

# The periodic site visit from the commission of expert peers

**Cristiano Violani**

*Sapienza University - Rome*  
*AVA expert and CEV chairperson*

**EQUAM TRAINING COURSE Rome, 11 – 12 June 2015**

---

- **The AVA System**
- **Actors and responsibilities required by AVA**
- **Internal Evaluation Committee (NVA), Quality Assurance Committees (PQ), Joint Committees Students-Professors (CPSD)**
- **The Annual Data and Self-Evaluation Form (SUA)**
- **Developments in the *European Standard and Guidelines***
- **How a university prepares the accreditation visit**
  
- **The AVA Requirements**
- **The Commission of Evaluation Experts (CEV)**
- **The Evaluation Criteria and the Forms used by the CEV**



# Requirements for Periodic Accreditation of Universities AVA F.2.3.1-F.2.3.2



**F.2.3.1. - QA 1: The university has established, declared and effectively pursued adequate **policies** to develop its vision on teaching and learning quality**

This requires clear and concrete objectives, verified learning outcomes, educational methods and resources and periodic **reviews** of the adopted processes and consequent results.

**F.2.3.2. – QA 2: The university knows to what extent its **policies** are actually implemented by those who manage the study programmes**

The **Quality Assurance Committee** provides the university with aggregate data that helps to orient its policies. Degree programmes and courses are regularly evaluated in terms of all actors (students, professors, support personnel, former students and labour market representatives) in order to ensure the overall quality of education.

# ***Different views on Internal QA should lead to different policies and goals***

- *Embed Quality Enhancement in the Mission / Vision*
- *Strategic Planning*
- *Staff Development*
- *Programme Development*
- *Research Development*
- *Social Commitment*
- Define a Set of Requirements and Criteria
- Define Key Performance Indicators
- Process Descriptions
- Data Collection
- Data Analysis
- **Rankings**

## **F.2.3.3. – QA 3 : The University degree programmes pursue continuous quality improvement to increase their value**

Based on the available resources, the university **Quality Assurance Committee** orients Degree Programmes towards a QA that satisfies not only pre-established criteria, but also ensures a commitment to continuous improvement of learning outcomes that are updated and oriented towards national and international best practices.

## **F.2.3.4. – QA 4 : The university has an efficient decision-making organization to monitor the quality of research and of the degree programmes**

**Evaluation Committees** and Joint Committees (**CPDS**) implement and document annual monitoring activities and QA orientation leading to recommendations and indications for the **Quality Assurance Committee** and university governance, which are both aware of the opinions, recommendations and indications produced by the **Evaluation Committee** and the **CPDS** and use them to implement improvements.



# Requirements for Periodic Accreditation of Universities AVA– F.2.3.5 e F.2.3.6



## **F.2.3.5. –QA 5– The QA system has been implemented and it functions efficiently in the sample of degree programmes visited**

The ANVUR has passed specific measures to identify critical control points, evaluation procedures for QA requisites 1-5 and criteria and procedures to position universities at one of four levels. The QA 5 requisite must include the effective adoption of a *diploma supplement* as indicated by current guidelines.

## **F.2.3.6. QA 6 - Further Requirements for Tele-Universities:**

**F.2.3.6.1. Evaluation of Student Learning Outcomes**

**F.2.3.6.2. System Integration**

**F.2.3.6.3. Quality of Learning Interaction**

**F.2.3.6.4. Student-tutor Interaction**

**F.2.3.6.5. Technological Requirements**

## QA 6 Research & QA 7 Sustainability

- **Requirement QA 6:** ensures that the university establishes, states and pursues appropriate policies to achieve its vision of research quality
- **Requirement QA 7:** ensures that the university has a sustainable academic programme



# Committee of Expert Evaluators

## CEV



1 **President** (System Expert)

2-3 Vice Presidents (System Experts)

1 **Coordinator and Communicator** (System Expert)

1 **Discipline Expert for each monitored programme** (6-9 Experts)

1-3 Students

A **Sub-Committee** (headed by one Vice President with 2-3 disciplinary experts and 1 student) is responsible for the evaluation of a group of three degree programmes and the 1-3 Departments running the programmes.

Each CEV is accompanied and assisted by an **ANVUR official** who organizes the visit (programme + logistics) and mediates with the institution, but does not participate in the evaluation.

# CEV Evaluation Responsibilities

Requirements	Evaluators
QA 1-2-3-4-6-7	System Experts
QA 5	Disciplinary Experts
QA 1.F-G QA 5.F-G	Distance Learning Experts
QA 1.E – QA 5.D.3	Student Experts (*)



# DESK ANALYSIS ON-LINE, SITE VISIT, AND CEV REPORTS



4-8 WEEKS BEFORE THE VISIT, ON-LINE DESK ANALYSIS & CEV  
TELECONFERENCES

DAY 1 INSTITUTIONAL AUDITS (Rector, Senate, NVA, PQ, etc.)

DAY 2 PROGRAMME 1 + DEPARTMENT 1 \* 3

DAY 3 PROGRAMME 2 + DEPARTMENT 2 \* 3

DAY 4 PROGRAMME 3 + DEPARTMENT 3 \* 3

DAY 5 COLLEGIAL REVISION OF THE EVALUATION FORMS AND  
PRELIMINARY RESULTS TO THE RECTOR

Within 4 weeks, the evaluation revision preliminary report must be presented to ANVUR which will send it to the university.

Within 8 weeks, following the university's reactions to the preliminary report, a final report is submitted to ANVUR.

All experts in a CEV are registered with and receive training from ANVUR

The CEV tools include:

- *ANVUR Guidelines for Periodic Accreditation*
- *Evaluation Forms*
- *Visit Diary*
- *Audit Notes*

# Elements Evaluated by CEV

Evaluations are conducted on the following elements:

- SUA DPs + RD (annual unitary data and self-evaluation form)
- Annual Review Reports
- Cyclical Review Reports (bi-annual, tri-annual, 5-6 year reports)
- Reports from the Student-Professor Joint Committees
- Annual Report by the Internal Committee for Evaluation
- All documents published on the university website
- Audits on university key figures; teaching, administrative and technical staff, students, alumni, external stakeholders, and department directors ...
- Results of student interviews with lecture attendees

# Section D - SUA-DP

---

Section D contains the following documents: annual reports by NVA and Joint Committees and Degree Programme Reviews (annual and cyclic).

The SUA-DP Section D is not public, but reserved to the university and accessible by ANVUR and CEV during the periodic accreditation process.

The SUA-DP contains 6 sub-sections. The first is reserved to system experts, while the other five sections are evaluated by disciplinary experts.

# Section D - SUA-DP

▶ QUADRO D1

Struttura organizzativa e responsabilità a livello di Ateneo

▶ QUADRO D2

Organizzazione e responsabilità della AQ a livello del Corso di Studio

▶ QUADRO D3

Programmazione dei lavori e scadenze di attuazione delle iniziative

▶ QUADRO D4

Riesame annuale

▶ QUADRO D5

Progettazione del CdS

▶ QUADRO D6

Eventuali altri documenti ritenuti utili per motivare l'attivazione del Corso di Studio

## Requisite QA 1.A The University pursues policies to implement its vision of education quality

Elements	Aspects to take into consideration
QA 1.A.1 Objectives and Planning	Does the university have public strategic guidelines to identify its position in terms of educational objectives both in a social and academic context? Are the courses and programmes provided coherently with these guidelines?
QA 1.A.2 Implementation Responsibility	Has the university clearly indicated who is responsible for degree programme design and management, as well as who is in charge of providing required services and resources?
QA 1.A.3 Quality Policies	Has the university implemented a diffuse culture of quality to protect students? Has it made them public along with its concrete objectives?
QA 1.A.4 QA Roles and Responsibilities	Does the university clearly indicated the roles and responsibilities of the actors involved in the education QA processes? Is there proof that these actors are able to efficiently and effectively carry out their duties?
QA 1.A.5 University Strategy for Education and QA	Do the university education strategies address cyclical review reports produced by degree programmes and the other documents produced by the Quality Assurance and Joint Professor-Student Committees, and the Evaluation Committee?

Each point in the form receives a grade on the following scale:

- A - Excellent Practice
- B - Approved
- C - Acceptable ... but it is **recommended that...**
- D - Not Approved due to specific problems (including the condition)

## EVALUATIONS

- A - practice to be highlighted by ANVUR. It must be accompanied by a description and by an explicit indication of why the CEV considered it excellent.
- B - does not require an explicit motivation
- C - requires explicit motivation and recommendations for change
- D - requires explicit motivation

In case of multiple items, the lower grade prevails.

## Excellent

- All the points are approved (B) without recommendations, at least one point received an A mark (excellent or best practice).

## Positive

- All the points are approved (B) without recommendations, one C may be compensated by an A.

## Approved with reservations

- One or more points received a C and recommendations for change.

## Unsatisfactory

- One or more points were “not approved” and there were too many Cs.

## The Forms also include:

- **Remarks** - are compatible with a B, but if not resolved by the next visit will lead to C and further recommendations or conditions;
- **Recommendations**
- **Conditions**
- **Excellent practice alerts**



**Indicator QA 1.B ensures that learning outcomes are comprehensible to students and that educational objectives are coherent with the professional outlooks students.**



<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Questions to Consider</b>
QA 1.B.1 Social Demand	Does the university verify that every DP efficiently ascertains the existing education demand and uses it to prepare its curricula to match professional profiles?
QA 1.B2 Training Project Communication	Does the university ascertain that the information in its SUA-DPs on learning outcomes and professional profiles are public?
QA 1B2 Admission Requirements (BIS)	Does the university ascertain that DPs efficiently verify the entrance level knowledge of students and the requirements necessary to complete their programmes?
QA 1.B.3 Learning Outcomes	Does the university ascertain that each DP clearly and completely indicates the learning outcomes (Dublin 1-2 descriptors) and transversal skills (Dublin 3-4-5 descriptors) it expects students to achieve and does it prepares an adequate curricula?



**Indicator QA 1.C determines whether and to what extent a university has adopted a plan for recruiting student workers - or students with difficulty attending classes - and has designed specific training and support services**

**Points of Attention    Questions to Consider**

	<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Questions to Consider</b>
QA 1.C.1	Recruitment	Does the university implement recruiting policies for student workers or students who have difficulties attending courses?
QA 1.C.2	Programmes	Does the university define specific procedures for creating and managing educational programmes that fit the needs of student workers or students who have difficulties attending courses?
QA 1.C.3	Services	Does the university provide support services for student workers or students who have difficulties attending courses?



**Indicator QA1.D ensures that training resources (teaching and support staff, facilities and equipment) are adequate to national and international academic and professional standards (where applicable) in terms of teaching and research integration and organizational requirements**

	<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Questions to Consider</b>
QA 1.D.1	Teaching staff and numbers	Does the university guarantee DPs a minimum three-year teaching resource sustainability?
QA 1.D.2	Teaching staff, competences and training	Does the university organise training and professional updating courses for its professors on pedagogy, university teaching, new technologies to support learning and docimology?
QA 1.D.3	Logistics	Does the university guarantee DPs logistic resources (lecture halls, labs, libraries) in sufficient quantity and quality for teaching and learning activities and to allow students to efficiently and effectively organise their learning?
QA 1.D.4	Technical and administrative staff	Does the university guarantee DPs personnel resources to support didactics and services (library, scientific, computer, linguistic) and to support services (offices, helpdesks, international mobility, orientation, stages, tutoring, etc.)?

Points of Attention	Questions to consider
---------------------	-----------------------

QA 1.E.1 Self-assessment of processes and results	Does the university guarantee an efficient self-assessment activity for processes and results related to university academics (Departments, Inter-Departmental Offices, Governance)?
QA 1.E.2 Management and monitoring of degree programmes	Does the university guarantee that DP managers efficiently monitor the programmes, implement all review points and act timely when new issues arise?
QA 1.E.3 Review timing and methodologies	Does the university guarantee that DP-level review activities are correctly implemented in terms of time and procedures?
QA 1.E.4 Student involvement	Do students participate in decision-making processes on educational quality? Is there evidence that their input is effectively requested and taken into consideration at all levels? (Governance, Departments, Inter-Departmental Offices, DPs)



**Indicator QA 1. F Tele-Universities:** ascertain that the description of **on-line academic programmes** is clear and explicit, even in relation to activities, services, functions and related responsibilities.



---

**Points of Attention    Aspects to Consider**

---

QA 1.F.1	Document on service quality	Does the service charter include an adequate description of academic programmes, DP structure and roles, functions and responsibilities, as well as transparency and quality criteria?
QA 1.F.2	Services	Is the programme integrated with services (library, administration, orientation, placement, etc.)?  Is the overall integration efficient?
QA 1.F.3	Student information	Are students aware of minimum connection requirements to satisfactorily enjoy didactic activities? Are these requisites guaranteed?

---



## Requisite QA .2 The University knows to what degree policies are implemented by degree programmes



### Points of Attention Aspects to Consider

QA 2.1	Monitoring 1	Does the university regularly monitor DP academic activities? Are Governance organisms, Departments and Inter-departmental offices defined? Are DPs aware of monitoring results?
QA 2.2	Monitoring 2	Does monitoring clearly reveal critical points and differences between planned and implemented programmes?
QA 2.3	Quality Assurance	Does the Quality Committee monitor processes, documentation, application of quality processes and DP results, including review activities and reports to Governance?
QA 2.4	Consequences of Monitoring	Do Governance organisms, Departments and Inter-departmental offices, etc. implement measures to correct the processes when the outcome differ from the expected ones, and improve the programmes?



## **Requisite QA.3** The University requests that DPS implement continuous quality improvement, pointing to results of increasing value



<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Aspects to Consider</b>
----------------------------	----------------------------

QA 3.1	Continuous Improvement	Does the university, either centrally or at the intermediate level (Departments, Schools, Inter-departmental offices) employ organisational tools and incentives to promote continuous improvement, both centrally and for peripheral structures?
QA 3.2	Quality Training	Does the university organise adequate training for professors, students and TA personnel involved in didactic activities and relative QA?

	Points of Attention	Aspects to Consider
QA 4.1	Decision-making system	Has the university clearly defined which actors have decision-making powers on DP quality? (Degree Programmes, Inter-departmental structures, etc.)
QA 4.2	Quality Committee - adequacy	Does the Quality Committee operate adequately to ensure QA requirements?
QA 4.3	Quality Committee - monitoring	Does the Quality Committee interact efficiently with university organisational actors (didactics, research, computer services, etc.) to ensure QA requirements?
QA 4.4	Evaluation Committee adequacy	Does the NVA operate adequately to ensure QA requirements?
QA 4.5	Evaluation Committee monitoring	Does the NVA adequately assess the organisation and activity of the Quality Committee and the results obtained in terms of QA requirements?
QA 4.6	Joint Committees - adequacy	Do the Student-Professor Joint Commissions operate adequately to ensure QA requirements?
QA 4.7	Joint Committees - activities	Do the Student-Professor Joint Commissions carefully analyse DP didactic activities to identify critical issues independently and request their review?

## **QA 5.A**

**Objective: ascertain the presence of monitoring and consultation processes on the labour market, including services and professions, to further define academic programmes. Is there evidence of the effects of these actions to identify work skills and competences that students require from Degree Programmes?**

## Requisite QA.5 Is QA effectively applied in sample monitored Degree Programmes at University?

	Points of Attention	Aspects to Consider	
<b>QA 5.A.1</b>	Consulted organisms	Is the range of consulted agencies and organisation (either directly or via sector studies) adequately represented at the regional, national and/or international levels?	
<b>QA 5.A.2</b>	Consultation procedures	Are consultation procedures efficient channels to gather information on relevant functions and competences?	
<b>QA 5.A.4</b>	Functions and competences	Are the functions and competences that characterise each professional profile described completely? Do they provide a useful basis for the definition of the expected educational results?	

## Sector QA5.B

**Objective: ascertain that DP educational results (expected and observed) are coherent with the education demand (functions and competences) and clearly described. Each teaching module must present specific objectives that are coherent with the DP learning results and that the level reached by students is clearly indicated.**

**This is based on a verified level of initial competences and knowledge that is adequate to begin the programme provided by the DP.**

# Requisite QA.5 Is QA effectively applied in sample monitored Degree Programmes at University?

	Points of Attention	Aspects to Consider
<b>QA 5.B.1</b>	Efficacy of Admission Requirements	How is the initial baggage of competences and knowledge verified? How are gaps identified and how is their bridging ascertained? <i>(for first and single cycle DPs)</i> How is the preparation of individual candidate students verified? <i>(for second cycle DPs)</i>
<b>QA 5.B.2</b>	Coherence between educational demand and learning results	Are the learning objectives of the DP for students (Dublin descriptors 1-2), including transversal skills (Dublin descriptors 3-4-5), coherent with the educational demands for the professional profiles identified by the DP?
<b>QA 5.B.3</b>	Coherence between DP academics and expected learning results	Are the didactic contents/methods/tools coherent with what described in the course catalogue and are the learning results indicated in SUA-DP section A4.b?
<b>QA 5.B.4</b>	Learning Evaluation	Are exams and other learning assessment tools clearly indicated in the course catalogue descriptions? Are they adequate and coherent with the objectives that must be assessed?



## **Requisite QA.5 Is QA effectively applied in sample monitored Degree Programmes at University?**

---



### **Sector QA 5.C**

**Objective: to ascertain the**

- Identification of critical issues highlighted by data and received indications;**
- Actions to correct processes (organization, didactic planning, etc.);**
- Adoption of coherent solutions with available resources to guarantee documented results.**

## Requisite QA.5 Is QA effectively applied in sample monitored Degree Programmes at University?

	Points of Attention	Aspects to Consider
<b>QA 5.C.1</b>	Data Analysis and issue identification	Does the Review Report identify the major issues revealed by the data and any observations/indications?
<b>QA 5.C.2</b>	Identification of causes of issues	Does the Review Report convincingly analyse the causes of the issues that have been identified? ( <i>i.e., education process, organisational factors, admission requirement factors, management of additional credits (OFA), work load, types of exam, administration of exams, etc.</i> )
<b>QA 5.C.3</b>	Solutions to issues	Does the Review Report identify plausible solutions to identified issues (adequate to their magnitude and compatible to available resources and DP management responsibilities)? Were these solutions implemented?
<b>QA 5.C.4</b>	Evaluation of solutions	Were these solutions identified in the Review Report implemented? Did subsequent review reports evaluate the efficacy of the solutions? If the results were not expected, were the solutions modified?

**Indicator QA 5.D Objective:** ascertain that student and graduate opinions are duly considered in DP quality management, which must adopt efficient procedures to monitor and communicate, identify critical issues, act at the appropriate level (organisational, didactic planning) and adopt solutions coherent to available resources.

	<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Aspects to Consider</b>	
<b>QA 5.D.1</b>	Publicising student opinions on DPs	Are the procedures adopted to publicise student opinion adequate? Are the analysis, advertising and distribution procedures based on these results adequate?	
<b>QA 5.D.2</b>	Student indications and observations	Are the CPDS and Review Groups active in the collection of students indications and opinions? Is the information revealed by these sources used?	
<b>QA 5.D.3</b>	Reception of student opinions	Do the DPs act on the main issues revealed by on student/graduate opinions? Do they introduce adequate corrective measures? Are the identified problems resolved? Does the Review Report indicate these activities?	

**Indicator QA 5.E Objective:** ascertain the existence of work orientation activities and DP initiatives for studies addressing effective work placement.

	<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Aspects to Consider</b>
<b>QA 5.E.1</b>	Graduate competences	Does DP efficacy monitoring involve external parties and particularly those consulted during the planning phase?
<b>QA 5.E.2</b>	Activities promoting graduate employment	Does the DP organise adequate initiatives and services to promote graduate employment (i.e., stages, high apprenticeship contracts, internships and other work orientation activities)



**Indicator QA 5.F Objective** : ascertain that effective quality management is in place – in terms of continuous improvement – and that all demands for redefinition or review of processes are systematically identified and addressed.



	<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Aspects to Consider</b>
<b>QA 5.F.1</b>	Mapping Processes	Are the main DP management processes clearly identified?
<b>QA 5.F.2</b>	Responsibility System	Are DP management roles and responsibilities clearly and accurately defined?
<b>QA 5.F.3</b>	Respect of Responsibility System	Are DP management roles and responsibilities respected?
<b>QA 5.F.4</b>	Resources and Services	Are DP human resources, materials and services adequate to achieve the established objectives?
<b>QA 5.F.5</b>	Transparency and Communication	Is public documentation on DP organisation and characteristics complete, updated and communicated to all professors? Is it transparent and accessible to all stakeholders?



## Indicator QA 6.A Evaluation of Research - Ensure that the university establishes, states and pursues appropriate policies to achieve its vision of research quality



### Points of Attention Aspects to Consider

QA 6.A.1	Research Objectives and Planning	Has the university defined a transparent research strategy with clearly defined objectives based on the pros and cons of the social and academic context? Has it planned research coherent with these guidelines?
QA 6.A.2	Third Mission	Has the university defined a third mission strategy? Does it implement activities coherently with this strategy?
QA 6.A.3	Implementation Responsibility	How does the university indicate how research management responsibilities and the acquisition of necessary resources and services amongst departments (or equivalent structures) and research structures (i.e., inter-departmental structures, research centres, etc.)?
QA 6.A.4	Resource Distribution	Does the university indicate the criteria and procedures governing research resource distribution to departments (or equivalent structures) and research structures (i.e., inter-departmental structures, research centres, etc.)? Are there merit criteria based on result evaluation defined by VQR and SUA-RD?
QA 6.A.5	QA Roles and Responsibilities	Does the university clearly define roles and responsibilities of all actors involved in Research QA? Do the actors involved have the tools and resources to act efficiently and timely



**Indicator QA 6.B Research Evaluation within the system of Quality Assurance: ensure that the university knows what extent their research policies are carried out by departments and research facilities**



	<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Aspects to Consider</b>
QA 6.B.1	Monitoring 1	Who plans and implements periodic monitoring of university research strategy by departments (or equivalent structures) or other research structures (research centres, etc.)? Are governance organisms, departments and other intermediate structures aware of monitoring results?
QA 6.B.2	Monitoring 2	Does the monitoring activity reveal critical issues in university research, in individual departments and in other research structures?
QA 6.B.3	Internal Quality Assurance Activities	Does the Quality Committee (or equivalent structure) supervise processes, documentation, quality policy application and research activity results, including review activities and report to governance organisms?
QA 6.B.4	Consequences of monitoring	If results diverge from expectations, do governance organisms, departments or other intermediate structures initiate procedures? Which?



**Indicator QA 6.C Research Evaluation - Objective:** ascertain the university enacts policies and actions to improve research quality of departments and research structures and constantly aims to improve



**Points of Attention Aspects to Consider**

QA 6.C.1	Continuous improvement	Does the university employ organisational tools and/or incentives to promote continuous improvement of research quality, both centrally and at the peripheral level?
QA 6.C.2	Quality Committee Members	Do the Quality Committee (or equivalent structure) members have the necessary competences and research experience, also in terms of QA?
QA 6.C.3	Evaluation Committee Members	Do the Evaluation Committee members have the necessary competences and research experience, also in terms of QA?
QA 6.C.4	Evaluation Committee Supervision	Does the Evaluation Committee efficiently evaluate Quality Committee organisation and activities? Are they suitable for Research QA?

## Requisite Q A .7 Didactic Sustainability - Objective: ascertain that the university has a sustainable didactic workload

	<b>Points of Attention</b>	<b>Aspects to Consider</b>
QA 7.1	Didactic workload sustainability	Is the university DID value compatible with existing DPs and relative educational activities?
QA 7.2	Relationship between DID and didactic quality	Do the university DPs include supplementary didactic activities (exercises, tutoring, labs, etc.) that help students obtain expected results?
QA 7.3	Numero di ore di attività didattica frontale per CFU	Do the university DPs provide an adequate number of frontal didactic activities per CFU to reach expected results?