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Brigida Blasi, Head of Third Mission/Impact Evaluation Unit
• Third round of the Italian national research assessment exercise
• Period: 2015-2019
• Object:
  1. the results of the scientific research achieved in the ev. period
  2. Third Mission activities generating impact in the ev. period
• Targets:
  • Universities
  • PROs
  • other research institutions (also private) upon request
• Units of Assessment: whole institution and internal divisions (departments)
VQR 2015-2019

- *Third* round of the Italian national research assessment exercise
- Period: 2015-2019
- Object:
  1. the results of the scientific research achieved in the ev. period
  2. *Third Mission activities generating impact in the ev. period*
- Targets:
  - Universities
  - PROs
  - other research institutions (also private) upon request
- Units of Assessment: whole institution and internal divisions (departments)
MAIN INNOVATIONS

**Call for participation VQR 2015-2019:**

- Number of research outputs to be submitted per institution
- Panel recruitment process and eligibility criteria
- Open Access
- Rating not ranking: quality profiles
- **Third mission and impact evaluation: case study**
- **Case study approach** vs previous round 2011-2014 *indicator-based peer review*
Each evaluated institution submits a set of Third mission case studies, as a selection of the impacts generated by the department/institution’s activities.

The number of required case studies has been established in the VQR Call.

The quality of the submitted case studies will be assessed and expressed into a 5-point rating scale.

Results: quality profile of Third Mission at institution and department level.
# VQR PANELS

## 17 DISCIPLINARY PANELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Name</th>
<th>Disciplines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Computer Sciences</td>
<td>Physics, Chemistry, Earth Sciences, Biology, Medicine, Agricultural and veterinary sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural and veterinary sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial and Information Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient History, Philology, Literature and Art History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, Philosophy, Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1 INTERDISCIPLINARY PANEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel Name</th>
<th>Disciplines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third mission Group of Evaluation (GEV TM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
staff from universities, managers from public/private administrations, with university-industry collaboration background, people from incubators, science parks, museums, 'science centres', public engagement and research valorisation networks…)

high scientific qualification and international experience in the field of research and its evaluation + third mission background
TIMETABLE

January 3:
Publication of the VQR Call for Participation + Publication of the public calls for the selection of panel members

September 25:
Announcement of revised timetable (due to COVID)

October 8:
Appointment of panel members

February 22 - April 23/May 7:
Submission of case studies by Universities and Research Organizations

June 1 – December 31:
Case studies evaluation by GEV TM

June 30, 2022:
Publication of results and list of assessed case studies
TIMETABLE

January 3:
Publication of the VQR Call for Participation +
Publication of the public calls for the selection of panel members

February 22 - April 23/May 7:
Submission of case studies by Universities and Research Organizations

October 8:
Appointment of panel members

September 25:
Announcement of revised timetable (due to COVID)

December 31:
Case studies evaluation by GEV TM

June 1 – December 31:
Publication of results and list of assessed case studies

June 30, 2022:
Publication of revised timetable (due to COVID)
• Specific examples of Third Mission with impacts in period 2015-19 set out in case studies

• The definition of impact is totally open but the case studies should be related to 10 areas of impact (FoA, fields of action) > different universities, different attitudes and tradition (self-determination with a grid)

• The impact described should be corroborated through a set of indicators and evidences chosen by each institutions, pertinent and meaningful to demonstrate the differences compared to the starting situation

• Submitted case studies: ~700 for 130 institutions in total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Fields of Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual and industrial property valorisation</strong> (patents, plant varieties and other products);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic entrepreneurship</strong> (e.g. spin-off and start-up companies);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology transfer structures and other Third mission intermediaries</strong> (e.g. technology transfer offices, incubators, science and technology parks, consortia and associations for Third mission);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production and management of artistic and cultural heritage</strong> (e.g. museum poles, archaeological excavations, music activities, historical buildings and archives, historical libraries, theatres and sports facilities);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical experimentations and health protection</strong> (e.g. clinical trials, studies on medical devices, non-interventional studies, patients’ empowerment initiatives, biobanks, veterinary clinics, information and prevention days, screening and awareness campaigns);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifelong learning and open education</strong> (e.g. continuous education courses, Continuing Medical Education courses, MOOCs);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Engagement</strong> (community events, science popularization, citizen science interaction with schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production of public goods and policy instruments for inclusion</strong> (e.g. public policy making/formulation, local development and urban regeneration programs, participatory democracy initiatives, consensus conferences, citizen panels);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovative tools to support Open Science</strong>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities related to the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals</strong>;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERIA & RATINGS

Social, economic and cultural dimension of the impact
Relevance in relation to the context
Added value for the beneficiaries
Contribution of the department or similar structure, highlighting the scientific linkage if relevant

The relation with research results is not taken for granted and involved in the evaluation only if relevant for the type of initiative and impact.

The GEV TM has qualified each criteria according to the FoAs > Document on the evaluation panel criteria (it will be soon translated in Eng).
Excellent and extremely relevant:
The case study is clearly described and the impact achieved in its field of action is evident and very substantial. The contribution of the submitting institution has been crucial in generating the impact. Where relevant, a strong link with the institutions’ scientific results is also evident. The results achieved are also corroborated by the set of proposed indicators that are completely pertinent. The impact is highly significant in social, economic and cultural terms and the intervention has created a high added value for a large and diverse audience of beneficiaries.
THE CASE STUDIES AT A GLANCE

- Prevalence of FoAs: Public Engagement, Inclusion and SDGs...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FoAs</th>
<th>Nr. submitted case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g. Public engagement</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Production of public goods and policy instruments for inclusion</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Activities related to the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable...</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Lifelong learning and open education</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Production and management of artistic and cultural heritage</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Clinical experimentations and health protection</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Technology transfer structures and other Third mission...</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Academic entrepreneurship</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Intellectual and industrial property valorisation</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Innovative tools to support Open Science</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Innovative tools to support Open Science
THE CASE STUDIES AT A GLANCE

- Prevalence of disciplinary areas: Life Sciences, Engineering, Social Sciences, Health Sciences...

![Bar Chart]

- 5 – Biological science: 9.4%
- 9 – Industrial and…: 8.5%
- 14 – Political and social…: 7.7%
- 6 – Medical sciences: 7.7%
- 11a – Historical…: 6.9%
- 10 – Ancient sciences,…: 6.2%
- 13b – Economics and…: 5.9%
- 13a – Economic and…: 5.5%
- 12 – Legal Sciences: 5.4%
- 3 – Chemical sciences: 5.4%
- 2 – Physical sciences: 5.3%
- 8a – Architecture: 4.7%
- 4 – Earth Science: 4.6%
- 11b – Psychological Sciences: 4.5%
- 7 – Agricultural and…: 4.5%
- 8b – Ingegneria civile: 4.4%
- 1 – Mathematical and…: 3.4%

Nr. of case studies
Prevalence of keywords (after lemmatisation): research, science, innovation, social, cultural, education, transfer, sustainability, inclusion, development, valorization, popularization, cooperation, collaboration, participation…
- Completion of evaluations (today 92/676) and publication of VQR Reports
- Besides narratives, a list of indicators as possible set of Knowledge Exchange and Societal Impact metrics
- Self-assessment and organizational learning at a micro and macro level
- Input for Knowledge Exchange and Collaboration policy (evaluation as incentive lever)
ANVUR VQR - THIRD MISSION WORKING GROUP

ANVUR Governing Board
Antonio Uricchio (President)
Alessandra Celletti (Vice-President and VQR Delegate)
Marilena Maniaci (Delegate for Internationalisation)
Menico Rizzi
Massimo Tronci

Director Daniele Livon
Research Evaluation Manager Marco Malgarini
Third Mission/Impact Evaluation Unit
Brigida Blasi, Sandra Romagnosi
VQR - GEV TM Coordinator Sauro Longhi
VQR - GEV TM Assistants
Virginia Zambrano, Renata Adami
THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION
Publication of ANVUR Evaluation Manual:

- classification in 8 areas
- informed peer review (analysis of quantitative indicators through expert judgement)
- for the 8 areas: criteria, indicators & questions - the evaluation chain

Creation of 90 TM indicators (standardized and comparable for all the HEIs)

Set up of the central data collection system (standardized and comparable data related to all HEIs)

Use of existing official data sources (i.e. for patents and spin-off companies) to improve data quality and reduce burden & costs for
THE EVALUATION CHAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>1. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>a. inventive activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. portfolio management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ability to strategically choose the inventions to be valorized through assignments, licenses, options and spin-out constitutions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td>exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.c.i) number of assignments, licenses, options contracts/total number of university patents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.c.ii) number of spin-out companies using university patents / total number of university patents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.c.iii) total revenues / total number of university patents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>1.c.1) Has the university developed a policy on intellectual property management and exploitation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.c.1) Is the intellectual property portfolio able to attract the interest of the economic world and obtain a flow of revenues?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ANVUR Evaluation Manual