

Quality Assurance of the Degree Courses:

Feedbacks The Cyclical Review Report

Quality Committee
Prof. Guido Orzes and Prof. Giovanna Ferrentino



The RRC template is designed by the PQ according to the model prepared by ANVUR and is divided as follows:

- 1) A title page;
- 2) D.CDS.1 Quality Assurance in the planning of the Degree Course;
- 3) D.CDS.2 Quality Assurance in the delivery of the Degree Course;
- 4) D.CDS.3 Management of the Degree Course resources;
- 5) D.CDS.4 Review and improvement of the Degree Course;
- 6) Comment on the indicators.

On the **title page** are present information on the Study Course and data regarding the composition of the Review Group, the dates of the meetings, the objects discussed, and the persons present.

The **parts 2-5**, which concern the attention points of the AVA 3 system, are divided into three sections (a, b, c)

CYCLICAL REVIEW REPORT 2025

Name of the Course of Study (CdS):	
Class:	
Location:	
Any other useful information (Department, Branch office):	
First academic year of activation:	
Last change to the Study Regulation:	
Last change to the Degree Regulation:	
Last stakeholder meeting:	

Specify who is involved in the Review Report (Review Group members and functions) and the working procedures (organisation, division of tasks, sharing procedure).

Study Course Council

Mandatory members:

Prof. (Degree Course Director – Responsible of the Cyclical Review Report)
Prof. (Lecturer of the Degree Course)
Prof. (Referent AQ of CdS)
Ms./ Mr. (Student Representative)

ANVUR recommends that the Student Representative is not a member of the CPDS. If this condition occurs, it is suggested to involve an additional student of the degree course in the Review group.

The blue sentences in the template represent indications and must be deleted before sending the draft Report to the Quality Committee.

Other components:

Prof. (Lecturer of CdS)
Prof. (Lecturer of CdS)
Dr. (Administrative Referent of CdS)
Dr. (Representative of Stakeholders)

Other actors involved:

The Degree Course Council met for discussion of the topics listed in the sections of this review report on the **dd/mm/yy**.

Topic of the discussion:

-
-

Presented, discussed and approved in the Faculty Council on: **dd.mm.year**

- It is advisable to indicate **the dates of the review group meetings** and not only the final date of approval of the document, if any. **Since this is a long and complex document, it is expected that it has been discussed in more than one meeting or in any case that there has been some work of exchange/comparison aimed at writing it.**
- If the RRC has been discussed just within the **Quality Assurance Group and not within the Course Council**, the sentence can be changed in: **"The quality assurance group or the RRC Group met for discussion..."**
- If the RRC Group does **NOT match with the one reported in SUA uploaded in the folder, explain why.**

PARTS RELATED TO POINTS OF ATTENTION AVA 3

The **parts 2-5**, which concern the attention points of the AVA 3 system, are divided into three sections (a, b, c):

- Changes identified since the last review (a)
- Analysis of the situation based on data and information (b)
- Objectives and improved actions (c)

The diagram of section a as present in the template

1 – Quality assurance in the degree course design

D.CDS.1-a Summary of the main changes identified since the last review (referred to the sub-field D.CDS.1)

Describe the main changes since the previous cyclical review, also in relation to the corrective actions implemented by the Degree course, considering the sub-field D.CDS.1 of AVA 3 and the related points of attention.

Description

Considering the sub-field D.CDS.1 of AVA 3 and the related points of attention, summarize in this table the corrective actions taken by the Degree Course on the basis of what emerged from the last Cyclical Review Report conducted for the Degree Course following the scheme reported below.

Action: N. (year)

Title:

Description:

Actions undertaken: *(Describe the actions undertaken and how they were implemented)*

Time of execution: *(in months)*

State of progress: *(executed - not executed; if not executed indicate the motivation)*

Achieved results: *(Describe the achieved results by specifying the reference indicator/s for the monitoring of the level of the achievement of the objective and the related detection/verification methods)*

- Description of the changes identified since the last RRC not related to the point of attention;
- Presence of actions **not executed** to which no explanations are given;
- Reference year for the actions 2024 or 2025 (it should instead be the year of the last RRC)

The diagram of section b as present in the template

Documentary sources section (no more than 8 documents):

Key documents:

- Title:
Short Description:
Reference (chapter/paragraph, etc.):
Document Upload / Link:

Supporting documents:

- Title:
Short Description:
Reference (chapter/paragraph, etc.):
Document Upload/Link:

In the folder where the RRC is loaded, documents used for the drafting of the RRC **not renamed based on the points of attention.**

In all the sections related to the points of attentions:

- Documents or supporting documents are not properly reported
- Description missed
- Reference chapter/paragraph not indicated
- Links to the documents missing.

The diagram of section b as present in the template

Self-assessment (without limitation of words) by answering the following questions in line with the Point of Attention D.CDS.1.1

*Include the main problems identified, challenges, **strengths** and **areas for improvement** emerging from the analysis of the period under review and the perspectives for the following period referred to the following questions:*

1. *Are the assumptions that led to the declaration of the character of the Degree Course in its cultural and professionalisation aspects at the planning stage still valid?*
2. *Are the needs and the potential for development of the reference sector satisfied, also in relation to subsequent study cycles, if any?*
3. *Have the main stakeholders interested in outgoing cultural/professional profiles been identified and consulted (students, professors, scientific and professional organisations, representatives of the world of culture and manufacture, also at international level), both directly and considering sector studies?*
4. *Have the ideas that emerged from the consultations been taken into consideration in the design of the Degree Course, above all with reference to the employment potential of graduates and the possible continuation of studies in subsequent cycles?*
5. *Do the declared job profiles, job opportunities and prospects realistically consider the different working possibilities for graduates?*
6. *Are the study programmes still considered adequate to achieve their objectives? Are they up to date in terms of content?*

Critical issues/areas for improvement

List in this section the critical issues and/or areas for improvement that have emerged from the discussion of the reflection points, with a sufficient level of detail to define any actions to be taken, to be reported in Section C.

- For sake of clarity, we kindly ask to leave the questions and to answer to each one or to write a single logically organized text;
- Avoid long text where a reader with difficulty can refer to the questions;
- Pay attention to the correspondence between the self-evaluation and the focus of the AVA 3 point of attention

- Self assessment not related to the point of attention;
- No clear reference of the **PDCA cycle (Plan-do-check-act)** in relation to the point of attention in question;
- Description of critical issues difficult to solve and not related to the point of attention.

Deming Cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act)



- ☐ Define the **Objectives**, i.e. the Results you want to achieve (Plan) and plan and develop an integrated **set of approaches and actions** to achieve the set objectives (Plan)
- ☐ **Implement the identified approaches and related processes** (Do)
- ☐ **Monitor** planning and implementation (Check)
- ☐ Promote **improvement actions** to make the approaches and processes more effective (Act)

The diagram of section b as present in the template

Self-assessment (without limitation of words) by answering the following questions in line with the Point of Attention D.CDS.1.1

Include the main problems identified, challenges, **strengths** and **areas for improvement** emerging from the analysis of the period under review and the perspectives for the following period referred to the following questions:

1. Are the assumptions that led to the declaration of the character of the Degree Course in its cultural and professionalisation aspects at the planning stage still valid?
2. Are the needs and the potential for development of the reference sector satisfied, also in relation to subsequent study cycles, if any?
3. Have the main stakeholders interested in outgoing cultural/professional profiles been identified and consulted (students, professors, scientific and professional organisations, representatives of the world of culture and manufacture, also at international level), both directly and considering sector studies?
4. Have the ideas that emerged from the consultations been taken into consideration in the design of the Degree Course, above all with reference to the employment potential of graduates and the possible continuation of studies in subsequent cycles?
5. Do the declared job profiles, job opportunities and prospects realistically consider the different working possibilities for graduates?
6. Are the study programmes still considered adequate to achieve their objectives? Are they up to date in terms of content?

Critical issues/areas for improvement

List in this section the critical issues and/or areas for improvement that have emerged from the discussion of the reflection points, with a sufficient level of detail to define any actions to be taken, to be reported in Section C.

D.CDS.1.3 – Training offer and programs

- Refer to the **TUNING MATRIX** created and uploaded as reference document in the same folder of the RRC.

D.CDS 2.1 – Orientation and tutoring

- Please mention initial, in-course and final (placement) orientation activities

D.CDS 2.2 - Knowledge required at admission and remediation of weaknesses (critical issues for many programs that must be addressed!)

- Bachelor and "ciclo unico": OFA should be foreseen, clearly communicated and the procedure to overcome them must be clear.
- Master Degrees: admission requirements + adequate preparation (high mark or admission exam/test).

Section c -Objectives and improved actions

Action: (D.CDS.X/n./RC-202X)

Title and description:

Area to improve:

Reference indicator/s: *(Specify reference indicator(s) for monitoring the degree of achievement of the objective and how it will be measured/verified.)*

Description of undertaken action:

Subject responsible: *(where possible it is suggested to identify a single person responsible for the action and not a group es. CdS, lectures of CdS)*

Resources: *(Define the types of resources needed (people, materials, technologies, services, knowledge, financial resources, etc.) and quantify them by assessing their actual availability)*

Time of execution: *(in months)*

Deadline: *(precise date)*

- ☐ Critical issues reported in section "b" which **DO NOT find an action** in the present section;
- ☐ **Corrective actions NOT covering multi-year and long periods.**

Comments to the indicators

- ☐ For indicators that present a **certain criticism** (value lower than the average of the geographical and national area or negative trend), **NO** comments on the possible causes and **NO proposed corrective actions**;
- ☐ **NO** analysis of the **trend over time** of the indicators;
- ☐ Corrective actions with **FEW or NO** connection to the highlighted criticisms;
- ☐ Suggestions that are generic, unachievable or dependent on other entities and uncontrollable.
- ☐ **NO links** between possible **causes of improvement or decline of** indicators over time and the actions implemented by the Degree Course after SMA and RRC Report.

Important dates

- We kindly ask that the **AQ Referent of each Faculty** carefully check whether the corrections of the PQ have been implemented by the RRCs.
- The revised RRCs should be approved by the Faculty Council by the end of **September** (allowing enough time to implement all the corrections suggested by the PQ)
 - *But... the revised draft of **one RRC per Faculty** should be submitted to the Evaluation Committee by 10th July (before approval by Faculty Council)*

❑ **Periodic Accreditation Visit** («Visita CEV») of **unibz**

❑ **I semester 2026** (January to June 2026) → but self-evaluation reports must be submitted 2 months before the visit

❑ **Structures assessed:**

- Institution as a whole (unibz)
- 2 Faculties (Departments)
- 2 PhD Programmes (usually belonging to the selected Faculties)
- **4 study programmes**

→ Selection done by ANVUR (5 months before the accreditation visit, at the latest) to obtain the highest possible representativeness from the point of view of:

- Disciplinary areas present within the university;
- Type of programmes;
- Possible presence of decentralised branches (sedi staccate);
- Performance measured by the indicators on students' careers (for study programmes) and on the last Research Quality Assessment (VQR, for Departments)



Freie Universität Bozen
Libera Università di Bolzano
Università Lìdia de Bulsan

Thank you

