



Systemic Governance – The Italian Case Study

Prof. Andrea Mignone – Dr. Monica Penco

Questions

After 30 years of NPM policies, what has happened in the Italian University system and in particular within the Universities?

Does anything change or not?

If yes, to what extend?

NPM in Italy

According to Capano even in Italy 2 trends can be found

- the traditional “planning and control” approach until the end of the 80’s
- NPM starting from the law 168/1989

NPM in Italy

Italy has been experimenting this model since 1989:

- 1989 statutory autonomy
- 1993 financial autonomy
- Quality and assessment systems
- Changes in the institutional structure and governance (1989 – up till now)

The first act: statutory autonomy

A lost chance for Italian universities to set their statutory charts:

- one would have expected universities to rush to approve their statutory charts
- it did not happen and in 1994 they were obliged by the Ministry to adopt the charts
- great isomorphism
- the Gelmini (240/2010) law shows a different trend

The second act: financial autonomy

- lump-sum budget and FFO (Ordinary Financial Fund): the Ministry doesn't decide anymore the university expenditures (limit of 90% of money spent for employees)
- universities can decide on students' fees
- institution of the VSU (Evaluation system for universities)

Indicators to get money

- **Teaching activities:**
 - students' opinions (questionnaire)
 - SUA-CdS based on self-evaluation by each Course of Study and by the university Unit for Evaluation
- **Research activities:**
 - VQR on research evaluation
 - SUA-RD (evaluation of resources-research activities and the so called “third mission”)

The AVA system: first step

Self-evaluation, evaluation and accreditation system: it is compulsory to meet criteria to get “accredited”

- a quality assurance system
- a quality board
- SUA-Cds submission
- final report
- students' opinion data collection (in graduation and graduated ones)

Criteria to activate a Course of Study

- Minimum number of professors
- Financial and economics sustainability of the CdS
- Educational planning

Minimum number of professors

1. Corsi con modalità di erogazione convenzionale o mista						
Tipologia corso	Docenza di riferimento (N. Min)	Professori a tempo indeterminato (N. min)	Ricercatori	Docenti in convenzione <i>ex art.</i> 6, comma 11 L. n. 240/2010, oppure docenti <i>ex art.</i> 1, comma 12, L. n. 230/2005, oppure docenti a contratto <i>ex art.</i> 23, L. n. 240/2010 (N. max) ³		Professori e ricercatori università straniere esclusivamente per corsi interateneo (<i>ex art.</i> 6, comma 11; <i>ex art.</i> 23, comma 3, L. n. 240/2010) o docenti già inseriti nella convenzione caricata nel RAD
				TOT	Di cui <i>ex art.</i> 23 L. n. 240/2010	
L	9	5	4	3	2	4
LM	6	4	2	2	1	3
LMU 5 anni	15	8	7	5	3	7
LMU 6 anni	18	10	8	6	4	9

Criteria for CdS Sustainability

$$\text{ISEF} = A/B$$

Where

A is $0,82 \times \text{FFO} + \text{Students' fees} + \text{costs for location}$

B is $\text{staff costs} + \text{amortization}$

$\text{ISEF} \leq 1$ University can activate a new CdS if the total sum of CdS remains the same

Educational Planning

The Course has to answer the questions as:

- If there is a similar CdS, why does University want to activate another ones?
- Which are the job opportunities for similar course in the same Region or in neighbouring ones?
- Which are the reasons for activating the CdS if occupational opportunities are not so high? If there are other similar CdS within the University?

Research Evaluation

It is the Research Quality Evaluation:

- Evaluation of 1 or 2 research product(s) in 4 years (it depend on the SSD – Scientific sector)
- By group of experts (GEV) appointed by ANVUR (National Agency for University and Research Evaluation)

Changes in Institutional Governance

Literature shows a good level of agreement according to the managerial criteria of the “Market University”

- new role for the Rector (more decisional power, different electoral system)
- relationships with local, national and international background (external stakeholders in the AC)

Changes in Institutional Governance

The Gelmini law defines compulsory criteria:

- compulsory central bodies (Rector, Academic Senate, Administrative Council, Evaluation Board, Financial editor Board, General Director);
- competencies, electoral system and term of office of the Rector;
- competencies, electoral system and term of office of the AS;
- competencies, electoral system and term of office of the AC (changes during the *iter*);

The Senate: the UNIGE case

Academic Senate (2012):

- Rector;
- 5 department heads (elected by all the heads, one for each school);
- 2 professors for each school (at least 2 researchers, 2 1st level and 2 2nd level)
- 2 administrative staff representatives
- 4 student representatives

Academic Senate (before 2012):

- Rector
- 11 Faculty deans
- 23 professors
- 2 administrative staff representatives
- 5 student representatives

The CdA: the UNIGE case

Administrative Council (2012):

- Rector
- 4 professors
- 1 administrative staff representatives
- 2 student representatives
- 3 external members (who have not been members for the last 5 years)

Administrative Council (before 2012):

- Rector
- 7 professors
- 2 administrative staff representatives
- 2 student representatives
- 3 external members

The Rector: the UNIGE case

- Representative power (formal relationships, agreements)
- Legal guarantee and control power (legislation supervision)
- Designation power (vice-rectors)
- Management power (guidelines for the annual plan, building plan)
- Executive power (execution of statutory chart and other regulation charts, urgency decree)
- Little changes between the two versions

The Rector: the UNIGE case

Is the Rector a manager?

- The role of the Rectors is seen as very different by the Rectors themselves according to the single situation namely according to the relationships with the Senate
- The role is seen as very different within literature too: according to some authors he/she can do whatever he wants (he/she can refuse himself to implement decisions taken by Senate or Council, he/she has the urgency decree power, he/she has the agenda setting power since he charts both the Assemblies). According to others, he/she can not (he/she is elected and he has to be accountable to his electorate for the whole mandate)
- In what direction do changes go? It is very complicated to say. On the one hand, the new statutory chart limits the Rector's power (as well as his/her managerial attitude) by adding the "motion of distrust" (proposed by 1/3 of the Senate and approved by the 2/3), on the other hand, his/her term of office lasts 6 years and can't be renewed. This may release the Rector by his/her electoral bonds

Managerial system?

On the one hand:

- evaluation systems
- political trend till 2010

On the other:

- back to central decision (evaluation, statutory chart)
- little change in structure and institutional governance

Essential bibliographical references

- Albert, S., Whetten D.A. (1985), *Organizational Identity*, in L.L. Cummings, B.M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Greenwich, JAI Press. Inc., Vol. 7, pp. 263-295;
- Capano, G. (1999), *Italy: the Endless Transition*, in D. Brown, F.X. Merrien (eds.), *Towards a New Model of Governance for Universities? A Comparative View*, London, Jessica Kingsley, pp. 195-219;
- Chandler, A.D.(1962), *Strategy and Structure*, Cambridge MIT Press;
- Clark, B. (1983), *The Higher Education System. Academic Organization in Cross National Perspective*, Berkley, University of California Press.
- Hall, D.J., Saias, M.S (1980), *Strategy follows structures!*, Strategic Management Journal, Vol. 1, n. 2, pp. 149-163;
- Van Vught, F.A. (1989), *Creating Innovations in Higher Education*, European Journal of Education, Vol. 24, n.3, pp. 249-270.





Università
di Genova