

ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT (AMR)

Last model update: **UQAC meeting of 11 December 2025**

DEGREE PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Name of the Degree Program: Bachelor's degree/Master's degree in ...

Degree classification:

School and/or Department:

Academic Year:

AMR INFORMATION SECTION

Members of the Quality Management Unit (QMU)

Prof. (Coordinator of the Didactic Coordination Commission) – Monitoring manager

Prof. (Professor of the Degree Program or Quality Assurance Officer)

Prof. (Professor of the Degree Program)

Prof. (Professor of the Degree Program)

Ms./Mr. (Student Representative)

Ms./Mr. (Student Representative)

Dr. (Administrative Staff with the role of)

Ms./Mr. (Labour Market Representative – if included in the QMU)

QMU meetings

The QMU met to discuss the topics covered in the sections of this Annual Monitoring Report, proceeding as follows:

Date

Data collection and analysis

Discussion and drafting of the first draft

Meeting duration:

Meeting modality (in person / online / hybrid):

Date

Review and finalization of the first draft

Meeting duration:

Mode of the meeting:

N.B. Please, note that since the report must be inserted in the Annual single form of the Degree Program, it is advisable to avoid tables, figures, and graphs.

Information Sources and Data Consulted

- University Datawarehouse
- Student Evaluation Surveys for the last Academic Year
- Indicators related to teaching quality, including the availability of teaching materials, classroom facilities, laboratories, and teacher availability
- Indicators providing information on students studying abroad or coming from foreign countries
- Indicators with the rates of students passing exams and graduating on time
- The students and graduates' satisfaction
- The employability of graduates in terms of how quickly they find jobs
- Others

Summary of the Discussion by the Didactic Coordination Commission

The Coordinator of the Degree Program in shows the document drafted by

ACTIONS PLANNED IN PREVIOUS AMR

It is recommended to evaluate any improvements following the corrective actions established in previous AMR, indicating, based on current information, whether such actions have had beneficial effects or not, and if the critical issues have been resolved or persist.

To indicate the outcomes of the planned corrective and/or improvement actions, particularly those in the previous AMR, specifying for each of them: the identified critical issue, the corrective action, the verification indicator, the outcome (resolved / unresolved).

Example

Corrective and/or improvement action n.1

- Critical issue
- Corrective action
- Verification indicator
- Outcome (resolved/unresolved)

(Repeat for all actions)

ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT SITUATION

Select and comment on specific proper indicators, then analyse their values and trends, comparing them with previous years and benchmarks (e.g. disciplinary-area, national, and/or regional), for identifying strengths and emerging weaknesses. Remember that the indicators are not direct measures of effectiveness, but their negative values represent sentinel events of the possible onset of critical issues. Comment also on data from the Student Evaluation Surveys. Include comments on guidance and tutoring services, as well as the involvement of professors, students, and stakeholders in monitoring and improving the Degree program. Finally, add comments on the other data listed in the section “Information Sources and Data Consulted” and the indicator “number of “Course details”.

Summarising, the main indicators to be employed are:

- *Degree program's indicators*
- *Student Evaluation Surveys*
- *Number of completed Course details*

When Changes to the Didactic regulations or to the CdS detail sheet are performed, provide clear motivations. The motivations may consist of corrective actions following any critical issues or improvement actions and must be consistent with them.

Example

Analysis of current data and comparison with previous years

Selection of indicators to focus on

Indicator X

Comment on the value and trend, comparison with national, regional, and university data.

CRITICAL ISSUES

Critical issues should be organised as persistent issues (identified in previous years) or emerging issues (identified in the current analysis). Then, each critical issue should be classified as:

- *minor (if it is deemed to be of little relevance, initiatives are nevertheless undertaken for improving the current situation)*
- *significant (if relevant, requiring specific and timely actions)*
- *requiring further investigation (which require further, in depth investigation and evaluation).*

Example

Persistent critical issues

- Issue x

Brief description, and classification (minor, significant, requiring further investigation)

Emerging critical issues

- Issue y

Brief description, connection with the analysis reported in the previous section (e.g. indicator trends), and classification (minor, significant, requiring further investigation)

(Repeat for all issues)

CORRECTIVE/IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS

The actions proposed should correspond to the critical issues highlighted (especially significant ones) or be broader improvement measures. All the corrective/improvement actions must be reasonably achievable and fall within the scope of the Degree program and its Didactic Coordination Commission.

The actions' description must include the issue to which respond, indicating their classification, prioritizing those classified as significant, and indicating whether they are persistent or emerging critical issues. Then, the objective of the action, the method, the responsibility, the timing and deadline, the necessary resources (human, material, structural), and the verification indicators must be stated.

Example

Corrective action n. X

- Critical issue/Improvement action
- Objective
- Planned action
- Responsibility
- Timing
- Required resources
- Verification indicators

(Repeat for all actions)