

JOINT STUDENTS AND TEACHERS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2024

CONCERNING THE 2023-24 ACADEMIC YEAR





CONTENTS

1.	FOREWORD	4
1.1.	FUNCTION	4
1.2.	COMPOSITION	4
1.3.	INSTRUMENTS	5
1.4.	ACTIVITIES	7
1.5.	THIS REPORT	9
PART A 10		
2.	STATE OF THE ART: ANALYSIS OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES REPORTED IN THE PREVIOUS ANNUAL REPORT AND EVALUATION OF THE PROCESSES IMPLEMENTED BY THE SCHOOL TO RESOLVE THEM	10
PART B 12		
3.	ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE DOCTORAL PROGRAM AND ANALYSIS OF END-OF-YEAR AND DOCTORAL EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES	12
PART C 39		
4.	ANALYSIS AND PROPOSALS REGARDING THE SERVICES OFFERED TO STUDENTS 39	
4.1.	INTRODUCTION	39
4.2.	QUESTIONNAIRES	39
4.2.1.	2024 Good Practice Questionnaire, relating to 2023	39
4.2.1.1.	Internal and external communication	45
4.2.1.2.	Canteen services	45
4.2.1.3.	Assignment expenses refund services	45
4.2.2.	End-of-Year Questionnaire and PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire	45
4.3.	OTHER ISSUES	48
4.3.1.	Workstation management	48
4.3.2.	Halal food in the canteen	48



4.3.3. Issuing and renewing residence permits for students of non-EU nationality.. 48

4.4. ACTIONS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE..... 49

PART D 50

5. REFLECTIONS AND ISSUES RAISED BY THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES IN
RELATION TO THE INDIVIDUAL DOCTORAL PROGRAMMES DURING THE MEETING ON 28
JUNE 2024..... 50

PART E 52

6. SUMMARY OF THE MAIN PROPOSALS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT 52

7. CONCLUSION..... 54

1. FOREWORD

1.1. FUNCTION

The Joint Students and Teachers Committee (the “Committee”) of the Scuola IMT Alti Studi Lucca (the ‘IMT School for Advanced Studies Lucca’) was **established**, pursuant to Article 2(2)(g) of **Law No 240/2010**, by Decree of the Director (now: Rector) of **7 November 2018**. The Committee acts as first internal evaluator of training activities and performs overall monitoring on the quality assurance of the training offer and the services provided to students. It is valuable to remember first of all, in view of the considerations that will be expressed in the Conclusion, that this report, like all the previous annual reports of the Committee, is the “downstream” result of constant observation “upstream” of the teaching activities and other services offered to students by the School during the year in question. This monitoring, which represents the main task of the Committee, extends throughout the entire calendar year, and is formalised conclusively in the annual report.

1.2. COMPOSITION

The Committee is composed of three student representatives and three faculty members appointed by the Rector. This report is the result of the work of the Committee in the composition established by Decree of the Rector Prot. IMT No 3424 of 4 March 2024, which ended its term of office on 31 October 2024, at the same time as the Rector’s term of office came to an end (pursuant to Article 3(1) of the Regulation governing the operation of the Joint Students and Teachers Committee, enacted by Decree of the Rector Prot. IMT No 14280 of 31 July 2024). That Committee continued its work beyond that date solely for the purpose of preparing this report by 31 December 2024, pursuant to Decree of the Rector Prot. IMT No 19892 of 14 November 2024 (the ‘outgoing Committee’).

In the 2024 calendar year, the outgoing Committee was made up of the following six members:

- **Student members:** [Giulio Pappa](#) (student representative on the Academic Senate), [Ruggero Roni](#) (student representative on the Board of Governors, acting as secretary) and [Mazhar Shehzad](#) (student in the XXXVIII doctoral cycle);
- **Faculty members:** [Amos Bertolacci](#) – Tenured Professor (acting as President); [Gustavo Cevolani](#) – Associate Professor, and [Irene Crimaldi](#) – Associate Professor.

The work of the outgoing Committee was conducted in English whenever possible.

Information about the composition of the new Committee, which took office on 14 November 2024, is available on the School's website (<https://www.imtlucca.it/it/the-imt-school/governing-bodies-and-committees/commissione-paritetica-docenti-studenti>), where the calendar of ordinary meetings held during the 2024 calendar year can also be found. The Italian version of the Annual Reports for 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023, covering the academic years 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 respectively, can be found on a different page of the School's website (<https://www.imtlucca.it/it/qualityimt/documenti>, in the section on "Internal Sources: Reports"), to which the page dedicated to the Committee refers. The English translations of the abovementioned reports can also be found on the English version of that page. Conversely, the Rules of Procedure governing the operation of the Joint Students and Teachers Committee are currently not available, either directly or indirectly, via the Committee's page on the School's website.

1.3. INSTRUMENTS

Communication between the student body and the Committee took place through **five main channels**.

- As in previous years, the outgoing Committee organised the administration of four types of opinion survey questionnaires each year by the School, collecting feedback from students:
 - end-of-year questionnaires, administered to all students (18-30 October, with a short extension thereafter) (End-of-Year Questionnaire; see below, Section IV.1), based on a grid of questions identical to that administered in the previous year;

- ab) questionnaires relating to the entire doctoral program, administered to students who defended their dissertations and obtained the degree of PhD in 2024, administered in the period January-October 2024 (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire; see below, Section IV.2), based on a grid of questions modified from the previous year following the integration of questions from ANVUR;
 - ac) questionnaires for the Good Practice project relating to the services provided by the School, completed by the School's students with reference to the 2023 calendar year (see Section V below). The answers provided by the students were obtained by isolating all of the questionnaires expressly indicated as having been completed by students.
 - ad) unlike the practice applied in the reports for the previous years, the analysis of the questionnaires surveying the students' opinions on the individual courses, the Teaching Evaluation Questionnaire, has not been considered in the present report as this is not expressly envisaged by the latest ANVUR Guidelines (AVA3 model) with reference to the PhD program, and these questionnaires have therefore been submitted for appropriate assessment by the relevant faculty boards and their coordinators.
- b) The student representatives on the Committee continuously collect the requests submitted by the student body during the year. Their role as student representatives in other School bodies and committees (Board of Governors, Academic Senate) facilitates the liaison function between students and the Committee. The presence on the outgoing Committee of Mr Mazhar Shehzad as a student representative facilitated communication with the international student community within the School.
 - c) A further channel of communication was represented by the public presentation of the 2023 Annual Report on **20 February 2024**, to which the entire School community was invited. As was the case with the release of previous years' reports, the discussion that followed the presentation of the annual report by the student members of the Committee provided an opportunity for exchanges and dialogue

between students, faculty and the School's administrative personnel on all the points addressed in the report.

- d) The Committee can be contacted directly by email at the address commissione.paritetica@imtlucca.it, which is also indicated on the dedicated page of the School's website, and which any student may freely use. That address also served for internal communication among the members of the Committee.

1.4. ACTIVITIES

In the 2024 calendar year, the outgoing Committee **met ten times** (1 February, 22 March, 19 April, 24 May, 28 June, 19 July, 26 September, 28 October, 22 November and 6 December). The meeting on 28 June was extended to include representatives of the students enrolled on the School's doctorate courses, with particular reference to the most recently established doctorate courses. The exploratory activities carried out in these meetings resulted in **communications** addressed to the School's Quality Enhancement Committee, regarding the time frame within which the Joint Ethics Committee processes the requests submitted to it by students and researchers, and regarding an informal survey carried out among students regarding the possibility of introducing halal food in the canteen, in order to differentiate the School's food offer due to the international nature of its student body (26 September 2024), and to the Campus Management and Front Office (the "Campus Office") regarding the procedure and timing for obtaining residence permits for foreign students (26 September 2024).

Of the ten meetings mentioned above, those relating to the full mandate of the Committee in the composition referred to in point I.2 (February-October), were formally convened by ten **notices of convening** (drafted jointly by the professor acting as chairman and the student acting as secretary) containing the agenda, and the outcome of these meetings was summarised in ten sets of **minutes** submitted from time to time for approval by the Committee at the following meeting. All meetings were minuted in English. In addition to the abovementioned meetings, there was also the **meeting** mentioned above held on 20 February **to present** and share the results **of the 2023 annual report** with the School community, which was also held in English.

The Committee also took part in a **joint meeting** held on 24 September 2024, formally recorded in special minutes, which followed similar meetings held in 2022 and 2023 and which, like the latter, involved the various Quality Assurance actors within the School (**Assessment Board, Quality Enhancement Committee, and Committee**) in order to improve the mutual interaction and specific actions of these three bodies, intensifying the synergies already initiated. The discussions at this meeting were recorded in minutes, which were made available to the School. In preparing the agenda for this meeting, the Committee pointed out that a special meeting should be devoted to the situation of international students, examining the various relevant aspects (arrival in Lucca, time spent at the School, placements).

As has already been pointed out in previous reports, **interaction and collaboration with the other bodies, committees and offices** within the School responsible for quality assurance in teaching and research (Quality Enhancement Committee and Assessment Board) and its implementation (PhD and Higher Education Office (the “PhD Office”) was fruitful. It is worth noting that the process of computerising the results of a number of questionnaires administered to students was commenced in 2024 (with particular reference to the End-of-Year and PhD Program Questionnaires), and valuable advice for the IT management and transmission of these results was provided to the outgoing Committee by technologist Dr. Davide Marchiori.

In its function as a permanent observatory of the School’s educational activities and the services offered by the School to its students, the outgoing Committee focused its work on **two main areas**. With regard to **teaching activities**, the Committee continued the in-depth analysis of the results of the satisfaction questionnaires for the individual doctoral years and the doctoral cycle as a whole, and the monitoring of compliance with the scheduling guidelines for courses and final examinations, paying due attention to an ever-expanding range of courses. With regard to the **services** provided to students, the Committee continued to monitor critical issues already reported previously and considered as “structural” concerning all students (with particular reference to the availability and adequacy of workstations), and paid particular attention to the methods used to guarantee that the international community within the student body is welcomed and respected and cultural differences are appreciated, in line with a specific area of

intervention outlined in the 2021 report and implemented in the reports for subsequent years.

1.5. THIS REPORT

This report is divided into **five main sections (Parts A-E)**, as shown in the following table:

I – Foreword

II – Part A: State of the art: analysis of the critical issues reported in the previous annual report and evaluation of the processes implemented by the school to resolve them

III – Part B: Organisational aspects of the doctoral program and analysis of end-of-year and doctoral evaluation questionnaires.

IV – Part C: Analysis and proposals regarding the services offered to students (educational support services and residential and non-residential services).

V – Part D: Reflections and issues raised by the student representatives in relation to the individual doctoral program during the meeting of 28 June 2024.

VI – Part E: Summary of the proposals contained in this report, with specific indication of their recipients.

VII – Conclusion

Compared to the 2023 report, this document does not include a summary of the results of the questionnaires surveying students' opinions on individual courses (Part C of the previous report). The analysis of these results is the responsibility of the faculty boards and PhD program coordinators (see above, I.3.ad). Part D is a new section of the report. This report presents an in-depth level of analysis, with the aim of providing the School with the best possible service in improving the processes highlighted, and to reaffirm the importance and central focus of the Committee as one of the quality assurance bodies. A summary of the salient points is provided in Part C.

PART A

2. STATE OF THE ART: ANALYSIS OF THE CRITICAL ISSUES REPORTED IN THE PREVIOUS ANNUAL REPORT AND EVALUATION OF THE PROCESSES IMPLEMENTED BY THE SCHOOL TO RESOLVE THEM

The 2023 Annual Report concluded with a summary (VI – Part E) providing an overview of the principal critical points identified, with an indication of the area of responsibility (teaching, services, international relations), the sections of the annual report in which these critical points had been extensively discussed, some possible proposals for solutions, and details of the offices or structures within the School to which these points were referred. A similar summary can be found in this report (see below, VI – Part E).

The issues relating to education concerned the following:

- 1) the only partial availability of the syllabuses for the courses;
- 2) the areas of dissatisfaction emerging from the sections of the questionnaires relating to educational aspects;
- 3) the late scheduling of classes;
- 4) the understaffing of the PhD Office and the need for its reinforcement;
- 5) the appropriateness of awarding student's credits for the training activities followed and teaching assistantship functions, without increasing the overall teaching timetable.

The issues relating to services concerned the following:

- 6) the efficiency of communication between the School administration and the students;
- 7) the need for an organic workstation allocation plan;
- 8) greater transparency in the School's policy regarding the disposal of badges and email accounts;

9) specific issues concerning one of the halls of residence.

Finally, with regard to international relations, problems were reported concerning the following:

- 10) the need for more information (in the form of a quantitative indicator) concerning applications by and admissions of international students;
- 11) the need to pay due attention to the indicator showing a decline in admissions of students who have obtained a degree abroad;
- 12) the specific dietary needs of the international student community.

Some of these reports were accepted and the problems indicated have been resolved or are in the process of being addressed. For some of these issues, the Committee has personally followed the process of assuming ownership and finding a solution. However, it was generally not possible to assess in detail the measures implemented by the School in 2024 to address and resolve the critical issues reported in the 2023 Annual Report. The main reason for this is the lack of clearly defined indicators and, above all, of specific communications in response to the points made by the outgoing Committee last year.

The outgoing Committee therefore hopes that, for the benefit of the work of the new Committee and the quality assurance processes within the School, the workflow and management responsibilities resulting from the reports that the Committee makes in its annual report or otherwise during the course of its activities will be clearly clarified. Specifically, it would be useful to clarify:

- (a) who is responsible for ensuring that the Committee's reports actually reach the intended recipients;
- (b) once the reports have reached their destination, who should monitor the process of:
 - (b1) assessment of the relevance of the report submitted;
 - (b2) planning of its resolution;
 - (b3) implementation of the planned solution, in the spirit of synergy among Committee, Quality Enhancement Committee and Evaluation Assessment Board;

(b4) communication to all actors in the quality assurance system, and in particular to the Committee, that the original report has been discussed and taken into account.

PART B

3. ORGANISATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE DOCTORAL PROGRAM AND ANALYSIS OF END-OF-YEAR AND DOCTORAL EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

For the thirty-ninth cycle (2023-2024 academic year), the doctoral programs offered by the School were the following:

- *Economics, Analytics and Decision Science (EADS);*
- *System Science (SYS), divided into four curricula: Complex Systems and Networks (CSN), Computational Mechanics (CM), Learning and Control (LC) and Software Quality (SQ);*
- *Management of Digital Transformation (MDT);*
- *Cognitive, Computational and Social Neurosciences (CCSN);*
- *Cultural System (CS), divided into two curricula: Analysis and Management of Cultural Heritage (AMCH) and Museum Studies (MUST);*
- *National PhD program in Cybersecurity (CYSEC).*

The Committee also notes that the School offers, jointly with the University of Florence, the Doctoral Program in *Social Sciences for Sustainability and Wellbeing (S3W)*, with the University of Florence as administrative headquarters.

III.1 Timetabling of courses provided in the 2023-2024 academic year

It is valuable at this point to monitor the extent to which the course calendars provided during the 2023-2024 academic year have complied with the timetabling criteria that – at the Committee’s urging – were discussed at the meetings of the Faculty Board of 9 October and 22 October 2019, and have since been taken into consideration by the administrative offices when establishing lesson calendars. The Committee received the following information from the PhD Office (email dated 18 November 2024).

Criterion 1 – Completion of all courses by the end of the academic year in question.

Most courses were completed by 31 October 2024. The following is a list of the number of courses in each doctoral program that were still unfinished as of 18 November 2024.

Courses yet to be completed:

- 3 CCSN
- 1 SYS
- 1 MUST

Courses yet to be scheduled:

- 1 EADS
- 1 SYS

Courses not provided due to the unavailability of the external lecturer or because they were not included in any syllabus:

- 4 MUST
- 2 SYS
- 2 EADS
- 2 TDM

Criterion 2 – Maximum daily (eight hours) and weekly (36 hours) commitment per student.

No deviations were identified, confirming full compliance with the criterion already recorded in previous academic years.

Criterion 3 – Maximum duration of each lesson (three hours for internal faculty and five hours for external faculty).

The limited number of cases with blocks longer than three hours was justified by the teaching methodology of the specific subject and/or the presence of many external students.

Criterion 4 – Time interval between lessons (minimum 24 hours – not applicable to external faculty – and maximum ten days).

When teaching was scheduled at the beginning of the academic year, all criteria are met. During the course of the year, faculty members may need to travel, for assignments or participation in conferences, to accommodate requests from students, because assignments due require more time, or because off-site lectures are planned (in the case of AMCH and MUST) for which scheduling is closely linked to the availability of the on-site teaching staff. On several occasions, therefore, there was a need to hold blocks of lessons in the afternoon and in the morning of the following day.

III.2 Sharing of teaching materials

Starting from the 2022-2023 academic year, the School's lecturers have been invited to make syllabuses and potentially other teaching material (slides, exercises and/or other materials) from their teaching available to the entire School community (students, professors and assistants), sharing them through folders on Google Drive, one for each course included in the teaching program. Last year, the Committee found that some lecturers had unfortunately left the folders for their lessons completely empty. In this regard, the Committee had suggested that each year a reminder be sent by email to lecturers indicating a deadline for uploading at least the syllabuses relating to their courses into their folders.

As of 9 December, this year, the PhD Office reported (at the Committee's request) that there are 253 folders in the drive, one for each of the courses included in the various teaching programs approved by the various faculty boards, and only 142 appear to contain a syllabus. The PhD Office also announced that this year a memo was sent by email (on 25 October 2024) to AMCH lecturers only on the instructions of the coordinator.

The Committee hopes that all lecturers will at least upload an initial version of the syllabuses of their courses at the time of their inclusion in the teaching program for approval by the faculty board. It also reiterates the need to email a reminder (before the start of each academic year) to all faculty to upload the updated syllabuses, and any other teaching materials, into the folders for their specific courses.

III.3 Examination of end-of-year questionnaires completed in the 2023-2024 academic year

In the 2022-2023 academic year, the version of the questionnaire based on the model prepared by ANVUR was administered, supplemented with a few questions on characteristic aspects of the doctoral experience at the School. The questionnaire was sent to all PhD students, and the survey period was 18 October – 8 November 2024.

The data from the end-of-year questionnaires are collected in the following tables: Tables 1 to 7 refer to the overall data, while Tables 8 to 14 show the results of the analyses performed by grouping the data into six groups, which essentially refer to six types of doctoral program:

- 1) CCSN: Cognitive, Computational and Social Neurosciences, either as a pathway within the doctoral program in Cognitive and Cultural Systems or as a new doctoral program in its own right;
- 2) AMCH+MUST: Analysis and Management of Cultural Heritage, along with Museum Studies, both as pathways within the doctoral program in Cognitive and Cultural Systems and as pathways within the new doctoral program in Cultural Systems;
- 3) EADS+ENBA: Economics, Analytics and Decision Sciences, along with the curriculum in Economics, Networks and Business Analytics of the former PhD program in System Science;
- 4) SYS (without ENBA): Systems Science, comprising both the current doctoral program in System Science, and all the curricula of the old doctoral program in System Science, except the ENBA curriculum included in group 3);
- 5) MDT: Management of Digital Transformation;

6) CYSEC: Cybersecurity.

The Committee would like to point out that the part of the questionnaire relating to questions on services (“facilities”) has not been analysed in this section of the report, but rather in the dedicated section (IV, Part C) of this report.

The overall response rate (Table 1) remains largely unchanged from last year, while Table 8 shows a decrease in the response rate for CYSEC: 52% compared to 63% last year.

	2021	2022	2023	2024
Questionnaires administered	118	115	202	244
Questionnaires returned (fully completed)	77	57	129	152
Response rate	65%	50%	64%	62%

Table 1. Response rates recorded for the End-of-Year Questionnaire in the period 2021-2024.

The Committee would like to point out that in the following tables, for each question considered, the number of responses refers to the total number of numerical responses received, also including partially completed questionnaires (which in 2024 amounted to 34 out of 244 administered (14%)). The red indicates the average ratings that can be considered as below sufficient (less than 6 on the scale from 1 to 10 used in the questionnaire). It should also be noted, in terms of notational convention, that full stops have been used instead of commas as decimal separators. In Tables 2 to 7, such ratings occur in only two cases, signalling an improvement over 2023, when eight failures were recorded. To confirm this improvement, the Committee also points out that in Table 8, the average rating went from 6.68 in 2023 to 7.45 in 2024. With regard to the analysis of the individual groups (Tables 9-14), the Committee points out that in Table 14, concerning the general degree of satisfaction, the average ratings for all groups examined are above sufficient, signalling an improvement over last year. Tables 9-14, however, reveal some critical, often minor, issues. Below we have listed, for each group, the questions for which a mark below a sufficient level was recorded:

- CCSN: Q24 in Table 9, relating to student involvement in the organisation of activities, Q11 and Q12 in Table 11, relating to information and support received for experiences at other institutions, and Q15 in Table 13, relating to students' teaching experiences;
- EADS+ENBA: Q4, Q5 and Q24 in Table 9, relating to teaching load and student involvement in the organisation of activities, and Q15 and Q16 in Table 13, relating to students' teaching experiences;
- AMCH+MUST: Q3-Q6, Q23-Q25 and Q27 in Table 9, relating to various aspects of teaching, such as teaching load, involvement of students in the organisation of activities and clarity in setting deadlines, Q29-Q31 in Table 12, relating to research activity, Q8 in Table 10, relating to support received during the period abroad, and Q11 in Table 11, relating to information and support received for experiences at other institutions;
- SYS (without ENBA): Q5 in Table 9, relating to learning assessment tests.

As far as EADS+ENBA is concerned, the Committee points out that critical issues concerning the teaching load and the involvement of students in the planning of activities had also been noted in past years for doctoral programs in the economics area and therefore appropriate measures had already been taken. In particular, with the establishment of the EADS doctoral program, the teaching load is considerably lightened compared to that of the old ENBA curriculum in System Sciences. EADS students were also given more freedom in determining their own study plans.

With regard to AMCH+MUST, the Committee notes that some of the critical issues mentioned above had also emerged from the analyses of the 2023 data, but to a greater extent. Therefore, although some critical issues are not completely overcome, an improvement over 2023 can be seen. This improvement is also confirmed by the rating obtained in the question on the overall level of satisfaction with the doctoral program (question Q47 in Table 14), which increased from 5.71 in 2023 to 7.04 in 2024.

For CCSN also, the rating obtained in question Q47 in Table 14 is higher than in 2023: we went from 6.21 in 2023 to 7.10 in 2024.

For CYSEC, in question Q47 in table 14 we have an evaluation substantially the same as last year's, confirming it as very good also for 2024: the rating has gone from 8.11 in 2023 to 8.46 in 2024.

The Committee recalls that in the 2023 report, it was not possible to separate the EADS doctoral program from SYS, as some students had entered their doctoral program incorrectly when filling in the questionnaire. It was also not possible to separate MDT because of the small number of questionnaires administered. It is therefore not possible this year to compare the results with those for last year for EADS, SYS and MDT.

With regard to Q5 (*"The interim assessments (exams, presentations, papers) are just a formality or have not been carried out at all"*), which was given an average rating of insufficient, the Committee points out that, in its opinion, the wording of the question is ambiguous with regard to the interpretation of the responses, as it is not clear whether a high rating should actually be judged positively.

Questions related to training activities and their organisation (sections: "Training", "Transparency and Engagement" and "Research training")	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1 – 10)	Average rating (Scale 0 – 100)
<i>Q1. The training activities are exhaustive and consistent with the main topics of my PhD course.</i>	143	6.87	65.22
<i>Q2. The topics addressed in the training activities are thorough and up-to-date.</i>	141	7.68	74.22
<i>Q3. The training activities help with the development of the PhD thesis.</i>	143	6.69	63.22
<i>Q4. The workload of the structured training activities (courses, seminars, workshops) lets me spend enough time on my research projects and my thesis.</i>	144	6.41	60.11
<i>Q5. The interim assessments (exams, presentations, papers) are just a formality or have not been carried out at all.</i>	129	5.39	48.89
<i>Q6. Overall, I am satisfied with the training activities provided.</i>	143	6.96	66.22
<i>Q23. Information about training and research activities is constantly updated.</i>	147	7.03	67.00
<i>Q24. PhD students are involved in the planning of such activities.</i>	141	5.91	54.67
<i>Q25. Information on deadlines and administrative procedures is constantly updated.</i>	149	6.95	66.11
<i>Q26. The topics discussed in the training activities were engaging.</i>	126	7.26	69.56
<i>Q27. The topics discussed in the training activities were consistent with the objectives of my PhD Program.</i>	130	6.93	65.89

Table 2. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data on questions concerning training activities and their organisation (sections: "Training", "Transparency and Engagement" and "Research training"). The number of responses refers to responses other than "Prefer not to answer". Orange indicates Q.5, for which the interpretation of the result is unclear.

Questions related to experiences abroad (section on "Experiences abroad")	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1 – 10)	Average rating (Scale 0 – 100)
<i>Q7. During my PhD, I have received proper information and support from my teachers about experiences abroad.</i>	117	6.56	61.78
<i>Q8. The support received from my home university in my research stay abroad is satisfactory.</i>	94	7.19	68.89
<i>Q9. The support received from the host university/institute in my research stay abroad is satisfactory.</i>	75	7.76	75.11
<i>Q10. Overall, I am satisfied with my research stay abroad.</i>	74	8.00	77.78

Table 3. (End-of-Year Questionnaire year 2024) Data on questions concerning experiences abroad (section on "Experiences abroad"). The number of responses refers to responses other than "Prefer not to answer".

Questions concerning experiences at other national research centres/companies/public bodies (section on "Experiences at other national research centres/companies/public bodies")	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1 – 10)	Average rating (Scale 0 – 100)
<i>Q11. During my PhD, I have received proper information and support from my teachers about experiences at other institutions.</i>	89	6.44	60.44
<i>Q12. The support received from my home university in my research stay at other institutions is satisfactory.</i>	73	6.93	65.90
<i>Q13. The support received from the host institution in my research stay is satisfactory.</i>	65	7.48	72.00
<i>Q14. Overall, I am satisfied with my research stay at other research centres/companies/public bodies.</i>	65	7.62	73.56

Table 4. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) data concerning experiences at other research centres/companies/public bodies (section on "Experiences at other research centres/companies/public bodies"). The number of responses refers to responses other than "Prefer not to answer".

Questions related to the thesis work and supervision received (sections: "Research output" and "Relationship with the advisory team")	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1 – 10)	Average rating (Scale 0 – 100)
<i>Q29. I am satisfied with the opportunities I had to disseminate my research</i>	137	7.00	66.67
<i>Q30. I have worked on an adequate volume of research outputs (e.g., articles, essays, book chapters, presentations, etc.).</i>	139	6.74	63.89
<i>Q31. Overall, I am satisfied with the research outputs that I have produced.</i>	139	6.78	64.11
<i>Q32. The frequency of contact with my advisory team was adequate.</i>	151	7.82	75.89
<i>Q33. My advisory team made themselves available to hold meetings.</i>	147	8.14	79.33
<i>Q34. My advisory team gave prompt feedback to my written submissions (e.g., paper/thesis drafts).</i>	142	7.61	73.56
<i>Q35. My advisory team ensured I made progress in my thesis research.</i>	144	7.62	73.56
<i>Q36. Overall, the supervision I have received has contributed to the successful progress of my thesis.</i>	147	7.63	73.78

Table 5. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data on questions concerning the thesis work and supervision received (sections: "Research output" and "Relationship with the advisory team"). The number of responses refers to responses other than "Prefer not to answer".

Questions relating to any student teaching experiences (section on "Students' teaching experiences")	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1 – 10)	Average rating (Scale 0 – 100)
Q15. My teaching helps me with my training.	37	6.59	62.16
Q16. The workload of my teaching lets me spend enough time on my training and research projects and on my thesis.	36	6.64	62.65

Table 6. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data on questions concerning any student teaching experiences (section on "Students' teaching experiences"). The number of responses refers to responses other than "Prefer not to answer".

General question (section "Overall satisfaction").	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1 – 10)	Average rating (Scale 0 – 100)
Q47. Overall, so far I am satisfied with my PhD.	151	7.45	71.67

Table 7. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Overall satisfaction data (section on "Overall satisfaction"). The number of responses refers to responses other than "Prefer not to answer".

	CCSN	EADS + ENBA	AMCH + MUST	SYS (without ENBA)	MDT	CYSEC
Questionnaires administered	47	39	51	46	9	52
Questionnaires returned (fully completed)	29	27	28	32	9	27
Response rate	62%	69%	55%	70%	100%	52%

Table 8. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Response rate for each group.

The Committee would like to point out that in the following tables, "NA" was indicated when fewer than four responses were received.

Questions related to training activities and their organisation (Sections: "Training", "Transparency and Engagement" and "Research training")	Average rating for CCSN		Average rating for EADS + ENBA		Average rating for AMCH + MUST		Average rating for SYS (without ENBA)		Average rating for MDT		Average rating for CYSEC	
Scale	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100
Q1. The training activities are exhaustive and consistent with the main topics of my PhD course.	6.70 (27)	63.37	6.63 (27)	62.55	6.08 (24)	56.48	7.75 (32)	75.00	7.86 (7)	76.19	6.65 (26)	62.82
Q2. The topics addressed in the training activities are thorough and up-to-date.	7.30 (27)	69.96	7.41 (27)	71.19	6.96 (23)	66.18	8.39 (31)	82.08	8.43 (7)	82.54	7.96 (26)	77.35
Q3. The training activities help with the development of the PhD thesis.	6.19 (27)	57.61	6.44 (27)	60.49	5.92 (25)	54.67	7.61 (31)	73.48	8.00 (7)	77.78	6.77 (26)	64.10
Q4. The workload of the structured training activities (courses, seminars, workshops) lets me spend enough time on my research projects and my thesis.	6.63 (27)	62.55	5.26 (27)	47.33	3.80 (25)	31.11	8.16 (32)	79.51	8.00 (7)	77.78	7.31 (26)	70.09
Q5. The interim assessments (exams, presentations, papers) are just a formality or have not been carried out at all.	6.71 (24)	63.43	4.73 (26)	41.45	4.35 (23)	37.20	4.39 (31)	37.63	7.00 (7)	66.67	7.00 (18)	66.67

<i>Q6. Overall, I am satisfied with the training activities provided.</i>	6.93 (27)	65.84	6.11 (27)	56.79	5.92 (24)	54.63	8.19 (32)	79.86	7.71 (7)	74.60	7.12 (26)	67.95
<i>Q23. Information about training and research activities is constantly updated.</i>	6.36 (25)	59.56	6.54 (28)	61.51	5.68 (28)	51.98	8.23 (31)	80.29	7.67 (9)	74.07	8.04 (26)	78.21
<i>Q24. PhD students are involved in the planning of such activities.</i>	5.07(28)	45.24	5.81 (27)	53.50	4.67 (27)	40.74	6.37 (27)	59.67	7.00 (9)	66.67	7.52 (23)	72.46
<i>Q25. Information on deadlines and administrative procedures is constantly updated.</i>	6.55 (29)	61.69	6.89 (27)	65.43	5.67 (27)	51.85	7.77 (31)	75.27	7.89 (9)	76.54	7.50 (26)	72.22
<i>Q26. The topics discussed in the training activities were engaging.</i>	7.36 (22)	70.71	6.80 (25)	64.44	6.27 (22)	58.59	8.14 (28)	79.37	7.00 (8)	66.67	7.67 (21)	74.07
<i>Q27. The topics discussed in the training activities were consistent with the objectives of my PhD Program.</i>	6.52 (23)	61.35	6.85 (27)	65.02	5.57 (23)	50.72	8.11 (28)	78.97	7.38 (8)	70.83	7.24 (21)	69.31

Table 9. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data, for each group, on questions concerning training activities and their organisation (sections: “Training”, “Transparency and Engagement” and “Research training”). The figure in brackets is the number of responses (other than “Prefer not to answer”) received, based on which the average rating was calculated. Orange indicates question Q.5, for which the interpretation of the result is unclear.

Questions related to experiences abroad (section on "Experiences abroad")	Average rating for CCSN		Average rating for EADS + ENBA		Average rating for AMCH + MUST		Average rating for SyS (without ENBA)		Average rating for MDT		Average rating for CySec	
Scale	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100
<i>Q7. During my PhD, I have received proper information and support from my teachers about experiences abroad.</i>	6.05 (20)	56.11	7.08 (25)	67.56	4.52 (21)	39.15	7.48 (23)	71.98	7.57 (7)	73.02	7.14 (21)	68.25
<i>Q8. The support received from my home university in my research stay abroad is satisfactory.</i>	6.44 (18)	60.49	7.57 (23)	72.95	5.75 (16)	52.78	8.93 (14)	88.10	7.25 (4)	69.44	7.37 (19)	70.76
<i>Q9. The support received from the host university/institute in my research stay abroad is satisfactory.</i>	8.64 (14)	84.92	7.80 (20)	75.56	7.55 (11)	72.73	8.64 (11)	84.85	NA (3)	NA	6.81 (16)	64.58
<i>Q10. Overall, I am satisfied with my research stay abroad.</i>	8.64 (14)	84.92	8.00 (21)	77.78	7.27 (11)	69.70	8.91 (11)	87.88	NA (3)	NA	7.50 (14)	72.22

Table 10. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data, for each group, on the questions in the section on "Experiences abroad". The figure in brackets is the number of responses (other than "Prefer not to answer") received, based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions about experiences abroad (section on “Experiences at other national research centres/companies/public bodies”).	Average rating for CCSN		Average rating for EADS + ENBA		Average rating for AMCH + MUST		Average rating for SyS (without ENBA)		Average rating for MDT		Average rating for CySec	
	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100
Q11. During my PhD, I have received proper information and support from my teachers about experiences at other institutions.	5.67 (15)	51.85	6.47 (17)	60.78	5.53 (15)	50.37	7.06 (16)	67.36	7.00 (6)	66.67	7.00 (20)	66.67
Q12. The support received from my home university in my research stay at other institutions is satisfactory.	5.43 (14)	49.21	7.00 (15)	66.67	5.70 (10)	52.22	8.67 (12)	85.19	7.25 (4)	69.44	7.50 (18)	72.22
Q13. The support received from the host institution in my research stay is satisfactory.	7.69 (13)	74.36	7.31 (13)	70.09	7.00 (10)	66.67	8.40 (10)	82.22	NA (3)	NA	7.00 (16)	66.67
Q14. Overall, I am satisfied with my research stay at other research centres/companies/public bodies.	7.50 (12)	72.22	7.69 (13)	74.36	7.10 (10)	67.78	8.60 (10)	84.44	7.25 (4)	69.44	7.44 (16)	71.53

Table 11. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data, for each group, related to the questions in the section on “Experiences at other national research centres/companies/public bodies”). The figure in brackets is the number of responses (other than “Prefer not to answer”) received, based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions related to thesis work and supervision received (sections: "Research output" and "Relationship with the advisory team")	Average rating for CCSN		Average rating for EADS + ENBA		Average rating for AMCH + MUST		Average rating for SYS (without ENBA)		Average rating for MDT		Average rating for CYSEC	
Scale	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100
Q29. I am satisfied with the opportunities I had to disseminate my research	7.14 (28)	68.25	6.50 (26)	61.11	5.63 (24)	51.39	7.72 (25)	74.67	7.00 (8)	66.67	7.92 (26)	76.92
Q30. I have worked on an adequate volume of research outputs (e.g., articles, essays, book chapters, presentations, etc.).	6.57 (28)	61.90	6.56 (27)	61.73	5.36 (25)	48.44	6.92 (24)	65.74	6.88 (8)	65.28	8.19 (27)	79.84
Q31. Overall, I am satisfied with the research outputs that I have produced.	6.29 (28)	58.73	6.42 (26)	60.26	5.33 (24)	48.15	7.52 (25)	72.44	7.22 (9)	69.14	8.07 (27)	78.60
Q32. The frequency of contact with my advisory team was adequate.	7.24 (29)	69.35	7.44 (27)	71.60	7.29 (28)	69.84	8.56 (32)	84.03	7.44 (9)	71.60	8.65 (26)	85.04
Q33. My advisory team made themselves available to hold meetings.	7.72 (29)	74.71	7.77 (26)	75.21	7.85 (26)	76.07	8.75 (32)	86.11	7.67 (9)	74.07	8.68 (25)	85.33

<i>Q34. My advisory team gave prompt feedback to my written submissions (e.g., paper/thesis drafts).</i>	6.93 (28)	65.87	7.00 (26)	66.67	7.38 (24)	70.83	8.13 (30)	79.26	7.56 (9)	72.84	8.60 (25)	84.44
<i>Q35. My advisory team ensured I made progress in my thesis research.</i>	6.64 (28)	62.70	7.46 (26)	71.79	7.71 (24)	74.54	8.03 (32)	78.13	7.56 (9)	72.84	8.28 (25)	80.89
<i>Q36. Overall, the supervision I have received has contributed to the successful progress of my thesis.</i>	6.36 (28)	59.52	7.54 (26)	72.65	7.59 (27)	73.25	8.16 (32)	79.51	7.67 (9)	74.07	8.48 (25)	83.11

Table 12. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data, for each group, on questions concerning thesis work and supervision received (sections: “Research output” and “Relationship with the advisory team”). The figure in brackets is the number of responses (other than “Prefer not to answer”) received, based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions relating to student's teaching experiences (section on "Students' teaching experiences")	Average rating for CCSN		Average rating for EADS + ENBA		Average rating for AMCH + MUST		Average rating for SyS (without ENBA)		Average rating for MDT		Average rating for CySec	
	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100
<i>Q15. My teaching helps me with my training.</i>	4.86 (7)	42.86	5.80 (5)	53.33	NA (3)	NA	7.75 (8)	75.00	6.83 (6)	64.81	7.13 (8)	68.06
<i>Q16. The workload of my teaching lets me spend enough time on my training and research projects and on my thesis.</i>	6.14 (7)	57.14	3.80 (5)	31.11	NA (3)	NA	7.63 (8)	73.61	7.67 (6)	74.07	7.86 (7)	76.19

Table 13. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data, for each group, related to the questions in the section on "Students' Teaching Experiences". The figure in brackets is the number of responses (other than "Prefer not to answer") received, based on which the average rating was calculated.

General question (section on "Overall satisfaction")	Average rating for CCSN		Average rating for EADS + ENBA		Average rating for AMCH + MUST		Average rating for SYS (without ENBA)		Average rating for MDT		Average rating for CYSEC	
Scale	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100	1-10	0-100
<i>Q47. Overall, so far I am satisfied with my PhD</i>	7.10 (29)	67.82	6.85 (27)	65.02	7.04 (28)	67.06	7.72 (32)	74.65	7.78 (9)	75.31	8.46 (26)	82.91

Table 14. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data, for each group, relating to the overall level of satisfaction (section on "Overall satisfaction"). The figure in brackets is the number of responses (other than "Prefer not to answer") received, based on which the average rating was calculated.

III.4 Review of doctoral evaluation questionnaires completed in the 2023-2024 academic year

This version of the questionnaire was distributed from January 2024 and the data collected covers the period from January to October 2024.

The questionnaire covered the following doctoral programs:

- Cognitive and Cultural Systems (curricula: "Analysis and Management of Cultural Heritage" (AMCH), "Cognitive, Computational and Social Neurosciences" (CCSN) and "Museum Studies" (MUST);
- Systems Science (curricula: "Computer Science and Systems Engineering" (CSSE) and "Economics, Networks and Business Analytics" (ENBA).

Specifically, 13 questionnaires were collected, seven of which came from CCSN, four from CSSE, one from AMCH+MUST and one from ENBA.

The data from the end-of-cycle questionnaires are collected in Tables 15 to 24, which contain the results of the analysis of the overall sample. The red indicates the average ratings that can be considered as below sufficient (less than 6 on the scale from 1 to 10 used in the

questionnaire). It should also be noted, in terms of notational convention, that full stops have been used instead of commas as decimal separators. The Committee would like to point out that in the following tables, “NA” was indicated when fewer than four responses were received.

The Committee would also like to point out that the part of the questionnaire relating to questions on services (“facilities”) has not been analysed in this section of the report. For the analysis on “facilities”, please refer to the specific section of this report.

As far as the response rate is concerned, the Committee saw a considerable drop, probably due to the significant increase in the length of the questionnaire (65 questions compared to 25 last year).

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Questionnaires administered	13	25	19	19	22	32
Questionnaires returned	11	21	8	11	18	13
Participation Rate	85%	84%	42%	58%	82%	41%

Table 15. Response rates recorded for the PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire in 2019-2024.

The following tables show a good degree of satisfaction with the doctoral programs. An average rating below a sufficient level was recorded only for the questions:

Q61.5 in Table 16 concerning work-life balance, Q50 in Table 23 concerning the involvement of students in the organisation of activities, and Q52 and Q53 in Table 24. For these last two questions, the Committee notes that they describe, rather than assess, an aspect of the doctoral program, namely whether the program content is more “theoretical/abstract” or “technical/practical”. Consequently, a rating below 6 does not necessarily indicate a criticality.

Finally, in Q58 of the questionnaire – “Would you recommend your PhD Program to other students?” – ten responses were given (in three of the 13 questionnaires collected, the

response was left blank), of which seven were “yes”, two were “no” and one was “Prefer not to answer”.

Comparison with last year’s data can only be made for the questions in table 16, which also appeared in the version of the questionnaire distributed last year. In this respect, the Committee points out that there was an improvement for Q61.1, Q61.3 and Q61.4, while there was a drop in the ratings for Q61.5, Q61.6 and Q61.7. The figures for 2023 are shown in the last column of Table 16.

Questions (Q61) from the section on “Overall satisfaction”	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1- 10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)	Average rating (Scale 0- 100) for 2023
<i>Q61.1 Academic experience</i>	9	8.2	80	69
<i>Q61.2 Academic advising and guidance</i>	10	7.3	70	70.5
<i>Q61.3 Interaction across disciplines</i>	10	7.5	72.22	60.25
<i>Q61.4 Research Training</i>	10	7.9	76.67	64.75
<i>Q61.5 Work-life balance</i>	10	5.3	47.78	53
<i>Q61.6 The extent to which the School has provided a welcoming and supportive environment</i>	10	7.6	73.33	81
<i>Q61.7 The extent to which the School has provided a culturally sensitive environment</i>	9	6.4	60	69
<i>Q61.8 Visa and immigration support</i>	3	NA	NA	NA

Table 16. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) The first three columns contain data on the questions in the “Overall evaluation” *section*. The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than “Prefer not to answer”, based on which the average rating was calculated. The fourth column shows data from 2023 for comparison.

Questions related to the section on "Training".	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q1. The training activities were exhaustive and consistent with the main topics of my PhD course</i>	11	6.9	65.56
<i>Q2. The topics addressed in the training activities were thorough and up-to-date</i>	11	7.5	72.22
<i>Q3. The training activities helped with the development of my PhD thesis</i>	11	6.8	64.44
<i>Q4. The workload of the structured training activities (courses, seminars, workshops) let me spend enough time on my research projects and my thesis</i>	11	7.3	70
<i>Q5. The interim assessments (exams, presentations, papers) were just a formality or were not carried out at all</i>	11	6.3	58.89
<i>Q6. The activities largely involved guest lecturers and experts as well</i>	11	7.5	72.22
<i>Q7. The activities largely involved international lecturers and experts as well</i>	11	6.5	61.11
<i>Q8. Overall, I am satisfied with the training activities provided</i>	11	6.5	61.11

Table 17. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data relating to questions in the section on "Training". The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than "Prefer not to answer", based on which the average rating was calculated. Orange indicates Q.5, for which the interpretation of the result is unclear.

Questions related to the section on " <i>PhD Thesis</i> ".	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q9. My PhD supervisor was helpful and always on call</i>	11	7.5	72.22
<i>Q10. My PhD supervisor helped me build a scientific collaboration network</i>	11	6.3	58.89
<i>Q11. My thesis helped me learn to organise and disseminate the results of my work</i>	11	8.0	77.78
<i>Q12. The groundwork for my thesis helped me build a scientific collaboration network</i>	11	6.7	63.33
<i>Q13. Overall, I am satisfied with the research I did for my PhD thesis</i>	11	7.7	74.44

Table 18. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data related to the questions in the section on "PhD Thesis". The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than "Prefer not to answer", based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions related to the section on " <i>Research</i> "	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q14. The other research I did was related to the main topics of my PhD thesis</i>	11	7.2	68.89
<i>Q15. The research I did helped me develop my PhD thesis</i>	11	8.1	78.89
<i>Q16. The workload of research let me spend enough time in the training activities and in my thesis</i>	11	8.2	80
<i>Q17. The research I did helped me learn to organise and disseminate the results of my work</i>	11	8.3	81.11
<i>Q18. The research I did helped me build a nationwide scientific collaboration network</i>	11	6.8	64.44
<i>Q19. The research I did helped me build an international scientific collaboration network</i>	11	6.6	62.22

<i>Q20. My PhD journey made me more adept at conducting independent research projects</i>	10	8.6	84.44
<i>Q21. Overall, I am satisfied with the other research projects I conducted</i>	11	7.8	75.56

Table 19. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data for questions in the section on “Research”. The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than “Prefer not to answer”, based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions related to the section on “Experiences abroad”	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q22. During my PhD, I have received proper information and support from my teachers about experiences abroad</i>	6	6.0	55.56
<i>Q23. The support received from my home university in my research stay abroad was satisfactory</i>	6	6.2	57.78
<i>Q24. The support received from the host university/institution in my research stay abroad was satisfactory</i>	6	8.8	86.67
<i>Q25. During my stay abroad, I received adequate supervision for my thesis project</i>	6	7.5	72.22
<i>Q26. My stay abroad helped me develop my PhD thesis</i>	6	7.7	74.44
<i>Q27. My research stay abroad helped me learn more</i>	6	9.2	91.11
<i>Q28. My research stay abroad helped me build a scientific collaboration network</i>	6	7.7	74.44
<i>Q29. Overall, I am satisfied with my research stay abroad</i>	6	8.2	80

Table 20. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data relating to questions in the section on “Experiences abroad”. The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than “Prefer not to answer”, based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions related to the section on "Experiences at other national research centres/companies/public bodies"	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q30. During my PhD, I have received proper information and support from my teachers about experiences at other institutions</i>	2	NA	NA
<i>Q31. The support received from my home university in my research experience at other institutions was satisfactory</i>	2	NA	NA
<i>Q32. The support received from the host institution in my research experience was satisfactory</i>	2	NA	NA
<i>Q33. In my experience at other institutions, I received adequate supervision for my thesis or research project</i>	2	NA	NA
<i>Q34. My experience helped me in the development of my PhD thesis</i>	2	NA	NA
<i>Q35. My research experience at other institutions helped me learn to disseminate the results of my work</i>	2	NA	NA
<i>Q36. My research experience at other institutions helped me build a scientific collaboration network</i>	2	NA	NA
<i>Q37. Overall, I am satisfied with my research experience at other institutions</i>	2	NA	NA

Table 21. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data relating to questions in the section on "Experiences at other national research centres/companies/public bodies". The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than "Prefer not to answer", based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions related to the section on "Students' Teaching Experiences"	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q38. My teaching helped me with my training</i>	1	NA	NA
<i>Q39. The workload of my teaching let me spend enough time on my training and research projects and on my thesis</i>	1	NA	NA

Table 22. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data related to the questions in the section on "Students' Teaching Experience". The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than "Prefer not to answer", based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions related to the section on "Transparency and engagement"	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q49. Information about training and research activities was constantly updated</i>	11	6.9	65.56
<i>Q50. PhD students were involved in the planning of training and research activities</i>	11	4.9	43.33
<i>Q51. I have always been adequately informed of deadlines and administrative procedures</i>	11	7.7	74.44

Table 23. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data for questions in the section on "Transparency and engagement". The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than "Prefer not to answer", based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions related to the section on "Overall satisfaction"	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q52. The PhD program was heavily skewed towards theoretical/abstract knowledge</i>	10	5.7	52.22
<i>Q53. The PhD program was heavily skewed towards technical/practical knowledge</i>	10	5.5	50
<i>Q54. Overall, I am satisfied with my PhD program</i>	11	7.9	76.77
<i>Q55. If I could go back in time, I would enrol in this PhD program again</i>	9	7.3	70
<i>Q56. If I could go back in time, I would choose this university again</i>	10	7.4	71.11
<i>Q57. If I could go back in time, I would do a PhD abroad</i>	9	6.0	55.56

Table 24. PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data for questions in the section on "Overall satisfaction". The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than "Prefer not to answer", based on which the average rating was calculated. Green indicates Q52 and Q53, for which a rating below 6 does not necessarily signal a criticality.

PART C

4. ANALYSIS AND PROPOSALS REGARDING THE SERVICES OFFERED TO STUDENTS

4.1. INTRODUCTION

This section provides a more in-depth analysis of the services offered to students and teaching and administrative staff, referring to the Good Practice questionnaires administered in 2023 and the questions they examine (IV.2). Similarly, this section deals with broader aspects in relation to services, bringing to the surface issues addressed during the various Committee meetings (IV.3). Finally, some specific actions of the Committee are discussed in Section IV.4.

4.2. QUESTIONNAIRES

4.2.1. 2024 Good Practice Questionnaire, relating to 2023

The questionnaires, which were administered between 20 February and 18 March 2024 with reference to the services provided in 2023, included a rating grid from 1 to 6. Although the number of responses (105) was higher in absolute terms than the previous year (78), there was a slight decrease in the response rate (39.5%) out of a total of 206 potential respondents (this was 180 the previous year). There was an increase in the number of the foreign students responding to the survey (27 in 2023, 17 in 2022, 15 in 2021). Overall satisfaction averaged 4.31 out of 6, in line with the previous year (4.26).

The breakdown of satisfaction ratings among the various services is as follows:

Service	Average rating (Scale: 1-6)	Average rating (Scale: 0-100)	Average rating (Scale 0-100) 2023 Questionnaire, referring to 2022
<i>Teaching support</i>	4.28	65.6	63.4
<i>Research support</i>	4.16	63.2	64.2
<i>Administration and personnel management</i>	4.00	60	56.8
<i>Supply support and campus services</i>	4.24	64.8	61.8
<i>IT systems</i>	4.35	67	68.8
<i>Communication services</i>	3.90	58	51.8
<i>Quality of information and information dissemination</i>	4.06	61.2	52
<i>Library services</i>	5.07	81.4	78.8

Table 25.a Summary table. Data on overall satisfaction in the general areas identified in the Good Practice Questionnaire (referring to services provided in 2023). The third column shows data from the 2023 questionnaire, referring to 2022, for comparison.

With regard to the School's performance compared to the previous year, 26.6% of the students judged it to be better (the previous year was 24%), 4.76% worse (the previous year was 5%) and 30% the same (the previous year was 37%), while 40% were unsure (the previous year was 33%; this category probably includes new students who have no basis for comparison with the previous year).

Questions from the 2024 Good Practice Questionnaire, referring to 2023	Average rating (Scale: 1-6)	Average rating (Scale: 1-6) 2023 Questionnaire, referring to 2022
With reference to the teaching workshops [I am satisfied with the technical support provided].	5.43	4.00
With reference to administrative and technical support for the use of digital learning tools (platform, video, etc.) [Indicate level of satisfaction]	4.50	4.72
With reference to support in the management of PhD courses [Indicate level of satisfaction].	3.99	3.8
With reference to information and promotion on calls and funding opportunities [Indicate level of satisfaction].	3.90	3.38
With reference to the support for drafting the project proposal for tenders [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.21	3.00
With reference to project management support (budgets, reporting) [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.21	3.5
With reference to support for IP management (contracts, agreements, IP framework) [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.50	3
With reference to the commercial application of research (spin-offs, patents, development contracts) [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.17	2
With reference to support for contract drafting (negotiation of clauses, contract drafting, verification of legality) [Indicate level of satisfaction].	5.00	5
With reference to support for the management of the institutional research catalogue/archive [Indicate level of satisfaction].	5.00	1.33
With reference to research laboratories [I am satisfied with the technical support provided].	4.46	3.8
With reference to the administrative support received for the PhD [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.12	3.96

With reference to refunding of assignment expenses [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.45	4.17
With reference to the support for the settlement of third-party fees [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.33	3.5
With reference to the support for the management of Visiting Professors (invitation, activation, reception, support for the host faculty, support for visiting) [Indicate level of satisfaction].	3.80	-
With reference to administrative support for the international expansion of the university's teaching staff (mobile teaching, visiting abroad) [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.55	4.5
With reference to support for the purchase of goods and services [Procedures are clear].	3.59	4
With reference to support for the purchase of goods and services [The activity is carried out in an appropriate time frame].	3.59	3.90
With reference to maintenance work [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.20	3.95
With reference to general services and logistics [The rooms are clean].	4.79	5.32
With reference to general services and logistics [Spaces/rooms are easily identifiable].	5.07	5.03
With reference to general services and logistics [The temperature is comfortable].	4.07	3.70
With reference to general services and logistics [Security of people and property is adequate].	5.25	4.89
With regard to general services and logistics [The size of the classrooms is appropriate for the number of students].	4.48	4.32
With reference to general services and logistics [Classroom support equipment (microphone, projector, etc.) is appropriate].	5.26	5.54

With reference to general services and logistics [The canteen/restaurant service is adequate (food quality, variety, courtesy)]	4.08	3.66
With reference to the university's actions and measures on energy and environmental sustainability [Actions taken are effective].	3.89	3.72
In reference to the Wi-Fi network [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.56	4.22
With reference to the personal mailbox and other cloud services (web conferences, storage, etc.) [Indicate level of satisfaction]	5.05	5.01
With reference to the IT Help-Desk service [Please indicate your level of satisfaction].	4.89	4.8
With reference to the information provided by the University [The University's services to support teaching staff are known].	4.38	3.73
With reference to the information provided by the University [The organisation of services in terms of roles and responsibilities is clear].	4.20	3.45
With reference to the information provided by the University [The procedure for accessing services is clear].	4.22	3.66
With reference to the information provided by the University [The dissemination of information about cultural activities, seminars and events is satisfactory].	4.63	4.40
With reference to the information provided by the University [The dissemination of information regarding environmental and energy sustainability is satisfactory].	3.87	3.12
With reference to the external promotion of the University's image [The University's image is promoted through the media].	4.24	3.87
With reference to the information provided, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the ease of navigation of: [The University's website]	4.49	4.10
With reference to the information provided, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the ease of navigation of: [The department's website/page].	4.34	3.96

With reference to the information provided, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the ease of navigation of: [The course website/page].	4.31	3.82
With reference to the information provided, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the ease of navigation of: [The University's intranet].	4.37	3.47
With reference to the dissemination of information through the University's official pages in the most common social media, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following: [Facebook]	4.28	4.15
With reference to the dissemination of information through the University's official pages in the most common social media, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following: [X (formerly <i>Twitter</i>)]	4.37	3.55
With reference to the dissemination of information through the University's official pages in the most common social media, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following: [<i>LinkedIn</i>]	4.54	3.93
With reference to the dissemination of information through the University's official pages in the most common social media, please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following: [<i>Instagram</i>]	4.26	3.47
With reference to the university library system [I am familiar with and up-to-date on the dissemination activities and events organised by the university library system].	4.99	4.21
With reference to in-presence services at libraries [The paper document collection is complete].	3.65	3.64
With reference to in-presence services at libraries [The opening hours of the libraries are adequate].	5.47	5.14
With reference to online operations [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.36	4.38
With reference to interlibrary services [Indicate level of satisfaction].	4.86	5.07

Table 25.b Satisfaction data in the individual areas identified in the Good Practice Questionnaire (referring to services provided in 2023).

4.2.1.1. Internal and external communication

Despite the fact that communication services recorded the lowest value among the macro areas highlighted (3.90, out of an average of 4.25 out of 6), there was a general increase in the degree of satisfaction compared to the previous year, thanks in part to the greater coordination effort promoted by the Communication Committee. In particular, with reference to the promotion of sustainability issues, the figure rose from 3.12 in 2021 to 3.52 in 2022 and 3.87 in 2023. In addition, strengths lie in the dissemination of information about cultural activities, seminars and events (4.63).

However, the constructive criticism on internal and external communication in the free comments highlighted in previous years persists, mainly concerning the ability to offer effective, transparent communication in order to establish a positive and informed academic environment and communication on social media, focused on a predominantly, if not exclusively, Italian audience, and often internal to the School in terms of followers and people reached.

4.2.1.2. Canteen services

Canteen services saw an increase in rating with a score of 4.08, up from 3.57 in the previous year (Table 25.b), reflecting the general appreciation of the service and staff. However, concerns about the variety of the menu, especially in the evening meals, as well as the quality of ingredients, are in line with last year. Furthermore, there has been an increasing need to address the requirements of those students requesting the inclusion of halal food in the meal planning (see Section V.3.2).

4.2.1.3. Assignment expenses refund services

The questionnaire shows a marked improvement over previous years in the refund service due to the efforts of administrative staff in processing refunds up to about two weeks after the submission of receipts. The 64 respondents rated the quality of services with an average score of 4.45, up from 3.88 the previous year.

4.2.2. End-of-Year Questionnaire and PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire

The most recently administered questionnaires from 2024 show a more than adequate picture of general satisfaction with regard to the responses to the questions on services ("Facilities").

In particular, positive feedback was recorded in relation to library service and the spaces used for work activities (rooms and other workstations), with a score of 7.79. This is also confirmed by the Doctoral Program Evaluation Questionnaire for 2024, albeit with a small number of responses (see Table 27 below). The lowest scoring questions are those on the individual space allocated (6.21) and whether the tools are adequate and accessible (6.63). In addition, Q64a saw the quality of career services graded with a score of 6.6, but with a sample of five answers. Comparing the most recent data for the End-of-Year Questionnaire and PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire with those of the Good Practice questionnaire shows that the values tend to be stable, with some slight variations on the negative side (library services) and on the positive side (IT services).

Questions related to the section on "Facilities and equipment"	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q17. The rooms and spaces used for the training activities were adequate (you can see, you can hear, you can sit).</i>	148	7.79	75.44
<i>Q18. The personal space allocated to PhD students is adequate (size, equipment, etc.).</i>	146	6.21	57.89
<i>Q19. The library services meet my needs.</i>	131	7.79	75.44
<i>Q20. The IT equipment and connections are suitable for all the activities carried out there.</i>	147	7.23	69.22
<i>Q21. The research equipment is adequate and accessible.</i>	135	6.63	62.56
<i>Q22. I am satisfied with the support provided by the secretary's office.</i>	142	7.17	68.56

Table 26. (End-of-Year Questionnaire, year 2024) Data relating to questions in the section on "Facilities and equipment". The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than "Prefer not to answer", based on which the average rating was calculated.

Questions related to the sections on "Facilities and equipment" and "Placement and career prospects"	Number of responses	Average rating (Scale 1-10)	Average rating (Scale 0-100)
<i>Q40. The rooms and spaces used for the training activity were adequate (you could see, you could hear, you could sit)</i>	6	8.7	85.56
<i>Q41. The space allocated to research was adequate (size, lighting, security, etc.).</i>	6	8.7	85.56
<i>Q42. The personal space allocated to PhD students was adequate (size, equipment, etc.).</i>	6	5.7	52.22
<i>Q43. The library services met my needs</i>	6	8.3	81.11
<i>Q44. The IT equipment and connections were suitable for all the activities carried out there</i>	6	8.3	81.11
<i>Q45. The research equipment was adequate and accessible</i>	5	7.6	73.33
<i>Q46. I am satisfied with the support provided by the secretary's office</i>	6	8.5	83.33
<i>Financial support</i>	6	7.7	74.44
<i>Q47. How would you rate the quality or availability of the following resources and services provided by the School?</i>			
<i>Plagiarism checker and thesis submission</i>	6	9.2	91.11
<i>Accommodation</i>	6	7.0	66.67
<i>Q64a. How would you rate the quality of the career services?</i>	5	6.6	62.22

Table 27. (PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, year 2024) Data for the questions in the sections on "Facilities and equipment" and "Placement and career prospects". The number of responses refers to the responses received, other than "Prefer not to answer", based on which the average rating was calculated.

4.3. OTHER ISSUES

4.3.1. Workstation management

As of November 2024, a reservation service has been implemented in the San Francesco Complex and the Brunero Paoli Complex, in addition to the one already active in the Library. This solution was adopted to address the discrepancy between the number of students at the School and the availability of desk space within the School. The Spaces Committee's decision is the result of shared work with the students (through a student assembly) and the relevant bodies and committees, including the Committee, which closely monitored opinions and possible solutions.

4.3.2. Halal food in the canteen

Over the past few months, the issue previously addressed by the Committee of the request by the community of students who consume halal food for religious reasons to be able to introduce this type of food into the school canteen meal plan has been taken up again, given the large number of students requesting this change. To this end, an internal survey of the student community was also conducted in July, which showed that 88.9% of the 108 respondents were in favour of the proposal. The Committee therefore referred the matter again to the competent office, which proposed that its evaluation be postponed until the new academic year, after the change to the new canteen service provider, which is currently taking place.

4.3.3. Issuing and renewing residence permits for students of non-EU nationality

In spite of the memorandum of understanding between the School and Lucca Police Headquarters signed on 12 October 2023, there are still difficulties in relation to the timings and procedures for issuing and renewing residence permits for non-EU students enrolling or already enrolled at the School.

The Committee has monitored the issue closely, highlighting the difficulties to the relevant internal and external bodies.

4.4. ACTIONS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE

The Committee undertook to address various and varied issues concerning not only teaching but also specific aspects of academic life, affecting not just students of the School. Among relevant aspects in the academic sphere, we highlight the role played by the Committee in dealing with all parties and bodies regarding the coordination and resolution of the issues highlighted in the previous sections. In particular, the Committee held a meeting with the contact persons for the doctoral programs, a new figure introduced as of 2024, in order to make them aware of the importance of the Committee and to listen to the needs of first-year students. In addition, there was a discussion on workstation management, suggesting the adoption of a reservation system along the lines of the one already in operation in the Library. In line with the directives of the administration, the Committee adopted the new Rules of Procedure on the functioning of the Committee at its meeting on 19 July 2024.

As for other actions undertaken by the Committee regarding the more general aspects of the students' lives and needs, we report the meetings and requests for speeding up the procedure by Lucca Police Headquarters regarding the renewal or recognition of residence permits for non-EU students. In addition, the demand for the introduction of halal food in the school canteen's meal plan was pursued. Likewise, the issue of increasing the cost of health insurance for non-EU students was addressed in consultation with the administration.

PART D

5. REFLECTIONS AND ISSUES RAISED BY THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES IN RELATION TO THE INDIVIDUAL DOCTORAL PROGRAMMES DURING THE MEETING ON 28 JUNE 2024

According to a practice implemented starting from 2023, the outgoing Committee, in order to gauge the opinion of the students on the quality of the processes in place at the School, intended to make use not only of the results of the questionnaires, but also of a direct consultation of the representatives of the various PhD programs offered by the School. A specific meeting (28 June 2024; see above, I.4) was dedicated to this purpose.

At the meeting on 28 June, the contact persons of the various doctoral programs were invited by the Joint Committee to be heard on any problems encountered in their respective areas. Several issues emerged, some specific to each program, others more general and shared by several programs.

Specific problems in individual programs:

For the **EADS program**, it was pointed out that the intensity and number of lecture hours in the first year of the PhD program make it difficult for students to define their own research projects. The solution adopted, in agreement with the teaching staff, was to reduce the number of compulsory hours in the first year and to allow students to attend courses (also abroad) during the second year, so as to leave more room for research.

In the **CS program**, the main concern is the three-year duration of the doctorate, which is considered too short for adequate research development. In addition, it was reported that there is a lack of a clear protocol for the possible extension of the scholarship by one year, as well as difficulties in organising teaching activities, attributed to a lack of staff in the PhD Office.

Another problem concerns the limited availability of textbooks in the IMT library for exam preparation.

In the **CCSN program**, the problem is not so much the number of lesson hours, but the load of exams that students have to take in the first year, which is at least six. In addition, the problem of the scarcity of IT resources was raised, particularly with regard to the server at the IMT, which is insufficient to meet the needs of students.

In the **MDT program**, it was reported that many international students are unable to obtain their visas in time to start their academic activities in Italy. This makes their integration into the academic community difficult. In addition, it was highlighted that the program's opening ceremony was conducted entirely in Italian, despite the presence of numerous international students.

Problems shared between several programs:

Some problems concern more than one program and were raised by the representatives in a shared manner. A recurring theme is that of the **waiting times for approval of research proposals by the Joint Ethics Committee**, which are very long. In addition, it was reported that the dedicated webpage is out of date, creating difficulties for students.

Furthermore, all contact persons called for the introduction of a **one-off bonus for the purchase of computers**, as research funds are not deemed sufficient to cover other essential expenses, such as participation in summer schools, workshops, conferences and research activities. A request was also made for the creation of **specific courses on how to write scientific articles**, as such courses are currently not offered and are considered essential for the preparation of students.

A further problem raised concerns about how **international students were not able to apply for residency in the Campus**, making it difficult for them to access basic services, such as a general practitioner in Italy.

PART E

6. SUMMARY OF THE MAIN PROPOSALS CONTAINED IN THIS REPORT

This section summarises the main critical issues raised in this report, with an indication of the area of concern (quality assurance, teaching, services, international development) and the sections of the report in which they are dealt with most extensively (left-hand column), some possible proposals for solutions (centre column), and the offices or structures within the School to which these issues have been directed (right-hand column).

Problem	Proposal	Recipient
1) (Quality Assurance) Clarify the process for taking on and possibly resolving the issues reported by the Committee in the Annual Report (II)	Specify the various steps in the workflow and the offices/structures within the School 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 as to the effectiveness of this method of surveying students' opinions in its current configuration, without prejudice to its fundamental importance as a surveying instrument (III.3-4)	Avoid repetition of questions within the same questionnaire, clarify for some questions the subject of the question itself and how it should be answered (such as Q5 of the End-of-Year Questionnaire, and Q52-Q53 of the PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire)	Quality Enhancement Committee, Assessment Board
3) (Teaching) Most lecturers only uploaded the course syllabus (mandatory for all lecturers) to the relevant Drive folder: some also uploaded additional teaching material, while others unfortunately left the folders for their lessons completely empty (III.2)	The Committee would like all lecturers to at least upload the syllabuses for their courses and, to this end, suggests that each year a reminder be sent by email to lecturers indicating a deadline for uploading the syllabuses relating to their courses into their folders. The Committee would also like the link to the	Vice-rector for Didactics

	Drive folder from which the individual course folders are accessed to be made public on the network School intranet.	
4) (Teaching) The evaluation expressed in the End-of-Year Questionnaire reveals areas of dissatisfaction	The Committee hopes that the results of these questionnaires will be given due attention	PhD Program Coordinators and School Quality Assurance Bodies
5) (Services) Communication services recorded the lowest value among the macroareas of the Good Practice questionnaires (IV.2.1)	The Committee hopes that the results of these questionnaires will be given due attention	Vice-rector for Gender Policy, Equal Opportunities and Communication
6) (Services) Q42 of the End-of-Year Questionnaire related to services ("The personal space allocated to PhD students was adequate (size, equipment, etc.).") registered a low level of satisfaction (IV.2.2)	As of November 2024, a reservation service has been implemented in the San Francesco Complex and the Brunero Paoli Complex, in addition to the one already active in the Library. The Committee would like the effectiveness of the measure to be monitored	General Director, School Administration, Spaces Committee
7) (International Development) Following the termination of the <i>ad hoc</i> agreement stipulated by the School with the Lucca Police Headquarters, the procedure for obtaining and renewing residence permits for international students once again experienced the difficulties recorded before the agreement in question was concluded (III.3)	The Committee hopes that the School will consider operational ways to remedy this problem, in addition to the logistical assistance already provided by the Campus Office	Vice-rector for Didactics, Quality Enhancement Committee, Delegate for internationalization
8) (International Development) The international community of students has dietary needs not currently covered by the canteen offer (V.2.3)	The Committee hopes that this critical issue, already taken on by the School, will be resolved quickly, as a sign of inclusiveness and cultural pluralism	School Administration

7. CONCLUSION

From the point of view of the **educational** offer, the new academic training opportunities are intertwined with an overall evaluation of the various doctoral programs by the students, with particular reference to the individual years of the course (see above, Section III. 3), as well as the doctoral program in its entirety, which shows **levels of satisfaction that indicate critical issues** to be explored and managed appropriately, given a **lower response rate to the questionnaires** compared to the previous year (a very marked decrease in the case of the PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire). One positive aspect is that the process of computerising the results of the questionnaires has begun, and this guarantees the accuracy of data recording and rapid transmission to stakeholders. One negative aspect is the **high percentage of questionnaires that were handed out and taken on by the students but not finished and left incomplete**, indicating that the length of the questionnaires can sometimes be discouraging and suggesting that a more general reflection on the sustainability of the number and breadth of existing questionnaires and on the clarity and organic nature of the questions contained in them might be valuable (in this regard, we note the repetition of some questions in the PhD Program Evaluation Questionnaire, the lack of clarity of the value and the method of answering some questions in the End-of-Year Questionnaire, and the high level of uncertainty recorded in the Good Practice Questionnaire when even first-year students are asked to evaluate their performance compared to the previous year).

From the point of view of **services**, the expansion of the School's student body of the School raises critical issues regarding accommodation, workstations and the canteen that have already been reported in previous annual reports. In this context, the School is called upon to enhance the assistance provided to students during their period of stay abroad (see the positive development in this sense reported above, IV.2.1.c) and to extend the attention from the School's students enrolled in doctorates for which the School is the administrative office, to the other types of students that gravitate around the School (students undertaking doctorates co-managed by the School, visiting students, etc.), bearing in mind the problematic housing situation in a city like Lucca that is geared towards tourism, and suggesting an improvement of guest services.

Finally, with regard to the **international nature and focus** of the School, the outgoing Committee is pleased to note that the **student component of the new Committee has increased from one to two international students**: this gives greater visibility and enhances the action of an international representation already present within the Committee since 2022. Equally welcome is the strengthening of the PhD Office, with a staff member recruited in 2024 and expressly dedicated to supporting the international mobility of students. However, the School is not only called upon to monitor its degree of international attractiveness and to implement measures to increase it, but also to ensure that international students, once admitted to the School, find **conditions favourable to their full integration into academic life**. In this context, **the focus on the specific services for international students** mentioned in this report (a food offer respectful of the needs of non-Italian cultures, and a procedure for obtaining and renewing residence permits that is as streamlined as possible) represents one voice in a larger chapter, which includes the representation of international students in the School's bodies, opportunities for integration into the social fabric of the host city, and job placements. With this in mind, the Committee hopes that the School will plan a more detailed data collection than that currently available and encourage specific moments of reflection on this issue (such as an *ad hoc* meeting of the bodies and committees responsible for quality assurance; see I.4 above), evaluating whether, for this purpose, it might be appropriate to administer a specific questionnaire for international students, in line the wish expressed by the Committee in its 2023 report.

To ensure that students receive **immediate feedback** on the comments received, to **implement measures that encourage them to turn to the Committee** for matters within its competence, and that allow them to **become fully involved** in the quality assurance processes, the outgoing Committee hopes that this report, like those of previous years, will also be translated into English, made available on the School's website and made the subject of a **public presentation**, open to the entire academic community of the School, in an English-language meeting to be held in the first months of 2025, with a shared social moment at the end of the proceedings, and with this practice to be maintained in the years to come. All the members of the School are invited to this meeting, as an opportunity to exchange views and further reflect on the issues

addressed and as an opportunity to **reiterate to the entire community with the School the prerogatives, tasks and importance of the Committee** within the School's quality assurance system.

Lucca, 19 December 2024

The Outgoing Committee