

ANVUR

Meeting of the Advisory Committee - 12 October 2016

*REPORT (ENGLISH Version)*

Agenda of the Meeting held on Wednesday, October 12, 2016 – 12:00 p.m at ANVUR, Rome:

1. Communications
2. Approval of minutes of the previous meeting
3. VQR - first results
4. AVA 2.0 - main changes
5. Cycle Performance - initial assessments
6. Work Plan of the Advisory Committee (art. 3 of the Functioning regulation of the Advisory Committee)
7. Establishment of subcommittees (art. 5 of the Functioning regulation of the Advisory Committee).

Attendees

|   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Conferenza unificata Stato-regioni, città ed autonomie locali                 | Adriana Agrimi                  |
| European Research Council   | Claudio Bordignon               |
| European Students' Union /ESIB  | Fernando Miguel Galan Palomares |
| Accademia dei Lincei  | Renato Guarini                  |
| Consiglio Nazionale dell'Economia e del Lavoro                                | Costanzo Jannotti Pecci         |
| Consiglio Nazionale dell'Economia e del Lavoro                                | Andrea Lapicciarella            |
| Consiglio Universitario Nazionale   | Alessandra Petrucci             |
| Convegno permanente dei Direttori Amministrativi e dirigenti delle Università | Antonio Romeo                   |
| European Students' Union / ESIB   | Mattia Sguazzini                |

Videoconference:

|   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| Consiglio Nazionale degli Studenti Universitari | Angelo Antinoro |
|---|-----------------|

Apologies :

|   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| Consiglio Nazionale degli Studenti Universitari | Nicola Minerva       |
| European University Association                 | Rolf Tarrach         |
| Segretario generale OCSE                        | Dirk Van Damme       |
| Consiglio Nazionale degli Studenti Universitari | Caterina Chiocchetta |
| European Research Council                       | Belen Gavela         |
| Consiglio Nazionale dell'Economia e del Lavoro  | Maria Castriotta     |

Absences :

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| Consiglio Nazionale dell'Economia e del Lavoro   | Delio Napoleone  |
| Conferenza dei Rettori delle Università Italiane | Gaetano Manfredi |

The participants are 9 plus one joining via videoconference, thus the quorum required is achieved and the meeting can start.

In addition to the President Graziosi, the councilors Checchi, Terracini, Meneghetti, the general manager Momigliano and the collaborator Romagnosi attend the works on behalf of Anvur.

President Petrucci thanks all the attendees for the participation and proposes a quarterly agenda for the Committee meetings; the participants agree the following dates:

- 17 January
- 4 April
- 4 July
- 10 October

All the meetings will be held at the headquarters ANVUR, from 12 to 16 pm.

Petrucci advises the Committee that the Board of ANVUR is completely reconstituted and gives the word to Graziosi that inform the attendees about the working progress of the ASN. At the moment Anvur is verifying the possession of the thresholds of the Candidates Commissioners. It is a very hardworking procedures that it is engaging many internal resources. There is a problem of dirty data, due to the fact that Cineca allowed to insert very different items, as reviews and articles.

Petrucci asks news about the national register project for names of professors and researchers and scientific publications (ANPrePS). Checchi replies that the decrees to launch the ANPrePS are still missing. In addition, some universities are ready while others do not yet have adequate IT systems.

Checchi informs the Committee about the working progress of VQR 2011-2014, which now is in its closing phase. There are some problems with people with dual affiliation. Also, at this time Cineca has a problem about labor strike, which could slow down the work. However within mid-October, ANVUR has to close on products in order to send to the MIUR the tables on results within the first week of November. Instead the panel's reports will be ready in January. Panels will work until the 31/10.

Lapicciarella asks information about the product evaluation methodology and Checchi answers that for the bibliometric panels the information source is Web of Science and Scopus. It was constructed an algorithm that takes into account the quotes and Impact factor. For the not-bibliometric panels there is the peer review. In this case, if the two assessments made are similar, the panel does not intervene. In case of divergence of opinion, the panel intervenes by asking a third reviewer.

Petrucci observes that, given the heterogeneity between the subject areas, the panels cannot cover them all. The representativeness is essential, because the panel is responsible of the whole area. Checchi explains that each member of panel turns to peers; if the differences are macroscopic, the areas are divided (as for example the area of psychology).

Lapicciarella asks if there are distortions in this process and if they have been studied. Graziosi recalls that he was president of a panel in the previous VQR and that the panel has found that the distortion is not so high. The other panels have confirmed the same thing. Moreover, Graziosi wanted to complete the peer review with the bibliometry, but it was not possible because it costs too much.

Checchi informs that ANVUR has launched calls for proposals to deepen these topics, but currently there is no evidence practicable. Petrucci asks to see the results of this research.

Agrimi asks for further clarification about the evaluation process of the panel. Checchi explains that the panel has a procedure of product validation. Once validated, the tables on the products are transmitted by ANVUR to the Ministry of Education. From this first delivery (early November) until January the panel works on the report, which may present some adjustments on products. The FFO distribution is based on the delivery of tables to the Ministry of Education.

Then, Agrimi asks what kind of intervention the regions can make with these results, and in particular with the results on the third mission. Checchi clarifies that there is a specific commission on the third mission, the CETM, and that the results of the third mission do not enter into the calculation of the share of rewards. Compared to the VQR panel, the CETM had more problems with the data, especially with regard to the exploitation of public goods, and conducted hearings to integrate information. Also, last June Anvur organized a workshop for a debate between the CETM and faculty and administrative staff, from which useful suggestions emerged. The CETM, with a final report, gives directions to ANVUR about the third mission.

Lapicciarella asks if Anvur has ever matched the VQR data with POR funding and Graziosi replies that it is not an activity of the Agency, neither by mandate nor resources.

The meeting continues with AVA and the recent changes. Terracini makes a brief review of AVA, Periodical Accreditation and the system of visits of universities and programs.

Lapicciarella asks if some universities have ever been closed and Terracini replies that this would be an activity of the Ministry of Education. However, some universities have been sent back, and some have not passed the Initial Accreditation. The accreditation judgment is important for universities at the institutional level and for reputation.

The review of AVA is due to some problems that emerged in the last three years of activity, such as for example the workload for universities to produce the documentation of the Quality Assurance processes and the slippage on the procedural aspects rather than on the results.

Galan asks the duration of Accreditation, how the programs are selected and if Anvur has compared the methodology with other international experiences. Terracini says that the duration of the Periodical Accreditation of the institution is five years, while for the programs it is three. This shift causes some problems in the visit management, so that Anvur asked the Ministry to align the periodicity of the institutional and programs Accreditation. The international experiences have been much studied. Compared to the Netherlands, for example, ANVUR is very small and for this reason it has some limits. For example, Anvur cannot visit all programs, and it assesses a sample of programs or the ones with critical aspects. Criticalities are given by quantitative indicators. The review of AVA is more in line with the ESG.

Galan finally asks if ANVUR plan to obtain accreditation from ENQA and Graziosi says that it is necessary to carry out the visits and the translation of documents.

The Committee requires a further study on the review of AVA and Terracini gives availability for a meeting focused on the topic, to be done by mid-November (when the new AVA guidelines will come out).

The meeting continues with AFAM, introduced by Meneghetti, through a reconstruction of the normative *iter* and of the state of art. The AFAM institutions can require the official recognition with universities. The Ministry of Education does an initial screening and then asks Anvur to verify the presence of the requirements, through seven experts. The 60% of the application has been rejected. At the moment Anvur is defining a clear framework for new applications, with a set of clear requirements.

Momigliano presents the Agency's activities related to the performance cycle and highlights that in Europe no national Quality Assurance Agency deals with this aspect. Anvur has created a working group, it was made a workshop on the topic and in 2015 the guidelines were drafted. The real activity therefore started in 2016, when the universities produced the first integrated plans of performance. ANVUR's task is to assess the consistency of the strategic lines of the institute and see if it is a bureaucratic exercise or not. The goal is to give to the universities a management tool. The first results will be seen in around 1year.

Once finished the report on ANVUR activities, the advisors and the general manager leave the meeting and Petrucci introduces the working plan, proposing to work in subgroups, besides ANVUR deadlines. The three thematic groups could be: 1) Evaluation and internationalization of higher education, 2) evaluation and internationalization of research, 3) evaluation of the activities related to the performance cycle, the third mission and research organizations. These groups may have a coordinator who will interface with the other.

The proposal is debated by the participants and doubts emerge about the division into subgroups. Romeo proposes to maintain the collegiality in the analysis of documents. Lapicciarella agrees with him and believes that is better to work on specific issues, requested by ANVUR. Galan remember that in the previous Committee, the Agency didn't ask specific advices. Bordignon believes that it is essential to define the mission of the Committee, as well as working across the various ANVUR activities. Petrucci and Agrimi believe that the Committee can play a proactive role. Finally, participants agreed that the Committee can make a contribution on internationalization and third mission.

Petrucci then continues with two other proposals: add some rules to the Committee guidelines and appoint Jannotti Pecci vice president of the Committee. Both the proposals are accepted.

The Committee will be held on 17<sup>th</sup> January at 12 am. The meeting closes at 2.30pm.

Roma, 11/11/2016