

**JOINT STUDENTS AND
TEACHERS BOARD**

ANNUAL REPORT

2025



CONTENTS

1. FOREWORD	4
1.1. FUNCTION.....	4
1.2. COMPOSITION AND OPERATION.....	4
1.3. SURVEYING TOOLS.....	5
1.4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT	5
2. ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE JSTB AND CURRENT STATE.....	6
2.1. MEETINGS OF THE JOINT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS BOARD.....	6
2.2. MEETINGS BETWEEN THE JOINT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS BOARD AND OTHER BODIES.....	7
2.3. ANALYSIS OF THE KEY ISSUES THAT EMERGED FROM THE PREVIOUS REPORT	7
3. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE IMT SCHOOL'S EDUCATIONAL OFFERING	10
3.1. END OF YEAR QUESTIONNAIRE	11
3.1.1. Training	12
3.1.2. Supervision	13
3.1.3. Experience abroad.....	13
3.1.4. Spaces and services.....	14
3.1.5. Transparency and communication.....	14
3.1.6. Research activities and output	15
3.1.7. Teaching carried out by students.....	15
3.2. PHD PROGRAMME EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	16
3.3. TEACHING EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (TEQ)	18
4. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE SERVICES OFFERED TO STUDENTS	21
4.1. GOOD PRACTICE QUESTIONNAIRE 2025 REFERRING TO 2024	21
4.2. IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS ADOPTED BY THE JSTB ON THE SERVICES OFFERED	27
5. POINTS OF ATTENTION AND KEY ISSUES	29
6. CONCLUSIONS.....	30

7. ATTACHMENTS 33

A. LIST OF JOINT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS BOARD MEETINGS..... 33

B. KEY ISSUES HIGHLIGHTED IN THE 2024 ANNUAL REPORT 34

1. FOREWORD

1.1. FUNCTION

The Joint Students and Teachers Board (hereinafter also referred to as the JSTB) of the IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca (hereinafter also referred to as the IMT School or the School) was **established**, pursuant to Art. 2, paragraph 2, letter g) of **Law 240/2010**, with the Director's Decree (now referred to as Rector) of **7 November 2018**. The JSTB operates as a first-level internal evaluator of the IMT School's training activities and carries out overall monitoring of the Quality Assurance (QA) of the educational offering and of the services offered to the School's students. In light of the considerations that will be presented in the **Conclusions** of this Report, it should be noted that, like all the previous Annual Reports issued by the JSTB, this Report is the "downstream" result of an ongoing "upstream" observation of the teaching activities and other services offered to students by the IMT School during the academic year in question.

1.2. COMPOSITION AND OPERATION

The JSTB is composed of three student representatives and three members of the School's faculty appointed by the Rector. This Report is the result of the work carried out by the JSTB with the membership defined by Rectoral decree No. 19892 of 14 November 2024:

- **Student members:**

- [Teresa Maria Callaioli](#), student in the XXXIX PhD cycle in Cultural Systems;
- [Hassaan Idrees](#), student in the XXXIX PhD cycle in Systems Science;
- [Irene Sánchez Rodríguez](#), student in the XXXIX PhD cycle in Cognitive, Computational and Social Neurosciences.

- **Faculty members:**

- [Linda Bertelli](#), Associate Professor in Aesthetics;
- [Gustavo Cevolani](#), Associate Professor in Logic and Philosophy of Science (acting as President);
- [Marianna Marino](#), Associate Professor in Applied Economics.

The composition of the JSTB can be consulted on the IMT School's website [on the dedicated page](#). Previous Annual Reports (starting from the 2019 one, relating to the 2018-19 academic year), on the other hand, can be consulted on the [Quality Assurance Documents page](#) in the Italian and English versions.

The work of the JSTB is governed by the [Regulations for the operation of the Joint Students and Teachers Board](#), issued with Rectoral decree No. 14280(325) of 31 July 2024 and subsequently amended with Rectoral decree No. 1584(37) of 3 February 2025, which replaced the "Guidelines for the Joint Students and Teachers Board" dating back to 2020.

The work of the JSTB is conducted mainly in English.

1.3. SURVEYING TOOLS

Communication between the student community and the JSTB took place through the following **main channels**:

1. four types of opinion questionnaires distributed annually by the IMT School and returned by students:
 - a. the End of Year Questionnaires, distributed between August 26 and September 26, 2025, to all students who, during this period, were enrolled in the first, second and third year of PhD Programmes with administrative headquarters at the IMT School, analysed in [section 3.1](#) of this Report;
 - b. the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire, distributed to students who defended their thesis and obtained the PhD title in 2025 in the January to October 2025 period, analysed in [section 3.2](#) of this Report;
 - c. the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaires, distributed to students enrolled in the IMT School's programmes, analysed in [section 3.3](#) of this Report;
 - d. the Good Practice project questionnaires relating to the services provided by the IMT School, filled out by the School's students with reference to the 2024 calendar year, analysed in [section 4.1](#) of this Report.
2. the student representatives within the JSTB, who continuously collected the requests pertaining to the same, which emerged from the student body during the year.
3. the commissione.parity@imtlucca.it email address, also indicated on the dedicated page of the IMT School's website, which each student is free to use to submit a report and that is also used for internal communication between the members of the JSTB.

1.4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

This Report is divided into **seven sections**:

1. The [Foreword](#) section, in which the JSTB is presented, with a focus on its functions, its composition and the tools used;
2. The [Activities carried out by the JSTB and current state](#) section, which briefly describes the its activities during the 2025 academic year and examines the proposals and key issues that emerged from the 2024 Report;
3. The [Analysis and evaluation of the IMT School's educational offering](#) section, in which the results of surveys of students' opinions, collected through the End of Year Questionnaire, PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire and Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire are analysed and evaluated;
4. The [Analysis of the services offered to students](#) section, presenting the results of the surveys conducted as part of the Good Practice project and the outcome of the initiatives undertaken by the JSTB with reference to the theme of services aimed at students;
5. The [Points of attention and key issues](#) section, which summarise the main issues that emerged from the Report, indicating some possible proposed solutions and the internal stakeholders to whom they are addressed;

6. The [Conclusions](#) section, in which a final summary of the contents of the Report is provided, together with a brief discussion of the general progress and necessary future actions;
7. The [Attachments](#) section, which contain supporting documentation.

Compared to the 2024 Annual Report, this document is characterised by a subdivision into sections, with the aim of simplifying and making it easier to consult the content.

This Report aims to provide an overview at an in-depth level of analysis, with the goal of offering the best possible contribution to improving the IMT School's Quality Assurance processes. A summary of the main points is provided in [section 5](#).

2. ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT BY THE JSTB AND CURRENT STATE

This section describes the main topics of discussion within the JSTB ([section 2.1](#)) and the outcome of the meetings with the students' representatives and the PhD Programmes spokespersons, with the Assessment Board and the Quality Enhancement Committee ([section 2.2](#)). Moreover, the key issues highlighted by the JSTB in the 2024 Annual Report and the initiatives implemented to resolve them are discussed ([section 2.3](#)).

2.1. MEETINGS OF THE JOINT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS BOARD

During the course of 2025, the JSTB met a total of **12 times**, once a month (with the exception of the summer break in August), from January to December 2025, once in a joint session with the Assessment Board and the Quality Enhancement Committee. During the meetings, several topics for discussion emerged, which are currently at different stages of progress, both in terms of analysis and proposed resolutions, where necessary. As provided for by the JSTB's mandate, the topics discussed concerned the quality of **teaching**, as well as of **services provided to students**. The main topics discussed regarding teaching were:

- **Monitoring of the curriculum planning:** the JSTB followed up on the key issues that had emerged in previous years, with particular attention to the teaching load of individual curricula (tracks) and overlaps between compulsory courses;
- **Extension of the PhD scholarship:** following a report from student representatives and a group of students from the XXXVIII cycle, which came to the attention of the JSTB on September 19, 2025, an analysis was carried out of the key issues relating to the six-month extension and the management of research grants. The JSTB considered that the key issues that emerged were mainly of a communication nature.

The main topics discussed regarding services were:

- **Halal menu:** discussion and introduction of Halal options in the School canteen;
- **Health insurance:** analysis and resolution of the previous lack of insurance coverage for non-Italian European students;

- **“Nulla osta”**: in-depth analysis of the nature of the “nulla osta”/authorisation required by the Prefecture for international students;
- **Support for extra-academic activities**: analysis and updates on sports policies and initiatives launched by other student groups;
- **Communication**: Promoting the development of a vademecum for the student community; communicating with the student body regarding the nature of the Quality Assurance Bodies (in collaboration with the Quality Enhancement Committee).

Please see [section 4.2](#) for a more in-depth analysis of the main issues addressed and their resolutions.

2.2. MEETINGS BETWEEN THE JOINT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS BOARD AND OTHER BODIES

Over the course of the year, the JSTB dedicated a significant portion of its activity to engaging with the student body to identify key issues pertaining to the PhD experience falling within its responsibility.

A key milestone in this process was the meeting held on July 7, 2025, with students’ representatives and with the PhD Programmes spokespersons, during which the following were discussed: (a) the contents of the 2024 Annual Report drawn up by the previous JSTB, (b) the low response rate to the IMT School’s questionnaires and (c) the need to improve internal communication. During the meeting, specific **key issues** relating to the individual PhD Programmes also emerged: delays in recognising exams for the Economics, Analytics and Decision Sciences (EADS) programme; infrastructure deficiencies and additional costs for research tools for the Cognitive, Computational and Social Neurosciences (CCSN) programme; issues related to badge deactivation and cafeteria access for the Cybersecurity programme; and challenges related to the teaching load and reimbursements for the Analysis and Management of Cultural Heritage (AMCH) programme. The same meeting made it possible to verify the progress of issues already raised in previous years, such as the reduction of the teaching load in EADS and the reduction of overlaps in CCSN courses.

Moreover, the annual **joint meeting** between the JSTB, the Assessment Board and the Quality Enhancement Committee was held on September 30, 2025, aimed at reviewing the system for collecting student opinion and at coordination between the bodies responsible for Quality Assurance. During the meeting, the main institutional questionnaires were examined and the key issue of low completion rates, already highlighted by the JSTB, was addressed. The opportunity to introduce and enforce the mandatory completion of the End of Year Questionnaire and the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire and to simplify the structure of the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire was also discussed. The discussion then extended to the overall functioning of the Quality Assurance system, with particular attention to the need to strengthen internal awareness of processes and begin to adequately prepare for the next Accreditation visit, including by appointing a dedicated task force.

2.3. ANALYSIS OF THE KEY ISSUES THAT EMERGED FROM THE PREVIOUS REPORT

The key issues highlighted by the JSTB in its **2024 Annual Report** (table E, section 6, included for ease of reading as [Annex B](#) to this Report) are presented below. For each

issue identified, the degree of implementation of the improvement actions proposed by the JSTB is discussed.

1. Quality Assurance – Clarify the process for managing and addressing complaints made by the JSTB in the Annual Report

The IMT School does not yet have a structured process in place for managing reports and monitoring the actions proposed by the JSTB. However, it should be noted that the process of reviewing PhD Programmes (defined in the "[Guidelines for the Review of PhD Programmes](#)") requires each Scientific Board to take note of the key issues reported and the aspects for improvement outlined by the JSTB in the relevant Annual Report. It is nevertheless considered beneficial to define a process that allows the JSTB to more effectively monitor the School's responses to the key issues highlighted in the Annual Report.

2. Quality Assurance – The low response rate to the questionnaires examined in this Report [2024] and the non-negligible number of questionnaires left incomplete raise questions about the effectiveness of this method for collecting student opinions in its current configuration, while nevertheless maintaining its fundamental importance as a surveying tool

During the joint meeting held on September 30, 2025, the JSTB discussed with the Quality Enhancement Committee and the Assessment Board solutions to improve the usability of the questionnaires for surveying student opinions and, hopefully, to increase response rates. In particular, the introduction of mandatory completion of the End of Year Questionnaire and the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire was discussed, as well as a major revision to the structure of the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire. At the same time, it was agreed to revise the wording of some of the questions.

On November 19, 2025, the IMT School announced the completion of the revision of the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire. The new version will be used starting in the 2025/2026 academic year. Moreover, the revision of the "PhD Regulations" (approved by the School's Bodies in December 2025), formalised the introduction of the obligation to complete the End of Year Questionnaire and the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire. Both of these initiatives aim to improve the effectiveness of these surveying tools, which will be assessed in the JSTB's 2026 Annual Report.

3. Teaching – Most teachers have uploaded only the course syllabus (mandatory for all teaching staff) to the dedicated Drive folder: some teachers have also uploaded additional teaching materials, while others have unfortunately left their course folders completely empty

At present, it is not possible to accurately monitor teaching materials - the syllabi of individual courses (mandatory) and any additional materials (optional) - available in the shared folders reserved for each course. However, from an informal check conducted in collaboration with the IT Services Office, the problem reported in the previous Report appears to persist. In this regard, it should be remembered that these are PhD-level courses and that, in particular for some specific programmes, they are closely linked to the teachers' ongoing research. There may therefore be cases in which the syllabus is updated or partially reformulated in collaboration with the class, in order to explore topics of high interest to the group of PhD students. This does not exclude but rather makes the availability of a clear and updated version of the syllabus, accessible to the student community, even more important.

The adoption of the course catalogue (ESSE3) developed by Cineca, expected by the end of 2025, will make it possible to at least partially resolve this problem, making available the related syllabi, in addition to the list of active courses. The effectiveness of the new system will be assessed in the JSTB's 2026 Annual Report.

4. Teaching – The evaluation expressed in the End of Year Questionnaire reveals areas of dissatisfaction

The PhD Programmes review process requires each Scientific Board to take note of the results of the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaires distributed to students for courses taught in the previous cycle within the programme, the results of the most recent End of Year Questionnaire distributed to students enrolled in the programme, as well as the results of the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire distributed in the previous calendar year to students enrolled in the programme who have completed their PhD. At this time, the Scientific Board are also required to define corrective actions in response to what has been reported by the student body.

The analysis of the End of Year Questionnaires for the year 2025 (see [section 3.1](#)) highlights that a number of areas of dissatisfaction remain. In particular, the score on the "PhD students are involved in the planning of such [training and research] activities" question remains slightly insufficient (5.91 in 2024, 5.89 in 2025).

A decline in some indicators can then be noted: "The workload of the structured training activities (courses, seminars, workshops) lets me spend enough time on my research projects and my thesis" (score decreased from 6.41 in 2024 to 5.95 in 2025) and "Information on deadlines and administrative procedures is constantly updated" (score decreased from 6.95 in 2024 to 5.77 in 2025).

As regards the "The interim assessments (exams, presentations, papers) are just a formality or have not been carried out at all)" question, the average score decreased from 5.39 in 2024, to 4.81 in 2025. However, as the JSTB highlighted in its previous report, it should be noted that the question is ambiguous, and a low score could indicate a positive perception of the examination methods.

In summary, the issue highlighted continues to persist for this year.

5. Services – Communication Services recorded the lowest value among the macro-areas of the Good Practice questionnaires (IV.2.1)

From the analysis of the Good Practice questionnaire for the year 2025 (see [section 4.1](#)), issues continue to persist. The question pertaining to communication services shows a decrease (from a score of 58/100 in 2024 to a score of 51.05/100 in 2025). Moreover, low scores emerge on other questions found in the questionnaire: Administration and personnel management (from a score of 60/100 in 2024 to a score of 57.27 in 2025) and Supply support and campus services (from a score of 64.8/100 in 2024 to 56.92/100 in 2025).

6. Services – Question Q42 of the End of Year Questionnaire relating to services ("The personal space allocated to PhD students was adequate (size, equipment, etc.)") recorded a low level of satisfaction

This question appears in both the End of Year Questionnaire (see [section 3.1](#)) and the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire (see [section 3.2](#)), which makes both the evaluation of results and comparison with previous years problematic. The PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire shows a worsening (from a score of 5.7 based on

6 responses in 2024, to a score of 4.86 based on 7 responses in 2025). This, however, must be evaluated in light of the small number of responses and the significant variability between tracks. The End of Year Questionnaire, on the other hand, shows an improvement (from a score of 6.21 based on 146 responses in 2024, to a score of 6.89 based on 107 responses in 2025). The issue therefore appears to partially persist but must be assessed with caution (see the additional evaluation in [section 3.2](#) of this Report).

7. Internationalisation – Following the termination of the ad hoc agreement stipulated by the IMT School with the Lucca Police Headquarters, the process for obtaining and renewing residence permits for international students is once again encountering the same challenges experienced prior to the agreement in question.

The issue apparently arose from the informal and temporary suspension of the Agreement upon the Rector's resignation in October 2024. The new Rector immediately reconfirmed the Agreement with the Police Headquarters, which was originally registered and signed on October 6, 2023, and is still in force with an expiration date of October 3, 2026. The reported issue therefore appears to have been resolved.

8. Internationalisation – The international component of students has dietary needs that are not currently met by the canteen's offering (V.2.3)

Following the student community's request to introduce Halal meat into the canteen menu, supported by the results of a questionnaire that highlighted broad consensus among students on the issue, the JSTB promoted an initiative to this end, subsequently managed by the Quality Enhancement Committee and the Campus Management and Front Office.

As of March 29, 2025, Halal meat has been available for both lunch and dinner, as an alternative to meat dishes on the menu, subject to reservation using a special form. The reported issue therefore appears to have been resolved.

Following reports of uncollected reservations, resulting in food waste, starting on May 8, 2025, the cost of the reserved but uncollected meal is charged directly to the student concerned.

3. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE IMT SCHOOL'S EDUCATIONAL OFFERING

The survey of students' opinions regarding the educational offering offered by the IMT School is primarily based on three questionnaires: the End of Year Questionnaire, the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire and the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire. This section discusses the results for each questionnaire separately.

To make it easier to read the tables and interpret the results, where possible, the JSTB has chosen to standardise the presentation of scores on a 1-10 scale. The End of Year Questionnaire and the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire already use a 1-10 scale. The Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire (TEQ), on the other hand, is administered

on a 5-point Likert scale, and the Good Practice questionnaire is administered on a 1-6 scale.

3.1. END OF YEAR QUESTIONNAIRE

In accordance with the document entitled [“Student opinions survey system”](#), approved by the Board of Governors on July 23, 2025, the questionnaire was sent to all students enrolled in the **first, second and third year** of PhD Programmes with administrative headquarters at the IMT School at the time of distribution of the same. The questionnaire was also sent to students of the XXXVII cycle, the last four-year cycle, who were enrolled in the **fourth year** at the time the survey was distributed.

The analysed responses were collected between August 26 and September 26, 2025. Unless otherwise indicated, results are expressed as the average of the scores recorded on a scale of 1 to 10. For dichotomous items, frequencies are reported. The results are presented for the **seven different areas included in the questionnaire**: Training, Supervision, Experiences abroad, Spaces and services, Transparency, Research and output activities, Teaching. As regards to services ([section 3.1.4](#)), please also refer to [section 4](#) of this Report.

In total, 241 questionnaires were sent out: 141 (58.5%) questionnaires were opened and 113 (46.9%) were fully filled out. The response rate is therefore lower compared to that of recent years (table 1).

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Questionnaires distributed	118	115	202	244	241
Questionnaires returned (fully filled out)	77	57	129	152	113
Response rate	65.3%	49.6%	63.9%	62.3%	46.9%

Table 1 – Response rates recorded for the End of Year Questionnaire during the 2021-2025 period.

As regards to the overall evaluation, measured by the answer to the final question of the questionnaire “Overall, so far I am satisfied with my PhD”, the average result is 7.34 out of 10, in line with last year’s result (7.45). This question was introduced only in 2023, so table 2 is limited to a comparison with the last two years.

	2023	2024	2025
<i>Overall, so far I am satisfied with my PhD</i>	6.68	7.45	7.34

Table 2 – Overall level of satisfaction with one’s PhD Programme derived from the specific question in the End of Year Questionnaire (data relating to the last three distributions of the survey, i.e. the years 2023-2025).

3.1.1. Training

The presence of a structured training is confirmed: 93.8% of participants answered "Yes" to the question "Does your PhD programme include structured training activities (courses, seminars, workshops)?" In most cases, this training is separate from the Master's degree courses offered: 85.8% of participants answered "Yes" to the question "Is the training activity separate from the one taught in the Master's degree courses?"

Overall, the evaluation pertaining to training is fairly good: the average score is positive but not yet high (6.96/10). In the 18 open comments on training, the following stand out in particular:

- the request for more seminars/laboratories (9 comments, 50%);
- a better alignment of courses with thesis objectives (7 comments, 38.9%);
- the reduction of the mandatory part (5 comments, 27.8%).

Problems related to overlaps between course calendars (1 comment, 5.6%), greater involvement in curriculum planning (3 comments, 16.7%) and the need for greater depth of content (2 comments, 11.1%) were also reported.

Questions	Number of answers	Average score (1-10)
<i>The training activities are exhaustive and consistent with the main topics of my PhD course.</i>	100	7.24
<i>The topics addressed in the training activities are thorough and up-to-date.</i>	100	7.69
<i>The training activities help with the development of the PhD thesis.</i>	101	6.57
<i>The workload of the structured training activities (courses, seminars, workshops) lets me spend enough time on my research projects and my thesis.</i>	101	5.95
<i>Overall, I am satisfied with the training activities provided.</i>	99	7.34

Table 3 – Average rating of training activities carried out within the relevant PhD Programme as emerged from the End of Year Questionnaire 2025.

The lowest score (5.95) concerns the compatibility between the teaching load and research work and preparation of the thesis, a slight decrease compared to last year (6.41/10). In this regard, the discussions within the JSTB brought to light that some PhD Programmes provide for a first year heavily focused on courses and exams, as a defining element of the curriculum. In these cases, the shorter period of time available for research and thesis work is not necessarily a factor of dysfunction, since first-year teaching activities can be considered a qualifying element of the training and a factor that can positively impact the placement of PhD students.

3.1.2. Supervision

Supervision emerges as one of the main strengths of the IMT School. The indicators relating to the relationship with the advisory team show the highest average values among the different sections of the questionnaire (8.26/10). Availability, quality of feedback and guidance received on the thesis work are particularly appreciated. However, some isolated cases of difficulty remain, with regards to which it is appropriate to continue monitoring the situation and improving the clarity of communication, particularly regarding response times.

Questions	Number of answers	Average score (1-10)
<i>The frequency of contact with my advisory team was adequate.</i>	107	8.11
<i>My advisory team made themselves available to hold meetings.</i>	106	8.66
<i>My advisory team gave prompt feedback to my written submissions (e.g., paper/thesis drafts).</i>	99	8.26
<i>My advisory team ensured I made progress in my thesis research.</i>	102	8.12
<i>Overall, the supervision I have received has contributed to the successful progress of my thesis.</i>	102	8.16

Table 4 – Average rating of supervision received during the relevant PhD Programme as emerged from the End of Year Questionnaire 2025.

3.1.3. Experience abroad

Scores relating to experiences abroad are overall positive (average score of 7.28/10). Students who have already left or are about to leave to carry out activities abroad highlight good training and networking opportunities. The main areas for improvement concern the preparatory phase (practical information, deadlines, reimbursements, and administrative steps), thus making the process smoother and more predictable.

Questions	Number of answers	Average score (1-10)
<i>During my PhD, I have received proper information and support from my teachers about experiences abroad.</i>	88	6.85
<i>The support received from my home university in my research stay abroad is satisfactory.</i>	58	6.81
<i>The support received from the host university/institute in my research stay abroad is satisfactory.</i>	46	7.91
<i>Overall, I am satisfied with my research stay abroad.</i>	44	7.70

Table 5 – Average rating of experiences abroad during the PhD Programme as emerged from the End of Year Questionnaire 2025.

3.1.4. Spaces and services

The perception of spaces and services is generally good, although not entirely uniform (average score of 7.36/10). Some differences between PhD Programmes emerge, particularly in relation to workstations and equipment. It remains important to ensure that all students have adequate workstations and the necessary tools available, with clear timeframes for maintenance and technical support.

Questions	Number of answers	Average score (1-10)
<i>The rooms and spaces used for the training activities were adequate (you can see, you can hear, you can sit).</i>	105	8.19
<i>The personal space allocated to PhD students is adequate (size, equipment, etc.).</i>	107	6.89
<i>The library services meet my needs.</i>	93	7.54
<i>The IT equipment and connections are suitable for all the activities carried out there.</i>	105	7.46
<i>The research equipment is adequate and accessible.</i>	96	7.3
<i>I am satisfied with the support provided by the secretary's office.</i>	106	6.81
<i>The rooms and spaces used for the training activities were adequate (you can see, you can hear, you can sit).</i>	105	8.19

Table 6 – Average rating of the spaces made available and the services offered to students as emerged from the End of Year Questionnaire 2025.

3.1.5. Transparency and communication

This is the area that requires the most attention by the School (average score of 6.06/10). Items related to updating operational information and communicating deadlines and procedures show lower scores compared other sections. In the open comments, in particular, short notices and calendar changes communicated too little in advance are highlighted.

Questions	Number of answers	Average score (1-10)
<i>Information about training and research activities is constantly updated.</i>	105	6.5
<i>PhD students are involved in the planning of such activities.</i>	99	5.89
<i>Information on deadlines and administrative procedures is constantly updated.</i>	105	5.77

Table 7 – Average rating of transparency and communication within PhD Programmes as emerged from the End of Year Questionnaire 2025.

The slightly insufficient score (5.89) on the involvement of students in the planning of teaching and research activities, in line with what was found last year, was discussed within the JSTB. From this discussion it emerged that this data should be interpreted with caution, given that in some PhD Programmes, the highly heterogeneous composition of the class and the training structure, which integrates very diverse activities and teachings, do not always allow or make it appropriate for all PhD students to be directly and systematically involved in planning activities. In these cases, curriculum planning remains primarily the responsibility of the Scientific Board, while still providing opportunities and tools for discussion with the student community.

3.1.6. Research activities and output

Indicators relating to research activities and outputs fall into an intermediate range: the evaluations are positive, but with room for growth.

For questions relating to research training, the average score is 7.02, while for research output it is 6.92. In the open comments, references emerge to transversal skills (e.g., data analysis, academic writing, public speaking) and the need for better initial support for the production and presentation of results.

These elements constitute qualitative evidence useful for defining potential corrective actions.

Questions	Number of answers	Average score (1-10)
<i>I am satisfied with the opportunities I had to disseminate my research</i>	94	7.03
<i>I have worked on an adequate volume of research outputs (e.g., articles, essays, book chapters, presentations, etc.)</i>	96	6.91
<i>Overall, I am satisfied with the research outputs that I have produced.</i>	96	6.82
<i>The topics discussed in the training activities were engaging.</i>	95	7.2
<i>The topics discussed in the training activities were consistent with the objectives of my PhD Programme.</i>	97	6.85

Table 8 – Average rating of research activities and outputs emerging from the End of Year Questionnaire 2025.

3.1.7. Teaching carried out by students

For the section dedicated to teaching carried out by students, a large percentage of “I prefer not to answer” and no answers were recorded (approximately 66%). Where teaching activities are present, evaluations tend to be positive, although not homogeneous. The high rate of non-response is consistent with a non-generalised involvement in teaching activities and with heterogeneous workloads among enrolled students.

Questions	Number of answers	Average score (1-10)
<i>My teaching helps me with my training.</i>	33	7.03
<i>The workload of my teaching lets me spend enough time on my training and research projects and on my thesis.</i>	33	7.13

Table 9 – Average rating of teaching carried out by students as emerged from the End of Year Questionnaire 2025.

3.2. PHD PROGRAMME EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire was distributed to students who defended their theses and obtained the PhD title between January and October 2025. In total, as of October 20, 2025, 14 questionnaires were collected, of which 8 were completed (completion rate on total responses of 57.1%) and 6 were partially completed (42.9%). The analysis reported in this section is based exclusively on the results of the **8 completed questionnaires**.

From a methodological point of view, the absolute number of questionnaires distributed (14) would make it impossible to draw robust conclusions for each single PhD Programme or track. This is even more true given that there are only 8 complete questionnaires. It is therefore recommended to use the data reported in this section with caution. Nevertheless, it was decided to also present the results in a disaggregated form by track (2 responses for each track), in light of their diversity, as an exclusively aggregated presentation would risk hiding specific key issues.

The overall average was calculated in two steps. First, the average of the responses to the items on a 1-10 scale was calculated for each participant. Then, the average of these individual averages was calculated. Based on this approach, each individual contributes equally to the final result and items with a smaller number of responses do not weigh disproportionately on the overall indicator.

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Response rate	42%	58%	82%	41%	47%
Aggregate average	7.9	7.9	7.5	7.2	7.7

Table 10 – Response rates recorded for the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire in the 2021-2025 period and their aggregate average.

The overall picture is positive: the aggregate response average stands at 7.73 out of 10, indicating generally good satisfaction with specific margins for improvement.

Among the strengths identified, experience abroad clearly stands out, which records the highest average (8.73/10), and the section dedicated to the PhD thesis, also characterised by high values (7.98/10). These findings suggest that mobility opportunities and the thesis process (including the supervision and advancement dimensions) are perceived as well-structured and useful. The results by track confirm a generally solid profile: in terms of experience abroad, CCSN stands out, reaching very

high values (9.44/10), while in terms of the thesis and research dimensions, CSSE shows a particularly positive perception (9.50/10), while AMCH shows much lower averages (6.5/10), suggesting different needs (e.g. intensity of tutoring, topic-methodology alignment). Overall satisfaction, although good (7.09/10), shows variability between tracks: CSSE maintains high values (8.88/10), while AMCH is characterised by lower ones (6.31/10).

	AMCH	CCSN	CSSE	ENBA	Average
Experience abroad	9.25	9.44	8.75	8.5	8.73
Facilities	8.05	7.30	8.70	7.25	7.78
PhD thesis	6.50	8.70	9.50	7.2	7.98
Research	6.44	8.38	9.31	6.5	7.69
Overall satisfaction	6.31	7.88	8.88	6.88	7.09
Training	5.56	7.62	7.81	5.44	6.65
Transparency	5.83	9.00	8.5	7	7.35
Track average	6.85	8.33	8.78	6.97	7.73

Table 11 – Average rating of each section of the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire by track and overall average.

Within this framework, training represents the relatively weakest area (6.65/10), with a differentiated profile between the tracks: the ENBA track stands at 5.29/10, followed by AMCH (5.64/10), while CCSN and CCSE reach 7.64/10 and 7.96/10 respectively. “The interim assessments (exams, presentations, papers) were just a formality or were not carried out at all” item, which totals a score of 4.62/10 on the entire sample, is a useful element for guiding the definition of corrective actions. Since this is a negatively formulated statement, lower values express disagreement and therefore a positive perception (verifications deemed effective): this is what happens in the AMCH (1.00/10) and CSSE (4.00/10) tracks, with the CCSN track in an intermediate position (5.00/10). The case of the ENBA track (7.00/10) is different, where the agreement with the statement is higher: here, the impression of “superficial verifications” or poorly structured ones is more pronounced, suggesting making the evaluation stages (rubrics, milestones, feedback) more visible and punctuated.

The areas requiring attention, on the other hand, concern training, which has the lowest average with a 6.65 out of 10. This piece of data, while not alarming, indicates the need to verify the alignment between the educational offering and the needs of PhD students (content, schedule/calendar, workload, prerequisites). In this area, trends differ by track: in the ENBA track, more negative perceptions emerge on specific aspects of the educational offering, while in other tracks the training experience appears more balanced.

A second indication is provided by one of the items on facilities (“The personal space allocated to PhD students was adequate (size, equipment, etc.)”), which has an average

of 4.86/10. The data is once again not uniform: the CCSN track drops to 3/10, while ENBA reaches 5/10 and the AMCH and CCSE tracks stand at 6/10. It should be noted that the question on spaces also appears in a more or less identical way in the End of Year Questionnaire (see [section 3.1](#)), where it records a positive evaluation and an improvement compared to last year (from 6.21 out of 146 responses in 2024, to 6.89 out of 107 responses in 2025). In this regard, it is worth taking note of the introduction of a study space reservation system at the end of 2024, designed to help optimise the use of shared desks available on campus. It is therefore possible that the negative evaluation emerging from the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire reflects the experience of students who were unable to benefit from the new system, while the positive evaluation from the End of Year Questionnaire (completed by current students) reflects the experience with the new system. This change, together with the small number of responses and the significant variability between tracks, makes both the evaluation of the results and comparison with previous years problematic.

3.3. TEACHING EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (TEQ)

The Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire (TEQ) is the tool through which students express an opinion on their teaching experience relating to the individual courses in which they were enrolled. The questionnaire is distributed during the last lesson of the course only if there are a minimum of 4 students who have attended at least 80% of the lessons. The questionnaire is anonymous and the results are returned in aggregate form. To protect the confidentiality of students and ensure a minimum level of statistical relevance of the results, the report containing the survey results is sent to the teacher/professor only if a minimum threshold of 3 students is reached.

Although not expressly provided for by the most recent ANVUR guidelines (AVA3 model) for PhDs, the IMT School has adopted the TEQ as an internal Quality Assurance tool. The survey provides useful insights in relation to the curriculum planning and ensuring continuous improvement, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement, and supporting the work of the Coordinators and of the Scientific Board. Moreover, the open comments on the content and methods often prove to be very useful to the teaching staff. It was therefore decided to include a summary analysis of the TEQ results in this Report, which had been excluded in the previous version thereof.

The TEQ is composed of two groups of questions. The first concerns the course and the second the teacher/professor. As far as the course is concerned, the questions focus on aspects such as organisation and clarity of the structure, relevance to the curriculum/research, intellectual stimulation, pace and workload, quality of materials, and balance between theory and application. Teachers, on the other hand, are assessed for clarity and preparation, organisation and time management, staying on schedule and respecting deadlines, teaching methods and tools, availability to provide support/feedback, and ability to promote an inclusive environment and student participation. All items are scored on a 1-5 scale. To facilitate comparison with other sections, the conversion to a 1-10 scale is also provided where useful.

Of the 199 courses scheduled, 10 (5%) were cancelled and 176 (88.4%) were delivered (the remaining 13 courses include 8 courses delivered for other universities, but in which no IMT School students participated, 4 refreshers relating to the previous calendar and 1 unscheduled course). Overall, the TEQ was distributed for 114 of the scheduled courses (57.3% of the total and 64.8% of those delivered). In the courses covered by the TEQ,

there was an expected count of 1,377 students and 1,014 questionnaires were collected, equal to a response rate of 73.6% (defined as the number of questionnaires collected per number of expected students). Reports were sent to teachers once the minimum threshold of 3 completions had been exceeded, for a total of 90 returns (45.2% of the total, 51.1% of those delivered and 78.9% of the courses for which the TEQ was activated).

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Response rate	67.74%	77.62%	70.5%	ND	73.6%

Table 12 – Response rates recorded for the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire in the 2021-2025 period.

Overall, the picture is very positive. The “overall” indicators are in the high range, standing at 4.42/5 for the course (8.7/10) and 4.57/5 for teaching staff (9.12/10). Even with respect to individual aspects, the averages are close together towards the top, with minor deviations: most of the indicators are above the threshold of excellence, while only one item has dropped slightly, without highlighting marked key issues.

The strengths highlight a consistent teaching profile: lessons are perceived as regular and well-organised (schedules are adhered to and the objectives and structure are clear), and teachers are well-prepared and available, capable of clearly explaining the concepts and supporting students even outside of the classroom. The evaluation process is also easily understandable and transparent. In short, the elements that allow the classroom experience to function effectively (organisation, clarity, reliability, relationships) are all solidly supported.

There remains room for improvement in one specific area: the perceived usefulness of the course for research and for the specific PhD Programme. The data is still positive, but slightly lower than the others, and suggests the need for a refinement: making it more clear in the syllabus and in the activities, how the course fits into the thesis projects (examples and assignments related to the lines of research). In parallel, additional work is being done on the internal structuring of the content: the sequence, the connections between modules, the balance between theory and application. This can also help enhance intellectual stimulation, which is already good but can be improved with small, targeted interventions.

In conclusion, the results portray a reliable, high-quality educational offering, with a solid foundation upon which to build light but high-return interventions to strengthen the link between curriculum and research.

Average scores per individual course		
Questions	Average score 1-5	Average score 1-10
<i>The course was intellectually stimulating</i>	4.41	8.67
<i>The official schedule of lessons was respected</i>	4.59	9.08
<i>The course was relevant and useful for my research goals and/or doctoral education</i>	4.30	8.42
<i>The course was well organised</i>	4.38	8.61
<i>The assigned work was reasonable</i>	4.41	8.67
Average (calculated by the JSTB)	4.42	8.70

Table 13 – Average ratings for courses collected using the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire.

Average teacher/professor ratings		
Questions	Average score 1-5	Average score 1-10
<i>The lecturer clearly explained (in the syllabus and/or in class) the requirements of this course, the educational objectives, and the topics</i>	4.56	9.01
<i>The lecturer clearly defined (in the syllabus and/or in class) the examination procedures (including the "no final exam" option)</i>	4.51	8.90
<i>The lecturer was well organised and prepared for the class</i>	4.61	9.12
<i>The lecturer was available for information and clarification outside of regular class time</i>	4.59	9.08
Average (calculated by the JSTB)	4.57	9.03

Table 14 – Average teacher/professor ratings collected through the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire.

4. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE SERVICES OFFERED TO STUDENTS

4.1. GOOD PRACTICE QUESTIONNAIRE 2025 REFERRING TO 2024

The questionnaires, distributed between February 18 and March 14, 2025, with reference to services provided in 2024, included a scoring grid from 1 to 6. 98 out of 293 potential students responded (33.4%), a decrease compared to the previous cycle, where a participation rate of 39.5% was recorded (table 15).

	Good Practice 2021, referring to 2020	Good Practice 2022, referring to 2021	Good Practice 2023, referring to 2022	Good Practice 2024, referring to 2023	Good Practice 2025, referring to 2024
Questionnaires filled out	74	60	78	105	98
Potential questionnaire recipients	157	167	180	266	293
Response rate	47.1%	35.9%	43.3%	39.5%	33.4%

Table 15 – Response rates recorded for the Good Practice questionnaire in the 2021-2025 period.

The lower response rate in this cycle slightly reduces the sample coverage and suggests that differences between areas should be interpreted with caution. The composition of the sample remains similar to that seen in previous years, with a majority of surveys filled out in Italian and a stable or slightly growing international component. In this context, the overall rating remains around 4.26/6 (in line with the 4.31/6 recorded last year), indicating a generally stable level of satisfaction despite the lower participation.

The average satisfaction rating in the various areas of the questionnaire is summarised in table 16. For each type of service, the table reports the average rating on a scale of 1-6, the corresponding percentage conversion and, in a comparison column, the data relating to the 2024 questionnaire referring to the 2023 services. Table 17, instead, reports the evaluation for each individual service. When reading both tables, it is useful to remember that a "sufficient" rating can be considered one greater than or equal to 4 out of 6 points (corresponding to 60 out of 100 points).

Service	Good Practice 2025 Questionnaire, referring to 2024		Good Practice 2024 Questionnaire, referring to 2023
	Average score (Scale: 1-6)	Average score (Scale: 0-100)	Average score (Scale: 0-100)
Teaching support	4.5	70.0	65.6
Research support	4.49	69.80	63.2
Administration and staff management	4.09	61.80	60
Infrastructure and Campus services	4.35	67.00	64.8
IT systems	4.66	73.20	67
Communication	4.01	60.20	58
Website and social media	4.14	62.83	61.2
Library	4.49	69.98	81.4

Table 16 – Summary table. Data relating to overall satisfaction in the general areas identified in the Good Practice 2025 questionnaire (referring to services provided in 2024). The third column reports the data from the 2024 questionnaire, referring to 2023, for comparison purposes.

As regards to the IMT School's overall performance compared to the previous year, 21.4% of students noted an improvement, 7.1% a deterioration, 34.7% considered it unchanged, while 36.7% stated "I don't know". Compared to the previous cycle (2024 questionnaire referring to 2023, which reported "better" 26.6%, "worse" 4.8%, "same" 30.0%, "I don't know" 40.0%), a slight decrease can be noted in the share of "better" opinions and a modest increase in "worse" opinions, while the uncertainty area ("I don't know") remains substantially stable, which likely includes a share of new students without a direct basis for comparison.

Questions from the Good Practice 2025 questionnaire, referring to 2024		Average score (Scale: 1-6)	Average score (Scale: 0-100)	Average score (Scale of 1-6) 2024 Questionnaire, referring to 2023	Average score (on a 0-100 scale) 2024 Questionnaire, referring to 2023
Teaching support	With reference to educational laboratories [You are satisfied with the technical support provided]	5	80	5.43	88.60
	With reference to administrative and technical support for the use of digital learning tools (platform, videos, etc.) [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.54	70.77	4.50	70
	With reference to support in the management of PhD courses [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4	60	3.99	59.80
Research support	With reference to information and promotion on competitive procedures and funding opportunities [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.21	64.17	3.90	58
	With reference to support for drafting the project proposal for competitive procedures [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.89	77.78	4.21	64.2
	With reference to project management support (budget, reporting) [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.56	71.11	4.21	64.2
	With reference to support for intellectual property management (contracts, agreements, IP framework) [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.67	73.33	4.50	70
	With reference to the promotion of research (spin-offs, patents, development contracts) [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.33	66.67	4.17	63.4
	With reference to support for drafting contracts (negotiating clauses, drafting contracts, verifying legitimacy) [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	5.25	85	5.00	80
	With reference to support for the management of the institutional research catalogue/archive [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4	60	5.00	80

	With reference to research laboratories [You are satisfied with the technical support provided]	4.75	75	4.46	69.20
	With reference to administrative support received for the PhD [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	3.96	59.18	4.12	62.4
Administration and staff management	With reference to mission reimbursements [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	3.86	57.27	4.45	69
	With reference to support for the settlement of third-party compensation [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.2	64	4.33	66.6
	With reference to support for the management of Visiting Professors (invitation, activation, reception, support for the host professor, support for the visiting professor) [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4	60	3.80	56
	With reference to administrative support for the internationalisation of the School's teaching staff (mobile teaching, visiting abroad) [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.5	70	4.55	71
Infrastructure and Campus services	With reference to support for the purchase of goods and services [The procedures are clear]	3.85	56.92	3.59	51.8
	With reference to support for the purchase of goods and services [The activity is carried out in an adequate timeframe]	4.00	60	3.59	51.8
	With reference to maintenance interventions [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.26	65,16	4.20	64
	With reference to general services and logistics [The premises are clean]	4.68	73.7	4.79	75.8
	With reference to general services and logistics [Spaces/classrooms are easily identifiable]	4.86	77.2	5.07	81.40
	With reference to general services and logistics [The temperature is comfortable]	4.25	65	4.07	61.40
	With reference to general services and logistics [The safety of people and things is adequate]	5.02	80.43	5.25	85
	With reference to general services and logistics [The size of the classrooms is adequate for the number of students]	4.35	66.97	4.48	69.6

	With reference to general services and logistics [The classroom support materials (microphone, projector, etc.) are adequate]	4.82	76.48	5.26	85.2
	With reference to general services and logistics [The canteen/refreshment point service is adequate (quality of food, variety, courtesy of staff)]	4.00	60	4.08	61.6
	With reference to the School's actions and measures on energy and environmental sustainability [The actions undertaken are effective]	3.93	58.63	3.89	57.8
IT systems	With reference to the Wi-Fi network [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.46	69.25	4.56	71.2
	With reference to personal email and other cloud services (Web Conference, Storage, etc.) [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	5.05	82.06	5.05	81
	With reference to the IT Help Desk service [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.75	75	4.89	77.8
Communication	With reference to the information provided by the School [The School's services to support teaching staff are known]	4.16	63.26	4.38	67.60
	With reference to the information provided by the School [The organisation of services in terms of roles and responsibilities is clear]	3.91	58.16	4.20	64
	With reference to the information provided by the School [The methods to access services is clear]	3.89	57.78	4.22	64.01
	With reference to the information provided by the School [The dissemination of information regarding cultural activities, seminars and events is satisfactory]	4.55	71.06	4.63	72.6
	With reference to the information provided by the School [The dissemination of information regarding environmental and energy sustainability is satisfactory]	3.55	51.05	3.87	57.4
	With reference to the external promotion of the School's image [The School's image is promoted through the media]	4.16	63.18	4.24	64.8
Web site and	With reference to the information provided, please indicate the level of satisfaction with the ease of navigation of: [The IMT School's website]	4.34	66.74	4.49	69.80

	With reference to the information provided, please indicate the level of satisfaction with the ease of navigation of: [The Department website/page]	4.24	64.82	4.34	66.8
	With reference to the information provided, please indicate the level of satisfaction with the ease of navigation of: [The Course/Programme website/page]	4.10	61.95	4.31	66.2
	With reference to the information provided, please indicate the level of satisfaction with the ease of navigation of: [The School's Intranet]	4.20	64.04	4.37	67.40
	With reference to the dissemination of information through the School's official pages on the most common social media channels, please indicate the level of satisfaction with: [Facebook]	4.00	60	4.28	65.60
	With reference to the dissemination of information through the School's official pages on the most common social media channels, please indicate the level of satisfaction with: [X (formerly Twitter)]	3.86	57.14	4.37	67.40
	With reference to the dissemination of information through the School's official pages on the most common social media channels, please indicate the level of satisfaction with: [LinkedIn]	4.43	68.57	4.54	70.8
	With reference to the dissemination of information through the School's official pages on the most common social media channels, please indicate the level of satisfaction with: [Instagram]	4.17	63.45	4.26	65.2
Library	With reference to the School's library system [I am aware of and up to date on the outreach activities and events organised by the School's library system]	4.58	71.62	4.99	79.8
	With reference to in-person services at the School's libraries [The documentation archive in paper format is complete]	3.44	48.75	3.65	53
	With reference to in-person services at the School's libraries [Library opening hours are adequate]	5.03	80.62	5.47	89.40
	With reference to online operations [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.45	69.09	4.36	67.2
	With reference to the School's interlibrary services [Please indicate the level of satisfaction]	4.77	75.38	4.86	77.2

Table 17 – Data relating to satisfaction in the individual areas identified in the Good Practice 2025 questionnaire (referring to services provided in 2024).

In the detail view of the individual areas (table 17), the configuration confirms elements that already emerged in the 2024 Report. The School's **IT systems** are confirmed as the main strong point (4.66/6); the Help-Desk service is rated very positively (4.75/6) and in open comments it is often described as fast and effective. The School's **Library** also maintains high levels (4.50/6), continuing the results seen in previous years both with regard to resources and for online services. **Teaching support** stands at similarly high values (4.51/6), with classrooms and laboratories perceived as adequate to the students' needs.

Within the **Campus Infrastructure and Services** cluster (4.35/6), the safety of people and things (5.02/6) and the easy recognisability of spaces and classrooms (4.86/6) stand out, contributing to an orderly and predictable daily experience.

The relatively weakest areas continue to be **Communication** (4,01/6) and, partially, **the website and social media channels** (4,14/6). In these macro-areas, lower ratings are recorded on the overall effectiveness of communication (3.86/6) and on the use of channel X (formerly Twitter) (3.86/6). Open comments highlight the need for clearer and more up-to-date information on deadlines, on the methods to access services, as well as on the division of responsibilities between different offices.

A specific key issue, which is reiterated in the open feedback, concerns thermal comfort: the item relating to comfortable temperature stops at 4.25/6, with reports of hot and cold and a limited ability to adjust the temperature locally.

Research support has an overall high average (4.49/6), but with some heterogeneity related to purchases/orders and missions (processing times and transparency of the steps). Finally, the **Administration and staff management** area (4.09/6) reflects some episodes of delays or failure to respond by specific offices, in line with the lower scores recorded for communication.

Taken together with the 2024 Report (2024 questionnaire referring to 2023), the overall configuration is therefore stable: **IT systems** and the **Library** continue to represent the strengths, while **Communication** remains a priority for improvement. The gaps between macro-areas are less marked this year, but the priorities remain the same: making operational information more visible and accessible, reducing response times by the various offices, as well as stabilising thermal comfort in teaching environments.

4.2. IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS ADOPTED BY THE JSTB ON THE SERVICES OFFERED

During the year the JSTB contributed to the management of several problems relating to services reported by the School's students, already briefly indicated in [section 2.1](#). Below, only the main key issues addressed by the JSTB and the related solutions identified during the year are described.

1. **Health insurance for foreign students from European countries.** One of the main issues addressed by the JSTB in 2025 concerned health coverage for European students. While non-EU students already received a partial reimbursement of their insurance costs, EU students, despite incurring similar costs, did not have access to the same support. The reason was that, in theory, European students could have requested free health coverage based on their country-of-origin insurance (using the S1 form). The JSTB therefore launched a study on the topic, which also involved the Campus Management and Front Office and a discussion with the Local Health

Authority, concluding that the S1 form does not constitute a viable solution for the majority of the Schools foreign European students. On October 28, 2025, the JSTB brought the issue to the attention of the Rector, who, in response, proposed the introduction of a €700 contribution per year for all non-Italian students (regardless of their geographical origin) to fully cover the cost of health insurance starting in 2026.

2. **Halal option in the canteen menu.** The JSTB has taken on the request, made by some students and already highlighted in the previous Report, to make Halal food options available in the School canteen, particularly during the Ramadan period. After assessing actual demand for the service through an informal survey within the student community, and thanks to collaboration with the Campus Management and Front Office, the JSTB raised the issue with the School's Governance. As of February 28, 2025 (the start of Ramadan), the School has introduced the option to book Halal meals through a dedicated system, which will remain active as part of the ordinary management of the canteen. The JSTB subsequently monitored the availability and effective continuity of this option, helping to resolve some occasional logistical and communication challenges.
3. **QA system guidelines and communication.** Over the course of the year, the JSTB collaborated with the Quality Enhancement Committee to draft a vademecum for the student community, contributing to the collection and organisation of recurring concerns that arose during meetings and in reports from student representatives. This collaboration led to the definition of a document – also available in English –, which can be integrated over time.
 At the same time, the JSTB's student body and the Quality Enhancement Committee organised an informational meeting for the student community on September 15, 2025, dedicated to Quality Assurance in the IMT School. The meeting, which saw very limited attendance, highlighted the need to rethink institutional communication methods on QA issues. In light of this outcome, the JSTB agreed to adopt new strategies aimed at new students, based on electronic communications and targeted information materials, which can be monitored more effectively.

5. POINTS OF ATTENTION AND KEY ISSUES

The main issues highlighted in this Report are summarised below, indicating the area of responsibility (Quality Assurance; Teaching; Services) (left-hand column), some possible proposed solutions (middle column), and the internal bodies to whose attention these issues are brought (right-hand column).

Key issues	Proposed improvement actions	Recipients
1) (Quality Assurance) The process of monitoring and managing the key issues emerging from the JSTB's Annual Report is only partially implemented; see section 2.3 .	Implement a monitoring and management process (beyond the sole evaluation by the Scientific Board), clarifying the different steps of the workflow and of the School's offices/departments responsible for the process	Quality Enhancement Committee, Assessment Board, Academic Senate, Board of Governors
2) (Quality Assurance) The response rate to the four questionnaires used by the IMT School is decreasing compared to previous years (End of Year Questionnaire and Good Practice Questionnaire) or remains low (PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire and TEQ); see section 3 and section 4.1	Continue to review and improve the questionnaires, identify possible incentives for their completion, and evaluate the effectiveness of the changes introduced during the year.	Quality Enhancement Committee, Assessment Board
3) (Teaching) There is no process for monitoring the uploading of syllabi and teaching materials to the shared drive by teaching staff; see section 2.3	Evaluate the adoption of a structured monitoring and communication process (reminder) and an incentive system for teaching staff	Vice-Rector for Didactics, Quality Enhancement Committee, General Director
4) (Teaching) The End of Year Questionnaire shows moderately negative evaluations for some aspects relating to the organisation of teaching; see section 3.1	Evaluate the opportunity for targeted corrections in the following areas: teaching load (e.g., rescheduling mandatory/optional courses); student involvement in planning teaching and research activities (e.g., improving communication between the Scientific Board and students regarding the goals and structure of the curriculum planning); communication regarding deadlines and administrative procedures	PhD Programmes Coordinators, Track Directors, Scientific Board, Vice-Rector for Didactics, Quality Enhancement Committee, Assessment Board
5) (Teaching) The institutional communication regarding the six-month extension of the PhD scholarship and the	Evaluate methods and timeframes for future communications that will allow for a more linear and clear	Vice-Rector for Didactics, Vice-Rector for Gender Policies, Equal

management of research grants has generated confusion among students.	flow of information between the School and the student community	Opportunities and Communication
6) (Services) The Good Practice questionnaire shows negative evaluations by the student community with regards to some of the administrative services offered; see section 4.1	Evaluate the opportunity for targeted corrections in the following areas: travel reimbursement procedures; procedures and timing for purchasing goods and services; canteen and workplace wellness services (heating and energy efficiency)	Quality Enhancement Committee, Assessment Board, General Director
7) (Services) The computing resources available to the student community are insufficient, particularly for some PhD programmes; see section 2.2	Evaluate the opportunity and methods of a targeted intervention to increase the computing resources available to students	Vice-Rector, General Director

Table 18 – Overview of the key issues that the JSTB has identified in this Report and the proposed improvement actions.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This Report has detailed the Joint Students and Teachers Board's activities for the year 2025 and the results of the analysis of the data available for the same period. As provided for by the JSTB's mandate, the topics discussed concerned the quality of teaching, as well as of services provided to students.

As regards to teaching, despite an overall positive evaluation, confirmed by the student questionnaires, some key issues emerged. The first, widely discussed within the JSTB, concerns the IMT School's institutional communication regarding the six-month extension of the PhD scholarship (table 18, point 5). For well-understood historical reasons, the length of PhD Programmes at the IMT School has undergone some changes over the last few years, first going from three to four years and then back to three. Moreover, many PhD scholarships have been extended beyond the formal duration of three or four years at the request of individual Advisors (e.g., based on project grants). Added to this was the effect of the PNRR (Italian National Recovery and Resilience Plan), which funded scholarships with some characteristics different from the School's "ordinary" ones. All these factors have generated confusion and concern among students, particularly those receiving PNRR grants, also because the School's communication on these aspects has not always been sufficiently clear, precise and timely. Moreover, the student community has reported discrepancies in communication on this matter, both between individual tracks or PhD Programmes (for example, on the individual programme's website), as well as by teaching staff. The JSTB hopes that in the future the IMT School will strengthen the methods and timing of its institutional communication on these issues, addressing both the student community and teaching

staff in a coordinated manner, thus reducing the risk of partial or misleading information and the consequent unrealistic expectations or plans.

Another issue concerns the uploading of teaching materials (starting with the mandatory syllabus) onto shared spaces by teaching staff (table 18, point 3). While considering that the adoption of the ESSE3 system should contribute to improving the situation, the JSTB hopes that the IMT School will adopt and implement a system for monitoring uploads and, where appropriate, adequate mechanisms for incentivising teaching staff in this regard. This, with the aim of consolidate good teaching practices and promoting the timely availability of comprehensive, high-quality teaching materials to the student community, including through the shared folder system already in use.

A final key issue relating to teaching concerns some (moderately) negative evaluations expressed by students in the End of Year Questionnaire (see table 18, point 4 and [section 3.1](#)), in particular with regard to the teaching load, the involvement of students in the planning of teaching and research activities and the communication relating to deadlines and administrative procedures. The JSTB leaves it to the Scientific Board of the individual PhD Programmes to evaluate the appropriateness and methods of any future corrective actions which, by their nature and the strong diversity of the curricula, require specific solutions that are difficult to generalise.

As regards to the services offered to the student community, the Report identified some specific key issues in some areas. The main one, which has already emerged in the past, concerns the problem of computing resources available to the student community. These are often insufficient, especially for students in those PhD Programmes in which the collection and analysis of data is an important part of the research work and therefore of the theses (table 18, point 7). The JSTB hopes that targeted interventions will be evaluated to promptly and sustainably increase the computing resources available to the student community. From the analysis of the Good Practice questionnaires, some key issues emerge, particularly relating to the areas of "Administration and staff management", "Campus infrastructures and services" and "Communication" (table 18, point 6 and [section 4.1](#)). In particular, there were less than fully satisfactory assessments regarding the procedures and timeframes for the reimbursement of travel expenses and the purchase of goods and services, as well as regarding canteen services and workplace well-being (for example, due to insufficient heating at some workstations). The JSTB hopes that the School will continue the process of improving and simplifying procedures, and carefully evaluate the balance between well-being and energy impact, identifying possible savings in other areas, such as nighttime lighting in common areas.

Finally, as regards to the Quality Assurance system as a whole, further room for improvement is identified, both in terms of the effectiveness of the process for collecting student opinions and in the operation of the JSTB itself, which is an integral part of the system. With regard to the first point (table 18, point 2), it is clear that the response rate to the four questionnaires used by the IMT School is decreasing compared to previous years (End of Year Questionnaire and Good Practice questionnaire) or remains low (PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire and TEQ). The JSTB hopes that the IMT School will continue its process of reviewing and improving these tools (which began in the current academic year with the revision of the TEQ), first evaluating, beyond the possible mandatory nature of their completion, the adequacy of the questionnaires to the specific needs of Schools of Excellence such as the IMT School. With regard to the functioning

of the JSTB (table 18, point 1), the process of monitoring and managing the key issues that emerge from its Annual Reports remains only partially implemented. The JSTB recommends that, following the sharing of the Annual Report with the School community, a process of targeted communication regarding individual key issues is initiated to specific recipients. This process should be followed by ongoing monitoring of the initiatives undertaken by the IMT School to address these issues, also with a view to informing the JSTB of these initiatives, which can then evaluate their effectiveness.

The JSTB hopes that this Report will be disseminated as widely as possible within the School community. This, also to effectively respond to the requests received during the year from the student community and to encourage students to actively participate in the IMT School's Quality Assurance processes.

Lucca – December 22, 2025

The Joint Students and Teachers Board (JSTB)

7. ATTACHMENTS

A. LIST OF JOINT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS BOARD MEETINGS

During the period covered by this Report, the JSTB met a total of 12 times on the following dates:

Date	Method	Notes
January 30, 2025	Mixed	
February 25, 2025	Mixed	
March 27, 2025	Mixed	
April 29, 2025	Mixed	
May 28, 2025	Mixed	
June 26, 2025	Mixed	
July 8, 2025	Mixed	Meeting extended to PhD Programmes spokespersons
September 25, 2025	Mixed	
September 30, 2025	Mixed	Joint meeting with the participation of the Quality Enhancement Committee, the Assessment Board and the JSTB
October 28, 2025	Online	
November 27, 2025	Online	
December 16, 2025	Mixed	

Table 19 – Calendar of meetings held by the JSTB in 2025.

The meetings were formalised in as many **meeting notices**, sent by the President and containing the specific agenda. The discussion was summarised in **meeting minutes**, drawn up in English, which were submitted to the JSTB for approval at the following meeting.

B. KEY ISSUES HIGHLIGHTED IN THE 2024 ANNUAL REPORT

The table below summarises the main key issues highlighted by the JSTB in the [previous Report](#) (table E, section 6).

Key issues	Proposed improvement actions	Recipients
1) (Quality Assurance) Clarify the process for managing and addressing complaints made by the JSTB in the Annual Report (II)	Specify the various steps of the workflow and the School offices/departments responsible for monitoring the process	Quality Enhancement Committee; Assessment Board; General Director
2) (Quality Assurance) The low response rate to the questionnaires examined in this Report and the non-negligible number of questionnaires left incomplete raise questions about the effectiveness of this method of collecting the opinions of students in its current configuration, while nevertheless maintaining its fundamental importance as a surveying tool (III.3-4)	Avoid repeating questions within the same questionnaire; clarify the purpose of some questions and how to answer them (e.g. question Q5 of the End of Year Questionnaire, and questions Q52-Q53 of the PhD Programme Evaluation Questionnaire)	Quality Enhancement Committee; Assessment Board
3) (Teaching) Most teachers have uploaded only the course syllabus (mandatory for all teaching staff) to the dedicated Drive folder: some teachers have also uploaded additional teaching material, others have unfortunately left their course folders completely empty (III.2)	The JSTB hopes that all teachers will, at a minimum, upload their course syllabi to the required folder and, to this end, recommend that an email reminder be sent to teachers each year, indicating a deadline for completing this task. It also hopes that the link to the Drive folder from which the individual course folders can be accessed will be made public on the School's Intranet.	Vice-Rector for Didactics
4) (Teaching) The evaluation expressed in the End of Year Questionnaire reveals areas of dissatisfaction	The JSTB hopes that the results of these questionnaires will be considered with due care.	PhD Programmes Coordinators and School Bodies responsible for quality assurance
5) (Services) Communication Services recorded the lowest value among the macro-areas of the Good Practice questionnaires (IV.2.1)	The JSTB hopes that the results of these questionnaires will be considered with due care	Vice-Rector for Gender Policies, Equal Opportunities and Communication
6) (Services) Question Q42 of the End of Year Questionnaire relating to services ("The	Starting in November 2024, a desk reservation service has been implemented in the San	General Director; School Administration,

<p>personal space allocated to PhD students was adequate (size, equipment, etc.)") recorded a low level of satisfaction (IV.2.2)</p>	<p>Francesco Complex and the Brunero Paoli Complex, in addition to the one already active in the Library. The JSTB hopes that the effectiveness of the measure will be monitored</p>	<p>Spaces and IT Services Committee</p>
<p>7) (Internationalisation) Following the termination of the ad hoc agreement stipulated by the IMT School with the Lucca Police Headquarters, the process for obtaining and renewing residence permits for international students is once again encountering the same challenges experienced prior to the agreement in question (III.3)</p>	<p>The JSTB hopes that the School will consider operational measures to overcome this problem, in addition to the logistical assistance already provided by the Campus Management and Front Office</p>	<p>Vice-Rector for Didactics; Quality Enhancement Committee; Delegate for Internationalisation</p>
<p>8) (Internationalisation) The international component of students has dietary needs that are not currently covered by the canteen offerings (V.2.3)</p>	<p>The JSTB hopes that this key issue, already addressed by the School, will be resolved quickly, as a sign of inclusiveness and cultural pluralism</p>	<p>School Administration</p>

Table 20 – Summary of the main issues reported by the Joint Students and Teachers Board (JSTB) in the 2024 Annual Report, with the proposed improvement actions and the parties involved.



SCUOLA
ALTI STUDI
LUCCA