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General framework

• Three Napoleonic Countries entering the NPM paradigm. The common legacy:
  ▪ All assume basically the best person for the post according to objective procedures through public competition
  ▪ Promotions are more likely to follow seniority criteria rather than performance indices
  ▪ Similar mix of internal and external labor market in academia
• Different routes, rationales and paces toward the Evaluative States
  ▪ FR: LRU/Pécresse (2007) strong push of institutional autonomy
  ▪ ES: LOU (2001) sharp acceleration on NPM principles (followed by LOMLOU in 2007)
  ▪ IT: Gelmini (2010) introduction of NPM as a bargained process with rectors (CRUI)
• Different stratification processes
  ▪ FR: excellence projects and collaborations among teams of teams
  ▪ ES: fraction between the strong regions and the weak ones
  ▪ IT: still scattered diffusion of good standing, with predominance of northern (VQR 2013)
• Different rules for promotions and recruitment
  ▪ FR: from collegiality (commission de spécialistes) to managerialism (comité de sélection)
  ▪ ES: abilitación/acreditación and double regional system (since 2001/2007)
  ▪ IT: ASN and local competitions (since 2013; in implementation)

Introduction of some up or out principle?
Which are the actors? The Agencies managing the tools

FR: AERES
- Evaluation of HEIs
  - Evaluating self-selected Centers

ES: CNEAI
- Individual evaluation of “research activeness” (sexenios)
  - National acreditación to be eligible in several sort of posts
    - Some local agencies (i.e. ENQA for Catalunya; ACAP for Madrid)

ANECA

IT: ANVUR
- VQR: compulsory research evaluation of all Departments
- ASN: individual habilitation for associates and full professorships
- AVA: accreditation of courses (still in implementation)
Main Hypothesis

• We assume that beneath different contexts with different evaluative tools, scholars – both individually, in groups and at institutional level – react to the introduction of NPM inspired tools in order to don’t be affected negatively in their careers and their pupils’ recruitment.

• So forth, evaluation (especially evaluation of research) should trigger, even though indirectly, changes regarding:
  • Mobility trajectories, affecting the inbreeding patterns
  • Modes of publishing:
    • Number of outputs
    • Sort of outputs
    • Introduction of (collective) strategies
  • Governance practices in bestowing posts
### How evaluation is seen from an organizational point of view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Strong points</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>National positioning</td>
<td>Spanish Ivy League</td>
<td>Find new resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2</td>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>International fund raising</td>
<td>Spanish Ivy League</td>
<td>Development through fund raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR1</td>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>New vision</td>
<td>Île-de-France</td>
<td>Cope with competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR2</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Regional enrollment</td>
<td>Outside Île-de-France</td>
<td>Manage the merging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT1</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Specific excellence</td>
<td>North West</td>
<td>Reduce collegialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT2</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong commitment</td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Push top-down management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Scheme of the interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEI</th>
<th>#Tot</th>
<th>%Female</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Hard Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How national HE systems and HE Institutions reacted to new rules

**FR: to rebel and then play by the rules**
- FR1 engages the new competition to be part of excellent circles autonomy at institutional level
- FR2 searches the geographical monopoly of students autonomy at centers level (MM)

**ES: to accept the Prince’s will and to run**
- ES1 is committed to reinforce their standing at national level autonomy at group level
- ES2 has to maintain a balance between public fund raising and bonds with private firms autonomy at MM level, but ruled by institution that manage the raised funds

**IT: to postpone and to play down the NPM**
- IT1 has to manage the misbalances between strong and weak disciplines weak central governance through evaluation (transition toward institutional autonomy?)
- IT2 wants to reinforce the third mission to avoid competition with close HEIs (not yet accomplished) autonomy at institutional level
Some preliminary conclusions

The effect of research evaluation not always produces changes in recruitment and promotion patterns

a) public financial availability still plays a crucial role (the Evaluative State rules as it manages resources)
b) practices can be enacted to bypass some NPM features
c) Evaluation of Research becomes a key role as far as stratification and prestige processes are enacted

Major changes concern especially “mid disciplines” (SS). In general, the mean of evaluation becomes promptly an end. The “to publish or perish” gets this declination (especially for promotions):

a) WoS & JCR instead of national reviews,
b) articles instead of books,
c) inter-groups projects instead of solitary/local works,
d) work group instead of single signed works
e) some “taylorization” of scientific production
f) strong emphasis over quality and prestige of projects that award recognition

Recruitment is strongly intertwined with stratification paths

a) self inbreeding is strongly in disrepute (legally and rhetorically) but the same attention is paid to try to inbreed
b) anti-parochialisms policies are effective if weak groups who recruit weak candidates are formally labeled as weak
A final global picture

• Mobility trajectories, affecting the inbreeding patterns
• In FR1 and ES1 there are some evidence of changes in favor of mobility (i.e. post-docs), even though the main pattern remain to inbreed one’s people. FR2 looks less affected, while mobility in ES2 has some issues of external market due to applied disciplines. IT1 and IT2 has no effect on mobility by evaluation

• Modes of publishing:
  • Number of outputs; Sort of outputs; Introduction of (collective) strategies
  • All these points are clear and manifest in all contexts and disciplines
• Governance practices in bestowing posts
• Evidence show that this is not true (or not yet), especially in Italy

- Stratification processes and prestige signaling, enacted directly or indirectly from evaluation, look to be the main factors to change careers