective actions for overcoming the critical elements revealed in the analysis section. These actions should be concrete and clearly detailed in relation to time frame and responsible parties for implementation.

SECTION 3: FINAL OVERALL ASSESSMENTS

Report an overall well-organized analysis in terms of strengths and areas for improvement for all the Courses of Study belonging the Department/School and general assessments.