

**Attachment 3 to Resolution No. 207 of October 15, 2020, by ANVUR Governing Board**

Procedure and methods for the evaluation of  
applications for new private universities  
pursuant to Decree No. 989/2019

## 1. Introduction

This document concerns the evaluation protocol for assessing the ANVUR requirements of for the initial accreditation of new private universities (excluding distance learning universities), as provided for by Ministerial Decree No. 989 of October 25, 2019, relating to the three-year planning period 2019-2021 (see Article 6).

The content of this document also fully implements, in the relevant aspects, the provisions of:

- Legislative Decree No. 19 of January 27, 2012, "Enhancement of the efficiency of universities and the introduction of incentive mechanisms in the distribution of public resources based on pre-defined criteria, including the establishment of a periodic accreditation system for universities and the valorisation of permanent researchers not confirmed in the first year of activity, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 1, letter a), of Law No. 240 of December 30, 2010";
- Ministerial Decree No. 6 of January 7, 2019, "Decree on self-assessment, evaluation, initial and periodic accreditation of universities and their study programmes";
- Directorial Decree No. 147 of February 10, 2020, "Modalities for submitting applications for the establishment of new private universities pursuant to Article 6, paragraph 3, of Ministerial Decree No. 989 of October 25, 2019".

## 2. Specific provisions and requirements

For the initial accreditation of new universities, ANVUR carries out its activities with specific reference to:

- Procedures and tasks established by Article 7 of Legislative Decree No. 19/2012.
- Verifying compliance with the conditions set forth in Article 6, paragraph 3, letters a) and c) of Ministerial Decree No. 989/2019.
- Verifying the possession of the requirements specified in:
  - Article 1, paragraph 2, and Annexes A, B, C, and D of Ministerial Decree No. 6/2019, including with regard to the study programmes for which simultaneous activation is proposed.
  - Directorial Decree of the Ministry of Education, University, and Research (MIUR) No. 147/2020.
  - Annex 8 of the AVA Guidelines for the periodic accreditation of universities and their study programmes, published on 10/08/2017.

### **ARTICLE 7 "ACCREDITATION OF UNIVERSITIES" OF LEGISLATIVE DECREE NO. 19/2012**

With reference to Article 7 of Legislative Decree No. 19/2012, the relevant provisions for the purpose of this evaluation are paragraphs 4 and 7:

1. *University are subject to initial and periodic accreditation, carried out in accordance with the criteria and requirements established by ANVUR.*
2. *Omitted*
3. *The accreditation process for new universities begins with the submission of a request for their establishment to the Ministry, along with the simultaneous accreditation of the study programmes intended to be established at the new university, in compliance with the provisions of the decree issued by*

*the Minister pursuant to Article 1-ter of Decree-Law No. 7 of January 31, 2005, converted, with amendments, by Law No. 43 of March 31, 2005.*

4. *The request, accompanied by the relevant documentation, is transmitted by the Ministry to ANVUR within 30 days of its receipt. ANVUR provides a reasoned opinion on the eligibility for accreditation of the institution and its study programs within 120 days from the receipt of the documentation. For this purpose, ANVUR may rely on the evaluation activities of experts, in accordance with and within the limits of Article 12, paragraph 4, letter d) of the Presidential Decree No. 76 of February 1, 2010. ANVUR may also plan assessments, including on-site visits to the university that has requested the initial accreditation, the costs of which are covered by the Agency budget, without any additional charge on public finances.*
5. *If the Ministry identifies elements that may lead to a different assessment from that of ANVUR, it may request a review of the evaluation with a reasoned request, following the provisions of Article 4, paragraph 2, of Presidential Decree No. 76 of February 1, 2010. ANVUR, within thirty days from the receipt of the Minister's request for further examination, provides a definitive opinion, specifically addressing the elements highlighted in the request for review.*
6. *The Minister, by means of a decree, grants or denies accreditation, based on ANVUR opinion. The decree, in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 5, of Presidential Decree No. 25 of January 27, 1998, indicates the implementation modalities and the timeline for the new university to initiate the establishment process for the new accredited study programmes.*
7. *Failure to obtain initial accreditation precludes any further phase related to the establishment of the new university. The potential negative outcome of the accreditation of one or more study programmes included in the proposal for the establishment of the university precludes any further phase of the process for the establishment of the new program(s), but does not preclude the initial accreditation of the university.*

#### **ARTICLE 6, PARAGRAPH 3, OF MINISTERIAL DECREE NO. 989/2019**

According to article 6, paragraph 3, of Ministerial Decree no. 989/2019, proposals for the establishment of new private universities, aimed at raising the quality of the university system, must comply with the following conditions:

- a. *Documented multi-year research activity by the promoting parties;*
- b. *Study offers related to BA and MA study programmes, excluding programmes belonging to study fields already active within a radius of at least 200 km, and in any case excluding fields where there is no need for increased national study offer (such as law, political science, communication sciences, music, performing arts, fashion, agricultural sciences, and veterinary medicine). For MA study programmes in medicine and surgery, the opinion of the relevant Region must also be obtained, taking into account the specific conditions of study offer in the regional context and their interaction with healthcare;*
- c. *The educational and developmental project of the institution must demonstrate full financial, logistics, and scientific sustainability, without relying on any state contributions. An annual assessment of the university's activities is planned, which includes evaluating the actual implementation of the project that was approved during the initial accreditation. At the conclusion of the initial five-year period, the university will undergo an assessment to determine the successful completion of the educational and developmental project. If the assessment yields a negative outcome, the legally recognized private university will be deactivated and suppressed.*

*By means of a Ministerial decree, based on ANVUR evaluation and taking into account the opinion of the relevant Regional Coordination Committee, as well as the Regions concerned in relation to requests related to medical and healthcare programmes, the initial accreditation or denial thereof of the university and study programmes is determined.*

[Omitted]

*The existing provisions for legally recognized private universities and state universities, regarding the recruitment of teaching staff and accreditation of study offer, including the examination of the university's teaching regulations, apply to universities referred to in this paragraph.*

It is important to note that the Ministry has only forwarded to ANVUR requests related to the establishment of study programmes for degree classes for which no programmes are already active **within a radius of at least 200 km** (in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3, letter b of Ministerial Decree No. 989/2019).

#### **D.M. NO. 6/2019**

The following provisions of the Ministerial Decree 6/2019 are relevant for the purpose of this evaluation activity:

- **Art. 1, paragraph 2.** Definitions: a. Initial accreditation: it refers to the authorization to establish and activate university institutions and Study Programmes, following the verification of the educational, research, structural and organizational requirements, as well as economic and financial sustainability, as specified in Annexes A, B, and D.
- **Annex A**, which specifies the **accreditation requirements for Study Programmes**, including:
  - a) Transparency;
  - b) Teaching requirements;
  - c) Limits on the fragmentation of teaching activities and the diversification of Study Programmes;
  - d) Structural resources;
  - e) Quality Assurance requirements for Study Programmes.
- **Annex B**, which specifies **the requirements for the initial accreditation of universities**, concerning:
  - a. Transparency;
  - b. (Financial, logistics, and scientific) sustainability, with specific reference to the presence of a Quality Assurance system organized according to the relevant ANVUR guidelines.
- **Annex C (Requirements and Quality Indicators for Universities and their Study Programmes)**, which, in point a), specifies the 4 Quality Requirements, providing indicators for each requirement (for detailed information, see Annex 8 of the *AVA Guidelines for the periodic accreditation of universities and study programs*, published on 10/08/2017).
- **Annex D (Reference numbers and maximum number of students and related groupings)**, which needs to be consulted for the class size determination and consequently for the calculation of required teaching staff and structural resources.

#### **MINISTERIAL DECREE 147/2020**

According to MIUR Ministerial Decree No. 147/2020, the proposals, submitted through the online procedure within the specified deadlines, **are evaluated by ANVUR for the purpose of initial accreditation of the universities and their study programs, in accordance with Article 7 of Legislative Decree No. 19/2012, taking into account the indicators specified in Ministerial Decree No. 6 of January 7, 2019.**

In relation to the objectives of **improving the quality of the university system**, which are the purpose of proposals for the establishment of new universities, it is also provided that (see Article 1, paragraph 5):

- a. *The "plans to meet the requirements of minimum teaching staff necessary for the proposed study programmes, exclusively through conventional teaching methods" shall consider "only tenured university professors and university researchers in accordance with the minimum numbers*

- indicated in Annex A of Ministerial Decree No. 6/2019, providing for their gradual appointment in close relation to the number of years of the offered programme."*
- b. *"The number of first year students to be considered for the plan to meet the minimum required teaching staff and for estimating the financial plan based on student contributions" shall not exceed the maximum numbers indicated for each class in Annex D of Ministerial Decree No. 6/2019."*
- c. *The financial plan shall be "prepared with reference to at least the first 7 years of activity" and demonstrate the "university's ability to ensure the full sustainability of its activities regardless of any state contribution."*

Attachment 1 of Ministerial Decree 147/2020 lists the Documentation to be attached by the promoting party to the application for the establishment of a new private University.

## ANNEXES

- Section 1. Evaluation Protocol - New Universities
- Section 2. Evaluation Protocol - New accredited Study Programmes
- Section 3. Operational Procedure for Evaluation

## Section 1 – Evaluation Protocol – New Universities

The objective of the evaluation is to verify the presence of accreditation requirements for the **University** in accordance with the aforementioned regulations, particularly Annexes B, C (as relevant to the location), and D of Ministerial Decree 6/2019, with reference to **Transparency and Sustainability**. It also refers to Annex 8 of the AVA Guidelines for the periodic accreditation of universities and their study programmes, published on 10/08/2017 (with specific reference to the universities).

**Promoting party:**

**Legal representative:**

**Proposed institution (name):**

### **A) Transparency (Annex B - Ministerial Decree 6/2019)**

For the purpose of initial accreditation, the completeness of the following information is verified in the SUA-CdS database:

- Name and general organization;
- Administrative data related to the accreditation process;
- General services for student orientation, tutoring, and job placement;
- Financial support and additional services for student welfare;
- International mobility;
- Data related to student careers (ANS - National Registry of Students and Graduates), staff, facilities, and the university's budget.

For each department of the location, the completeness of the following information is also verified for the purpose of initial accreditation:

- Objectives, human and instrumental resources, and management of the university departments;
- Research results in terms of scientific production, internationalization, competitive grants, and scientific recognition;
- Third mission activities.

### **B) Sustainability (Annex B - Ministerial Decree 6/2019)**

For all universities, including decentralized branches, the following must be ensured:

- Full financial, logistics, and scientific sustainability;
- Adequate teaching and research facilities and equipment, as well as student services consistent with the specific needs of the activated study programmes, including tutoring activities;
- Documented, significant, and adequate (at least five years) research activities, including international research. New decentralized branches can only be accredited after verifying the existence of research centres in the location that are functional to the productive activities of the territory.
- Presence of a Quality Assurance system organized according to the relevant ANVUR guidelines (as specified in Annex C of Ministerial Decree 6/2019 and Annex 8 of the AVA Guidelines for the periodic accreditation of universities and their study programmes, published on 10/08/2017).

## **FINAL OPINION FORMULATION**

The evaluation of the location requirements should be conducted:

- by taking into consideration the "Points of Attention" provided for each requirement;
- based on the analysis of the documents submitted by the promoting party and listed in the following sections, as specified in Attachment 1 of Ministerial Decree 147/2020.

<b>SECTION A: INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROMOTING PARTY</b>	
A.1	<p>Organization:</p> <p>A.1.1 - Deeds of incorporation</p> <p>A.1.2 - Statute</p> <p>A.1.3 - Institutional roles with respective names and CVs</p> <p>A.1.4 - Identity document and CV of the legal representative</p>
A.2	<p>Multi-year research activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Report on the activities carried out in the last five years, including participation in national or international competitive research grants, patents, spin-offs, and international awards or recognition.</li> <li>- CVs and scientific publications of the researchers employed by the promoting party in the last 5 years (maximum 3 per author) with ISBN/ISMN/ISSN or indexed in WOS or Scopus.</li> </ul>
A.3	<p>Financial data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial statements for the years 2017-2018 (Income statement, balance sheet, and accompanying notes).</li> <li>- Budget forecast for the years 2019 and 2020.</li> </ul>

<b>SECTION B: REPORT ON THE PROPOSED UNIVERSITY</b>	
B.1	Information regarding the specific purposes and peculiarities of the proposed initiative.
B.2	Information on organizational principles, governance bodies' structure, and mechanisms for the functioning of academic activities, such as admission procedures, tuition fees, student support initiatives, etc. Additionally, information on research organization and activities.
B.3	Already signed agreements and memoranda of understanding with public and private entities at the local, national, and/or international level.
B.4	Layout of the University's Statute

B.5	Layout of teaching regulation – general section
B.6	Description of the Quality Assurance System

<b>SECTION C: STUDY OFFER</b>	
C.1	Class, study programme name; academic year of first activation (within a maximum of 3 years) - exclusively through conventional methods, in accordance with the provisions of Annex 3 of Ministerial Decree No. 989/2019.
C.2	Annual Accreditation Single Form (SUA-CdS). The mandatory sections are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QUALITY: Presentation and Section A (Learning Objectives)</li> <li>• ADMINISTRATION: Section F (Educational Activities and Teaching Organization)</li> </ul>
C.3	Plan to meet the minimum teaching requirements (Full and associate professors, Type A and B researchers) within the normal duration of study programmes.

<b>SECTION D: FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY (regardless of any public financial contribution)</b>	
D.1	General report on the costs and funding sources for the university, at least for the first 7 years.
D.2	Financial plan of the institution - income statement and balance sheet.

<b>SECTION E: BUILDING RESOURCES</b>	
E.1	List of properties (address, ownership status; planimetry).
E.2	Summary table of available buildings by function (teaching, research, administration, auxiliary and support services, sports facilities).

<b>SECTION F: OPINION</b>	
F.1	Opinion of the competent Regional Coordination Committee for the territory.
F.2	Opinion of the Region (Medicine and Healthcare-related courses).

Therefore, all the requirements indicated in the table below are considered, and for each of them, a reasoned evaluation is made leading to a Positive or Negative Judgment.

#### EVALUATION OF THE UNIVERSITY

REQUIREMENT	EVALUATION
A – TRANSPARENCY	
B1 – FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY	
B2 – LOGISTIC SUSTAINABILITY	
B3 – SCIENTIFIC SUSTAINABILITY	
B4 – QA SYSTEM	

Considering that the establishment of new universities must ensure the improvement of the quality of the university system (as stated in Article 6, paragraph 3 of Ministerial Decree 989/2019), a positive evaluation of the location is obtained if all requirements have received a Positive Judgment. Therefore:

Positive evaluation of the University	When all 5 requirements have received a positive judgment.
Negative evaluation of the University	When there is even a single negative judgment among the 5 requirements.



In case of a positive evaluation, before formulating the final definitive evaluation proposal, it is still necessary to proceed with the on-site visit of the locations indicated by the promoting party in the application to the Ministry. If the outcome of the visit is also positive, the final evaluation is POSITIVE.

**(A) - TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENT**

*Taking into account the legal provisions regarding private universities, it is necessary to verify that the documentation presented allows to have a clear and complete overview of the structure of the promoting party, the objectives, and the regulatory and organizational framework of the proposed university. Particular attention should be given to the clarity of the university's development plan, organization, student services (admission procedures, orientation, tutoring, financial support, and student welfare, international mobility), the personnel that will constitute the university, and the structure of the budget.*

Points of Attention	Main documentary references
Does the documentation provide clear evidence of the institutional and regulatory framework of the <b>promoting party</b> and its relationship with the proposed university? Does the <b>promoting party</b> have appropriate institutional purposes in relation to the establishment proposal of the new university?	A.1, A.3 B.1, B.3, B.4, B.5 E.1, E.2
Does the attached documentation provide a clear representation of the overall structure (organization, locations, facilities, personnel, budget) of the proposed university?	B.1, B.2, B.4, B.5, B.6 C.2 (SUA-CdS of the proposed study programmes) E.1, E.2
Is the Development Plan of the proposed university clearly and comprehensively defined? Is it consistent with the organizational structure, the Quality Assurance System, and the resources allocated in the financial plan? Is it adequately supported by already signed agreements and memoranda of understanding with public and private entities at the local, national, and/or international level? Does it allow for annual monitoring of activities and evaluation at the end of the first five years?	A.1 B.2, B.4, B.5, B.6 D.2
Are the roles and responsibilities of the organizational structures clearly defined?	A.1 B.6
Are the key aspects of student interest clearly defined (admission and enrolment procedures, financial benefits, student welfare, orientation, study programs, tutoring, mobility, job placement)?	B.4, B.5, B.6 C.2

**MOTIVATED JUDGMENT A - TRANSPARENCY**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Positive Judgment	
Negative Judgment	

## (B) – SUSTAINABILITY REQUIREMENTS

*The verification of full financial, logistics, scientific sustainability, as well as the educational and developmental project of the university, should be developed through a detailed analysis of the following elements.*

### B.1. Verification of full economic and financial sustainability

The full economic and financial sustainability of the educational and developmental project of the university should:

- Be supported by the documentation provided by the promoting party.
- Be independent of any state contribution, even in the long term.
- Be substantiated by a financial plan prepared with reference to at least the first 7 years of activity.

#### *Objective B.1 - Verification of Full Economic and Financial Sustainability*

*The proposal for the establishment of the university must ensure full asset, economic, and financial sustainability, based on the structure and reliability of revenues and costs, and complete independence from any state contributions. It is necessary to verify the institutional qualification and solidity of the promoting party. The financial plan should adequately and consistently reflect what is described in the proposal for the establishment of the university, with reference to the expected development in the first 7 years of activity, and be developed in compliance with the regulations concerning non-state universities.*

Points of Attention	Main documentary references
Are the financial relationships between the promoting party and the university clear and properly defined?	A.1, A.3 B.1, B.2, B.3, B.4 D.1, D.2
Does the promoting party demonstrate a solid financial and economic position that is also suitable for the proposed university.	A.3 D.1, D.2
Is the financial plan consistent with the organizational, educational, scientific, and logistics development of the university, as stated in the attached documentation?	B.1, B.2, B.3, B.4, B.5, B.6 D.1, D.2 E.1, E.2
Does the financial plan of the university take into account all revenue and cost items that characterize the activity of a private university? Does the forecast of revenues and costs ensure economic and financial balance? Has it been developed with motivated and reliable projections, with reference to the first 7 years of activity?	B.1, B.2 D.1, D.2
Are the costs for student support policies and student welfare adequately assessed and consistent with the expected number of enrolments?	B.1, B.2, B.3, B.4, B.5, B.6 D.1, D.2
Is there a gradual recruitment of tenured professors and researchers to ensure the quantitative and qualitative sustainability of the study programmes, reaching at least the minimum numbers specified in Annex A of Ministerial Decree 6/2019?	B.1, B.2, B.3, B.6 D.1, D.2

## MOTIVATED JUDGMENT B1 - SUSTAINABILITY REQUIREMENTS

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Positive Judgment	
Negative Judgment	

### B.2. VERIFICATION OF FULL LOGISTICS SUSTAINABILITY

The verification by the CEV of the full logistics sustainability of the educational and developmental project of the University is based on the analysis of the building and instrumental resources, educational and research facilities, and student services (classrooms, electronic classrooms, student study spaces, libraries, laboratories, IT infrastructure, administrative offices, etc.) and should:

- Be supported by the documentation provided by the promoting entity;
- Be consistent with the specific needs of the study programmes that are intended to be offered, including tutoring activities.
- Be demonstrated by the adequacy and coherence of the structural resources provided by the promoting party for the implementation of the educational and scientific project of the university, and by the temporal evolution of this adequacy for a duration covering the planned financial period of 7 years.
- Be related to the size of the student population, estimated with reference to its evolution over the 7 years covered by the financial plan.

#### *Objective B.2 - Verification of Full Logistic Sustainability*

*It is necessary to ensure that the location has an organization and infrastructure that are appropriate and consistent with the proposed scientific and educational project.*

Points of Attention	Main documentary references
Are the facilities and spaces for teaching and research (classrooms, laboratories, libraries, equipment) clearly identified and suitable for the educational and scientific project, as well as for the size of the academic community and student population, taking into account their potential growth and evolution?	B.1, B.2, B.3, D.1, D.2, E.1, E.2
Are the facilities and spaces for administrative and auxiliary services are clearly identified and appropriate for the organizational and scientific structure of the university?	B.1, B.2, B.3, D.1, D.2, E.1, E.2
Does the institutional proposal of the university adequately consider the availability of residential services and canteens for students, also through agreements with external parties?	B.1, B.2, B.3, D.1, D.2, E.1, E.2
Are the properties included in the proposal available to the new University? Do the ownership titles guarantee continuity in their utilization?	E.1, E.2

### MOTIVATED JUDGMENT B2 – LOGISTIC SUSTAINABILITY

.....

.....

.....

.....

Positive Judgment	
Negative Judgment	

### B.3. VERIFICATION OF FULL SCIENTIFIC SUSTAINABILITY

The scientific sustainability of the educational and developmental project for the University should:

- Highlight a significant and adequate research activity by the promoting party, for at least five years, with an international level of quality.
- Be consistent with the proposed study offer and assessable through the evaluation of the adequacy of faculty members, both in terms of numbers and qualifications, to support the needs of the study programme, considering both scientific content and educational organization.
- Demonstrate the impact on the improvement of research quality within the university system, taking into account the international context, which is essential for research activities.
- Highlight the impact, in terms of third mission activities, of the proposed teaching and research activities, both in the relevant territory and in the overall enhancement of the university system's quality.

#### *Objective B.3 - Verification of Full Scientific Sustainability*

*Ensure the presence of a significant and adequate research activity by the promoting party, for at least five years and of an international level, consistent with the proposed educational project and supported by faculty members who are suitable in terms of quantity and qualification to meet the study programme needs.*

Points of Attention	Main documentary references
Are the CVs of the faculty members presented by the promoting party related to researchers who have been employed by the promoting party in the last five years?	A.2
Is there a significant and adequate research activity carried out by the promoting party for at least five years? Is it also carried out at an international level?	A.2
Is the research activity carried out by the promoting party for at least five years? Are the scientific publications of the researchers employed by the party qualitatively and quantitatively consistent with the proposed educational project?	A.2 C.1, C.2
Are the faculty members specified in the Implementation Plan collectively appropriate, in terms of quantity, role, and scientific qualification (verified through their respective scientific-disciplinary sectors), to support the needs of the proposed study programmes, taking into account their scientific content?	C.1, C.2, C.3
In relation to the proposed University, are objective criteria defined within the quality system for quantifying the needs and allocating resources?	B.6

### MOTIVATED JUDGMENT – SCIENTIFIC SUSTAINABILITY

.....

.....

.....

.....

Positive Judgment	
Negative Judgment	

#### B.4. VERIFICATION OF THE PRESENCE OF A QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM

The verification of the presence of a Quality Assurance System at the proposed University, organized according to the relevant ANVUR guidelines, should be developed based on Requirements R1, R2, and R4 mentioned in point a) of Annex C of Decree Law 6/2019 and Annex 8 of the AVA Guidelines for the periodic accreditation of Universities and Study Programmes published on August 10, 2017.

The verification should take into account that, dealing with new universities and not new decentralized branches, not all elements mentioned in Annex C of Decree Law 6/2019 and Annex 8 of the AVA Guidelines can be applicable. The verification should, therefore, be limited to:

**Requirement R1: Vision, strategies, and university policies regarding the quality of teaching and research.**

The promoting party must demonstrate that it has developed ex novo (in the case of a new institution without reference to existing universities) or adapted (in the case of a new institution with reference to existing universities) a solid and coherent Quality Assurance (QA) system for teaching and research. This system supports continuous improvement and strengthens accountability towards external stakeholders. It includes the preparation of guidelines and strategic planning. The QA system ensures coherence between the strategic vision, centrally defined objectives, and their implementation in terms of policies, internal organization, utilization of teaching and research potential, results, periodic assessment, and implementation of improvement measures.

**Requirement R2: Effectiveness of university QA policies.** The University's QA system, as described by the promoting party in the relevant documentation, must be structured ensure effectiveness in terms of defining internal responsibilities, information flows, and interactions between responsible structures and their roles in managing evaluation and self-assessment processes.

**Requirement R4: Quality of research and third mission activities.** The QA system for research and third mission activities described in the proposal of the new university must be effective, with policy orientations defined by the University and pursued by the Departments and/or other equivalent structures responsible for research and third mission management.

*Objective B.4 - Verification of the Presence of a Quality Assurance (QA) System*

*It is necessary to ascertain that the promoting entity has established a:*

- *Robust QA system for ensuring the quality of teaching and research, explicitly outlined in guiding documents and strategic planning.*
- *Coherent system aligned with its political, organizational, educational, and research vision.*
- *Effective system in terms of defining internal responsibilities and managing information flows.*

*The QA system should also be pursued by the Departments and/or other equivalent structures that have the competence and role in research and third mission activities management.*

Points of Attention	Main documentary references
Has the promoting party defined its clear and articulated vision of the quality of teaching and research, along with the policies for its implementation, considering the complex interrelationships between them? Does this vision take into account the potential for development and the impact within the socio-cultural context? Does it also consider all cycles of the proposed study programmes?	B.1, B.2, B.4, B.5, B.6

Is the strategic planning structured with clearly defined, achievable, and verifiable objectives that take into account the socio-cultural context, the missions and potential for scientific development of the University, the ministerial programming, and the necessary and available resources?	B.1, B.2, B.4, B.5, B.6
Has the promoting party an overall vision of the structure of the proposed study offer and its development potential, which is consistent with its policies and takes into account the needs of stakeholders and the territorial, national, and international context of reference?	B.2, B.4, B.5, B.6
Has the promoting party ensured that the design of the proposed study programmes takes into account the development needs expressed by society and the relevant (scientific, technological, and socioeconomic) context? Has this been achieved through consultations with a suitable range of stakeholders and/or by utilizing sector studies?	B.2, B.4, B.5, B.6, C.1, C.2
Has the promoting party ensured that, during the design phase of the study programs, the connection between the available scientific expertise and the educational objectives has been emphasized? If the University has an international orientation, have initiatives been planned to promote the internationalization of the overall study offering?	B.4, B.5, B.6 C.2 (SUA-CdS of new study programmes)
Has the promoting party defined an overall strategy to ensure the quality of research and third mission activities?	B.1, B.2, B.3, B.4, B.5, B.6, D.1
Has the promoting party planned for the presence of appropriate bodies and structures to achieve its objectives, in accordance with the regulations for private universities? Are the tasks and responsibilities of the involved bodies and structures clearly defined?	A.1 B.2, B.4, B.5, B.6

**MOTIVATED JUDGMENT - QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Positive Judgment	
Negative Judgment	



VALUTAZIONE FINALE

REQUIRMENTS	FINAL EVALUATION
A – TRANSPARENCY	
B1 – FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY	
B2 – LOGISTIC SUSTAINABILITY	
B3 – SCIENTIFIC SUSTAINABILITY	
B4 – QA SYSTEM	

Motivated Judgment of the final CEV opinion

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ONLY IN THE CASE OF A POSITIVE ASSESSMENT, AN ON-SITE VISIT TO THE UNIVERSITY IS REQUIRED

The purpose of the visit is to verify the actual state of the facilities in relation to the information provided in the attached documents. The actual state of the visited facilities should be consistent with the declarations made in the documentation and confirm the adequacy of the structure and coherence of the resources provided by the promoting party for the implementation of the University educational and scientific project. The adequacy of the facilities should also be evaluated in relation to the development plan outlined by the University for the first 7 years and its corresponding economic and financial plan.

Definitive Evaluation following the on-site visit:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

## Section 2 - Evaluation Protocol - Study Program Proposals

Promoting party:

Study programme:

Degree Class of the Study Program:

Main regulatory references for the evaluation of new Study Programmes:

DM 6/2019	Annex A - Accreditation requirements for Study Programmes with reference to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Transparency;</li> <li>b. Teaching requirements;</li> <li>c. Limits on the fragmentation of teaching activities and diversification of study programmes;</li> <li>d. Structural resources;</li> <li>e. Quality Assurance requirements for Study Programmes.</li> </ul>
DM 6/2019	Annex C - Requirement R3 and Quality indicators of the Study Programmes
DM 6/2019	Annex D - Reference numbers and maximum limits of students and their respective groups.
Decreto Direttoriale 147/2020	Annex A - Section C: Study Offer Note: It is mandatory to complete the sections of the SUA-CdS: QUALITY: Presentation and Section A (Learning Objectives) ADMINISTRATION: Section F (Training Activities and Teaching Regulation)

For proposals of new institutions, the CUS opinion on Teaching Regulation has not been requested.

Main documentary references to be analysed for the evaluation of new Study Programmes:

SUA-CdS	Presentation Section (General information about the program; Contacts and Structures; Brief overview of the study program)
SUA-CdS	Section A - Training Objectives (QUALITY) (Table A1.a; Tables A2, A3, A4; A5)
SUA-CdS	Section F - Training Activities and Teaching Regulation (ADMINISTRATION)
CINECA Platform	B.5 - University Teaching Regulation - General Part; Section E - Building Resources (Tables E.1 and E.2)

The verification of the presence of a Quality Assurance System at the University, organized according to the relevant ANVUR guidelines, should be developed based on Requirement R3 mentioned in point a) of Annex C of Decree Law 6/2019 and Annex 8 of the AVA Guidelines for the periodic accreditation of Universities and Study Programmes published on August 10, 2017.

The verification should be conducted considering that, as new universities and not new decentralized branches, not all elements mentioned in Annex C of Decree Law 6/2019 and Annex 8 of the AVA Guidelines can be applicable. Therefore, the verification should be limited to:

**Requirement R3: Quality of Study Programmes.** The objectives identified during the design of the study programmes should be consistent with cultural, scientific, and social needs, taking into account the characteristics that distinguish bachelor's and master's study programmes. Each programme should ensure the availability of adequate teaching resources, personnel, and services. Monitoring of results, strategies for correction and improvement, and student-centred learning should also be considered.

The verification of this point will be based on the combination of what can be found in the Quality Assurance System documentation prepared for the university and the information provided in Section A of the Quality Frame and Section F of the Administrative Frame of the SUA-CdS related to the presented study programmes.

Guidelines for the formulation of the final proposal.

Positive evaluation of the study programme	When all three requirements receive a positive evaluation
Negative evaluation of the study programme	When there is at least one negative evaluation for any of the three requirements.

\*\*\*

Objective I: Verify the reasons for the activation of the Study Programme. Verify that the cultural and professional profiles of graduates are clearly defined.

Points of attention	Main documentary references
Do the reasons for activating the Study Programme justify this decision? Are the identified objectives consistent with cultural, scientific, and social needs?	The study programme in brief (Presentation) A2.a, A4.a, A4.b.1, A4.b.2, A4.c
Are the consulted stakeholders adequate in terms of quantity and representativeness, taking into account their actual involvement in the design of the study programme?	A1.a
Are the cultural and professional profiles, functions, and competencies clearly defined and consistent with each other?	Il corso di studi in breve (Presentazione) A2.a, A4.a, A4.b.1, A4.b.2, A4.c
Is the educational path clearly described and consistent with the cultural and professional profiles of the graduates?	A2.a
Does the educational organization comply with the Decree on Degree Classes?	SUA-CdS Section F
Are the learning outcomes clearly defined and consistent with the cultural and professional profiles?	A4 e A2.a
Are there assessment methods (exams and final assessments) in place consistent with the educational objectives of the course?	A4

Motivated Judgment for Objective 1 - Motivations, cultural and professional profiles

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Positive Judgment	
Negative Judgment	

Objective II: Ensure that the Study Programme promotes student-centred teaching, taking into account the international dimension, and encourages the use of flexible methodologies while properly assessing knowledge and skills.

Points of Attention	Main documentary references
<u>Only for three-year Bachelor's programmes or Single-Cycle Master's programmes:</u> Are the required entry-level knowledge clearly defined? Are the procedures for overcoming any knowledge deficiencies (OFA) clearly described?	A3
<u>Only for Master's programmes:</u> Are the admission requirements clearly defined? Are the methods for verifying these requirements indicated (e.g., for students coming from different disciplinary fields or from other universities)?	A3
Are the orientation activities (upon entry, during the programme, and upon completion) described, which promote informed choices by students? Is there an adequate tutoring service?	B.5 Scheme of the University Teaching Regulation - General Part
Are there educational pathways and support initiatives in place to promote the participation of different types of students (e.g., support tutoring, dedicated programs for highly motivated and deserving students, athlete students, international students, students with specific needs such as working students, students with disabilities, students with young children)?	B.5 Scheme of the University Teaching Regulation - General Part
<u>Only for internationally-oriented courses:</u> Are there appropriate initiatives and tools in place to promote an international dimension in teaching? Does the Study Programme encourage an international learning experience (e.g., cooperation agreements with foreign universities for joint study programme design, support for student mobility, presence of international students, course delivery in a foreign language, presence of foreign faculty members in the study programme)?	B.5 Scheme of the University Teaching Regulation - General Part

Motivated Judgment for Objective 2 – Student Centred teaching

.....

.....

.....

.....

Positive Judgment	
Negative Judgment	

Objective III: Verify that the Study Program has an adequate number of teaching staff, technical-administrative personnel, and suitable facilities to meet the educational needs.

Points of Attention	Main documentary references
Is the Faculty Recruitment Plan adequate in terms of quantity (Article 4, paragraph 2 of Decree Law 6/2019 and Article 1, paragraph 5 of Decree 147/2020), role, and scientific qualification (verified through the relevant disciplinary area) to ensure the recruitment of professors capable of guaranteeing the full quantitative and qualitative sustainability of the study programme? Does the Faculty Recruitment Plan only consider permanent university professors and researchers, according to the minimum numbers indicated in Annex A of Decree Law No. 6/2019?	C.3
Are the facilities for teaching (classrooms, laboratories, libraries, equipment) and administrative services provided by the promoting party adequate for the needs of the educational project and the expected number of students, taking into account the projected growth of student numbers in the first 7 years of activity?	E.1 e E.2

Motivated assessment for Objective 3 - Resources

.....

.....

.....

.....

Positive Judgment	
Negative Judgment	

\*\*\*

### FINAL EVALUATION

REQUIRMENT	FINAL EVALUATION
Objective I – Motivations, cultural and professional profiles	
Objective II – Student- centred teaching	
Objective III – Resources	

Motivated Judgment of the CEV final opinion:

.....

.....

.....

.....

## Sezione 3 – Evaluation Procedure

The Evaluation Expert Panel (CEV), appointed by ANVUR for the evaluation of proposals for new private universities (excluding distance learning universities) and new Study Programmes, is composed of:

- CEV President;
- System Experts - serving as Supervisor for Sub-CEVs;
- Economic-Financial Sustainability Expert;
- Student Expert;
- Disciplinary Experts.

All Experts are selected from ANVUR Evaluation Expert Register.

The CEV is responsible for remotely examining the documentation related to the institution and the Study Programmes prepared by the promoting party, conducting on-site visits, and collectively drafting and approving a final report.

The CEV must organize itself into sub-commissions (Sub-CEVs) for the different accredited institutions.

For each application, an evaluation protocol is prepared for the institution and a separate evaluation protocol for each proposed new Study Programme.

The necessary documentary sources for the examination are referenced in the protocols and are available on the platform: <https://miur.cineca.it/ANVUR/index.html>

The System Experts and the Student Expert, each in their respective areas of expertise, prepare the institution evaluation protocol related to Requirements A (Transparency Verification), B.1 (Full Economic-Financial Sustainability Verification), B.2 (Full Logistic Sustainability Verification), B.3 (Full Scientific Sustainability Verification), B.4 (Verification of the presence of a Quality Assurance System).

The Disciplinary Experts prepare the evaluation protocol for each assigned Study Programme.

**The evaluation activity must be conducted with a comprehensive approach and be primarily based on criteria of coherence and feasibility of the presented project.**

### **Coherence:**

The project must aim to improve the quality of the university system and demonstrate substantial coherence between different scientific and educational objectives. Therefore, the project's ability to fully integrate different planned activities such as teaching, research, third mission, recruitment, and investment in research and educational infrastructure is crucial.

### **Feasibility:**

The feasibility criterion is essential for the project's fulfilment. It assesses the method, reliability, and functionality in the medium-term use of resources concerning planned development actions.

\*\*\*

### **The Role of the CEV President**

The President of the CEV, selected from the System Experts of the AVA Register, will coordinate the work of all the involved Experts and submit to ANVUR Governing Board: the institution evaluation protocol; the evaluation protocol for each Study Programme for which the promoting party requests accreditation.

The final report, for each application, must be collectively evaluated and approved by the entire CEV, taking into account the preliminary analysis carried out by the different CEV components.

The CEV President is responsible for defining, meeting ANVUR's deadlines, the timing and deliverables for the CEV Experts and assigning specific points of attention/objectives, both at the institution and Study Programme level, in a comparative perspective, to the Student Expert.

The coordination and guidance role of the President also involves ensuring that all the Protocols are correct and consistent, also from the formal point of view. He/She also verifies the cited documentation, aiming at a clear and effective communication. The President had the duty to review the work of the System Experts, Disciplinary Experts, Economic-Financial Sustainability Expert, and Student Expert. He may suggest any necessary or appropriate modifications.

### **The Role of the System Expert**

The System Expert, selected from the System Experts of the AVA Register, is responsible for coordinating the work of the Disciplinary Experts in their Sub-CEV and preparing the institution evaluation protocol, including the following verifications:

- Verification of Transparency (A);
- Verification of full Economic-Financial Sustainability (B.1), supported by the Economic-Financial Sustainability Expert;
- Verification of full Logistic Sustainability (B.2), in preliminary coordination with the Student Expert;
- Verification of full Scientific Sustainability (B.3);
- Verification of the presence of a Quality Assurance System (B.4), in preliminary coordination with the Student Expert.

The System Expert is the Supervisor of each Sub-CEV and adopts procedures to ensure thorough and collective evaluations within their Sub-CEV, providing guidance and managing delivery times.

The Sub-CEV supervisor must verify that the contents of the evaluations of the individual Study Programmes are consistent with the evaluation protocol.

The Sub-CEV supervisor submits the disciplinary protocol to the CEV President.

The coordination and guidance role of the Sub-CEV supervisor also involves ensuring the correctness and consistency, also from the formal point of view. He/She also verifies the cited documentation, aiming at a clear and effective communication. It is within the responsibilities of the supervisor to review the work of the experts in their Sub-CEV and, if necessary, he/she may suggest any necessary or appropriate modifications.

### **The Role of the System Expert responsible for the verification of full Economic-Financial Sustainability**

The System Expert responsible for providing support to the CEV regarding the verification of full Economic-Financial Sustainability is selected from the System Experts of the AVA Register who possess specific financial expertise. For each application, they collaborate in the preparation of the evaluation protocol's section concerning the verification of Requirement B.1. With regard to the economic-financial aspects related to student-related dimensions, they may collaborate with the Student Expert.

### **The Role of the Student Expert**

The Student Expert, selected from the Student Experts of the AVA Register, contributes to the preparation of the institution evaluation protocol for all applicants, particularly in the following verifications:

- Verification of full Logistic Sustainability (B.2), in preliminary coordination with the System Expert.
- Verification of the presence of a Quality Assurance System (B.4), in preliminary coordination with the System Expert.



- Upon request from the System Expert responsible for the verification of economic-financial sustainability, the Student Expert provides his/her contribution, specifically regarding the student-related parts.
- Upon request from the CEV President or other Experts, they provide their contribution to the evaluations.

The Student Expert must transmit his/her areas of expertise to each System Expert, who integrates his/her evaluations.

### **The Role of the Disciplinary Expert**

The Disciplinary Expert, selected from the Disciplinary Experts of the AVA Register, is part of one or more Sub-CEVs and is primarily responsible for evaluating the Study Programme.

The assignment is done vertically: ANVUR assigns one or more Study Programmes to each Disciplinary Expert, who has the task of analysing all the documentation submitted by the promoting party and preparing the evaluation protocol. The Disciplinary Expert must transmit the evaluation protocol of the Study Programme to the System Expert - Sub-CEV supervisor. The Sub-CEV supervisor, after verifying the protocol, transmits the evaluations to the CEV President.

\*\*\*

All meetings of the CEV and among its members can be conducted online.