

Advisory Committee
Meeting of 4 March 2020
Meeting minutes

Participants at the meeting

The ANVUR Advisory Committee met electronically on Wednesday 4 March 2020 at midday. The following individuals were present:

Organisation	Member of the Advisory Committee	Present	Present by videoconference	Absent with apologies	Absent
European Research Council (ERC)	Claudio Bordignon			X	
National Council for Economics and Labour (CNEL)	Maria Castriotta			X	
National Council for Economics and Labour (CNEL)	Michele Dau			X	
European Students' Union/ESIB	Rajko Golovic		X		
Lyncean 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		
European Research Council (ERC)	Cristina Grasseni		X		
National University Council (CUN)	Alessandra Petrucci	X			
Permanent Conference of the Administrative Directors and Managers of Italian Universities	Gabriele Rizzetto		X		
European Students' Union/ESIB	Mattia Sguazzini		X		
Secretary-General of the Organisation for Economic Co- operation and Development (OECD)	Dirk Van Damme			X	

The meeting of the Agency's management was also attended by Ines Panico, Technical Secretariat/Legal Affairs Assistant, who assisted the President as the secretary compiling the minutes, and the President herself. During the discussion on point 3 of the agenda, the new President of ANVUR, Prof. Antonio Felice Uricchio, was scheduled to join the meeting.

Activities of the meeting

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 15 October 2019
3. EQR 2015-2019 tender: more details about the third mission evaluation
4. ANVUR programme of activities for 2020-2022
5. Working plan for the Advisory Committee, in accordance with Article 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Committee
6. Other business

1. Notices

Prof. Petrucci took the floor, updating those present on the appointment of Rajko Golovic (designated by the European Students' Union/ESIB) as a new member of the Advisory Committee as a replacement for Fernando Galan Palomares. The President then noted that the term of office of Rolf Tarrach (designated by the European University Association (EUA)) had ceased and the Committee was awaiting corresponding notification, and that the Committee was also awaiting the appointment of the new member to be designated by the Conference of Rectors (CRUI) as a replacement for Prof. Gaetano Manfredi. Prof. Petrucci also advised that three new members designated by the National Council of University Students (CNSU) had been appointed: Alessandra Rundo Sotera, Giovanni Dall'Avo Manfroni and Matteo Giugovaz. The President asked the members to introduce themselves in turn. Lastly, the floor was taken by Rajko Golovic, the new member designated by the European Students' Union/ESIB, recently appointed by means of a Decree of the President of ANVUR. Rajko Golovic greeted the participants and introduced himself.

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

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2019

The President asked for any comments from those present about the minutes described above. As there were no comments or requests for additions to the minutes, Prof. Petrucci declared that the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2019 were approved.

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

3. EQR 2015-2019 tender: more details about the third mission evaluation

The President took the floor, and welcomed the new President of ANVUR, Prof. Antonio Felice Uricchio, elected by the Governing Board in December. Prof. Antonio Felice Uricchio attended the meeting to introduce himself and provide his own institutional greeting. Prof. Uricchio indicated that he was fully available for the purpose of finding a system to make dialogue with the

Advisory Committee more effective and stated that he had advised Prof. Petrucci that he fully intended to make use of the proposals, ideas and suggestions that the Committee may offer. Prof. Uricchio stated that the Agency's work was a team effort and the contribution of the Advisory Committee could certainly progress, especially in this new phase focused in particular on the start of EQR 2015-2019. Prof. Uricchio also added that significant

activities also included the start-up of the new phase of accreditation of study courses and new universities. Prof. Uricchio then announced that in the next half-year, work would begin on the definition of the AVA 3 Guidelines, especially in order to address the critical issues emerging in relation to AVA 2 and to create a valid support tool for the university system as a whole. Prof. Uricchio confirmed the intention to strengthen the Agency's international development, above all through the creation of a solid network of relationships with other international agencies. With regard to the third mission evaluation as part of EQR 2015-2019, Prof. Uricchio stated that the interdisciplinary Group of Evaluation Experts (GEE) would be asked to perform a challenging task, because the list of types of activities that could be considered in identifying the third-mission activities is particularly extensive, and the decision had been made to use a method, falling between the Australian experience and that of the English Research Excellence Framework (REF), whereby third-mission activities would be evaluated on the basis of case studies submitted by the institutions being evaluated. The GEE would have significant responsibility in identifying the evaluation methodologies. Prof. Uricchio noted that the documents on the GEE evaluation methods were to be published by 25 May and stated that the contribution of the Advisory Committee on that subject would be very valuable. Prof. Uricchio concluded his words by wishing the members of the Advisory Committee good luck in their work.

Prof. Petrucci then took the floor, and stated that the Advisory Committee could make an active contribution to the criteria for evaluation of third-mission activities as part of EQR 2015-2019 and asked those present to state their opinions on that issue. Prof. Grasseni took the floor, saying she felt that the third-mission evaluators should not be drawn solely from professional experience in the field of economics, but also from cultural and social spheres. Prof. Laforgia spoke to indicate that activities that provide an economic benefit for universities could not be considered and evaluated, but, rather, only those activities for which universities produce services and advice without economic returns. This would therefore eliminate the differences in GDP between regions, assigning true value to those committed to the growth of the region without obtaining economic benefit.

It would in fact be somewhat mocking for universities operating in areas where development is lagging to see value placed on third-mission activities with significantly facilitated payment in regions that are substantially economically richer. If third-mission activities need to be valued, there is a need to eliminate all actions that generate revenues for the universities in relation to those activities. Gabriele Rizzetto then took the floor, stating that it was important and relevant to know the criteria before choosing the cases, and these must be clearly stated, because the case studies to be submitted would be carefully selected. Mattia Sguazzini then spoke, indicating a desire to receive more documentation about the evaluation of third-mission activities as part of EQR 2015-2019, because he felt that the documents available were not sufficient to enable suggestions and contributions for the Governing Board. Prof. Petrucci advised that the Guidelines on Single Annual Report Form (SUA)-Third Mission were available in the Advisory Committee DROPBOX folder, and read certain specifications stated in the document. Mattia Sguazzini took the floor again to ask whether a list of criteria that could be used for the abovementioned evaluations was available. Prof. Petrucci confirmed that no such list of criteria was available.

Prof. Petrucci stated that the Advisory Committee could provide its opinion by stating recommendations on the composition of the interdisciplinary GEE, the members of which were to be selected by ANVUR, so as to ensure the necessary diversity of skills. Prof. Grasseni then took the floor, stating that the Advisory Committee should undertake activities to explain the criteria used to evaluate third-mission and social-impact activities. Prof. Lapicciarella spoke to indicate that it was very difficult to provide suggestions and that he did not believe that the GEE could operate effectively. The President asked the members to send their comments and suggestions as soon as possible, so that the Governing Board could have them at the beginning of May.

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

4. ANVUR programme of activities for 2020-2022

The President held the floor and reviewed the principal points relating to the ANVUR 2020-2022 programme of activities, focusing in particular on the updates to the AVA Guidelines and the activities associated with EQR 2015-2019, with specific reference to the third-mission evaluation. Gabriele Rizzetto then took the floor, and stated, with reference to the next EQR, that the question of open access would become a major problem that would have a considerable impact on the method of publication. He therefore felt that it was appropriate for ANVUR to discuss the need to take this change in relation to open access into account when choosing the evaluation method, addressing the issue as part of the programme of activities. Mattia Sguazzini then took the floor, noting that it would be appropriate for ANVUR to involve the Advisory Committee in relation to the evaluation methodologies and, in terms of the activities undertaken to gauge the opinions of students, he noted that the Committee had provided observations to the Agency but had not received any feedback. With regard to the section on international development, Mr Sguazzini focused on the EUniQ project, stating that this project was not restricted in terms of time and he felt that it would be appropriate to have time cues from the Governing Board to determine whether it could be useful to involve the Advisory Committee on this issue. He would also welcome more detailed information to establish whether training initiatives are planned in relation to evaluation and quality assurance within Europe that could interest the Advisory Committee or Student Experts. Prof. Petrucci resumed the floor, and, still in reference to the Agency's activities, noted that this year would also see the drafting of the *Report on the status of the university and research system* and announced that this would require the availability in open format of the data to be used to perform the analyses included in that report. Prof. Petrucci stated that from 2020, ANVUR would begin cooperating with ISTAT for the purposes of a complete redesign of the current survey on professional integration of individuals with PhDs, with the objective of undertaking a census-based survey each year, and noted that ALMALAUREA had already conducted a survey on the employment situation of individuals with PhDs, for which documents were available in relation to the methodology used. She therefore believed it appropriate to advise the Governing Board accordingly. Prof. Petrucci concluded by confirming that she would ask the Governing Board for feedback on the document drafted by the Advisory Committee on the issue of gauging the opinions of students, updates about the expiry dates for the EUniQ project, and more details

about the review of the AVA Guidelines and lists of class A and scientific journals, and would pass on the question about open access.

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

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

The President noted that Mattia Sguazzini had drafted a document containing proposals for amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Committee, which had been sent the day before to all members. Prof. Petrucci therefore asked those present to provide any observations and opinions about the issues covered in that document. Gabriele Rizzetto took the floor, stating that the fundamental critical issue was linked to the performance of the meetings of the Advisory Committee, in which the legal quorum was never achieved because of limited participation by members. Another problem was linked to a failure by ANVUR to recognise the role of the Advisory Committee. Lastly, Mr Rizzetto proposed envisaging the possibility of creating working sub-groups within the Advisory Committee, at the discretion of the President, and, in relation to the procedures used to elect the President, stated that because the Committee was an appointing body, there should be a predetermined criterion and not an election among the members. Mattia Sguazzini then took the floor and reviewed the two main critical issues addressed in the document concerned and the corresponding solutions proposed: the absence in the Rules of Procedure of a process for electing the President and the validity of the meetings in terms of the participation of members. With regard to the comments made by Gabriele Rizzetto, Mattia Sguazzini confirmed that the election of the President by the members of the Advisory Committee was permitted under Presidential Decree No 76/2010 on *Rules concerning the structure and functioning of the National Agency for the Evaluation of the University and Research Systems (ANVUR)*. Mattia Sguazzini then suggested the possibility of eliminating from the Rules of Procedure a number of references to the fact that the opinions provided by the Advisory Committee are not binding for the Governing Board, and noted that this wording was not present in Article 11 of Presidential Decree No 76/2010 on *The Advisory Committee*, which governs the powers and composition of the Committee. Indeed, the opinions provided by an advisory body are not binding and there is therefore no need to note that characteristic several times in its Rules of Procedure. Prof. Grasseni then took the floor, thanking Mattia Sguazzini for his work and stating that she fully supported this latter proposed modification. With reference to the options presented in the document under discussion in relation to the procedure for electing the President of the Committee, Prof. Grasseni proposed that the member of the Committee with most seniority in terms of length of membership should preside over the voting process. In the case of a tie in voting, she proposed that the youngest member be elected President. Andrea Lapicciarella then spoke, stating that the fundamental question was linked to the functions assigned to the Advisory Committee and this should be discussed, confirming in any case that he had sent an email to the President indicating his own preferences in relation to the options proposed in the document. Prof. Lapicciarella proposed that it be emphasised in the Rules of Procedure that the opinions provided

by the Advisory Committee were required to be ex ante and not ex post. Prof. Petrucci then took the floor, stating that she supported the proposal to state in the Rules of Procedure that *'persons absent with apologies shall not be included in the calculation of the total number of members of the Committee for the purposes of validity of the meeting, with the exception of the first meeting and meetings for election of the President'*, but did not agree with the proposed modification of the section relating to reporting of absences of members, because this could be linked not to the wishes of the person concerned but to contingent problems. Prof. Petrucci authorised Mattia Sguazzini to reword the proposed modification to the Advisory Committee's Rules of Procedure in the light of the views stated in the meeting.

In closing, the President thanked Mattia Sguazzini for his valuable contribution and urged the members to exchange opinions and suggestions so that a draft modification to the Rules of Procedure could be formalised at the next meeting.

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

6. Other business

There was no Other Business.

The President thanked the participants and declared the meeting closed at 13:40. The next meeting will be held on 12 May 2020 and the final meeting on 15 September 2020.

THE PRESIDENT (Prof. Alessandra Petrucci)*