ALLEGATO C

Proposte di modifica del
QUESTIONARIO STUDENTI

SOMMARIO/SUMMARY

In this document, we propose some changes to the student questionnaire proposed by SISSA. In particular, the proposals are subdivided in three groups:
- reformulations of questions that were already present; in this case, we indicate the code of every question in the questionnaire;
- additions of new questions; in this case, we label the questions with a similar code to a very close question that was already present (for instance, we label by H5.1 and H5.2 new questions that are very similar in the topics with the question H5);
- deletions of questions; in this case, we indicate the code of every question in the questionnaire.

RIFORMULAZIONI/REFORMULATIONS

Question H3: “Do you think that psychological assistance service at SISSA is needed?”

We propose to adopt the same formulation of Question H1: “How would you judge the efficiency of the Students' secretariat?” to inquire about the efficiency of the Psychological Support.

Question H5: “How well are you informed about the activities of students' representatives in your Area, in the Academic Senate and in the Administrative Council/Board of Directors?”

Reformulation: “Which of the following activities of the students’ representatives are you actually informed about?”
Options:
- Representation in your Area Council
- Representation in the Academic Senate
- Representation in the Administrative Council/Board of Directors
- Representation in the ARDISS committee
- Representation in the Student-Professors joint committee (Commissione Paritetica)
- Representation in the Evaluation Unit (Nucleo di Valutazione)
- Representation in the Guarantee Committee for Equal Opportunities, Employee Wellbeing and Non-Discrimination at Work (CUG)
- Representation in the Quality Assurance Unit (Presidio di Qualità).

Question L1: “Did you attend any course this academic year?”
Reformulation: “Did you attend any course in your PhD program in the _____ academic year?” We believe it is important to specify the academic year of reference.

Question L2: “How well informed are you about the scientific activities of other groups in SISSA?”
Reformulation: “How well informed are you about the scientific activities of other research groups in your area?”

Question L3: “What do you think about the usefulness of SISSA colloquia?”
Reformulation: “Are you generally interested in the SISSA colloquia topics?”

Question L8: “Was the level of the exams appropriated to the level of the corresponding courses?”
We propose this question to be conditional on the academic year indicated at the beginning of the questionnaire, in order to collect responses only from first-year students.

Question N2: “Were you free to choose the project/supervisor that you liked the most?”
Reformulation: “Were you free to choose your supervisor?”
Options:
- Yes
- No.
Conditional: If no, why?
Options:
- Prompt your response:
- I’d rather not say.
Question N10: “Have you already been assigned a research project?”
Reformulation: “Do you have a well defined research project?”
Options:
- Yes
- No
- Not applicable.

Question O3: “Who has been your main mentor in relation to your training for the lab activities?”
Reformulation: “How much have you been trained for your lab activities?”

Question Xxx1: “How would you rate the safety level in your lab?”
Reformulation: “How would you rate the safety level in the lab environment?”

Question P4: “How effective was the PhD program to train you as a young scientist in the subject chosen for your studies?”
Reformulation: “How effective was the PhD program to help you develop the following skills?”
Options:
- Critical thinking
- Independence
- Technical skills
- Knowledge of the relevant literature for your chosen field
- Developing a network of contacts.

We envision this question to have a 1 to 4 scale for each option, with the addition of a “not applicable” choice.

RIFORMULAZIONE OPZIONI MULTIPLE-CHOICE/REFORMULATION MULTIPLE-CHOICE OPTIONS

Question B2: “Which of the following topics are you actually informed about?”
In this case, we propose to keep the old set of options, by adding a new set, as listed below.

Previous options:
- SISSA Statute and Ph.D. rules
- SISSA contributions (housing, laptop, etc.)
- Housing Service
- ARDISS card to get meal discounts and the process to obtain them (ISEE)
- Psychological Assistance
- Students@sissa wiki
- Students' representatives
- SISSA Club Activities
- CUS (Trieste university sport activities organizing committee)
- SISSA Kindergarten.

We propose to add the following options:
- Dental care;
- CUG;
- Ombudsperson;
- TTO (Technology transfer service).

**Question P1:** “What would you like to do after your PhD?”

In this case, we propose to change the set of options, by substituting the previous with the following.

**Previous options:**
- Keep on with a scientific career in a public institution
- Research for private institution/industry
- Something completely different
- I don’t know
- Other.

We propose to have the following pool of options:
- Stay in Academia
- Become a researcher for the industry
- Become a data scientist
- Become a teacher
- I don’t know
- Other.

**DOMANDE AGGIUNTE/ADDED QUESTIONS**

**Question H1.1.**

We propose to adopt the same formulation of Question H1: “How would you judge the efficiency of the Students' secretariat?” to inquire about the efficiency of the Help Desk.

**Question H1.2.**

We propose to adopt the same formulation of Question H1: “How would you judge the efficiency of the Students' secretariat?” to inquire about the efficiency of the Technology Transfer Service.
Question H5.1: “How do you get informed about the activities of the students’ representatives?”
Options:
- Word-of-mouth
- Poster and flyers
- Social media
- Direct communication from the students’ representatives
- Other: indicate main sources.

We envision this question to offer the possibility of indicating a maximum of two options.

Question L10.1: “Have you ever attended courses in other institutions outside of SISSA?”
Options:
- Yes, in another research institute in Trieste (e.g., ICTP)
- Yes, at the University of Trieste
- Yes, in an institute outside of Trieste (e.g., University of Trento)
- No.

We envision this question to offer the possibility of indicating all of the compatible options.

Question N10.1: “How much time after the beginning of your PhD you started working on your project?”

Question N2.1: “Were you free to choose your research project?”
Options:
- Yes
- No.

Conditional: If no, why?
Options:
- Prompt your response:
- I’d rather not say.

We propose to substitute Question N5 with the following group of questions:
Question N5.1: “Are you satisfied with the amount of time you spend with your supervisor?”

Question N5.2: “How would you judge the quality of time you spend with your supervisor?”

Question N5.3: “How would you judge the availability of your supervisor in helping you on your project?”
Question N5.4: “Does your supervisor have the expertise necessary to mentor you on your research project?”
Options:
- Yes
- No.
Conditional: If no, is he/she available to help you in indicating other collaborators?
Options:
- Yes, a researcher within my research group
- Yes, a researcher in my Area
- Yes, an external researcher
- No.

Question N5.5: “How would you rate the amount of feedback you receive from your supervisor on the quality of your work?”

Question N5.6: “To what extent does any of the following figures support you in your research activity?”
Options:
- My supervisor
- A senior researcher (post-doc)
- Other professors at SISSA
- Other professors outside of SISSA
- Technicians
- Other students.

We envision this question to have a 1 to 4 scale for each option, with the addition of a “not applicable” choice.

Question N5.7: “Overall, how would you rate the supervision on your research project?”

Question O1.1: “How easy it is for you to access the laboratory resources necessary for your research activity?”

**CANCELLAZIONI/CANCELLATIONS**

We propose to delete the following questions:

Question B3: “Which of the following facilities do you use?”
Question H6: “How would you judge the efficacy of the students' representatives in your Area, in the Academic Senate and in the Administrative Council/Board of Directors?”

Question M2: “Have you ever attended at least one seminar in any other scientific institution in Trieste this past year?”

Question M10: “Have you ever attended at least one seminar organized by another PhD course?”

Question L11: “The quality of the courses you followed, organized in other SISSA PhD programs, is on average:”

Question N5: “Overall how effective is the supervision of your Ph.D project by your supervisor?”

Question N9: “Does the project you are working on reflect the quality expectations that you had when you entered SISSA?”

Question xxx3: “In your perception, is safety a priority at SISSA?”

Question xxx7: “Are your requests regarding the correction of unsafe conditions acted on promptly?”

Question xxx8: “How would you rate the support of Health and Safety Service Staff?”

Question P3: “Do you think that your research project is good enough to be able to get a position after SISSA?”