Co-funded by
the European Union

ERASMUS+ CBHE PROJECT # 101177299-ECAMPUS-EDU-2024-CBHE

"FOSTERING SOCIALLY DISTANCED AND INCLUSIVE ON CAMPUS EDUCATION IN ARMENIAN HEIS"

UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI GENOVA (UNIGE)

BEST PRACTICE COLLECTION & BENCHMARKING OF QA IN DIGITAL TLA

COUNTRY CASE – ITALY

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

GENOA 2025

Contents

Section 1: Institutional & National Context

- **Country**: Italy
- **Institution**: University of Genoa
- **Organisational structure involved in the project**: International Cooperation Development Unit (https://rubrica.unige.it/strutture/struttura/100311)
- **Type of QA initiative**: Institutional Quality Assurance System of the University of Genoa, aligned with ANVUR (https://aq.unige.it/)
- **Website**: https://unige.it/
- **Targeted education levels**: Bachelor, Master, and PhD

Maturity of e-learning in the national/institutional context.

E-learning in Italy can be considered advanced, particularly in higher education, where national strategies (e.g. Piano Nazionale Scuola Digitale, Repubblica Digitale) and European frameworks (DigCompEdu, DigComp 2.2/3.0) provide a strong reference.

At the University of Genoa, digital education has reached a consolidated stage through institutional initiatives such as the UTLC, EduNext participation, and innovative practices including micro-credentials, EPICT certification, with a AI-related syllabus.

A concrete example is the Master's Degree in *Digital Humanities – Interactive Systems and Digital Media*, which adopts the "*Integrated Digital Didactics (DDI) model*". The DDI model is a hybrid format combining in-presence lectures with online participation, enhancing accessibility for non-local students, enabling shared teaching agreements with other Italian and international universities (up to 12 ECTS), and increasing the attractiveness of the programme.

Moreover, the Digital Education Hub project, funded by the Italian PNRR, strengthens institutional capacity for blended and online learning, positioning UNIGE as a national and European reference point.

Finally, together with University of Roma Tre, the University of Genoa has launched the international initiative on Cyber Humanities (with a Manifesto), contributing a visionary framework that reframes competences for the algorithmic age and highlights the cultural, ethical and civic dimensions of digital education.

Section 2: QA Focus Areas in Digital TLA

2.1 Digital Course Design

Pedagogical model for e-learning:

- At the institutional level, the reference model (standard practice) is still largely traditional, lecture-based, with e-learning often limited to the use of Moodle/Teams for sharing materials and asynchronous communication.
- Alongside this, pilot programmes (e.g., Digital Humanities – Interactive Systems and Digital Media, Engineering master courses, and faculty training initiatives at UTLC) are testing Integrated Digital Didactics (DDI) and Prompt-Based Learning approaches, embedding AI literacy, metacognition, and academic integrity.

Curricular flexibility:

- In most programmes, curricula are still designed for face-to-face delivery.
- Pilot courses experiment with modularity, blended learning, and micro-credentials (Open Badges, Living Syllabus) to allow flexible pathways and international sharing (up to 12 CFU through inter-university agreements).

Actors involved in course design:

- Standard practice: course design is carried out mainly by academic staff with limited support structures.
- Pilot programmes: UTLC instructional designers, IT/digital units, library staff, and inclusion services are systematically involved in co-design, with QA units using digital delivery checklists.

Consideration of student needs:

- Most courses address student profiles indirectly through general orientation and tutoring services.
- Pilots include early diagnostics, multiple learning pathways (synchronous/async, recordings, forums), and accessibility by design (captions, alt-text, colour safety).

Operational artefacts:

- Common to all courses: course descriptor + syllabus uploaded to the LMS.
- In pilots: extended artefacts such as Digital Delivery Plans, ILO (Intended Learning Outcomes) ↔ assessment matrices, integrity guidelines for GenAI use, and mid-course pulse surveys feeding QA reports.

Summary note:

The University of Genoa is thus at a dual speed:

- a broad baseline of traditional practices with incremental digital support, and
- leading-edge pilots that model European QA-aligned practices for digital TLA.

2.2 Online Assessment & Exams

Baseline (majority of programmes)**:**

- Assessments are still predominantly traditional: in-presence written or oral exams, with limited use of online tools.
- Moodle/Teams platforms are used mainly to upload assignments and collect essays, but without systemic digital assessment design.
- Academic integrity relies on classical supervision, with plagiarism checks performed manually or through Compilatio tool (only in some departments).
- Students are informed of exam regulations via course descriptors and the institutional handbook, but specific training on digital assessment protocols is not systematic.

Pilots and innovative practices:

- *Digital Humanities Master* and selected Engineering/Digital Competence courses use online quizzes, project-based assessments, and e-portfolios integrated in the LMS, aligned with Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs).
- *Prompt-Based Learning* pilots introduce reflective assignments where students must document how they interact with GenAI tools (ChatGPT, GitHub Copilot), ensuring both skill development and academic integrity.
- Authentication:
  - Experimental use of plagiarism-detection software and originality reports.
  - Structured oral defenses (synchronous online with recording) complement written submissions to confirm authorship.
  - In some pilots, "AI integrity briefs" clarify acceptable vs. unacceptable uses of generative AI.
- Student preparation: in pilot courses, orientation sessions explain how digital exams are conducted,
- integrity rules for AI use, and how assessment rubrics are applied.

QA mechanisms:

- In traditional courses: QA relies on end-of-course surveys and general monitoring in annual programme reports.
- In pilots: assessment methods are explicitly mapped to ILOs in Digital Delivery Plans, with QA checklists reviewing alignment, integrity measures, and accessibility of online exams.

Summary note:

The University of Genoa is moving from a traditional, exam-centered culture towards a hybrid model where pilots demonstrate innovative, integrity-aware assessment formats. The challenge ahead is to extend these practices systematically across programmes, while embedding clear QA mechanisms for digital and AI-supported exams.

2.3 Learning Analytics

Baseline (majority of programmes)**:**

- At present, systematic use of learning analytics is limited across most courses.
- Data from the LMS (Moodle, Teams) are mainly used for administrative tracking (enrolments, assignment submissions, exam registration).
- Course evaluations rely largely on student satisfaction surveys, with little integration of real-time engagement or performance analytics.
- There are no standardised dashboards at programme level for monitoring student learning behaviour.

Pilots and innovative practices:

- In the *Digital Humanities Master* and selected Engineering/Digital Competence courses, pilot projects use LMS activity logs to monitor student participation in forums, completion of online tasks, and access to learning resources.
- *Prompt-Based Learning* pilots experiment with *analytics on student–AI interactions*: prompts, iterations, and reflections are collected as evidence of metacognitive growth and critical use of GenAI.

- *Living Syllabus* model includes a feedback loop where analytics (attendance, activity completion) inform micro-adjustments during the course.
- At institutional level, the *UTLC* has started testing dashboards for faculty, aggregating data on participation and student engagement in blended modules.

QA mechanisms:

- In traditional courses: QA reports include generic data (pass rates, completion rates, satisfaction scores).
- In pilots: analytics-informed indicators are added to annual monitoring (e.g., participation rates in digital activities, timely submission of tasks, engagement patterns in forums).
- Ethical considerations: pilot projects apply basic GDPR-compliant policies (aggregated, anonymised data) and explicitly inform students of how learning data may be used for QA and improvement.

Summary note:

Learning analytics at UniGe is currently nascent and uneven: widespread adoption is still missing, but pilots in Digital Humanities, Engineering, and UTLC training show promising pathways for integrating analytics into QA decision-making.

The main challenge is scaling these practices institution-wide while ensuring compliance with ethical and privacy standards.

2.4 Digital Student Support

Baseline (majority of programmes)**:**

- Academic support: most programmes rely on traditional office hours and email; some departments use Teams/Moodle forums for Q&A but with limited systematic monitoring.
- Technical support: the central IT service provides helpdesk support during office hours for LMS access, institutional email, and exam registration; responsiveness outside working hours is limited.
- Psychological support: the university counselling service is available mainly in presence, with limited online access; since COVID-19, online booking and occasional video counselling have been introduced.
- Training in digital tools: generic orientation at the beginning of studies introduces students to Moodle, Teams, and the e-library, but without personalised guidance based on digital profiles or needs.

Pilots and innovative practices:

- In the *Digital Humanities Master* and *UTLC* initiatives, structured onboarding modules introduce students to the VLE, e-library, collaboration tools, and digital communication etiquette.
- Helpdesks with extended hours (chat/email support in evenings) are being tested in some courses with high online components.
- Peer tutoring and mentoring schemes are piloted, where digitally skilled students support peers in using e-learning platforms and AI-supported study tools.

- For students with disabilities, the inclusion office collaborates with IT staff to provide accessible formats, captioning, and screen-reader–compatible resources.
- In courses experimenting with *Prompt-Based Learning*, specific AI literacy support is offered: students are trained in how to use generative AI responsibly, critically evaluate outputs, and document usage in assignments.

QA mechanisms:

- In traditional courses: student surveys ask about adequacy of academic and technical support but without systematic disaggregation.
- In pilots: mid-course surveys ask explicitly about digital support (helpdesk responsiveness, accessibility of resources, effectiveness of training). Results are reviewed in programme QA reports.
- UTLC monitors access logs of helpdesk platforms and uses this data as part of QA for digital services.

Summary note:

UniGe, digital student support is still fragmented and uneven: most students rely on standard services during working hours, while pilots demonstrate more advanced models (structured onboarding, peer mentoring, extended-hour helpdesks, AI literacy training). The QA challenge is to move from reactive services to a proactive, tailored support model, ensuring inclusiveness and responsiveness in digital learning environments.

2.5 Staff Digital Competence

Baseline (majority of programmes)**:**

- Training for digital pedagogy: most staff have not received structured training in digital pedagogy; digital skills are largely self-acquired or developed informally during COVID-19 emergency remote teaching.
- Support services: central IT provides basic help for LMS and videoconferencing tools; advanced instructional design support is available only upon request and not evenly distributed across departments.
- Workload and coordination: digital delivery is often perceived as an *add-on* to traditional teaching; staff report increased workload without systematic workload balancing or recognition in evaluation frameworks.
- Peer exchange: some spontaneous communities of practice exist (e.g., faculty using Moodle forums), but no formalised system across the whole university.

Pilots and innovative practices:

- The UTLC (University Teaching & Learning Centre) offers structured professional development modules on digital pedagogy, blended learning, AI literacy, and prompt-based learning. These include workshops, webinars, and micro-credential pathways.
- EPICT certification (including the new Conversational AI syllabus) provides recognised pathways for educators to develop and certify their digital competence.
- Selected programmes (e.g., *Digital Humanities Master*, Engineering courses, teacher education modules) collaborate with instructional designers and e-

learning technologists to co-design courses, aligning Intended Learning Outcomes with digital tools and assessments.

- Peer exchange initiatives: pilot "teaching innovation circles" allow staff to share experiences on blended learning, AI-enhanced teaching, and accessibility practices.
- Workload coordination: in pilot projects, digital delivery is planned in advance through Digital Delivery Plans, which map effort, synchronous/async balance, and assessment load across the teaching team.

QA mechanisms:

- In traditional courses: QA monitors staff training indirectly (self-reports, course surveys mentioning digital competence).
- In pilots: participation in UTLC/EPICT training and innovation circles is tracked and reported; QA reports highlight staff digital development as a quality dimension.
- New initiatives align with OECD guidance on teacher professional learning and the OECD Teaching Compass on teacher agency and well-being, framing digital competence not only as technical but also as pedagogical and ethical capacity.

Summary note:

Staff digital competence at UniGe is currently uneven: while many staff still rely on traditional teaching models with minimal digital integration, pilot projects and UTLC initiatives show how structured training, certification, and peer learning can foster a culture of continuous professional growth in line with European and OECD frameworks.

2.6 Digital Accessibility & Inclusion

Baseline (majority of programmes)**:**

- Accessibility for students with disabilities: the university's Inclusion Office provides services such as exam accommodations, alternative formats on request, and access to assistive technologies. However, most teaching materials are still not designed by default for accessibility (e.g., captions, alt-text, colour-safe slides are often missing).
- Support for diverse/remote backgrounds: participation from commuting and working students is partially supported by the recording of some lectures and asynchronous access to materials on Moodle/Teams, but not systematically across all programmes.
- Learning pathways: the standard model is synchronous, in-presence teaching; asynchronous or blended options are offered inconsistently and often depend on individual instructors.
- Equity tracking: QA reports include some statistics on student progression and success rates, but equity indicators specific to digital inclusion are not yet systematically monitored.

Pilots and innovative practices:

- Digital Humanities Master (with Integrated Digital Didactics) systematically offers asynchronous access (recordings, structured online activities, discussion forums) and supports remote students, including those from outside the Liguria region.

- UTLC and pilot courses implement Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles: captions for video content, accessible document templates, device-agnostic resources, and attention to colour contrast and readability.
- Collaboration between IT services and the Inclusion Office has produced digital accessibility guidelines for faculty, applied in microcredential and Living Syllabus pilots.
- Prompt-Based Learning pilots also highlight AI as a tool for inclusion (e.g., generative AI supporting students with language barriers or providing adaptive feedback).
- Some departments experiment with equity dashboards (tracking participation in online modules by gender, socio-economic background, or disability status).

QA mechanisms:

- In traditional programmes: accessibility is checked mainly through compliance with disability regulations and general student surveys.
- In pilots: QA reports explicitly include indicators on accessibility measures implemented (captions, alt-text, alternative formats), availability of asynchronous pathways, and participation rates of remote or non-traditional students.
- Equity and inclusion are gradually being reframed as core QA dimensions, aligned with the ESG 2015 principles and UNESCO frameworks on teacher/learner agency and well-being.

Summary note:

At UniGe, digital accessibility and inclusion are uneven across programmes: while baseline provision ensures legal compliance, pilot initiatives show how systematic adoption of UDL, asynchronous pathways, and targeted QA indicators can make inclusiveness a measurable and proactive dimension of digital education quality.

2.7 Data Protection & Ethics

Baseline (majority of programmes)**:**

- Institutional policies: UniGe complies with EU GDPR and Italian privacy legislation. Student data are managed centrally by the ICT services, with clear rules on storage, access, and retention. Policies are published on the university website, but awareness among students and faculty is limited.
- Transparency: students are informed at matriculation about data handling (enrolment, exams, LMS use), but this information is often presented in legal-administrative language and not contextualised for digital learning environments.
- Informed consent: consent is generally embedded in enrolment procedures and IT service agreements; it is not course-specific and rarely refers to digital tools or learning analytics.
- Monitoring breaches: data breaches are managed by the Data Protection Officer (DPO), with mandatory reporting and corrective actions. However, sanctions and follow-ups are rarely visible to the teaching staff or students.

Pilots and innovative practices:

- Digital Humanities Master and Prompt-Based Learning pilots explicitly include ethical use of digital tools and AI in student integrity guidelines. Students are asked to sign or acknowledge "acceptable use" briefs clarifying boundaries for GenAI, plagiarism, and data sharing.
- Some pilot projects use course-level informed consent for learning analytics (e.g., students informed that activity data will be used for pedagogical support and QA).
- In UTLC training, case-based workshops are offered to staff on data ethics, covering AI bias, transparency, and accountability.
- Transparency practices: pilot syllabi include short "Data & Ethics statements" clarifying what data are collected, for what purposes, and with what safeguards.
- Ethics by design: alignment with the Cyber Humanities Manifesto and with the AI Literacy frameworks encourages critical reflection on algorithmic systems and students' rights in digital environments.

QA mechanisms:

- In traditional QA cycles: data protection is monitored indirectly through institutional compliance with GDPR and external audits.
- In pilots: QA reviews explicitly check for the presence of data transparency statements in syllabi, student consent procedures for analytics, and inclusion of digital ethics in learning outcomes.
- Breach reporting is formally handled by the DPO, but QA units are beginning to track incidents and responses as part of continuous improvement.

Summary note:

At UniGe, data protection is robust in terms of legal compliance but still underdeveloped pedagogically: most students and staff experience it as a background regulation rather than an active component of digital learning.

Pilot projects demonstrate how data privacy and ethics can be made transparent, course-specific, and educational, turning compliance into an opportunity to foster algorithmic reflexivity and responsible citizenship.

2.8 Digital Infrastructure QA

Baseline (majority of programmes)**:**

- Evaluation of LMS: the institutional LMS (Moodle, integrated with MS Teams) is centrally managed by ICT services. Reliability and uptime are monitored internally, but formal evaluation of usability and accessibility is limited to occasional user surveys.
- Review cycles: infrastructure updates follow ICT maintenance schedules, with periodic software upgrades and security patches. Formal *pedagogical reviews* of the platform's adequacy are not systematically embedded in QA processes.
- Outages and risks: ICT services have procedures for managing outages, with service announcements and recovery protocols. However, faculty and students often experience limited communication and delayed responses during disruptions.

- Alignment with teaching needs: course-level adaptations are left to individual instructors. There is no institution-wide process ensuring that the LMS supports innovative pedagogy or is adapted to diverse teaching contexts.

Pilots and innovative practices:

- UTLC pilots run usability reviews of the LMS with faculty and students, focusing on navigation, accessibility, and integration with digital tools (e.g. e-library, plagiarism detection, analytics dashboards).
- In the *Digital Humanities Master* and other blended courses, feedback loops collect student opinions on reliability, accessibility (captioning, mobile compatibility), and perceived usefulness of LMS features.
- Some pilots experiment with add-on tools (interactive quizzes, peer feedback modules, AI-assisted tutoring), tested in collaboration with IT services and instructional designers.
- Risk management: pilots use structured *contingency plans* (alternative communication channels, backup assessment procedures) to handle platform outages during exams or key deadlines.

QA mechanisms:

- In traditional QA: monitoring is primarily technical (uptime, incident logs, security compliance), with little integration in annual QA reports.
- In pilots: QA reviews include platform usability and accessibility indicators, student satisfaction with LMS, and mapping of LMS functionality vs. teaching needs (e.g., capacity for blended delivery, interactive assessment, analytics).
- Results from pilots are used as evidence in QA reporting and inform proposals for institutional infrastructure improvements.

Summary note:

At UniGe, the LMS and digital infrastructure are "technically reliable but pedagogically under-assessed": while ICT ensures continuity and security, QA processes only partially capture usability, accessibility, and alignment with teaching needs.

Pilot projects illustrate how infrastructure QA can become more "user-centred and pedagogically grounded", turning the LMS into a lever for teaching innovation rather than just an administrative platform.

Section 3: Key QA Principles and Criteria

Framework – Why and how it is done:

At the University of Genoa, the Quality Assurance (QA) system ensures that teaching, learning and assessment – including digital and AI-enhanced practices – are consistent with the institution's mission and European standards.

- Why: to guarantee that students receive high-quality, inclusive, and future-oriented education, while society benefits from research and innovation aligned with ethical, cultural, and civic values.
- How: through a structured QA system that combines governance policies, stakeholder engagement, continuous monitoring and improvement, and periodic accreditation by ANVUR, in line with the ESG 2015 and ENQA standards for e-learning.

Guiding principles:

- The QA system is based on the following core principles:
- Equity and inclusion – ensuring access, participation and success for all learners, with attention to gender equality, diversity and social sustainability.
- Learner-centeredness – designing programmes that are flexible, responsive to student needs, and oriented towards active and lifelong learning.
- Innovation and internationalisation – promoting digital and AI-supported teaching methods, interdisciplinarity, and alignment with the European Higher Education Area.
- Transparency and accountability – publishing objectives, processes and outcomes, engaging both internal and external stakeholders in continuous review.
- Continuous improvement – systematic self-evaluation, monitoring, and external accreditation cycles (ANVUR), in line with ESG 2015.

Standards and benchmarks used:

- European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG 2015) – overarching reference for QA in higher education.
- ENQA "Quality Assurance of E-learning" (2018) – informing the evaluation of digital and blended teaching.
- National standards by ANVUR – for initial and periodic accreditation of programmes, departments and doctoral schools.
- Institutional policies (Politiche per la Qualità, 2025) – approved by the Academic Senate and Board of Governors, aligned with the Strategic Plan 2021–2026.

Implementation:

QA principles are operationalised through:

- Policy and governance – the University Quality Presidium coordinates QA across teaching, research, and third mission; periodic review reports are approved by governing bodies.
- Processes – design, monitoring, and review of teaching programmes (including digital and blended formats), research, and third mission activities.
- Stakeholder involvement – students, faculty, administrative staff, and external partners contribute via surveys, course evaluations, and formal committees (e.g. Joint Teaching Committees).

Indicators:

- Evaluation is based on a set of quantitative and qualitative indicators, including:
- Student enrolment, progression and completion rates.
- Graduate employability and alignment with labour market needs.
- Student satisfaction surveys and course evaluation questionnaires.
- Faculty participation in professional development (e.g. UTLC training on digital competences and AI literacy).
- External evaluation and accreditation outcomes (ANVUR).
- Evidence of innovation and internationalisation (e.g. Digital Humanities Master's with DDI model, Digital Education Hub project, Cyber Humanities initiative).

Through these principles, standards and indicators, the QA framework of the University of Genoa ensures that digital teaching, learning and assessment are not only consistent with European and national benchmarks, but also embedded in the institutional culture of continuous improvement.

Section 4: QA Methodologies and Tools

Level of analysis: Institutional (University of Genoa), with alignment to national (ANVUR) and European (ESG 2015, ENQA e-learning 2018).

Internal QA tools and processes:

- Dashboards and monitoring systems: institutional dashboards provide data on student enrolment, progression, drop-out rates, and completion times, linked to programme reviews.
- Course review and reporting: each programme undergoes annual self-assessment (Scheda Unica Annuale del Corso di Studio - SUA-CdS) and periodic in-depth review (Rapporto di Riesame Ciclico – R.R.C.), including e-learning and blended components.
- Surveys and feedback tools: systematic use of student evaluation questionnaires on teaching quality, digital resources, and learning environments; additional ad-hoc surveys on innovation and e-learning.
- Learning analytics: pilot use of LMS data and digital platforms to track student engagement, participation in online activities, and outcomes in blended courses.

External QA mechanisms:

- ANVUR accreditation: initial and periodic accreditation of programmes, departments, and doctoral schools, including digital formats.
- Peer reviews and site visits: evaluation commissions, including external experts, conduct document reviews, stakeholder interviews, and on-site/online visits.
- Compliance with ESG 2015: regular checks ensure alignment with European QA standards and guidelines.
- **The next ANVUR accreditation visit will take place in Genoa in October 2025.**

Data and indicators:

The QA system integrates both quantitative and qualitative metrics:

- Student satisfaction and course evaluation results.
- Graduate employment rates and stakeholder feedback.
- Participation in mobility programmes and internationalisation indicators.
- Faculty engagement in professional development (e.g. UTLC training on digital competences, AI literacy).
- Use and effectiveness of digital resources, based on access data and surveys.

QA cycle:

- Annual cycle: yearly monitoring reports and updates of course information.
- Rolling review: continuous monitoring supported by dashboards and mid-term adjustments.
- Periodic accreditation: every 5 years for programmes and institutional structures, conducted by ANVUR.

Adaptation to e-learning specifics:

QA practices are explicitly extended to digital teaching, learning and assessment:

- Integration of digital indicators in student surveys (usability of platforms, access to digital resources, satisfaction with blended formats).
- Review of hybrid models such as the Integrated Digital Didactics (DDI) adopted in the Master's in Digital Humanities.
- Attention to inclusiveness: monitoring of accessibility, student participation at a distance, and digital divide mitigation.
- Ethical and cultural dimensions: initiatives such as the Cyber Humanities and Conversational AI syllabi ensure that quality is not only technical but also pedagogical, ethical and civic.

Section 5: Stakeholder Involvement

Level of analysis: Institutional (University of Genoa), aligned with national (ANVUR) QA requirements and European ESG 2015 standards.

The QA system of the University of Genoa ensures broad and structured participation of stakeholders in quality processes, including digital teaching, learning and assessment.

- Students:
  - Provide structured feedback through course evaluation surveys, including items on digital resources and online learning environments.
  - Participate in Joint Teaching Committees (Commissioni paritetiche per la didattica e il diritto allo studio di Scuola), where they contribute to reviewing course quality and proposing improvements.
  - Are directly consulted in periodic programme reviews and pilot projects on digital innovation (e.g. Integrated Digital Didactics, AI literacy courses).
- Academic Staff:
  - Involved in course design, review, and monitoring, including blended and online components.
  - Participate in faculty development programmes coordinated by the University Teaching and Learning Centre (UTLC), focusing on digital competences, AI literacy, and inclusive pedagogy.
  - Contribute to internal QA through self-assessment reports and peer evaluation processes.
- QA Units:
  - The University Quality Presidium coordinates QA policies and monitors compliance with ESG 2015 and ANVUR requirements.
  - The University Evaluation Unit (Nucleo di Valutazione) provides independent oversight of QA effectiveness, ensuring transparency and accountability.
  - Regular internal and external review reports include sections dedicated to digital teaching and e-learning.
- IT/Digital Support Units:

- Provide technical support for digital platforms (e.g. LMS, e-library, videoconferencing).
- Collaborate with academic units to ensure usability, accessibility, and continuous improvement of digital infrastructures.
- Support learning analytics projects for monitoring online participation and engagement.

- Employers/Alumni:
- Contribute through advisory boards and stakeholder consultations, ensuring that programme learning outcomes—including digital competences—are aligned with labour market needs.
- Alumni feedback is collected to evaluate the effectiveness of skills acquired, including the ability to operate in hybrid and digital environments.

- External Experts:
- Participate in ANVUR accreditation procedures (initial and periodic), bringing national and international perspectives.
- Collaborate in peer review activities of courses and departments, including evaluation of digital learning practices.
- Engage in international networks such as EduNext and Cyber Humanities initiatives, providing additional benchmarking and expertise.

This multi-stakeholder engagement model ensures that QA processes for digital TLA are inclusive, participatory, and aligned with both institutional mission and European standards, reinforcing transparency, continuous improvement, and societal relevance.

Section 6: Results, Impact, and Lessons Learned

Level of analysis: Institutional (University of Genoa), with implications for national and European policy frameworks.

Results and improvements:

- Quality of teaching and learning: QA processes have supported the integration of blended and digital models (e.g. Integrated Digital Didactics in the Digital Humanities Master's), improving course accessibility and international attractiveness.
- Access and inclusiveness: The use of hybrid teaching formats has facilitated participation for students from outside the region, working students, and international mobility participants.
- Student engagement: Regular surveys and course reviews show higher engagement in courses adopting interactive and digital methodologies, especially those embedding AI literacy and prompt-based learning practices.

Institutional and policy impact:

- At the institutional level, QA outcomes have led to the formal adoption of University Quality Policies (Politiche per la Qualità), explicitly referencing digital education, inclusiveness, and sustainability.
- At the national level, UniGe's initiatives (e.g. Digital Education Hub – PNRR, Living Syllabus, EPICT certification, Conversational AI syllabus) are recognised as good practices contributing to discussions at CRUI and ANVUR level.
- At the European level, participation in networks like EduNext and contributions to the eCampus project have aligned local practices with DigCompEdu, DigComp 3.0, and ENQA QA in e-learning guidelines.

Lessons learned for implementation and sustainability:

- Integration, not parallelism: digital QA should be embedded into existing institutional QA cycles (annual reviews, periodic accreditation), rather than treated as a separate track.
- Stakeholder co-agency: involving students, staff, and external partners in QA enhances ownership, relevance, and sustainability.
- Balance between innovation and accountability: successful adoption requires space for experimentation (e.g. living labs in Digital Humanities and Engineering), but also robust monitoring and transparent reporting.
- Future sustainability: aligning QA with micro-credentials and professional development pathways creates a scalable model that can be continuously updated with emerging competences (e.g. AI literacy, cyber humanities).

Overall, the QA framework has strengthened the university's capacity to innovate responsibly in digital education, ensuring that quality, inclusiveness, and cultural responsibility remain central while adopting new technologies.

Section 7: Documentation & References

Level of analysis: Institutional (University of Genoa), with national and European alignment.

Institutional documents & Sites (University of Genoa):

- Institutional policies: Politiche per la Qualità di Ateneo – Università di Genova (22 July 2025).
- Strategic Plan: Piano Strategico 2021-2026 – Università di Genova, con aggiornamento 2026 (20 June 2025).
- The Quality Assurance System: Sistema di Assicurazione della Qualità – Università di Genova (update 31 July 2025).
- UTLC – Unige Teaching and Learning Centre.
- EPICT – European Pedagogical ICT Licence: Certificazioni Digitali per i Docenti.
- Micro-credentials and Open Badge initiatives.
- MyOpenBadge Portal – UniGE.
- Living Syllabus (pilot projects, Digital Citizenship and Digital Humanities): Living syllabus per l'informatica per la cittadinanza digitale e per le digital humanities.
- Cyber Humanities Manifesto.

- Prompt Based Learning . Prompting the future: educator competencies and case-based innovation for GenAI in higher education, CINI ITAL-IA 2025, June 23–24, 2025, Trieste, Italy (in press).

National frameworks and references:

- National agency for the evaluation of universities and research institutes: ANVUR – Agenzia nazionale di valutazione del sistema universitario e della ricerca.
- Periodic accreditation of universities: ANVUR - Accreditamento periodico delle sedi e dei corsi di studio.
- Regulations for the initial and periodic accreditation of : ANVUR – Linee guida per accreditamento iniziale e periodico.

European frameworks:

- DigComp - DigComp HUB: "On the road to DigComp 3.0".
- DigCompEdu - Bekiaridis, G.: "Supplement to the DigCompEDU Framework - Outlining the Skills and Competences of Educators Related to AI in Education". AI Pioneers Project - WP3 (2025).
- European Commission - European educational area - quality education and training for all (2025).
- Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015).
- Considerations for Quality Assurance of E-learning Provision – Report (ENQA 2018).
- OECD. (2025, May 30). The OECD Teaching Compass 2030.
- UNESCO - Ai competency framework for teachers (Last update:18 August 2025).
- UNESCO - Ai competency framework for students (Last update:18 August 2025).
- eCampus WP1 Reports and Needs Analysis (2025).
- Policy Paper for Armenian DCF in Higher Education (2025).
- Best Practice Report & Policy Paper for AM HE Sector (2025).
- Presentation - *From Framework to Action: Strategic Insights on DigiComArm for Armenia's Digital Future* (UNIGE, eCampus Online Workshop, 27 August 2025).

Section 8: Reflections and Transferability

Level of analysis: Institutional (University of Genoa), with potential transferability to national and European higher education systems.

What makes this practice transferable?

- The University of Genoa's QA system is fully embedded in the national QA framework (ANVUR) and aligned with the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG 2015).
- Digital and AI-related competences are not treated as parallel tracks, but integrated into existing QA cycles (annual monitoring, periodic accreditation).
- Practices such as the UTLC faculty development, micro-credentials, and Living Syllabus are modular and adaptable, making them replicable in diverse institutional contexts.

- The combination of policy backbone (ESG/ANVUR), pedagogical innovation (Prompt-Based Learning), and cultural paradigm (Cyber Humanities) provides a holistic model that can be applied in different settings.

What challenges might others face?

- Institutional readiness: implementing QA for digital TLA requires governance structures, staff training, and IT support that may not be equally available in all institutions.
- Balancing innovation and accountability: institutions may struggle to preserve spaces for experimentation while meeting strict QA requirements.
- Stakeholder engagement: ensuring meaningful involvement of students, alumni, and employers requires a culture of participation that may not yet be consolidated everywhere.
- Equity considerations: addressing digital divides (access, competences, infrastructures) is a precondition for ensuring inclusive QA processes.

What would you recommend for adaptation in other systems?

- Start with pilot initiatives in selected faculties (e.g. "living labs" in Digital Humanities, Engineering, Teacher Education) before scaling QA practices to the whole institution.
- Align digital QA with national accreditation systems and European frameworks to ensure legitimacy and comparability.
- Combine quantitative indicators (progression, employability, surveys) with qualitative evidence (student reflections, peer reviews) for a more balanced evaluation.
- Introduce micro-credentials and professional development pathways as sustainable tools to continuously update competences and maintain QA relevance.
- Foster an ecosystem perspective: QA for digital education is most effective when embedded in policies that integrate teaching, research, and third mission with ethical and civic dimensions.

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.