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Main issues emerging from the current evaluation system of the “organisational and individual performances” in Italian universities

1. Excessive bureaucracy;
2. Need to rationalise timing and scheduling;
3. Little coherence, generally, among the system of performance and the evaluation mechanism of the primary missions of the university (teaching, research, knowledge diffusion) and the administrative support functions;
4. Need to reinforce the link between resources and objectives;
5. Need to enlarge the range of the administrative activities which fall within the valuation activity (greater emphasis on ordinary activities of the administration);
6. Emphasis on individual performances draws away attention from the evaluation of the “the method” and of the “processes”;
7. Need to reinforce competences OIV within the Nuclei, many have been created before full understanding of the implications of the new evaluation schemes;
8. Need to rethink the application of transparency and anticorruption to Universities.
Areas on which the technical table of of CONVUI in currently working (1/2)

• Level of integration of the planning instruments: greater functional and temporal coordination and need to link objectives and resources in order to make the planning tools effective:
  – reschedule deadlines, format and contents of the tools of strategic and operational planning (*piano triennale, pianificazione strategica*), evaluation instruments (*piano delle performance*) and economic and budgetary planning (resource allocation).

• Function of the OIV within the overall evaluation system:
  – Need to maintain and strengthen the principle that performance concerns the whole of the activities of the University (primary and support): organisational performance should not be seen as a stand-alone process.
  – Exploit further the value added of the multidisciplinary composition of the *Nucleo* through the reinforcement of a unitary approach to evaluation of which organisational performance is only one aspect.
  – drawbacks seem to outweigh the advantages of separation:
    • weaken the link between performance, evaluation and the primary activity of universities;
    • increase the number of actors and create an excessive administrative and economic burden for universities;
    • accountability of universities when defining its components;
    • need to change the law.
  – Strengthening the *Nucleo* requiring the presence within it of members who have experience with system performance evaluation within Universities;
  – Need to guarantee a direct link between the Nucleo and ANVUR.
Areas on which the technical table of CONVUI in currently working (2/2)

• The *Nucleo* should **evaluate methods and processes** and not just merit (excessive *focus* on individual performance evaluation rather than organisational performances);

• Need to place greater **emphasis** on **ordinary administrative and support activities** and not, just, on innovative projects (which are a small fraction of the total activities of the university administration).

• Excessive *focus* on the **rewarding system** linked to the evaluation proposal
  – Evaluation and rewarding should be separate moments.

• A clearer definition of the responsibilities of the *Nucleo*, safeguarding the **autonomy of the Universities** and of the **heterogeneity of the system**.

• Improve the interaction between ANVUR and *Nuclei*, besides institutional exchanges of documents:
  – the interaction would reinforce the role of the Nuclei and strengthen their role and their ability to affect decisions within Universities.
Need of re-tuning the system...An issue of method: how?

• **Co-production of innovation** together with the actors who have, until now, applied the evaluation framework within the University and know the implications, advantages and drawbacks of the current system
  – Discussion with CRUI, CONVUI, CODAU;
• Often the problems do not stem from the legislative framework but from **implementation**;
• The issue is not only the **solution** or the **proposal**, but **how the solution is conceived, participated and implemented**: there might be more than one solution;
• Within CONVUI we are implementing a **bottom-up approach**, currently within the **Nuclei**, but the idea is that, each **Nucleo** will proceed, within its University, to **share and discuss** issues which emerge from the CONVUI analysis with the main **stakeholders** aiming at finding shared solutions.
• Greater **transversal integration** with other relevant actors.