



ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT (AMR)

Last model update: UQAC meeting of 12 February 2026

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

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.

Guidelines for completion

For each selected indicator, provide a discursive comment on its value and trend, comparing it with values of previous years and benchmarks. Based on this analysis, briefly outline any critical issues, which will then be examined in detail in the following section.

CRITICAL ISSUES AND CORRECTIVE/IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS

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).

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 previously planned corrective and/or improvement actions, specifying for each of them: the identified critical issue, the corrective action, the relevant verification indicator, the outcome (RESOLVED / UNRESOLVED).

If the critical issue is resolved, the section concerning the corrective/improvement action¹ should not be completed. If the critical issue is unresolved, the corrective action must be specified (which may differ from or coincide with that adopted in the previous year).

All the proposed corrective actions must be reasonably achievable and fall within the scope of the Degree Program's and its Didactic Coordination Commission's responsibilities; they may also be actions aimed at broader improvement even if not directly linked to critical issues.

When describing the corrective and/or improvement action, the following elements must be specified: corrective action and its implementation modality, responsibility, timeframe, required resources (human, instrumental, and/or structural), and monitoring indicators. This information, which may differ from or coincide with those adopted in the previous year, must also be provided in the case of new corrective actions proposed for critical issues previously classified as persistent and not yet resolved.

¹ Corrective actions are not to be understood as the objective pursued by the action, but rather as the specific measures that the Degree Program plans and implements in order to address the critical issue. For each critical issue, the manner in which the corrective action is implemented must be described (e.g. to achieve the **objective** of increasing the number of graduates, the Degree Program may move a bottleneck examination to a different academic year [**action**]; the **way** in which this action is implemented to achieve the objective may consist of a modification of the Degree Program Didactic regulations).

Guidelines for completion

Persistent critical issues

- Issue x (critical issue previously classified as persistent and now resolved)
 - Brief description
 - Corrective action and implementation modality adopted in the SMA of the previous year
 - Monitoring/Verification indicator/s previously adopted
 - Outcome (critical issue resolved)
- Issue y (critical issue previously classified as persistent and not yet resolved)
 - Brief description
 - Classification (minor, significant, requiring further investigation)
 - Corrective action and implementation modality adopted in the SMA of the previous year
 - Monitoring/Verification indicator/s
 - Outcome (critical issue unresolved)
 - Corrective action (define whether new or carried over from the previous year)
 - Implementation modality
 - Responsibility
 - Timing
 - Required resources
 - Monitoring/Verification indicator/s

Emerging critical issues

- Issue z
 - Brief description
 - Connection with the analysis reported in the previous section (e.g. indicator trends)
 - Classification (minor, significant, requiring further investigation)
 - Corrective action
 - Implementation modality
 - Responsibility
 - Timing
 - Required resources
 - Monitoring/Verification indicator/s

(Repeat for all issues)

Improvement actions (not directly linked to a specific critical issue)

Improvement action n. X

- Brief description
- Planned action
- Responsibility
- Timing
- Required resources
- Monitoring/Verification indicator/s

(Repeat for all actions)