

Advisory Committee

Meeting of 15 January 2019

Meeting minutes

Participants at the meeting

The ANVUR Advisory Committee met on Tuesday 15 January 2019, at midday, at the organisation's headquarters at Via Ippolito Nievo, 35 in Rome. The following individuals were present:

Organisation	Member of the Advisory Committee	Present	Present by videoconference	Absent with apologies	Absent
European Research Council	Claudio Bordignon			X	
National Council for Economics and Labour (CNEL)	Maria Castriotta			X	
National Council of University Students (CNSU)	Nicola D'Ambrosio			X	
National Council for Economics and Labour (CNEL)	Michele Dau			X	
National Council of University Students (CNSU)	Pietro De Ponti			X	
National Council of University Students (CNSU)	Mario Donadio			X	
European Students' Union/ESIB	Fernando Miguel Galan Palomares			X	
Lycean Academy	Renato Guarini		X		
National Council for Economics and Labour (CNEL)	Costanzo Jannotti Pecci			X	
Unified Conference of the State, Regions, Cities and Local Authorities	Domenico Laforgia		X		
National Council for Economics and Labour (CNEL)	Andrea Lapicciarella	X			
Conference of Rectors of Italian Universities (CRUI)	Gaetano Manfredi			X	
European Research Council (ERC)	Valeria Nicolosi		X		
National University Council (CUN)	Alessandra Petrucci	X			
Permanent Conference of the Administrative Directors of Italian Universities	Gabriele Rizzetto	X			
European Students' Union/ESIB	Mattia Sguazzini		X		
European University Association	Rolf Tarrach			X	
Secretary-General of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	Dirk Van Damme			X	

The meeting was also attended by Prof. Daniele Checchi and Prof. Raffaella Rumiati, respectively an ANVUR Governing Board member and the ANVUR Vice-President, Sandro Momigliano, Director of the Agency, and Ines

Panico, Technical Secretariat/Legal Affairs Assistant, who assisted the President as the secretary compiling the minutes.

Activities of the meeting

The President, Prof. Alessandra Petrucci, first informed the persons present that although the number of people present at the meeting was not legally sufficient to be able to deliberate, the meeting would nonetheless take place in order to further explore the issues included on the agenda.

The meeting commenced with an analysis of the items on the agenda, which were the following:

1. Notices
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2018
3. Update on ANVUR activities for 2019-2021
4. Progress on EQR 2015-2019: documentation sent to the group of experts
5. Guidelines on Single Annual Report Form (SUA)-Third Mission and Social Impact
6. Guidelines for integrated management of performance and budget cycles
7. Working plan for the Advisory Committee, in accordance with Article 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Committee
8. Other business

The President proposed a reorganisation of the items on the agenda, because of the availability of Mr Momigliano and Prof. Checchi. By unanimous agreement of those present, the agenda was reorganised as follows:

1. Progress on EQR 2015-2019: documentation sent to the group of experts
2. Update on ANVUR activities for 2019-2021
3. Notices
4. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2018
5. Guidelines on Single Annual Report Form (SUA)-Third Mission and Social Impact
6. Guidelines for integrated management of performance and budget cycles
7. Working plan for the Advisory Committee, in accordance with Article 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Committee
8. Other business

1. Progress on EQR 2015-2019: documentation sent to the group of experts

In reference to the item referred to above, the meeting was attended by Prof. Daniele Checchi, an ANVUR

Governing Board member, who reviewed the general principles contained in the document relating to the guidelines for the third Evaluation of the Quality of Research (EQR) exercise (2015-2019) as these came out of the discussions within the ANVUR Governing Board. These principles serve as the basis for the implementation of a dialogue with the Universities Department of the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR), in order to launch the publication of the EQR tender notice for the period 2015-2019. He noted the requirement stated by various rectors that the EQR be able to guarantee the comparability of results over time and highlighted the importance of reducing the distinction between bibliometric and non-bibliometric sectors, in accordance with the principle of informed peer review.

Prof. Checchi informed the Committee of the specific attributes of the proposals for the new EQR. Specifically, with regard to the *selection and submission of outputs*, he provided the following clarifications:

- 1) A minimum number of outputs will be identified for monitoring of research activities, variable on the basis of the publication practices of the community concerned;
- 2) Consideration should be given to the differing numbers of authors, with the individual works being weighted using a function inversely correlated to the number of authors and the different roles played in the drafting of the contributions;
- 3) The outputs will be submitted by the rector on the basis of a proposal from the department;
- 4) The reference population will be the employees of an institution (university or research organisation) as at 31 October 2019. At the request of the individual universities, external consultants and contractors may be offered the option of voluntarily submitting their own outputs, with the resulting additional costs being paid by the individuals requesting this option (on-demand evaluation).

Mr Lapicciarella advised those present that he needed to leave the meeting because of an unforeseen commitment.

For the *evaluation of the departments*, in addition to the requirement to submit a number of outputs linked to the number of employees, they would be asked to submit a document illustrating their specific characteristic lines of research, supported by a number of research outputs, which could be peer-reviewed by the Groups of Evaluation Experts (GEE) for the department's main area. This would therefore be a reasoned document indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the research activities, recruitment policies and research outputs and at least one example of a third-mission success achieved over a five-year period. The evaluation process must be concluded with the awarding of a merit category and/or recommendations for improvement actions. At the same time (or alternatively), each university and research organisation may prepare a report on its third-mission activities, performed centrally, which would be peer-reviewed by a third-mission GEE. The final positioning of the universities and research organisations would be identified using a range of indicators linked to both the quality of the research and the third-mission activities.

With reference to the *selection of the Groups of Evaluation Experts*, Prof. Checchi stated that there should not be significant changes with respect to the previous EQR, and the members should therefore be selected using public calls for tenders, and should meet adequate standards of scientific productivity. The candidates will be selected by

the ANVUR Governing Board using pre-established criteria and on the basis of gender equality. The number of members of each gender may not be less than 30% of the total.

Lastly, in accordance with the guidelines stated by the Chamber of Deputies' Commission on Culture, ANVUR's Governing Board hopes that each article submitted for the EQR will be freely accessible through open access (a sufficient condition for identification will be the fact of having uploaded one's output into a university archive with access reserved only for the university).

Prof. Laforgia then took the floor, and informed those present of his concern about the decision to take into account the different roles played in the drafting of the contributions, because of the differing numbers of authors. He suggested careful consideration of this proposal, because the decision could be subject to numerous disputes.

The floor was then taken once again by Prof. Checchi, who responded to Prof. Laforgia by clarifying that this proposal had been made to reduce the weighting of the outputs with a number of authors, so as to tie the authors themselves to submission of a larger number of outputs.

Prof. Nicolosi then took the floor, and expressed her full agreement with the comments made by Prof. Laforgia.

Mattia Sguazzini then spoke, and asked Prof. Checchi to specify when the request would be submitted, in relation to the on-demand evaluation referred to above. Prof. Checchi clarified that this would be a request submitted ex post by the universities.

In terms of the report to be submitted by the departments for the purposes of the evaluation, Mattia Sguazzini asked whether this would be evaluated and whether the content would be fully verified. Prof. Checchi confirmed that the reports would be evaluated, while the verification would be left to the GEE. Prof. Rumiati spoke to this point, stating that guidelines would be developed, intended specifically to limit the risks described by Mr Sguazzini. These would include more precise instructions with reference to the third-mission document/report. In highlighting the complexity of the SUA-TM, Prof. Rumiati also expressed a hope that this document could be used to enable a comparison between the data and that document. Mattia Sguazzini once again took the floor, asking for more specifics about the standardisation of the scores assigned to the outputs. Prof. Checchi advised the meeting that the standardisation practices would represent a continuation of the previous practices. Following his comments, Mattia Sguazzini reiterated his opposition to the use for evaluation purposes of the standardised indicator of departmental performance.

Prof. Guarini took the floor, and asked for a document to be made available as soon as possible detailing the information provided by Prof. Checchi, so that the members could have a document to review that could be used as the basis for new analysis and proposals.

Gabriele Rizzetto took the floor, and congratulated Prof. Checchi and Prof. Rumiati on the work undertaken in drafting the document on the new EQR. He expressed his full support for the introduction of the ex post evaluation, as a means of overcoming the vision of the evaluation activities performed by ANVUR as merely a summation of the data.

Prof. Nicolosi then took the floor, and, in reference to free access on an open-access basis to any article submitted for the EQR, as anticipated by Prof. Checchi, asserted that there was a risk of copyright infringement and the legal limits therefore needed to be considered carefully.

Before closing the discussion on this item, the President added, in relation to the composition of the GEE and in particular the adoption of the principle of rotation of experts, that there was a need to ensure more limited continuity of members (no more than 30%), and highlighted the importance of this issue above all in non-bibliometric areas.

Having completed their involvement, Prof. Checchi and Prof. Rumiati thanked those present and left the meeting at 13:05.

Discussion of the first item on the agenda having been concluded, the President introduced the next item.

2. Update on ANVUR activities for 2019-2021

In relation to the abovementioned item, the Director of the Agency, Mr Sandro Momigliano, took the floor and first updated the Committee about the inspection by the international experts from the ENQA. The Director noted that the inspection had gone smoothly and the Agency had been given a completely positive response by the auditors assigned by the ENQA, who also recognised ANVUR's independence. Mr Momigliano then advised that the Evaluation Report on the Agency would only be made public after 25 April next, the date of the meeting of the ENQA Board.

The Director then reviewed the information stated in the *ANVUR Activity Plan for 2019-2021* associated with the human resources hired by the Agency. In particular, Mr Momigliano clarified that the Agency currently had three fewer people, who could not be replaced, because of secondment to other Administrations, and the Agency therefore had 32 permanent employees and 14 employees with 18-month contracts about to expire, for an estimated requirement for permanent personnel of 48 individuals. The Director added that if the the contracts about to expire could not be extended, the Agency would find it difficult to perform its activities when the contracts expired.

Mr Momigliano then moved on to review the principal activities that the areas of the Agency would undertake in the course of the three-year period and in particular clarified that, from the first few weeks of 2019, the AVA Unit would be involved in a series of activities required to initiate for the first time the initial accreditation of special-

status superior graduate schools, in accordance with Ministerial Decree No 439/2013. Specifically, the Unit will be involved in initiating and concluding the procedures for selection and training of Italian and foreign experts, to be included in the Committee of Experts on School Evaluation (CESE). Given the specific characteristics of special-status superior graduate schools, ad hoc training is envisaged for these experts after the creation of the CESE. In cooperation with the MIUR and the CINECA Consortium, an IT platform will also be created to enable the organised gathering of all the information and documentation provided by the schools for the purposes of evaluation and monitoring. Furthermore, action will be taken to supplement the set of electronic platforms intended to enhance the efficiency of the activities: one for online training and one for the Evaluation Expert Commissions (EEC), for classification of journals.

The Director then advised that, in the course of 2019 and mainly in the two-year period 2020-2021, there would be an intensification of the activities relating to the third EQR exercise, which will cover the period 2015-2019. In particular, the Organisational Unit responsible would undertake the ad hoc analyses required by the Governing Board in order to improve evaluation procedures. Over the end of 2019 and the beginning of 2020, the procedures intended to select the new members of the Groups of Evaluation Experts (GEE) would be implemented, on the basis of a call for expressions of interest published on the Agency's website. Relationships would also be developed with the principal suppliers of bibliometric data. Lastly, Mr Momigliano stated that the MIUR had chosen to focus the Agency's evaluation activities more on results than on procedures and added that, in his opinion, a focus on processes was of fundamental importance, because evaluations cannot be made solely on an ex post basis.

Prof. Laforgia then spoke, and advised that he had to leave the meeting.

The floor was then taken by Prof. Guarini, who asked for a cost analysis statement for each of the Agency's activities. Mr Momigliano clarified that the greatest costs were for AVA and that the additional costs arose from costs for personnel and for the acquisition of data banks, and advised that the document requested would be made available. He then stated that for the EQR, there was a chapter on costs in the *'Biennial Report on the status of the university and research system for 2018'*.

Mattia Sguazzini then spoke, and requested information about the implementation of the Agency's transparency system. Mr Momigliano advised that graphs and statistics would be prepared, covering the evaluation experts, for example, but also other aspects of the activities. A list of employees would also be published on the Agency's website, and those deeming it appropriate would have the option of inserting their CVs.

Prof. Petrucci then took the floor, and asked about the possibility of having access to a more advanced platform than skype for participation in meetings, where applicable to promote the performance of informal meetings. Mr Momigliano proposed WebEx as a potential platform to be used and advised that he would try to move this

request forward. Prof. Petrucci also suggested that there should be discussion about the possibility of implementing a system for collecting feedback from universities about the performance of accreditation inspections. Mr Momigliano supported the proposed introduction of an evaluation tool.

Discussion of the second item on the agenda having been concluded, the President introduced the next item.

3. Notices

Prof. Petrucci took the floor, and welcomed Prof. Domenico Laforgia as a new member of the Advisory Committee, replacing Adriana Agrimi, who had left. Prof. Petrucci also advised that, following the selection procedure undertaken by the relevant committee, the list of 15 candidates from which the MIUR was to select the new members Governing Board of the Agency had been published.

The discussion on the third item on the agenda having been concluded, the President introduced the next item.

4. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2018

In relation to the abovementioned item, the President asked for any comments from those present about the minutes requiring approval. As there were no comments, Prof. Petrucci stated that the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2018 had been approved and introduced the next item on the agenda.

Discussion of the fourth item on the agenda having been concluded, the President introduced the next item.

5. Guidelines on Single Annual Report Form (SUA)-Third Mission and Social Impact

In relation to the abovementioned item, the President took the floor and advised that the final Guidelines on Single Annual Report Form (SUA)-Third Mission and Social Impact were available on the Agency's website and invited the members of the Advisory Committee to consult them so they could make any relevant comments.

Discussion of the fifth item on the agenda having been concluded, the President introduced the next item.

6. Guidelines for integrated management of performance and budget cycles

In reference to the abovementioned item, the President invited the members of the Advisory Committee to consult the documents made available, so they could then be discussed at the next meeting to develop proposals for the Governing Board.

Discussion of the sixth item on the agenda having been concluded, the President introduced the next item.

7. Working plan for the Advisory Committee, in accordance with Article 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Committee

The President asked the members of the Advisory Committee to reflect on the documentation relating to the subjects addressed to suggest new discussion points, emphasising the importance of exchanges of opinion among the members of the Committee and the members of the ANVUR Governing Board, in particular on the issue of the EQR, with the new exercise having begun.

Discussion of the seventh item on the agenda having been concluded, the President introduced the next item.

8. Other business

Prof. Petrucci reiterated once again the importance of taking part in the meetings of the Advisory Committee and recommended that those present promote participation, specifically because of the important function that the Advisory Committee performs for the Agency's Governing Board.

Prof. Nicolosi then took the floor, and asked whether it was possible to use a more functional videoconference system, as had already been addressed by the President.

As the final item on the agenda had been addressed, the President thanked the participants and declared the meeting closed at 14:30. The next meeting will be held on 14 May 2019.

Signed digitally by : ALESSANDRA PETRUCCI

Organisation: UNIFI/01279680480

Date: 03/04/2019 17:32:50

THE PRESIDENT

(Prof. Alessandra Petrucci)1