

# The Students' Role in Quality Assurance Process

Simone Campanella

**Abstract**—Over the last ten years, the role of Students within Quality Assurance (QA) systems has evolved from mere consultation to active and structured participation, becoming a central element in the design, review and evaluation of the educational offer. In national contexts such as the AVA model, and considering the 2015 ESG, Student participation is today recognised as a lever to improve the transparency, relevance and quality of teaching activities.

Alongside generalized participation, this article highlights the specific contribution of Students with expertise in evaluation, who are engaged in evaluative processes in collaboration with ANVUR and play a strategic role both in internal evaluation (self-assessment of degree programmes, monitoring of learning outcomes, structured feedback) and in external evaluation (peer review, periodic site visits, evaluation committees). Students involved in self-assessment processes help to identify perceived levels of competence and to reduce the self-referentiality inherent in self-evaluation, thereby enhancing the quality of the data collected and fostering practices of co-design and accountability.

Through a critical analysis of practices and tools, the article demonstrates how the systematic integration of Students participating in internal processes together with Student evaluation experts strengthens the effectiveness of the QA system, promoting a shared and sustainable culture of quality within the University.

**Keywords**— ANVUR, Internal QA, Quality Assurance, Students, Student-Centered approach.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the 1990s, a process of reforming higher education known as the "Bologna Process" has been underway. Its implementation has required the convergence of national systems towards uniform quality standards, conceiving quality as a lever for process improvement and promoting the creation of a European Higher Education Area (EHEA).

Università degli Studi di Macerata, Marche.

Simone Campanella is with Università degli Studi del Molise, CB 86100 ITA (corresponding author to provide phone: 335 166 6640; e-mail: [author@simone.campanella@unimol.it](mailto:author@simone.campanella@unimol.it)).

According to the 2010 OECD report, significant changes have taken place in the global higher education landscape in recent years: "with the massification, commodification and diversification of the Student body, education is now [...] an important driver and indicator of competitiveness". In this context, many countries have implemented policies to promote and enhance professional development based on relevant teaching. However, these new reforms have not always focused on the link between quality assurance and teaching improvement. In fact, the OECD's 2020 review highlights this very issue, stating that "quality assurance rarely encompasses the quality of teaching" (p. 26). However, "quality" is a polysemic term that is difficult to interpret [10] [20].

Despite this, higher education has managed to orient teaching development programmes towards developing a deeper understanding of the pedagogy of quality<sup>1</sup> [16] oriented towards an increasingly Student-centred vision.

According to Oinam (2017, p. 27), quality education meets the needs of Students and contributes to promoting their development. In this sense, the role of the teacher is important because, in order to be effective, they must be able to guide Students to explore a new topic from different perspectives, stimulating reflection and dialogue. The focus then shifts to the Students, orienting the approach towards a Student-centred vision.

In Italy, for example, with the evaluation processes promoted by ANVUR, quality teaching becomes "effective" teaching, in which the role of Faculty Development, TLC and Student participation in Quality Assurance (QA) processes take on a significant dimension in academic contexts. It is in this dimension that the central role of the Student reaches its peak: no longer a mere user of a service but a stakeholder in a *semplezzo*<sup>2</sup> process.

Students thus become active participants in a complex process capable of providing functional feedback to the Internal QA process, with a view to guiding the improvement actions promoted by the University's governance. Quality Assurance, therefore, is established as a central and shared mechanism at European level, a pillar for international cooperation in Higher Education (HE). The adoption of the European Standards Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) represented a turning

<sup>1</sup>In this context, the term "quality" refers to a "transformative process" that reflects the development of academic programmes and initiatives promoted by the Teaching and Learning Centres (TLCs).

<sup>2</sup>According to neurophysiologist Alain Berthoz, *semplezzo* is the strategy by which extremely complex systems manifest themselves through simplified and rapid processes.

point in European cooperation in the university sector<sup>3</sup>, establishing shared principles and standards for QA procedures and aligning national regulatory frameworks.

The aim of the ESG is to define a new approach to Quality Assurance so that the effectiveness of internal QA mechanisms can be evaluated. Subsequent revisions of the ESG, particularly in 2015, in line with the "Common Framework for Quality and Quality Assurance in Higher Education" developed by the E<sub>4</sub><sup>4</sup> consortium (ENQA, ESU, EUA, EURASHE), have strengthened their role, harmonised European Higher Education systems and influencing national policies. The ESG therefore represent a central element of QA in Europe, not only because they establish shared principles and standards, but also because they guide Quality Assurance towards common concepts, objectives and tools for their implementation.

Through a critical analysis of practices and tools, this contribution aims to analyse the evolution of the role of Students included in QA policies, in accordance with ESG standards, with reference to objective 2, part 3 of the official document entitled "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance Agencies". It also aims to highlight the participation and role of Students in the transformative processes of university education, outlining how they have redefined the value of a shared and sustainable culture of quality within universities.

## II. QUALITY ASSURANCE IN EUROPE

Students have consistently played a central role in promoting quality assurance processes since their integration into the Bologna Process. The fundamental reasons for including this process go beyond mere bureaucratic compliance: it is in fact conceived as a continuous process of critical analysis of the education system, aimed at promoting the improvement of the quality of degree programmes through the identification of strengths and areas for improvement [19].

The involvement of Students in Quality Assurance (QA) processes in Europe, as enshrined in the ESG, has played a decisive role in consolidating a shared and participatory culture of quality within Higher Education. Their participation has helped to make QA systems more inclusive and transparent, promoting an approach geared towards the continuous improvement of educational programmes.

Students, recognised as key stakeholders, make an essential contribution to assessing the effectiveness of teaching processes, the adequacy of services and the consistency between educational objectives and learning outcomes. This involvement not only allows for more accurate identification

of areas for improvement but also strengthens the legitimacy and credibility of the assessment processes, ensuring a balanced representation of the different perspectives within the university system. In this way, Student participation is an essential element in the construction of a QA system capable of responding effectively and sustainably to the needs of the academic community and society.

The Students' perspective sometimes differs radically from that of experts in the field, lecturers or external evaluators. As also reported in the document published by ENQA "QA-Fit" and published by the E<sub>4</sub> Consortium [6], their perspective has revealed that, in various contexts, the implementation of quality assurance procedures presents critical issues due to an overly formal application of processes or overly broad interpretations of indicators and standards, which reduce their effectiveness and substantial value.

In many cases, this distance stems from overly formalised procedures and the sometimes rigid or abstract application of quality indicators and standards, which risk losing their substantive value and their function of effectively improving training programmes. In relation to the findings of the "QA-Fit" document, Students point to the need for a more participatory approach that is genuinely oriented towards continuous improvement, in which quality is perceived as a shared and meaningful process. Greater integration of the Students' point of view in the design and evaluation of QA policies could help to make these practices more effective, inclusive and consistent with the educational mission of academic institutions, thus promoting a culture of genuinely participatory quality.

Students' perception of QA processes, often characterised by a certain distance from their direct educational experience, can be understood in the light of the concept of a culture of quality. As highlighted by Del Gobbo [9], the term "culture" refers to a set of shared values, norms and practices that configure quality not as a mere system of procedures, but as a collective responsibility of all members of the academic institution.

In this perspective, QA should not be limited to a formal exercise of control or regulatory compliance but should become a dynamic process capable of involving Students, teachers and technical-administrative staff in a process of continuous improvement.

The adoption of models such as the Common Assessment Framework (CAF) in European universities highlights this drive for continuous improvement and learning from

<sup>3</sup>The ESG was the first policy document adopted by higher education ministers in which the central role was given to the stakeholders (E<sub>4</sub> consortium) promoting the proposal. Secondly, it promoted concrete commitments between different national jurisdictions, creating a coherent system based on well-structured cause-and-effect relationships to ensure its implementation [11].

<sup>4</sup>The E<sub>4</sub> Consortium is made up of the main associations promoting QA at European level, including the European Student Union, founded in 2009. The

establishment of this pool of experts, selected from among the best students already involved in QA processes in their countries of origin, promotes student participation in QA across Europe, providing students with a cross-cutting view of QA policies. The ESU also organises study sessions and workshops to train students to debate, share opinions and learn about QA processes and policymaking.

experience, through the Deming Cycle<sup>5</sup> [12]. The aim is to ensure high quality and economic standards by enhancing organisational and individual results and performance [12].

In this sense, QA contributes to the definition of policies and strategies, the management of resources and processes, and the monitoring of results, with the ultimate goal of creating public value and responding effectively to the needs of the world of work and society. It is a tool for organisational awareness and learning, capable of activating reflective processes and strengthening the link between universities and society, guiding the University towards a vision of sustainable human growth and development, drawing on the principles of the CRUI's first experience, "Campus One".

The publication of complete, up-to-date and easily accessible information on the objectives, training programme, resources, results and management system of the degree programme (Requirement E4) is fundamental for QA. This process is essential for "identifying problems, examining them in depth and implementing solutions that ensure high-quality training that responds to contemporary challenges" [1].

### III. QUALITY ASSURANCE IN ITALY

Since the Bologna Process, the framework for Quality Assurance (QA) has established a solid system to promote Student participation, with the aim of safeguarding the interests of the entire Student community.

In Italy, QA policies have undergone a progressive evolution rooted in the early initiatives promoted by the Conference of Italian University Rectors (CRUI), culminating in the establishment of ANVUR in 2006. In this context, the CRUI has assumed a role of considerable importance as a forerunner of quality practices and standards which, in turn, have guided national reforms, shaping the competences and operational tools of ANVUR.

A specific focus in this evolutionary process concerns the development of Student involvement in QA processes: from being mere recipients of evaluations to becoming active participants capable of contributing to the definition of indicators and procedures. Indeed, over the past ten years, the engagement of the Student body has undergone a profound transformation. Initially, under the first AVA programme (Self-Assessment, Evaluation, Accreditation), also known as AVA1, Students were involved merely as stakeholders in QA processes. With the second programme, AVA2, the approach changed as Students began to actively participate in the Evaluation Units and in QA bodies and committees. This evolution culminated in the current AVA3 programme, in which Students play an active role in both evaluation and self-evaluation processes, encouraging the entire academic community to reimagine itself through a Student-Centered vision.

Having a comprehensive understanding of the institutional and cultural developments that have shaped the current AVA system makes it possible to appreciate the challenges and prospects for further enhancing Student participation and continuous improvement of academic quality. The transition from the first AVA1 programme to the current AVA3 reveals a shift from a primarily formal to a substantive form of participation: Students are no longer merely consulted; their opinions and contributions are effectively integrated into decision-making and improvement processes. This integration transforms Student input into concrete governance practices, capable of making the QA system collaborative and education Centered.

Furthermore, the establishment of a system grounded in a culture of Quality has enabled the internal structures of universities (such as the Evaluation Unit, the Quality Assurance Office, and the Joint Teaching-Student Committees) to be equipped with clearly defined roles and effective operational tools. These structures translate Student participation into monitoring, feedback, innovation, and genuine improvement. Finally, supporting this entire process is the systematic integration of Student opinions, an explicit requirement within the AVA3 guidelines, which represents a key indicator of progress toward an academic model that not only promotes quality but also shares and experiences it as a common and collective dimension.

### IV. THE STUDENTS' ROLE

The role of Students in QA processes has been progressively recognized and strengthened throughout all phases of the evolution of QA models, in Italy and in Europe, "moving from mere consultation to active and participatory involvement" [17]. The participatory approach to evaluation consists in the involvement of Students in representative bodies with a view to co-designing and updating Internal QA processes [8]. Their involvement in information management processes recalls the more general theme of the \*Student Voice\* in evaluation processes. The attention to the \*Student Voice\* by higher education institutions is in continuous improvement, as also demonstrated by the growing rate of interest in this topic and its related applications for the enhancement of educational pathways [8].

This attention progressively translates into an institutional recognition of the value of Student participation not only as a right but also as a strategic resource for educational and organizational innovation. The \*Student Voice\*, in fact, represents the possibility for Students to express opinions, proposals, and evaluations concerning their educational experience, contributing actively to the construction of a truly participatory quality system. From this perspective, universities are called to develop tools and practices that make

<sup>5</sup>The Deming Cycle is an iterative management method divided into four phases (Plan-Do-Check-Act), used for the continuous improvement of processes and products. It involves identifying a problem, defining clear objectives and targets, planning a small-scale change, analysing the results

collected and implementing any improvement actions, to standardise the process change and replicate it on a larger scale.

it possible to collect, analyse, and enhance in a systematic way the contribution of Students, promoting inclusive decision-making processes oriented toward continuous improvement.

The consolidation of this approach not only strengthens the culture of academic quality but also promotes greater Student responsibility, making them co-protagonists of their own learning path and, more generally, of the development of the university institution.

With reference to the procedures of evaluation and periodic accreditation of higher education institutions in Italy, ANVUR has already for several years strengthened the role of Students: starting from the first accreditation programmes, AVA1, the objective was to "ascertain that degree programmes encouraged and considered the contribution of Students in decision-making processes on the quality of education" [17].

With ESG 2015 and AVA2, the Student-Centered approach became predominant [1] [2]. Students are considered fundamental stakeholders whose needs must be considered in the design and updating of the educational offer [1]. Their opinion is collected through questionnaires on teaching activities and the adequacy of resources, the results of which are then communicated to the internal actors of the University [1].

The AVA3 model further strengthens the participation of Students [2]. Although the sources do not detail their composition in all specific bodies as in previous cycles, the importance of their role is highlighted. Even during the Periodic Accreditation (AP) meetings, an entire slot is dedicated to Students with the CEV to allow a space for equal discussion with the appropriate committees. However, at the general didactic level, the Student-Centered approach is a priority [2]. The analysis of real teaching practices, also through Student feedback, is crucial for the improvement of teaching action [14] [15].

Their active participation aims to make Students informed and aware of the quality system adopted by the University. The involvement of Students in the evaluation process can take different forms, such as \*peer review\*, which "encourages reflection on one's own and others' path" [7] and "helps to develop transversal competences" [5].

Students are involved in self-assessment processes, contributing to identifying the levels of perceived competence and to "reducing the self-referentiality inherent in the self-assessment process" [17].

## V. EVALUATION EXPERT STUDENTS

Students with established experience in University QA bodies and committees (for example, the University Quality Assurance Unit, the Joint Teaching-Student Committees, and the Quality Management Unit) may in turn become part of the ANVUR Register of Evaluation Experts with the profile of Student Experts. For registration in the Register with the profile of Student Expert, ANVUR requires the submission of an application in response to public notices and the demonstration of previous experience in QA processes, in

addition to compliance with the formalized selection procedures established by the Agency. The permanence and effective engagement of those registered in the Register are subject to continuous training obligations, the signing of the Code of Ethics, and participation conditions aimed at ensuring the competence and professionalism of Student Experts.

Student Evaluation Experts (hereinafter SEV) are active participants in the review process implemented by ANVUR for External Evaluation. They collaborate, on an equal footing with other members, in the Evaluation Expert Panels (PEV) for Initial Accreditation, and in the Evaluation Expert Committees (CEV) for Periodic Accreditation. In this sense, the role assigned to Students is central, reinforcing the principles of legitimacy and diversity promoted by ENQA. At the same time, evidence emerging from the "QA-Fit" project highlights the risk that Student participation may be perceived as formal or "tokenistic" when it is not accompanied by clearly defined roles, adequate training, and transparency mechanisms communicated to the Student community [11].

Furthermore, the presence of Students promotes trust in the external review process within the Student community and contributes to balancing the assessments of the Expert Panels, focusing attention on a Student-Centered vision in both teaching and learning processes. This configuration is consistent with European principles according to which quality must be understood as a shared culture, and Student participation must be structured in such a way as to promote collective responsibility, transparency, and continuous improvement processes within institutions [18].

The participation of Students in ANVUR evaluation processes fosters the acquisition of specific expertise, as it integrates direct observations of the educational experience, qualitative assessments, and knowledge of teaching contexts with quantitative data. This contribution makes the University's Internal QA system more precise, improving its diagnostic capacity, the identification of critical issues, and the orientation of corrective measures. Moreover, the active involvement of Students promotes accountability practices addressed to new Students, making procedures and standards transparent, transferring knowledge about institutional expectations, and creating reporting channels that facilitate the integration and participation of new enrollees.

## VI. TOOLS AND PRACTICES OF QA STUDENTS

According to a study by Kivistö and Pekkola [13], Quality Assurance is articulated in three dimensions: primary, secondary, and latent Quality Assurance. This definition supports the promotion of Student-Centered learning, enhancing its role in the definition of approaches, guidelines, and practices categorized as QA procedures. In defining "latent" Quality Assurance, the scholars argue that it can be understood as a set of actions, practices, and policies that can be categorized as quality assurance procedures even if they are not explicitly designated as such [13]. This assumption attributes even greater relevance to the "good practices" that Students can implement within their respective universities.

The expertise of Students, already experienced and active participants in ANVUR evaluation processes, moreover, allows institutions to have a tool capable of guiding the good practices of new Students involved in QA processes. Some universities, such as the University of Molise, are implementing a peer training system, in which SEVs become Student tutors and train new Student representatives in university bodies and committees, thus fulfilling the commitment required by ANVUR guidelines for the training of Students on QA systems and their functioning. In this sense, assigning a clear role to Students allows the governance bodies to implement a process of systemic inclusion that confers an extra-institutional role upon the Student. This makes it possible to redefine the role of the Student, not only as a stakeholder in a linear process, but as an actor in a circular process that encourages them to adopt a metacognitive perspective capable of contributing to the growth of the academic community.

Furthermore, encouraging Student participation as active members of internal and external processes allows the new governance to reduce the self-referentiality inherent in the self-assessment process [17], which occurs when self-assessment is perceived as a mere bureaucratic formality [17], allowing the Student to acquire information on the effectiveness of the study programme<sup>6</sup> and representing an extension of the principle of Student centrality in teaching and learning processes [17]. This opportunity therefore allows universities to implement forms of peer training among Students, increasing the value of their contribution and their commitment in the role of Evaluation Experts with ANVUR.

ANVUR, for example, in the procedures of Periodic Accreditation (AP), made known through its institutional channels, recognizes among the dimensions assessed in the Site requirements a specific indicator for the "Role assigned to Students" (requirement A.5), in which it notes, as a general principle, the solicited and practiced participation at all levels by Students in accordance with current regulations. In this sense, a relevant factor is considered not only the inclusion of Students as agents within the various QA bodies and committees, but also their role as promoters of peer training activities, to inform Students about the processes and the results they have generated. The agency also recognizes in the AP reports Strengths, Areas for Improvement, and "Good Practices" in relation to the indicator under evaluation, attributing an even greater role to Students.

## VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

In the field of Quality Assurance, the authentic inclusion of Students represents a strategic lever for the improvement of teaching and for the construction of a shared and responsible institutional culture. To produce systemic effects, it requires a formalization of roles, specific training paths for Students and

staff, and methodological tools that integrate transparent accountability procedures with the effective closure of improvement cycles.

The rigorous measurement of effectiveness and efficiency requires the adoption of operational indicators and longitudinal studies to evaluate impacts on learning outcomes and on the quality of processes.

In a dynamic context such as that of Higher Education, in which the role of the Student in QA processes is increasingly central, the present study shows that the real inclusion of Students produces essential contributions for developing a shared and responsible culture. Maximizing these effects is indispensable in order to systematically measure both the quality of Student practices and participation in training activities, combining quantitative indicators and qualitative evaluations, with the aim of transforming Quality Assurance into a driver of continuous, democratic, and sustainable improvement, capable of responding agilely to the future challenges of universities.

Promoting a culture Centered on QA and on the role of Students within these processes allows Universities to build a Student community aware of the importance of its role and aware of being an active agent for the change of the internal and external processes of universities.



**S. Campanella** was born in Isernia, Molise Italy, in 1996. He received the degree in *primary education sciences* with specialization in *support activities* from the University of Molise, Campobasso, Italy, in 2023. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree (XL cycle) in *teaching and learning sciences (T&LS)* at

the University of Macerata, Macerata, Italy, in cooperation with the University of Molise. His research focuses on *faculty development* and *Quality Assurance processes* for university teaching, with particular attention to ANVUR protocols and the dissemination of quality assurance and evaluation practices among university faculty.

He has been a member of the international ESU (Expert Students Union) pool from 2025. He served as Student Representative for the academic years 2020–2023 within the University Quality Assurance Board and the Joint Teaching–Student Commission of the SUSEF Department at the University of Molise. He has been part of an internal working group of AVA experts at the same university, organizing training sessions to promote a culture of quality assurance among faculty and Students. Since 2021, he has been registered as a Student Expert Evaluator in the national register of evaluation experts, with significant experience in both initial and periodic accreditations in collaboration with ANVUR. He has participated in several high-level training schools and international events on quality assurance, where he has also been a speaker (Budapest, Brussels by ENQA, Braga). His current research interests include *university quality assurance systems*, *faculty development*, and *evaluation*

<sup>6</sup> In practical terms, the skills most required of students involved in QA processes relate to the co-construction and co-design of the course, the drafting of objectives, and the development and systematisation of QA procedures.

processes in higher education. He is also Regional Coordinator (Molise) of CHS – the Italian Coordination of Support Teachers.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ANVUR, *Accreditamento periodico delle sedi e dei corsi di studio universitari: Linee guida*. Roma, Italia: Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca, 2017.
- [2] ANVUR, *Accreditamento periodico delle sedi e dei corsi di studio universitari: Linee guida per il sistema di assicurazione della qualità negli Atenei*. Roma, Italia: Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca, 2024.
- [3] R. I. Asiyai, “Best practices for quality assurance in higher education: implications for educational administration,” *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 843–854, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1710569>
- [4] S. Bardakci, Y. Y. Yelbay, and M. D. Avsaroglu, “Global diffusion of quality assurance research in higher education: a study on collaboration and concepts,” *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 657–672, 2024.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2253157>
- [5] A. M. Bigatti and F. Di Benedetto, “Correzione tra Pari: la peer review può adattarsi alla Matematica del primo anno,” in *Faculty Development e innovazione didattica universitaria*, A. Lotti, G. Crea, S. Garbarino, F. Picasso, and E. Scellato, Eds. Genova, Italia: Genova University Press, 2021, pp. 301–314.
- [6] Gvritishvili, Ana, et al. Quality Assurance Fit for the Future-Students' Perspective. *European Students' Union*, 2023.
- [7] G. Cándito, “Feedback e Peer review nella didattica della rappresentazione dell'architettura,” in *Faculty Development e innovazione didattica universitaria*, A. Lotti, G. Crea, S. Garbarino, F. Picasso, and E. Scellato, Eds. Genova, Italia: Genova University Press, 2021, pp. 321–330.
- [8] G. Carci and S. Nirchi, “Student engagement in university external quality assurance processes in Italy,” *Pedagogia oggi*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 138–145, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.7346/PO-012023-15>
- [9] G. Del Gobbo, “Cultura della Qualità e Faculty Development: Sinergie da Sviluppare,” *Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning*, vol. 3, p. 6, 2021.  
<https://doi.org/10.3280/exioa1-2021oa12063>
- [10] M. Devlin and G. Samarawickrema, “The criteria of effective teaching in a changing higher education context,” *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 111–124, 2010.
- [11] European Students' Union, *Quality Assurance Fit for the Future - Students' perspective*. Brussels, Belgium: European Students' Union, Sept. 17, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://esu-online.org/publications/quality-assurance-fit-for-the-future-Studentsperspective/>
- [12] Fondazione CRUI, *CAF Università: Il modello europeo di autovalutazione delle performance per le università*. Roma, Italia: Fondazione CRUI, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://www.fondazionecriui.it>
- [13] J. Kivistö and E. Pekkola, *Quality of Administration in Higher Education*. Stockholm, Sweden: Sveriges universitets- och högskoleförbund (SUHF), 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://bit.ly/2LGNN2Q>
- [14] A. Lotti, G. Crea, S. Garbarino, F. Picasso, and E. Scellato, *Faculty Development e innovazione didattica universitaria*. Genova, Italia: Genova University Press, 2021.
- [15] L. Mortari, F. A. Pizzato, R. Silva, and A. Bevilacqua, “L'analisi delle pratiche discorsive come strumento a servizio dell'innovazione didattica nella Higher Education: un'esperienza nella legal education,” *Excellence and Innovation in Learning and Teaching: Research and Practices*, vol. 6, special issue, pp. 45–62, 2021.
- [16] S. Patfield, J. Gore, E. Prieto, L. Fray, and K. Sincok, “Towards quality teaching in higher education: pedagogy-focused academic development for enhancing practice,” *International Journal for Academic Development*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2022.
- [17] L. Refrigeri, “L'autovalutazione per il miglioramento dei percorsi di studio universitari,” in *La funzione educativa della valutazione: Teorie e pratiche della valutazione educativa*, A. M. Notti, Ed. Lecce, Italia: Pensa MultiMedia, 2017, pp. 685–696.
- [18] Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), Brussels, Belgium, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://bit.ly/2G3D134>
- [19] A. Squarizoni, *Guida alla compilazione del Rapporto di Autovalutazione associato al Modello CRUI per l'AQ dei CdS universitari*. Roma, Italia: Fondazione CRUI, 2011. [Online]. Available: <http://www.fondazionecriui.it/HomePage.aspx?ref=1938>
- [20] H. Welzant, L. Schindler, S. Puls-Elvidge, and L. Crawford, “Definitions of quality in higher education: A synthesis of the literature,” *Higher Learning Research Communications*, vol. 5, no. 3, p. 2, 2011.  
<https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v5i3.244>