PROCEDURE FOR STUDENTS AND PROFESSORS OPINION SURVEY

DRAFTING	REVIEW	APPROVAL
31/12/2021	14/02/2022	30/05/2022

REVISION INDEX	MODIFIED CHAPTER/PARAGRAPH	APPROVAL DATE	REASON FOR REVISION
00			Document Issuance
01	2; 3; 4	19/09/2024	Update

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.   PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this procedure is to define the management methods for collecting students' and teachers' opinions on teaching activities. The survey is mandatory for attending students pursuant to Article 1, paragraph 2 of Law 370/1999 and is an integral part of the Quality Assurance System, as well as a necessary requirement for accreditation.

2.   REFERENCES

− Law No. 370 of October 19, 1999

− ANVUR Guidelines for the Quality Assurance System in Universities – Periodic Accreditation of Institutions and Degree Programs

3.   RELEVANCE FOR THE COMPLIANCE OF OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES

This document is **specifically relevant** to the Integrated Activity and Organization Plan (PIAO).

4. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Activity	Structures/organs/entities										
	University Quality Assurance Committee	Quality Assurance Office	IT and Telecommunications Service	Teaching Staff	Teaching Offices	Student Community	Evaluation Unit	STP	Department Director	CCS President	Governing Bodies
1. Planning the "Student Opinion Survey Week"	R	C									
2. Request to open online questionnaires [1]		R	C								
3. Opening of questionnaires for courses delivered in the relevant semester		C	R			C					
4. Awareness activities for questionnaire completion [2]	R	R		C	C						
5. Completion of questionnaires				R		R					
6. Closing of the survey		C	R								
7. Data extraction, analysis, and processing			R								
8. Communication of analytical results to faculty, limited to delivered courses			R		C						
9. Uploading and publishing data on POWER BI and			R								

---

[1] Questionario studenti frequentanti, questionario studenti non frequentanti, questionario docenti

[2] Campagna comunicativa tramite i canali *social* di Ateneo, comunicazioni inviate ai docenti da parte dell'Ufficio AQ, attività di motivazione effettuata dai docenti in aula, supporto da parte delle Segreterie Didattiche

UniTusMoodle platforms [3]												
10. Data processing and analysis for the Evaluation Unit Report		C		R				C	R			
11. Drafting of the Evaluation Unit Report	C	C							R	C		
12. Data analysis and review of suggestions to identify possible interventions [4]										R	R	R

Legend

R= Responsible

C= Involved

---

[3] The data can be accessed through a controlled access system with different permissions based on the role within the University (Ref. Section 7).

[4] The CdS Responsible, in the presence of courses with evaluations significantly deviating from the overall program average, must take action by gathering additional analytical elements to understand the reasons behind these discrepancies. In collaboration with the students of the program, particularly those involved in the CPDS if present, the Coordinator should suggest targeted measures to improve critical aspects of the course experience for students. The proposed improvement actions will be included in the Periodic Review Reports of the study programs.

5. TIMELINES AND DEADLINES

Phase	Timeline/Deadline
Phase 3	December, Year X (for courses delivered in the first semester of the academic year X/X+1)
	May, Year X+1 (for courses delivered in the second semester and annual courses of the academic year X/X+1)
Phase 6	September 30, Year X+1 (for courses delivered in the first semester of the academic year X/X+1)
	October 31, Year X+1 (for courses delivered in the second semester and annual courses of the academic year X/X+1)
Phase 11	By April 30, Year X+2

6. STRUCTURE AND QUESTIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

a) *Structure and questions of the attending students' questionnaire*

COURSE

1 - Were your prior knowledge and skills sufficient to understand the topics covered in the exam program?

2 - Is the course workload proportionate to the assigned credits?

3 - Is the provided and recommended teaching material adequate for studying the subject?

4 - Were the exam methods clearly defined?

TEACHING

5 - Were the schedules for lectures, exercises, and other teaching activities respected?

6 - Does the instructor stimulate/motivate interest in the subject?

7 - Does the instructor present the topics clearly?

8 - Are the supplementary teaching activities (exercises, tutoring, labs, etc.) useful for learning the subject?

9 - Was the course taught consistently with what was stated on the degree program website?

10 - Is the instructor available for clarifications and explanations?

T2 - Does the instructor provide comprehensive answers to clarification requests?

INTEREST

11 - Are you interested in the topics covered in the course?

T3 - Overall, are you satisfied with how the course was conducted?

a) *Structure and questions of the non-attending students' questionnaire*

ATTENDANCE

Indicate the main reason for not attending or for reduced attendance in classes:

o Work

o Attending lectures of other courses

o Attendance is not very useful for exam preparation

o The facilities dedicated to teaching activities do not allow interested students to attend

o Other

COURSE

1 – Were your prior knowledge and skills sufficient to understand the topics covered in the exam program?

2 – Is the study workload of the course proportionate to the assigned credits?

3 – Is the teaching material (both recommended and available) adequate for studying the subject?

4 – Were the exam procedures clearly defined?

TEACHING STAFF

5 - Is the professor available for clarifications and explanations?

INTEREST

6 - Are you interested in the topics covered in the course?

c) Structure and questions of the Professors questionnaire

Average number of students who attended the course: __

DEGREE PROGRAM, CLASSROOMS, EQUIPMENT, AND SUPPORT SERVICES

1 - Is the study workload of the courses scheduled for the reference period acceptable?

2 - Is the overall organization (schedule, exams, midterm and final assessments) of the courses scheduled for the reference period acceptable?

3 - Was the lesson schedule for the courses in the reference period designed in a way that allows students to attend classes and engage in adequate individual study?

4 - Were the classrooms where the lessons were held adequate (visibility, audibility, availability of seats)?

5 - Are the facilities and equipment for studying and supplementary teaching activities (libraries, laboratories, etc.) adequate?

6 - Was the support service provided by the administrative offices satisfactory?

TEACHING

7 - Were the attending students' prior knowledge sufficient to understand the topics covered in the lessons and included in the exam program?

8 - Are there coordination methods in place for the course programs scheduled for the reference period?

9 - Was the explanation of the exam procedures clearly understood?

T1 - Overall, are you satisfied with the course delivered?

7. LEVELS OF ACCESS TO OUTCOMES

Category	Displayed Evaluation Results
Central Level	
Rector	All courses of the University
Academic Senate (President)	All courses of the University
Board of Directors (President)	All courses of the University
General Director	All courses of the University
University Quality Committee (President)	All courses of the University
Evaluation Unit (President)	All courses of the University
Support Office (as per the Quality Assurance Model)	All courses of the University
Departmental Level	
Department Director	All courses of the Department
Department Council (President)	All courses of the Department
Joint Student-Teacher Committees (President)	All courses of the Department
departmental AQ structure	All courses of the Department
CdS AQ structure (CdS President)	All courses of the Study Program
CCS President	All courses of the Study Program
Study Program Council (President)	All courses of the Study Program
Department Teaching Office (Head)	All courses of the Department
Teacher (including fixed-term researcher)	All courses of their affiliated department
Teacher who delivers a course in a Study Program within a Department different from their affiliation	Evaluation of their own course
Contract Instructor	Evaluation of their own course
Student	Courses within their study program (regardless of curriculum)