FINAL REPORT

(English version)

CONFIDENTIAL

Contract n° : SOE2 - CT 95 - 2004

Project n° : 2001

Title : EVALUE
Evaluation and Self-Evaluation of Universities in Europe

Project Coordinator : Pierre Dubois
University of Paris X (UPAR10.TEM), France

Partners :

Germany, University of Hamburg (UHAM.AE)
Germany, University of Erlangen-Nüremberg (UERL.IS)
Spain, University of Barcelona (UBCN.ICE)
Finland, University of Helsinki (UH.SO.RGCS)
France, University of Paris X (UPAR10.TEM)
Italy, CONICS, Roma (CONICS)
Italy, Software for Higher Education, Milan (SISIT)
Norway, Akershus College for Higher Education (HIAK)
Portugal, University of Lisbon (ULIS.IDCE)
Portugal, New University of Lisbon (UNLIS.CSA)
United-Kingdom, London School of Economics (LSEPS.CER)

Reference period : 1 February 1996 / 31 July 1998
Starting date : 1 February 1996 **Duration : 30 months**

Date of issue of this report : 31 July 1998

Project funded by the European Community
under the Targeted Socio-Economic Research Program (TSER)

ABSTRACT

Thanks to 31 case studies of public universities, the partnership EVALUE has answered the three questions posed from the beginning and which deal with performance. 1. Under some conditions, it is obvious that the evaluation improves the university performance. 2. Because each university is, at the same time, a public institution and administration, a set of professional bodies, a firm of knowledge production and diffusion, and because each university has a specific history, the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model is the most pertinent when the university wants to improve its performance. 3. Evaluation dealing with the education-employment relationship is not very structured : the question is more and more situated in all the relationships tied by universities with their economic, political, cultural and social environment.

The evaluation made by many public bodies is, in the eight countries, irreversible. The main stake of the external evaluation is today its contribution to the development of internal evaluation. External evaluation and internal evaluation interact in order that universities, within the frame of their strategy and under the constraint of accountability for money, succeed in improving the quality and performance of teaching, research, and services delivered to users.

Public universities are evaluated and evaluate themselves because they depend on the public authorities and because they are autonomous by law; from now on, the evaluation parallels conformity controls made by the public authorities. Universities are evaluated and evaluate themselves in order to manage in a better way more and more missions : are they able to be excellent in all the fields? So, evaluation can be utilised to manage the tensions between traditional teaching, profession-oriented teaching and continuous training, the tensions between fundamental research and applied research, the tensions in the field of the university-territory relationship (to increase the participation rate in Higher Education, to participate in the cultural liveliness of the territory and in its economic development). At last, universities are evaluated and evaluate themselves because they know strong financial pressures : the increase of the students number, the diversification of missions and degrees made compulsory a growth of the public funding and oblige universities to diversify their financial resources.

The model, the most in favour of dynamics of university change (performance and quality), implements a pluralist evaluation (*participative* and contradictory), a context-sensitive one (taking in count the university environment), a dynamic one (taking in count the university objectives and history), an integral one (making links between all the university activities and dimensions), ant at last which is repeated at regular intervals. The model is developing, but it is still confronted with the other evaluation models.

At the institutional level, the main conditions of development of the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model are the strengthening of the university autonomy (status, forms of government, financial resources) and the enlarging of *contractualisation* policies (from contracts between the public authorities and each university to contracts within each university and between universities). Activities, objectives and results of contracts are evaluated; in that context, an increasing link is observed between evaluation results and allocation of resources.

1. SYNTHESIS

To evaluate means to make, with formal methods and in reference to some objectives and to reference criteria, a judgement about a situation, an activity, an organisation, an individual, an action or a programme; experts are mobilised to evaluate. To evaluate always involves comparisons, within time and/or within space, of several situations, organisations, individuals. To evaluate is also to propose, to recommend changes in rules, organisations, methodologies, cultures.

Is the evaluation a condition of the improvement of the university performance? Which evaluation is the most effective to reach the objective and which are its conditions of emergence and dissemination? EVALUE proposed to answer to these two questions[1]. So, EVALUE had the objective : to develop the knowledge of the evaluation effects. The main policy implication for Higher Education, issued from the research results, is : the "pluralist", "context-sensitive", "dynamic" evaluation seems to be the most pertinent evaluation model to improve the university performance; the strengthening of the university autonomy and the expansion of the contractual policies would favour the development of this evaluation model.

The synthesis summarises two parts of the final report. The point 1 (European university and universities in Europe) and 2 (Evaluations) summarise the third part of the report, devoted to the description of the research results. The point 3 (policy implications for Higher Education) summarises the fifth part of the report.

1. European University and universities in Europe

Common features to universities in Europe : public control and autonomy

During the last years, important changes have concerned Higher Education in the eight countries (Germany, Spain, Finland, France, Italy, Norway, Portugal, United-Kingdom). The history is : continuation of the State control on the universities, and, at the same time, development of the university autonomy. Control and autonomy are situated, more and more often, in a new frame, this of a bargained contract between the public authorities and each university (contract covering several years, fixing objectives and allocating means). This context explains the evaluation development : evaluation is a new form of the State control, and, at the same time, is a possible support for the development of the university autonomy, is a decisive instrument of the "contract" policy.

[1]. EVALUE also had a third objective : to question the education-employment relationship and the university-territory relationship, to explore the evaluations in that field. These questions have been processed in the 31 case studies. Results are summarised in the synthesis and are exposed in a more detailed way in the part 3 of the report.

The public universities form part of the Higher Education public service. Public authorities create them, decide on the missions that universities have to fill and the values that they have to disseminate, establish rules that they have to respect, allocate financial resources, evaluate results. Today, these public authorities are not only the national State : the regional political powers and the European Union have strengthened theirs interventions in Higher Education. However, the university is also a powerful whole of professionals bodies (teachers and researchers), historically based upon the evolution of the knowledge. At last, the university is also a firm which produces and disseminates the knowledge; because of this, it is bound by new constraints : to fix objectives, to use in a better way its resources, to obtain results. So, each public university is a complex organisation which has to manage the tensions and the potential contradictions issued from the fact that it is, at the same time***, an institution, an administration, a whole of professional bodies, a company***.

These tensions, common to the European universities, are perfectly expressed in the tension which exists between the public control on the universities and the university autonomy (autonomy is legitimate for the professionals bodies and for the professional managers). These tensions are identifiable in four fields (missions of the Higher Education system, status and structures, funding, degrees and research); in these four fields, there always is, at the same time, a control by the public authority and an university autonomy.

Public universities have been reformed. Reforms have reasserted the public service values that the universities have to disseminate and to reinforce; reforms have strengthened the ***diversification of the assigned missions*** : initial and continuous training, scientific and technological research, learning by research, dissemination of expert abilities, international co-operation, diversification of career openings for the students, dissemination of the scientific and technological culture, participation to the economic and social development... The diversification of missions has, as a direct consequence, the diversification and the multiplication of the partners which the universities have to bargain and to co-operate with.

Public authorities have decided a ***strong development of the Higher Education system*** in order to face the increase of the student number and the extension of studies, to make equal the opportunities of access on the whole territory. Public authorities create the universities, but, in the context of their statutory and administrative autonomy, the universities have an internal autonomy to organise the teaching structures and the research ones, to implement the most adequate administrative services.

Universities are mainly funded by the public authorities. Their development and the professionnalisation of the studies generate increased costs. In a period in which public budget deficits have to be under control, public funding cannot increase indefinitely, in spite of political priorities in favour of Higher Education. In this context, the financial autonomy of the universities is questioned : to spend money in a better way thanks to modernisation operations, to look for other financial resources.

At last, ***degrees and diplomas, research orientations*** are controlled by public authorities. The diversification of the missions assigned to the universities involves a diversification of the diplomas and of the delivered degrees, a development of the applied researches in addition to the fundamental ones, a creation of research networks with external partners. The university autonomy is practised in these two fields.

Another common feature : evaluation, public control and university autonomy

The evaluation, decided by the public authorities, is developing and is sometimes written in the law as an university obligation. Evaluation bodies, decision-makers and actors are a lot; methods are diverse. Evaluation is becoming an irreversible phenomena and it is, from now, rooted within the university culture; however, it is nowhere stabilised. Bodies are likely to evaluate activities, objectives and results. The development of the external evaluation can be understood in the context of universities which are, at the same time, controlled by the State and autonomous by law.

After a phase of discovery and of experimentation, ***the main challenge of the external evaluation is today the development of the internal evaluation*** : external evaluation and internal evaluation interact in order that the universities, within their strategy and with the best cost, succeed to improve the quality and the performance of teaching, of research, of services delivered to the users. Universities are evaluated and they evaluate themselves so as to well manage tensions between more and more missions : are they able to be the best in all the fields? So, evaluation is sometimes used to manage tensions in the teaching field (tensions between traditional degrees, professional ones, and continuous training), in the research field (tensions between fundamental research and applied research), in the field of the university-territory relationship (to increase the participation rate in Higher Education, to participate in the cultural activities of the territory, to impulse the economic and social development).

Reference models for evaluation are diverse and are conjugated or superposed in the present operations of evaluation, run in the universities. Two models are even extremely old - the conformity control and the peer-review - and are linked to the fact that the university is at the same time an institution-administration and a organisation made of professional bodies. A third model (***managerial model***) is developing in the present period and can be only understood if we consider that the university is not only a public administration and a whole of professional bodies, but also a company which produces services for users and customers with limited resources. These models sometimes organise comparisons between universities. Three frames of comparison are possible : the evaluation can judge an university or a part of a university in comparison to the excellent universities; it can judge it in relation to standards, decided by the public authority or by the university community itself; at last, it can judge it in comparison to average situations (average of all the universities or of the similar universities).

These three reference models are concerning evaluations which are specialised, largely decided by authorities (external to the universities), and conducted by external experts. They do not make obvious the role of the internal evaluation and of the internal actors, the beneficial interrelation between the different evaluation fields. The results of the EVALUE research demonstrate the pertinence of another model : we call it the model of the ***pluralist, context-sensitive and dynamic evaluation***; this model is presented and discussed in the part 3 of this synthesis.

Between universities sharing common features and universities "unique" : ideal-types of universities

It is possible to defend the following thesis : a given university does not look like another university; it is looking for being "unique" in a context in which the competition between the

universities is developing more and more. Each university is "unique" because it is marked by its history and by the choices made during that history. These choices make that the university, with its own manner, conjugates or makes a hierarchy between the missions prescribed by the public authorities; it realises its public missions by an original set of degrees and of researches, by an implementation of original structures, by specific financial choices, by specific appropriations of the evaluation results...

However, we also observe ***similarities between some universities***. If we take into account nine dimensions to characterise universities (missions, seniority, student population, teaching disciplines, structures, research, staff, financial resources, relations with the territory), we can make the hypothesis that these features are not conjugated by random. The observations issued from case studies have allowed to build, ex-post, three ideal-types of universities : the universities of general character (or universities of full exercise), profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences, universities of territorial development.

2. Evaluations : research results

This second part of the synthesis presents the main results of the research. They are based upon "states of play" of the evaluation, of its objectives, of its bodies; these states of play have been realised twice, in 1996 and 1998. The results are mainly issued from 31 case studies[2]. Four points are developed :

Contents and Objectives of the Evaluation

2.1. Evaluation of university activities and university results in the field of teaching, of research, and of education-employment-territory relationships

2.2. Evaluation of resources : evaluation of the academic staff, of the non-academic staff, of the organisation (university government, financial resources, structures)

Evaluation : Actors and Methods

2.3. The Actors of Evaluation and the Decision to Evaluate

2.4. Statistics and indicators

[2]. States of Play and Case Studies are in the CD-ROM EVALUE (it includes all the raw materials of the research).

2.1. Evaluations of activities and of results

Evaluations of teaching and learning

Universities have a mission of teaching and learning. The diversification of this mission is a tendency of the present period : universities do not have only to disseminate a high level knowledge for students registered in a process of an initial education, but, and more and more, they also have to prepare students to employment, to organise the continuous training for employees. Knowledge is structured in diplomas : they are dominantly disciplinary or dominantly profession-oriented (in that case, they often conjugate several disciplines). The dissemination of knowledge and expertise is organised according to a progression (undergraduate to postgraduates degrees). ***The tendencies observed in Europe*** are : diversification of the degrees, increasing importance devoted to profession-oriented degrees and to high level degrees (masters and doctorates), will to increase the number of graduates to have a better economic and social development. The diversification and the lengthening of studies involve a diversification of the student population according to the age, the status, the attendance modalities (part-time or full-time, at distance, sandwich courses...)

In most of countries, ***public authorities control the degrees***, either by defining their contents (national curricula), either by distributing them on the territory, or evidently by allocating resources to organise them. This traditional control (a priori control) is a first form of evaluation; for profession-oriented degrees, the control is also made by professional bodies (accreditation procedures). At the same time, universities have, traditionally but also by law, an autonomy in the pedagogical matters. Evaluation of teaching and learning cannot be understood without that double reference (external control and pedagogical autonomy).

In the nineties, the evaluation of teaching and learning is developing : it deals with diverse aspects and has varied forms. The external evaluation, made by national bodies or by co-operative bodies initiated by some universities, has two great modalities. The first compares the teaching of a given discipline in all the universities or in a whole of universities; the second one compares all the diplomas inside only one university. These two forms present an advantage and an disadvantage. The first allows a comparative state of play of a discipline at the national level; so, each university is able to know its strong and weak points; however, each university is permanently engaged in an evaluation process of its different degrees. The second form concentrates in the time all the teaching evaluations, makes easier the internal mobilisation, links in a better way the teaching evaluations and the organisation functioning; conversely, it makes difficult the comparison of a specific diploma between universities.

The external evaluation is successful when it allows to set up internal evaluation processes in a permanent way, when changes are decided in the teaching contents, in the learning methods... In that case, the pedagogical autonomy is more or less practised, by the way of innovative practices (***student participation in evaluation***). Nevertheless, internal evaluation of teaching and learning is under pressure : it is an effectiveness evaluation, looking for an improvement of teaching quality, pedagogical methods, student learning, successes in the exams, insertion of graduate students in the labour market. At the same time, the internal evaluation has to take into account the available and limited resources, to rationalise and to save them : it is also an efficiency evaluation. So, it is not surprising if some teachers are reluctant to evaluation, if evaluation sometimes generates frustrations (only one example : teaching in small group is very

effective, but, due to the lack of resources, it is systematically developed only in some countries.

Evaluations of research

Universities have a traditional mission of research; but a diversification is in progress : fundamental research and research-&-development are from now linked, in favour of the economic development. The ***tendencies observed in Europe*** are : a research activity existing in all the universities (we do not observe a cut between research universities and teaching universities), an extension within universities of specific structures devoted to research at the expense of structures associating teaching and research, an extreme fragmentation of the research fields (linked to the knowledge evolution and to the question - non still resolved - of the interdisciplinary co-operation), a diversification and a specialisation of the financial resources (decrease of the funding issued from the university lump sum budget), a stronger competition between universities to catch external funding.

The strengthening of the research evaluation, of its activities, resources, processes and results is another observed tendency : ***universities have to be accountable of their researches, of their research performance***, because the allocated financial resources are important. More precise points : the development of external evaluation, linked with an internal evaluation, is almost universal; the external evaluation can be in keeping with a *contractualisation* process between the public authority and the university; the conjugation of external and internal evaluation makes more complex evaluation processes. The research evaluation is more and more a collective one, an evaluation of the research units and no more only an evaluation of the researchers as individuals. Evaluating the quality and the performance of research makes necessary the use of referents, of criteria : the tendency is the use of international quality standards, the mobilisation of international experts; the development of European research contracts has certainly reinforced this tendency towards the homogenisation of referents.

The evaluation of research associates qualitative evaluation and quantitative evaluation. It makes compulsory the recourse to experts of the research field and to their qualitative judgements. However more and more often, it mobilises ***quantitative indicators***, specially when research centres have to be compared : abilities to catch external funding, publications ranked by importance, international co-operations and mobility, post-graduate education and training for research... Conversely, quantitative indicators for the applied sciences (patents, mobility of researchers towards the industry, creation of small companies issued from research centres) are not so developed. In all the countries, publications are taken into account in the evaluation process; researchers accept this evaluation criteria : the potential perverse effect - researches without risks or publishable in a short term, multiplication of publications issued from the same research - is not actually observed and can be easily maintained under control (for the last Research Assessment Exercise, British researchers have been allowed to submit to evaluation a maximum of four publications). The most difficult question is the question of comparability of the quantitative indicators between the scientific disciplines and the social/human sciences : the latest meet difficulties to have good scores for each of the indicators; the question is resolved in some universities, when they have set up internal policies of *contractualisation*, of partial resource re-allocations between the disciplines on the base of locally bargained criteria.

A last tendency is observed. The ***evaluation results have more and more an financial impact***: policy of excellence centres, receiving additional resources. However, the tendency is not universal : development funds, internal or external to universities, allow the creation of new research centres or the launch of new research topics; they counterbalance the tendency to a funding based upon results.

Evaluation of the education-employment relationship

In the present period and in most countries, university teaching and research missions are becoming more precise. From now, universities have to prepare students to employment, to participate to the production and to the updating of skills which are required by the changes in production systems (as well for the future employees as for the present ones), to contribute to the economic development and more particularly to the dynamics of the territory in which they are located.

In spite of the importance of these new assignments, their evaluation ***has been developed more recently*** in comparison to the teaching and research evaluations. This evaluation field is not very regulated and not very institutionalised. Optional, the evaluation is largely informal and punctual. When it is implemented, it is characterised by a great variety of actors, contents and objectives, by the diversity of evaluation instruments.

Several evaluation fields are possible : creation of profession-oriented diplomas and/or changes in their contents, continuous training, insertion of students in the labour market, university-territory relationship. ***The development of an evaluation dealing with the professional insertion of students*** depends on the labour market situation, on the university seniority, on the specificity of the offered diplomas. Structures, provisions, methodologies, measures are diverse : punctual surveys, observatory inside the university, regional observatory working together with a national observatory.

Evaluation of the university-territory relationship is, still more, marked by the multiplicity of objects and objectives : increasing skills of the local young population, fixing young people on the territory (avoiding their departure towards the great university towns), increasing the locals markets of products and service by the student consumption, giving life to the territory by cultural and social activities organised by the university, creating jobs within the university, launching university-firm partnerships for research and technological transfers, partnership between universities of the same region.

The attention paid for the new university missions is explained by ***different factors*** : graduates' difficulties to find a job (so, the students question the relative value of different university degrees), greater attention paid by firms in the university resources and in the continuous education opportunities, a partial decentralisation of education questions towards the local authorities (specially towards the regions), increasing of university funding by the local authorities.

However, the weak development of the evaluation of the education-employment-territory relationship can be explained by ***a lot of obstacles***, due to the actors and to the difficulty in building questions and analysis. Graduates keep few contacts or do not have contacts with their university and, so, make few feed-back about the teaching they have received. Some

teachers are reluctant to an evaluation of the diplomas and of their contents by the professional milieus ("employers only know their specialised and short term interests"); they are in favour of an evaluation which also measures the social pertinence of degrees and not only their economic performance. Employers are interested in the partnership with universities, however they are reluctant to promise to hire students in training courses, to recruit new graduates, to fund the research in a long term. Public authorities, State and Regions, are also responsible : lack of implication of the official evaluation bodies in the field, weak allocation of specific financial resources.

The weak development of this evaluation field is also explained by ***the difficulty of building clear problematic***. Methodologies to measure the students' professional insertion are got under control, but a central question remains : are the difficulties to find a job for the students graduated in a given discipline explainable by the poor quality of teaching and/or by the deterioration of the labour market due to other factors? The evaluation of the university-territory relationship questions the diversity of territories : which is the pertinent space for the evaluation? the local space? the regional, the national, the European ones? More, the results of the interrelation between the education system and the social, economic (labour market), cultural environment are particularly difficult to apprehend and to interpret, because the parameters to take into account are a lot.

2.2. Evaluations of resources

By resources, we mean evidently the personnel (academics, engineers, technicians, administrative personnel and workers), but also the financial resources. At last, the organisation is also a resource : the university government and the structures (faculties, departments, administrative and technical services). In comparison to the teaching and to the research evaluations, the evaluation of resources is still weakly structured and is relatively new, even if the evaluation of staff, as individuals, is traditional. The evaluation of resources is centred on the efficiency : are they used in the best way to reach good results?

Evaluations of academic staff

Several tendencies are observed in Europe. In the recent period, the number of teachers has increased because of the increase of the student number. Academic staff is traditionally organised in disciplines and in ranks; their missions are teaching, research and responsibilities in these two fields. Their evaluation, as individuals, is traditional : they are evaluated when they are recruited and during their career. Academic staff evaluation is traditionally made by the peers of the same discipline. Another tendency is largely observed : the lack of professional and of continuous training to practise the teaching function.

Beyond these common tendencies, we observe ***differences and changes*** : supervision rates (number of teachers by student) differ according to the countries (they are higher in the Northern Europe) and according to the disciplines (they are higher in the scientific and health disciplines); teachers are, in most countries, civil servants, but the number of teachers who have a contract for a limited duration is increasing. The changes in the evaluation field are also obvious. We observe ***a strengthening of the recruitment power by each autonomous***

university, parallel to the traditional power of the disciplinary professional bodies. The evaluation of the teachers' contribution in the quality and in the performance of teaching and research is developing. This tendency is paradoxical : evaluation of the individual performance and of the collective one sometimes coexist. A logical, but still rare, consequence of performance measures is the development of individual and/or collective contracts which fix the objectives to reach.

The recruitment always associates at least two decisional authorities (the faculty or the department, and/or the university as such, and/or a national authority); it always pays attention for research. Conversely, the composition and the size of recruitment committees, the periodicity of recruitment, the modalities and the criteria taken in count to evaluate the applicants (apart from the research criteria) are very diverse. The role plaid by the central authorities of the university seems to be increasing : they decide on the employment policies (they are directly linked to the financial resources), and so they influence the number of jobs; sometimes, they influence some elements of the wages (amount of premiums and conditions to have them); at last, these authorities have a power of sanction.

The teachers' collective contribution in the faculty teaching and in the department researches is more and more evaluated. Sometimes, the evaluation of teaching involves an evaluation of the pedagogical performances of the teachers; a phase of self-evaluation of the working conditions, of the time devoted to the preparation of lectures and of the interrelations with the students can precede the evaluation; students can be associated to the process. External evaluators, when they evaluate teaching or teaching projects, can evaluate teachers' abilities and skills; it is the same for the evaluation of the research centres. A possible consequence is a greater competitiveness between colleagues and a greater control by them; so the traditional freedom of teaching and research could be limited in the future.

Evaluations of the non-academic staff

There are two kinds of non-academic staff evaluation; managers, engineers, technicians, administrative personnel, workers are concerned. The first deals with the people, considered as individuals, and with the main steps of their career (recruitment, learning, stabilisation on the job, promotion, mobility); that evaluation organises people' flows according to the available jobs in administrative structures, according to rules and to individuals' demands. The second one, more innovative, deals with the ***collective contribution of those personnel*** to the efficient and effective university functioning. If the first type of evaluation is present in all the countries, the second one is only beginning.

In a general context of increasing workloads for universities, ***two configurations of countries*** can be identified on the basis of two parameters : the number of non-academic staff and the university financial situation. The first configuration deals with the countries of the northern Europe (Finland, United-Kingdom, Germany, Norway) : there is a great number of non-academic staff, but the financial pressure on the universities is strong. The second one deals with the countries of the southern Europe (Spain, France, Italy, Portugal) : there is a relatively smaller population of non-academic staff, but the financial pressure on the universities is less strong. So, the countries, in which the rate of supervision (number of non-academic staff by student) is the best, implement, because of the financial pressure, evaluations of the non-academic staff contribution.

In the first configuration of countries, the ***evaluation objectives*** are rather : to measure the effectiveness of the administration, to use people in the best way in order to achieve the university missions, to create performance and quality indicators of the delivered services, to reduce non-academic number, to simplify and to rationalise the administrative structures, to find the best arbitration between centralisation and decentralisation of the administration, to clarify the hierarchical lines. In the second configuration of countries, the evaluation objectives are rather : to have a better knowledge of the non-academic population, to check the implementation of the administrative rules, to create individual payment systems, to set up equal and standardised workloads, to make the personnel more professional and responsible, to create new functions and new jobs.

The process of the non-academic staff evaluation is relatively slow : it needs several years, knows successive steps, involves a large participation of personnel. The evaluation deals with a lot of objects, linked to questions of effectiveness and efficiency : job contents, tasks, task allocation, relations and orders, payment systems (for the job and for the individual performance). The ***most frequent evaluation effects***, or the clearest ones, are the development of staff continuous training, the clarifying of responsibilities, the development of computerised information systems, the creation of internal evaluation units of cost and/or performance indicators.

Among the factors pushing to the evaluation of the non-academic staff contribution to the university functioning, we observe : the stabilisation of the student number (the university has to be attractive), the budget "globalisation" and the potential financial difficulties, the structure diversification and the strengthening of the central administration, an administration government which gives the priority to the quality of services delivered to the users. Among the factors slowing down the evaluation, we observe : strict external regulations (recruitment and mobility rules, payment systems, promotion and career directly linked to the seniority, working time, job security...), uncertainties about the administration government (lengthening of the hierarchical lines, lack of unity in the hierarchical lines, persistence of the traditional trade union control).

Evaluations of the organisation

The evaluation of the organisation concerns a whole of resources : the university government and the decision-making process, the teaching and research structures, the financial resources. The evaluation questions : is the university organisation efficient and effective to achieve the teaching and research missions which are assigned by the law? We observe, in the case studies, two tendencies. Evaluations of the organisation are rather specialised; they are not directly linked to teaching and research evaluations; they are weakly co-ordinated. The evaluation of the organisation is developing, but it is not institutionalised in all the countries and in all the universities; the evaluation of the university government and of the decision-making process meets a lot of obstacles.

* Evaluations of the university government

It is paradoxical to observe that the external evaluation of universities, which is developing in all the European countries, pays little attention for the university governments, in spite of the fact that they are reinforced. How the university government analyses the needs of the society, of the users, of the partners? How they decide the objectives to achieve? Which priorities they set up? Which resources they allocate to the priorities? How and by which organisation they implement them? How they evaluate the results? Who are the governing people? If we have to rule out the hypothesis that governments have a little influence on the university results, several hypothesis can explain the ***weak development of the governments evaluation***. The governing staff, when he decides an external evaluation, can exclude the topic from the evaluation. The external evaluators do not evaluate the government because he has to implement the imposed or recommended changes. To evaluate the governments can lead to destabilise some of them and this fact is not desirable because, at present, it is difficult to find teachers who accept to take responsibilities. At last, university governments are elected for a limited period : the evaluation would take the place of the election.

In fact, ***the university government and particularly the rector play a key-role*** in the development of external evaluations and in the dynamics of internal changes. At the same time, the external evaluation strengthens the central government of universities. More, the evaluation is one of the factors which contributes to the consolidation of a specific government, the presidential one or more precisely the presidential-managerial one (strong rector and strong administrative hierarchical line working according to the entrepreneurial criteria). However, the perpetuation of such a government is governed by the alliances or compromises passed with the two traditional university governments, the collegial one (one cannot abolish the influence of the academic staff profession bodies), the bureaucratic one (with an administrative hierarchy who controls the implementation of rules set up by the public authority).

* Evaluations of financial means

The role of public resources in the university funding is predominant in all the countries. However, changes are obvious and allow to understand the orientations of resources evaluations. All the changes seem to be the consequence of ***increased financial pressures*** : in a context of Higher Education growth, publics authorities want keep under control and to rationalise financial resources allocated to universities. The financial pressure is higher in the countries of northern Europe, i.e. in the countries in which the expenses by student are higher than in the average of OECD.

First evolution : ***the "globalisation" of the allocated resources***. Universities can distribute a lump sum budget according to their strategy; it is a way to reaffirm the autonomy and the responsibility of each institution. In fact, the globalisation is not total : it rarely includes investments for real estates; in France, the lump sum budget does not include the civil servant wages. Another tendency is that the resources are allocated by the public authorities not only according to activity criteria (number of students for instance), but, more and more, upon the basis of contracts. In the first time, these contracts fund objectives, bargained with and accepted by the public authorities; in the second time, but according to a proportion which is still minority, contracts allocate funding according to the achieved results (funding according to the performance achieved during the previous period). We also observe a tendency to

allocate funding for a number of years for the investments or for the contract objectives. At last, we observe a tendency to the diversification of financial sources : increased funding by regional public authorities, by firms, by students (student fees).

To evaluate the financial means is to evaluate ***the resources and the expenses*** of each institution and of its components. Resources and expenses are presented under the form of a budget (resources and expenses for the following period) and/or of a balance sheet (resources and expenses of a previous period). The budgeting process (preparation, discussion and vote by the university council) is an internal evaluation of the financial means. At the same time, budget and balance sheets are the main tool for the evaluations conducted by external evaluation bodies. A clear and transparent presentation of the balance sheet is the necessary basis for the "accountability" principle. This principle is still rarely implemented : we have to emphasise that budgets and balance sheets, presented in the university councils, have a very diverse structure, not only from a country to another, but also from an university to another within the same country. The most often, comparisons are impossible.

A second tendency is, in most of countries, that the university balance sheet is regulated by the public accounting : this limits the financial autonomy of universities; as a consequence, universities sometimes set up more flexible and private structures (Foundations or Associations), particularly for the research or continuous training activities. One of the financial means evaluations is the ***"conformity control"*** : resources and expenses are examined by external bodies who have in charge the economic and financial control of the public institutions. In some countries, we observe the tendency of these bodies to audit the pertinence of expenses. A third tendency is the punctual recourse to private consultant agencies : they audit such or such aspect of the financial situation.

The last tendency is the ***development of the internal evaluation***. It is developed in relation with the internal process of resources allocation. New allocation mechanisms and new criteria of resources distribution between the university components : they allow changes in allocated resources according to the strategic choices, decided by the university. The internal evaluation is particularly developing when there are a financial pressure, limited or reduces resources; it is also an effect of the external evaluations. It needs, at least in a first period, a strengthening and a centralisation of the budgetary and financial management : we observe, for instance, the creation of central funds that the rector can allocate according to the university strategy. Then, the evaluation can lead to decentralised budgetary policies (each component is responsible for its resources and its expenses), to policies of internal contracts (funds are allocated to an university component according to its objectives and to its results).

* Evaluations of structures

One of the consequences of the growth in the student number is ***the increasing number of structures*** within universities, particularly at their central level. The other tendency is this of ***more complex structures*** because of the diversified missions assigned to universities. So, the problems questioned by evaluations are : do new structures have to be set up? Do the existing structures have to be split or merged? How structure levels are pertinent? Is it necessary to centralise or decentralise? Are the same tasks achieved by several structures? The will of more flexible structures, more dynamic, ready to fill the users' needs, according to the quick changes of the environment, is central in the evaluation of structures.

Three great types of structures have been identified for the analysis : traditional academic structures (faculties, departments, institutes, research centres...), support structures for teaching and research (libraries, computing centres...), non-academic structures (administrative and technical services, the most often centralised, such as personnel, financial, student registration services...). National evaluation bodies essentially evaluate teaching and research, and, at a lower degree, they evaluate the organisation : 62 evaluations of structures have been identified in the 31 case studies; they have been classified and some statistical operations have been made on them (it is the only case in the research).

More than a half of the evaluations deal with the academic structures of teaching and research. On third concerns the non-academic structures and only one sixth the support structures for teaching and research. These evaluations are essentially decided by the universities in the context of their autonomy : it seems to be an important condition to monitor changes. They are internal evaluations in one third of the cases, external evaluations but decided by the university management in another third of cases, audits by private consultant agencies in 5% of the cases. The evaluations of structures are decided by the public authorities, only in 25% of the cases.

75% of the identified evaluations have been made in the universities of general character : they essentially evaluate their academic and their non academic structures and, at a lesser degree, their support structures; they decide on the evaluation and on their external or internal realisation as the average of universities. The profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences evaluate, more than the average, the support structures and the non-academic structures; more than the average, they make internal evaluations and mobilise private agencies, as if, because of their proximity with firms, they adopt their behaviour. At last, the universities of territorial development do not evaluate a lot their structures; they are more concerned by the external evaluations (evaluations essentially concern their support structures); maybe, these universities, because they know an important growth and because they frequently set up new structures, are not ready to evaluate the structures (it would be a non-sense for the new ones).

More, ***other results are important***. It seems that there are not more evaluations in the universities with a great autonomy than in the universities with less autonomy; nevertheless, it seems that there are more external evaluations when the university autonomy is strong. The degree of decision-taking decentralisation seems to be an interesting advantage for the valuation development. Internal evaluation bodies seem to play a pushing role in the development of the organisation evaluation. However, the most important factor for the evaluation of structures is the financial situation : the financial is pushing the rationalisation.

2.3. The Actors of Evaluation and the Decision to Evaluate

The configurations between the actors are crucial for the results and the outcomes of evaluation, for the organisational change and learning. Two criteria can be used to elaborate typical configurations : the initiator of the evaluation process and the system of the authority, power, dependency or autonomy between the key actors. The key-question is the type of connection between the evaluation, decision, negotiation and action.

Controlling evaluation, the most often, is initiated by the public authorities and is compulsory, its aim being to elaborate or legitimise decisions of financial, statutory or organisational nature which are made by the initiator on behalf of his position of authority. The link to the decisions is strong or even automatic. It is based on the results of evaluation rather than on the process. The use of common indicators allows broad comparisons. Participation is restricted. The process is sectorial, highly discontinuous, and the learning process is weak. According to the goals of renovation the state-run initiatives have in recent years been oriented to reduce costs and develop accountability and to set up a new form of regulation, to strengthen selectively the higher education system in a context of internationalisation, to harmonise and rationalise the higher education system, to preserve the unity and quality of the universities in the face of decentralisation and development into mass universities.

Autonomous evaluations result from an initiative by the evaluees themselves (university, faculty or laboratory, local actor). The goals are as follows : to promote the elaboration and assessment of quality, to reach international standards, to change internal organisation and culture, to legitimate the direction of the university, to gain access to professional or institutional network resources and to sharpen the university's image, to augment its visibility in a context of competition, and to keep control of the process in the face of the State's initiatives. Autonomous evaluations are developing in specific contexts : situation of competition, universities which are relatively homogeneous, strong power of the rector. Development, learning and quality enhancement are stressed. The terms of reference are self-defined : there is no comparison with other situations (but comparisons through time are allowed) and evaluation is highly contextualized. The link to a policy, to decisions taken by internal or external authorities, is weak or non-existent and so are the resources that can be put at the disposal of the evaluees to upgrade their performance. Participation is broad, but motivation may be weak, because of the absence of a link between the decisions and the means.

Hybrid situations, conjugating controlling evaluation and autonomous evaluations, are a lot. At first, they are co-operative or contractual configurations, initiated by the government and by the university. They involve the contracts and their negotiation (evaluation of the university performance and of its results, funding according to performance or to objectives). ***Vertical contractual agreements*** allow a broad participation and a flexible dialogue between evaluation and decision. However, the degree of participation is highly dependent upon the way the head of the university organises internal evaluation and project construction processes. This contractual form is highly unstable, as it combines contradictory elements : devices which correspond to the logic of controlling evaluation, such as the use of quantitative indicators triggering off automatic decisions of resource allocation on a global basis along with the approaches which favour negotiations on a project.

The case studies demonstrate several experiments in "benchmarking" between two or several universities, ***co-operative initiatives (bilateral or federate)***. These experiments have been based on joint initiatives of two or several universities providing interesting examples of participatory "cross-evaluation". Bilateral configurations allow an opportunity to establish a climate of confidence, especially if universities are not competing with one another. However, the problem of means is left open. Horizontal multilateral co-operative forms of the federate type make it possible to disconnect evaluation from decisions, which means a less threatening process for the evaluees.

At last, it seems that a combined set of evaluation initiatives is not the most frequent situation, but an ***uncontrolled accumulation of evaluation ventures***, launched independently by the various actors and/or bodies. Three problems result from the situation: a problem of priorities, a problem of timing (calendar), and a problem of co-ordination (coherence). But, it may happen that an initiative triggers off another initiative, or is strengthened by an another initiative; central initiatives in the field of evaluation are not necessarily a hindrance to the development of the initiatives at the level of the universities.

In the case of a central initiative, the evaluation can be delegated to the administration of the Ministry, to official evaluation bodies of their own standing, to a consulting firm, to the university itself. In the case of an initiative coming from the leadership of the university, the operation may be commissioned to an agency set up by a Rectors'conference, to a management consulting group, to an internal body. There are ***several problems connected with the commissioning processes*** : the initiator has difficulties to make the complex terms of reference sufficiently explicit for the commissioned agency, or for the commissioned agency to the experts; there is a risks of bureaucratisation of the agency, especially if it is established on a long-term basis; the commissioned agency or experts may lack responsibility if they are not considering the consequences of the evaluations they produce; this can lead to irresponsible and decontextualized evaluations or to loose, unstructured and consensual evaluations which are not very useful.

Concerning the institutionalisation of the evaluation at the university level, the case studies demonstrate ***the crucial importance of permanent structures***, ensuring coherence and appropriate timing of the various evaluation procedures in the university, and maintaining continuity. They can provide support for decentralised initiatives. They seem to be efficient only if they are tightly linked with the direction on one side and with the faculties on the other

Evaluation in all of its configurations mobilises a ***variety of experts*** : expert-decision-makers (well-known figures and nominated by the ministry), professional experts who are salaried full-time and work on a permanent basis, occasional experts, university counsellors, internal experts who are members of the internal evaluation units or commissions of the universities and faculties. Usually the criteria that are used in the nomination of external experts are competence and objectivity. They receive in general little or no specific training. Their legitimacy can originate from the legal basis of the evaluation procedure, from the statutory position of the authority that nominated them, from their own scientific reputation, from their institutional position, from their intervention modalities; a trust relationship is crucial. Moreover, there may be problems with the responsibility (the experts are not informed about the consequences of the evaluation and they are not called upon to come and see what has been accomplished on the basis of their recommendations).

The degree of participation in the evaluative process has an effect on the acceptance of the results, on the fate of actions or decisions which can be taken and on the conditions of long-term learning processes. As a rule participation is very differentiated. The launching of an evaluation process often creates expectations : therefore, participants can be demotivated by the experience of evaluations which have led to no visible decision or change, or which have led to decisions which are not related to their own experience. If the link to the outcomes of the decisions is conceived as a threat, the trust of the evaluated actors is low. The quality of participation is also different if the decision is seen as an open one to be taken on the basis of

the results of the evaluative process, or if the evaluation appears to the actors as being set up to legitimise a decision which has already been taken

Sectorial division is one of the most striking features of evaluation practices. It is deeply anchored in the separation of university activities between teaching, learning, research and administration, corresponding to a variety of sectorial professional statuses, interests, bodies and organisations, as well as to subdivisions within or between the ministries and disciplinary fields. The implications of this sectorial approach are as follows : overload, impossibility to link evaluation to a larger project and to a coherent strategy at the level of the university, impossibility to engage in the learning process, opportunistic adjustments. For all these reasons, ***integration of diverse proceedings is a very crucial question***. It should occur at an early stage in the evaluative process. It is only possible if it is monitored at a decentralised level. However integration is not systematically favoured by the configurations; controlling evaluation models are not very conducive to such an integration.

Diffusion of the results of evaluation is subject to major difficulties. In the case of government initiatives, publication is favoured when no link exists between evaluation and financial decisions. In autonomous evaluation, diffusion is generally restricted to the inner circles and it is up to the evaluee to decide. In contractual procedures, diffusion is heavily restricted, as the results of evaluations are perceived as "hot stuff ", as the universities are competing for resources, and as the rectors of the university are afraid of being an hostage to the results of evaluation vis-à-vis own faculties and laboratories.

The link between evaluation and decision varies a lot according to the model of evaluation. Controlling evaluations may become destructive if the complex field of negotiations and political decisions is eliminated by automatically connecting the indicators to the decisions. The contractual models acknowledges the importance of negotiation on the basis of the results, linking it with a negotiation on the project which is being set up by the university in exchange for allocations. Nevertheless, the link to actual decisions is an important component of motivation among the evaluees, as well as a factor of responsibility for the experts.

Who benefits from the evaluation? Who are the losers? The balance of power structures is related to the ministry’s ability to strengthen the position of the university (contractual procedures) or to weaken it (discipline by discipline State-initiated evaluations). Wherever the allocation of public funds on the basis of performance indicators has been utilised, this has strengthened the position of the direction of the universities : it is left free to a certain degree to reallocate the funds inside the university. A strengthening of the rector's or president's position is even greater when the allocation of funds depends on a contract negotiation.

At last, ***individual and collective learning*** can be described in terms of better performance, of getting more information about the university issues and the surrounding world, of an ability to communicate and discuss and to make a diagnosis of the situation. In the whole process cumulative knowledge and memory are important. The learning process can be inhibited by a tight link between the evaluation and decision, if the decision appears as a threat of sanction to the participants. However, it can also be inhibited by the absence of any link between evaluation and decisions. Combined models seem to provide a more favourable framework.

2.4. Evaluation, statistics and indicators

The relevance of descriptive statistics and indicators is growing in all countries, particularly in the countries which already have a longer tradition of evaluation or which develop systematic evaluations. On the one hand, indicators enable comparisons between the performance of an academic and/or department and/or university with the performance of other academics, departments or universities at a given point of time ('synchronic' perspective). On the other hand, they enable comparisons between performance over a period of time ('diachronic' perspective). At present, there are statistics/indicators produced at different levels : at an international level (OECD, Eurostat), at a national (and sometimes regional, at university level. Despite the obviously growing relevance of statistics/indicators in evaluation in general there is considerable variation in terms of the way in which statistics and/or indicators are actually used at a university and /or national level in the different countries : statistics and indicators are a social construction; they always answer contextualised questions, questions linked to political, economical, social stakes.

Statistics and/or indicators have traditionally been used for the purposes of providing information. The ***various other aims*** highlighted (quality assurance, reduction of costs, distribution of resources and marketing) are all closely linked with "new evaluation" procedures.

In all the countries, ***statistics and indicators are produced in various fields***. Four fields can be identified where indicators are typically used as part of evaluation processes, namely, teaching (number of students per subject, per university...; number of students who are successful in examinations), research (number and size of research grants attracted by an academic or by an institution, publications), costs/resources (to identify the inefficient use of resources) and the relationship between education and employment (to measure the success of students, coming from a certain institution or with a qualification in a certain discipline, on the labour market).

There are clearly ***tremendous problems*** associated with the production and interpretation of statistics and indicators, especially in relation to international comparisons using nationally produced statistics. This does not necessarily mean that one has to object the use of statistics/indicators in evaluation processes at all; one simply has to take these possible difficulties into account when using them. Problems of reliability (this can be explained by either ex-post corrections of former provisional statistics or by the fact that the basis for the calculation of statistics/indicators has changed over time). Problems of validity (do drop-out rates of students really measure the quality of the course and/or of the teaching? do citations by other academics which are the basis of citation indices really measure the quality of the research of a scholar?). Problems of interpretation (in Germany, the indicator "length of study per subject" is a highly debated aspect of the present discussion on university reform).

Three kinds of statistics/indicators are produced for evaluation matters at universities : input (number of students, number of academic staff...), process (student drop-out rates...) and output (examination results, employment rate...). What can be observed as a trend in Europe at present is a shift of emphasis from input to process and output. With the political pressure for reforms of the public sector (the desire for more efficiency and the introduction of market principles, with their focus on outputs and outcomes), universities also came under scrutiny. Outputs and resource allocations are more and more linked.

Statistics/indicators are of a growing importance in the evaluation procedures of the universities. Despite substantial criticism of their use, there is a legitimate interest of the public to get concise and precise information about what is going on within the universities and how the tax-payers' money is spent, by whom and for what purposes and whether this is being done in an efficient way. Statistics/indicators might help to keep universities under public and democratic control.

3. Policy implications for Higher Education[3]

3.1. Developing the "pluralist", "context-sensitive", "dynamic" evaluation

Today, the main evaluation stake is the development of a model which pushes the universities to transform by themselves, which encourages them to fill, in a more efficient way, the missions assigned by the State and by the whole society, the missions of teaching, of research, of economic, cultural and social development. The universities have to be more effective (to achieve results according to their missions), and more efficient (to use the allocated resources in the best way).

The present models of evaluation have showed their limits. Controlling evaluation, initiated by the public authorities, is legitimate because the universities are a public service; from now, it is a new tool of monitoring in a context of financial pressure; it has to be maintained, even if the scene of the evaluation bodies has to simplified because it is too complicate (several bodies make the same evaluations). However, controlling evaluation does not sufficiently succeed in generating dynamics of changes within the universities, even when it is associated with a *contractualisation* policy (finalised allocation of resources). More, it is often contradictory with the development of the university autonomy.

Autonomous evaluation, initiated by the universities themselves, gets out of breath because its comparative references are difficult to set up, because it does not succeed in interacting with the external decisions and funding. Managerial evaluation shocks the university cultures : universities may not only function according to the market logic; they have to be efficient and effective, but they have to disseminate, to reinforce service public values; they have to achieve the laws set up by the State; they have to respect and to involve the academic staff and non-academic staff professional bodies.

An evaluation model, which would not take into account the fact that each university is, at the same time, a service public institution, an administration, a whole of professional bodies, a knowledge firm, would fail.

---

[3]. More recommendations and more detailed ones, dealing with the different fields of evaluation (teaching, research, education employment relationship, financial resources, organisation), and dealing with the actors and the methods of evaluation, are in the part 5 of this final report : "conclusions and policy implications for Higher Education".

One of the aims of the EVALUE research was, from the beginning in 1995, the development of the pluralist evaluation model. This objective, which has been specified by the research investigations and by its results, is, more than ever, a topical question : ***the "pluralist", "context-sensitive", "dynamic" evaluation model has to be developed***. The Pluralist evaluation associates and takes into account the analysis and the points of view of all the university actors and partners (stakeholders), even if they are contradictory. The dynamic evaluation compares the university to itself : which are the changes during the last years? The context-sensitive evaluation is sensitive to the different dimensions of each university context, particularly when the university is compared to other universities. This evaluation model seems to be the most pertinent to achieve the objectives which involve the present European universities. Which are the features of this evaluation model? Which are the conditions of its development (at present and in the observed 31 cases studies, all the model features are not set up)? Which reforms are needed to disseminate the model?

The pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model features are as follows :

Objectives of the evaluation	- to involve the university in a process of structural, organisational, administrative and cultural changes - those changes want to improve the quality of the university activities and more globally its performance according to its different missions, to the public service values, to the professional bodies ethics

Objects of the evaluation	- evaluation has to concern all the university activities, all its resources, all its results - it has to integrate the sectorial and fragmented evaluations (particularly when the teaching evaluations are apart from the research evaluations)

References of the evaluation	- it is context-sensitive. It compares the university to itself, to a reference period : which are the changes? Which dimensions have been improved? Which one have deteriorated? - it identifies the strong and the weak university points, the opportunities for the university, the threats for it. - it describes and explains the changes : is the university responsible, totally or partially, of ?

Decision of the evaluation	- it is decided by the university, and/or by several universities of the same region or which have the same profile (universities of one or of several countries). The decision is taken by the rector(s), with the agreement of their teams(s) and of the university councils.

Internal actors of evaluation	- at first, it is an internal evaluation because it has to be "participative" - it has to be largely accepted by all the members of the university community - it has to directly associate the actors concerned by the evaluation object and/or the people who have a good knowledge of the evaluated object - it has to set up an acceptable and equitable division of the evaluation work between academic and non academic staff - in that sense, it is contradictory : the differences of interests, of opinions, of representations have to be expressed and accepted

External actors of evaluation	- it is also (and it has to be) an external evaluation - it has to mobilise external experts : their independence is one of the conditions of the reliability, of the scientific character of their observations and recommendations - it has to mobilise diverse external experts, national and international ones, scientific people, managers and professionals of the economic, cultural and social world - it has to rest on the quantitative and qualitative methodologies, the tools and guidelines set up by the national and international evaluation bodies (v.g. European Rectors Conference)

Methods of evaluation	- it has to conjugate quantitative (statistics dealing with contexts, activities, resources, processes, results...) and qualitative methods (document analysis, interviews, meetings...) - it has to mobilise a pertinent and efficient management information system with a choice of few statistics, followed in the duration, accepted by all the university members, and understandable - it has to master the evaluation agendas in order to avoid an evaluation "tiredness" due to too high workloads; it has to master the evaluation steps in order that the results are known in the best deadlines

Dissemination of the evaluation results	- the results are disseminated and discussed in the university : all the participants are the first recipients of the results (the evaluation is participative). The formative and the cultural effects of the evaluation have to be strengthened by the way of internal debates about the most debated values which are carried out by the evaluation. The objective is to enlarge the internal consensus within the university, to create a greater university identity. - the results are communicated to the university stakeholders - the most efficient evaluation experiences (innovative practices, good practices) are disseminated outside the university

Effects and institutionalisation of the evaluation	- it is participative in that sense that it associates the evaluation participants and recipients to the changes to decide - it has to commit the university in a continuous, progressive, systematic and improved process of evaluations. However, each evaluation has to be comparable to the previous ones (in order to allow the comparisons within the time). Dashboards are needed. - its recommendations and the actions which are decided have to be followed, internally and externally. - the creation of an internal evaluation unit (statistical unit, information system, committee to follow the decided actions...), is, under some conditions, a good practice. Resources have to be devoted to the unit; the training of its members has to be ensured - the evaluation has to diffuse an economic culture in order that its economic advantages are precisely identified and are higher than its financial costs.

Which are the conditions of development of the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model? Which reforms are needed to disseminate the model? The main conditions and the needed reforms are the strengthening of the university autonomy and the enlargement of the *contractualisation* policy. These reforms are the main policy implications for the future of the Higher Education system in Europe. They are based on the EVALUE results.

3.2. More autonomy for the public universities

How to conjugate the affiliation to the public sector and the performance? The development of the evaluation has, in the recent period, increased the necessary control of the public authorities upon the universities. At the same time, this development wants to be based on the autonomy of efficient and responsible universities in front of the whole society. In fact, the present situation of the university autonomy brakes the development of the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model.

The features of the university autonomy, set up by the law more than one decade ago, do not face the contemporary stakes. The university autonomy has to reassessed and strengthened : if the publics authorities assign public service missions to the universities, if they want that the universities achieve them with an efficient and a responsible manner, if they develop the evaluation in order to control the achievement of the missions, they cannot, at the same time, precisely regulate the university activities, the dimensions of their activities.

The present laws, in the different countries, give an autonomy to the university in several fields (statutory, administrative, financial, teaching matters). However, each of these autonomy fields is strongly regulated[4]; more, the decisions, taken by the universities within the frame of their autonomy, are controlled and not only ex-post controlled. Is the important thing that the

[4]. The reinforcement of the contractualisation policy in France, announced for 1999, foresees : "the university can propose experiences in order to propose new roads *outside the regulated framework*"; each experience will be examined case by case.

universities achieve results according to their assigned missions or is it that the universities literally respect detailed rules and not pertinent rules in the statutory, administrative, financial, and pedagogical matters?

The most urgent, for the development of the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model, is to strengthen 1/ the statutory autonomy, particularly the university government, 2. the financial autonomy.

Strengthening the statutory autonomy and the university government

The pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation is initiated by the university(ies) : it implies that such a decision may be taken. Such a decision is taken more easily when the university government is strong; actually, in a significant number of cases, the Rector plays a key-role in the launching of evaluations. He becomes more legitimate and credible to be the evaluation promoter, if he respects the sensibilities and the interests of the different disciplinary components of his university. He is legitimate according to his bargaining successful experience with the public authorities, according to his ability to get together a powerful and legitimate direction team, to his capacity to transform the role of the university councils (discussions, consultations and decisions taken on the basis of dashboards, of the evaluation results). Nevertheless, when the rector is changed, the chances of the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model, are weakened : the new rector, in order to impose himself, is able to give up what the previous rector has built. Conversely, the decision of a pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation is not easily taken when the central university government is weak, i.e. when the traditional faculty power is strong (model of the collegiate government), or when the trade-unions, who represent the personnel and/or the students, take a significant part in the decision.

The law has to strengthen the statutory autonomy of the universities and so the university governments, to give them a right of decision or, at least, a right of experimentation in the statutory matters; however, this right has to depend on a clear commitment to make internal evaluations. The statutory experimentation could deal with : the duration of the rector's term(s) of office, the modalities of election, the rector's powers, the composition of the university council(s), the role of the university council(s) (control and potential sanction upon the rector's staff), the reinforcement of the university stakeholders' role within the university council(s)...

Strengthening the financial university autonomy

The financial policies of the public authorities, concerning the universities, have significantly changed during the recent period : budgetary restrictions and/or decreases of the public resources by student, globalisation of the allocated resources, resources allocated according to the objectives of a contract, link set up between the allocated budget and the results, strengthening of the conformity control and development of the pertinence control on the expenses.

These changes make the universities to develop the internal evaluation processes of their resources and of their expenses. At the same time, the universities are pushed by the public authorities to diversify their resources in order to increase them, to look for new resources from partners more and more diversified. The universities may not work in that direction

because they quickly face a lot of rules set up by the public authorities, and because these rules are not always pertinent.

In all the countries, the financial university autonomy has to be strengthened : the financial regulations have to be reassessed and reduced. For its part, the European Commission has to launch debates dealing with the Higher Education funding, and particularly dealing with the users' contribution (students and companies). Today, a majority public funding - Higher Education is a public investment - and a minority users' funding - to have a higher Education degree is an individual profitable investment - may be conjugated.

3.3. Enlarging the contractualisation : internal and multilateral contracts

The regulations, set up at the national level in the statutory and financial matters, may be reduced because the controlling evaluation by the public authorities has been developed during the recent period. In the same way, they may be reduced because contractualisation policies, between the public authorities and the universities, have been developed.

Evaluation and contractualisation between the public authorities and each university

Today, evaluation and external contractualisation are linked. In the frame of Higher Education policies decided by the public authorities and after a process of self-evaluation, the university sets up by itself objectives to achieve. The objectives, proposed by the university according to a project and to a strategy, are evaluated. Then, a negotiation with the public authority is undertaken : the conclusion of the bargaining is the allocation of public resources in the context of a contract. Contractualisation is largely accepted by the universities; it has to be strengthened where it exists; it has to be set up where it does not still exist. However, the negotiation has to be an actual one; it does not have to be a show; it implies that the negotiation may fail (such an issue will be possible in France from 1999 : if an agreement between the university and the ministry is not found, the contract will not be signed).

Today, it seems that the contractualisation policy may be and has to be enlarged in two directions : within each university (internal contractualisation), and between universities (multilateral contractualisation).

Promoting the development of contracts within each university

The pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation puts the university in a process of changes: the changes can be organised under the frame of an internal contractualisation or of a management by projects. A case, observed within an university, shows that a process of changes follows some steps which associate evaluation and internal contractualisation : analysis of the evaluation results (observations and recommendations), setting up of committees in order to elaborate a planning of precise actions, decision to implement the actions by the university council(s) (the council can decide on a hierarchy among the objectives to reach), decisions dealing with the deadlines to achieve the objectives, allocation of resources (according to the activities, to the objectives and/or to the results of the previous period), mobilisation of external experts if they are needed, potential adjustments during the following

period, assessment in a given deadline under the form of an internal and of an external evaluation.

This internal contractualisation should be encouraged and should be helped by a permanent structure, which would be in charge of the logistics, of the follow-up and of the assessment of the internal contracts. The universities, which would accept to enter in that kind of process, which would create permanent units of evaluation or of evaluation support, should have a specific funding, either within their contract with the public authorities or under the frame of experimentation funding, sponsored by the European Commission.

Promoting the co-operative initiatives of evaluation and the multilateral contracts

It seems that vertical contractualisation and horizontal co-operation provide many opportunities to cumulate the advantages and limit the defects of the controlling and autonomous evaluation models. However, horizontal co-operation cannot be established if additional means are not taken into account. Therefore, it should be linked with vertical contractualisation formula including regional, national and European authorities. On the other hand, since contractual procedures tend to strengthen simultaneously the position of the ministry (giving more precise information and control over the universities and competition between universities), and the position of the heads of the universities (centralisation of internal power), the negative effects might be counterbalanced if these contractual procedures are associated with diversified co-operative ventures, bilateral and multilateral, academic and non-academic, at the national and the international levels. This would diminish dysfunctional competition between universities and encourage a broad participation of all types of actors.

Horizontal co-operative evaluations and multilateral co-operations are worth promoting and supporting. Horizontal co-operation needs financial resources and cannot go on without additional resources, even if it saves money because it is a source of efficiency : comparisons bring ideas to make scale savings. The European Commission should be able to give a financial support to the universities which would participate in horizontal evaluations and in multilateral operations of contractualisation, under the frame of European university partnerships.

2. BACKGROUND and OBJECTIVES of the PROJECT

EVALUE proposed to reply to three questions dealing with the university performance.

1. Is the evaluation one of the conditions to improve the performance of each university?

In order to answer to the question, we have identified what the evaluation meant by performance in the different fields of the university activities (teaching, research, organisation, education-employment relationship); we have identified how the evaluation process measures the performance and which are the methodologies (expertise, indicators...). Then, the evaluation results within the universities had to be analysed. The case studies, and particularly the case studies of the universities which have been revisited more than one year after the first investigation, have allowed to improve the knowledge of the evaluation effects and impacts : effects and impacts are analysed in each of the chapters of the part 3 (the research results) and in the conclusion of the part 3.

Under some conditions, the evaluation is able to improve the university performance.

2. Which evaluation is the most efficient and which are its conditions?

In order to answer to the question, we had to identify evaluation models : conformity control, peer reviews, managerial evaluation, quality audits...

Because each public university is, at the same time, a public service institution and administration, a whole of professional bodies, a firm of knowledge production and dissemination, the model of the pluralist, context-sensitive and dynamic evaluation is the most pertinent and the most efficient for the universities : it is characterised in the point 3 of the second part (see supra the policy implications for Higher Education)

3. Does the evaluation question the education-employment relationship?

In spite of an increase in the number of Higher Education graduates, of difficulties for some graduates to find a job, of increased and diversified relations between firms, territorial public authorities and universities, that field of evaluation seemed to be not a lot developed.

The research results shade that statement. It has seemed important to enlarge the field "education-employment relationship" to all the relations that the universities have with their economic, political, cultural and social environment. There is an actual interrogation of the universities about this question, but the evaluations are not systematic and are few structured, principally because of methodological and theoretical difficulties. The question is dealt with in part 3 (results research), chapter 1, point 3.

EVALUE has achieved his objectives. The planned workload (two states of play of the evaluation fields in 1996 and in 1998, 31 case studies, a hypertext with more than 7.000 pages and with eight data bases, have been realised), and the agendas have strictly been respected.

3. SCIENTIFIC DESCRIPTION of the PROJECT RESULTS and METHODOLOGY

Introduction. European University and universities in Europe

Pierre Dubois

1. The common features to universities in Europe : public control and autonomy

During the last years, important changes have concerned Higher Education in the eight countries (Germany, Spain, Finland, France, Italy, Norway, Portugal, United-Kingdom). They essentially deal with the new relations between the public authorities and the universities. The history is : continuation of the State control on the universities, and, at the same time, development of the university autonomy (statutory, administrative, financial, pedagogical autonomy). Control and autonomy are situated, more and more often, in a new frame, this of a bargained contract between the public authorities and each university (contract covering several years, fixing objectives and allocating means). This context explains the evaluation development : evaluation is a new form of the State control, and, at the same time, is a possible support for the development of the university autonomy, is a decisive instrument of the "contract" policy.

Those changes are common in Europe. Europe is a pertinent space, like it was when the first medieval universities were open. The eight observed countries (is spite of the fact that Norway is not a UE member) share a lot of common features : level of economic development, budgetary constraints (they have to decrease the public and the budget deficits, impulses given by the directives and by the white papers of the European Union, development of the teachers and students mobility between the countries, harmonisation of the degrees, European cooperations for research, participation rate in Higher education.

The university as a public service, a whole of professional bodies, a company

The public universities[5] form part of the Higher Education public service. Public authorities create them, decide on the missions that universities have to fill and the values that they have to disseminate, set up the regulations that they have to respect, allocate financial resources, evaluate results. Today, these public authorities are not only the national State : the regional political powers and the European Union have strengthened theirs interventions in Higher

[5]. All the countries (apart from Portugal, but the balance sheet is enough negative) do not consider the development of private universities and /or the privatisation of some public universities.

Education. ***The national State, the Region[6], and the European Union*** assign missions, emphasise some values, bring funding, ask the universities of their territory for accountability. The diversification of the public interventions and of the assigned missions are a first source of complexity for the universities in Europe.

The university is not only a public service. The university is also a ***powerful whole of professionals bodies*** (teachers and researchers), historically based upon the evolution of the knowledge. they have in charge the knowledge production by the way of research and the knowledge dissemination by the way of teaching. The diversification of the knowledge, which has generated increasing divisions among the professional bodies, are a second source of complexity for the universities in Europe.

At last, the university is not only a public service and a whole of professional bodies. It is also ***a firm which produces and disseminates the knowledge***; because of this, it is bound by new constraints : to fix objectives, to use in a better way its resources, to obtain results. Each university has to be efficient (to achieve the best results according to resources) and effective (to achieve results according to assigned objectives). Market logics - and the knowledge market is today an international market - penetrate the public universities : in a context of competition, universities have to be attractive and competitive.

So, each public university is a very complex organisation. As a part of the public sector of higher Education, it is an institution which has to disseminate and reinforce general values, and it is an administration which has to respect the public regulations. As a whole of professional bodies, it has to respect their ethics and values. As a knowledge firm, it has to have an effective management. Each university is a complex organisation which has to manage the tensions and the potential contradictions issued from the fact that it is, at the same time***, an institution, an administration, a whole of professional bodies, a company*** <Dubois, 1997>[7].

These tensions, common to the European universities, are perfectly expressed in the tension which exists between the public control on the universities and the university autonomy (autonomy is legitimate for the professionals bodies and for the professional managers). These tensions are identifiable in four fields (missions of the Higher Education system, status and structures, funding, degrees and research); in these four fields, there always is, at the same time, a control by the public authority and an university autonomy.

---

[6]. Traditionally, the Region plays an important role in Higher Education in a federal country as 'Germany, but also in a country as the United-Kingdom (Funding Councils are different for England, Scotland and Wales). In Spain, after the law on the autonomy, Regions are the main financial body of their universities; at that level, they have restored the learning of the regional languages (in Catalogna, in the Basque country...). In the other countries (France, Italy and Portugal), Regions are mobilised to fund the universities. Conversely, the Region seems to have a less important role in Norway and in Finland.

[7]. Dubois Pierre, 1997, "L'organisation des universités : complexification, diversification, rationalisation, évaluation", *Sociétés contemporaines*, 28, octobre.

Assignment of values and missions by the public authorities and university autonomy : diversification of the missions and of the partnerships

During the last fifteen last years, public universities have been reformed by law[8]. Reforms have reminded the public service values that the universities have to disseminate and to reinforce: equality and equity of the chances of access and of treatment, tolerance, secularity, progress, justice, democracy... Reforms have strengthened the ***diversification of the assigned missions*** : initial and continuous training, scientific and technological research, learning by research, dissemination of expert abilities, international co-operation, diversification of career openings for the students, dissemination of the scientific and technological culture, participation to the economic and social development... At the same time, these reforms, taking in count the existence of the professional bodies and the constraints of the knowledge company, have strengthened and reaffirmed the university autonomy[9].

The diversification of missions has, as a direct consequence, the diversification and the multiplication of the partners which the universities have to bargain and to co-operate with : other universities (including the foreign universities), continuous training bodies, local public authorities, firms and structures of partnership with the economic milieus, professional associations, social partners (trade-unions...), bodies for the local development, foundations, directions of the European commission.

The development of the ***partnerships with the companies*** is coherent with the diversification and the growth of technological and professional degrees, with the development of R&D (universities are asked for more applied research). These partnerships take different forms which are described in the different chapters (evaluation of teaching, of research, of the education-employment relationship, of the territory-university relationship, of the university government)

Control of the university structures by the public authorities and university autonomy in the statutory and the administrative matters

Public authorities have decided a ***strong development of the Higher Education system***. The number of public universities has significantly increased during the last 25 years[10]. This growth is explained by different factors :

- to the ***increase of the students number*** : it is linked to a larger participation of young people in Higher Education (the most often, more than 30% of the present young generation have access to Higher Education), to the extension of studies (development of the doctoral studies), and in spite of « numerus clausus » (at least for the access to some degrees), set up in some

[8]. New laws dealing with the universities : Spain (1983), Finland (1991), France (1984 et 1989), Italy (1980, 1989 et 1990), Norway (1987, 1995), Portugal (1988), United-Kingdom (1988, 1992).

[9]. In the United-Kingdom, the situation is more complex : according to the cases and to the fields, autonomy has decreased or has increased.

[10]. Norway, after an evaluation made by OECD, is the only country which has recently decreased the number of its Higher Education institutions. A hundred of regional high schools have been merged in 26 higher Education Colleges.

countries. Public authorities have built new universities in order to face the increase of the student number. In the most recent period, in some countries, the student number is stabilising; this new period can accentuate the competition and/or the co-operation between the universities.

- to a political will ***to make equal the access opportunities in Higher Education*** on the whole territory, to a political will the associate the universities to the regional economic development. Some reforms accompanied the political will : they have increased the power of the regional public authorities, under the frame of decentralisation policies.

- in some countries, high schools or polytechnics, which previously organised professional degrees, prepared during two or three years, are acquired an university status[11].

Public authorities create the universities and control, in the most of countries, the creation of some of their internal structures (faculties). However, in the context of their statutory and administrative autonomy, the universities have an internal autonomy to organise the teaching structures and the research ones, to implement the most adequate administrative services. Another common feature to the eight observed countries (United-Kingdom makes exception) is that, because of the statutory autonomy, universities are managed by elected bodies in which teachers are the majority (however, the representation and the participation of the non-academic personnel, of the students, of external partners are secured). This participative and collegiate system is challenged by a strengthening of the university central staff (rector, board of directors).

Public funding and financial autonomy of universities

Universities are mainly funded by the public authorities. Their development and the professionnalisation of the studies generate costs which are more and more high. In a period in which public budget deficits have to be under control, public funding cannot increase indefinitely, in spite of political priorities in favour of Higher Education. So, we observe a financial disengagement, at least a relative one : it is more obvious in the northern Europe than in the southern Europe.

The financial pressure is not only the common feature. We also observe a globalisation of the allocated budget, contractualisation processes, a question about the periodicity of the financial allocations, a link - at present, it is still a weak one - between the allocated resources and the university results, a strengthening of the conformity controls, of the pertinence controls. Inequalities of financial resources between the universities are important (passed, inheritance, guaranteed incomes); student fees are generally weak. In this context, the financial autonomy of the universities is questioned : they have to spend money in a better way thanks to

[11]. It is the case for Polytechnics in the UK, for Regional high schools in Norway. In Italy, some high schools have been integrated in the existing universities; their degrees became "Corsi di diploma" delivered by the university. A contrary situation has to be observed : Finland has recently created High Schools for professional topics : they are independent from the universities. Finland is another exception : it is the only country in which a debate deals with a too great number of universities. A merging between the two universities of Tampere has, for a time, debated (see the two case studies).

modernisation and rationalisation operations, to look for other financial resources (from firms, from the local public authorities, from the European Commission).

Control by the public authorities and university autonomy in the teaching and research matters

Degrees and diplomas, research orientations are controlled by the public authorities. The diversification of the missions assigned to the universities involves a diversification of the diplomas and of the delivered degrees, a development of the applied researches in addition to the fundamental ones, a creation of research networks with external partners. Public control is maintained in these different fields.

The university autonomy also deals with teaching and research : autonomy makes possible the diversification. The universities appropriate (or they do not) the reforms of the degrees, the research policies which are pushed by the public authorities : they look (or they do not) for teaching all the possible degrees, for having a large whole of post-graduation degrees (based upon labelled research centres), for focusing on the profession-oriented degrees, for being associated to the teaching of the highest levels (post-graduation).

2. Another common feature : evaluation, public control and university autonomy

The evaluation, decided by the public authorities, is developing and is sometimes written in the law as an university obligation. Evaluation bodies[12], decision-makers and actors are a lot; methods are diverse. Evaluation is becoming an irreversible phenomena and it is, from now, rooted within the university culture; however, it is nowhere stabilised. Some reforms took place during the EVALUE research or are considered (merging of bodies in France and in the UK); in some countries (Spain, Finland, Italy, Norway, Portugal), the new evaluation mechanisms are not still fully operative. The first evaluation bodies dealt with research, the most often before the eighties. From the mid-eighties, and sometimes more recently, bodies are likely to evaluate activities, objectives and results. From now, the changes in the evaluation system, its extension, its results can be objects of evaluation.

The development of the external evaluation can be understood in the context of universities which are, at the same time, controlled by the State and autonomous by law. The State wants to know the impact of reforms : are they implemented with pertinence and effectiveness by the autonomous universities. Universities have to legitimate their autonomy : do they use efficiency the public financial resources? The relationship between autonomy and evaluation is complex. Evaluation is beside the traditional control (conformity or pertinence control), made by the public authorities. At the same time, universities are autonomous to decide their own evaluations ; the hypothesis is made that the decision of an evaluation by the university itself is a condition of the development of the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation.

[12]. The description of the evaluation bodies, of their assignments, of their evolution, of their composition, of their methods has been made in the « states of play » of 1996 and 1998 (they are annexed to this final report). A form for each evaluation body is also included in the CD-ROM : each body is analysed according to about twenty criteria.

The universities, public and autonomous, accept to account for the funding they have received; so, in more and more cases, the results of the evaluations have consequences on the allocated funding. After a phase of discovery and of experimentation, ***the main challenge of the external evaluation is today the development of the internal evaluation*** : external evaluation and internal evaluation interact in order that the universities, within their strategy and with the best cost, succeed to improve the quality and the performance of teaching, of research, of services delivered to the users.

Universities are evaluated and evaluate themselves because they are under strong financial pressures : the increase in the students number, the diversification of the degrees and of the missions have required a growth of the public funding, with sometimes a decrease of the public expenses by student; so the universities look for diversifying their resources and, to obtain these other resources, they are concerned by additional evaluations.

Universities are evaluated and they evaluate themselves so as to well manage tensions between more and more missions : are they able to be the best in all the fields? So, evaluation is sometimes used to manage tensions in the teaching field (tensions between traditional degrees, professional ones, and continuous training), in the research field (tensions between fundamental research and applied research), in the field of the university-territory relationship (to increase the participation rate in Higher Education, to participate in the cultural activities of the territory, to impulse the economic and social development).

3. Questions of research, methodologies and understanding of the observations (building ideal-types)

Questions of research

EVALUE proposed to reply to three questions dealing with the university performance and had three objectives.

1. Is the evaluation one of the conditions to improve the performance of each university? The evaluation results within the universities had to be analysed.

2. Which evaluation is the most efficient and which are its conditions? Developing the pluralist, context-sensitive and dynamic evaluation model is necessary.

3. Does the evaluation question the education-employment relationship and more generally the relations between the universities and their economic, cultural and social environment? A specific attention has been paid to that field of evaluation which seemed to be not a lot developed.

Methodologies

In order to reply to those questions and to reach those objectives, the following methodologies have been implemented :

- every national team realised, in 1996 and 1998, a "***state of play***" of the evolution of Higher Education and of the different national evaluation bodies in order to analyse and to

understand contexts of the evaluation development. Those "states of play" are based on the analysis of laws, of events dealing with Higher Education, of an important bibliography, of statistical sources; they are also based on interviews with personalities belonging to evaluation bodies.

- every national team has made ***four case studies*** (three in the United-Kingdom) of universities. They have been chosen according to several characteristics : interesting experiences of evaluation, size, seniority, disciplines, geographical location. In each university, pertinent documents have been gathered, interviews have been conducted (30 to 70 for each case); so, near 1.500 people have been interviewed. Five fields of evaluation have been analysed : teaching and learning, research, academic staff, organisation, education-employment relationship. For each of them, the analysis of the evaluation process has been central : context, decision, actors, methods, results, effects.

	Case study 1	**Case study 2**	**Case study 3**	**Case study 4**
Germany	Erlangen-Nüremberg	Hamburg	Dortmund	Rostock
Spain	Girona	Madrid (autonomous)	Basque Country	Barcelona (autonomous)
Finland	Helsinki	Tampere	Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration	Technological University of Tampere
France	Aix-Marseille I	Littoral	Paris XII Val-de-Marne	Savoie
Italy	Udine	Venice	Catania	Polytechnics of Torino
Norway	Bergen	Agder College	Oslo College	Oslo
Portugal	Beira Interior	Aveiro	Lisbon	Technological University of Lisbon
United-Kingdom	East London	Glasgow	Wales (Cardiff)	

- every national team has ***"revisited"*** one case study, at the beginning of 1998 (at least more than one year after the first wave of interviews), in order to study, in a better, the evaluation effects, the changes influenced by evaluations.

- during the last year, the co-ordination groups, in charge of the different following chapters, have completed the document analysis and the interviews by interviews with the colleagues of the other countries. It is well known that researchers, when they are writing on their national situation, do not always think to write in their report things or interpretations which seem obvious for them. ***"Crossed interviews"*** allowed to limit those lacks.

- at last, it is obvious that the nine co-ordination meetings have been essential and bee by themselves one of the methodological elements.

- so, a very great number of materials has been gathered (more than 7.000 pages). The important thing is to keep them for future researches, lead by EVALUE researchers or by other ones. All the raw materials are within the CD-ROM : it is organised in a huge hypertextual base, using the Folioviews software.

The structure of the INFOBASE, organised by country, is the following :
1. Synthesis texts : states of play, cases studies, provisional final report
2. Laws
3. Chronology (since 1993)
4. Statistics and Indicators
5. Bibliography and abstracts : several thousands of references and several hundreds of abstracts
6. Acronyms
7. Addresses (partners, evaluation bodies, reviews...)
8. Evaluation bodies : data base with several items for each evaluation body

Understanding observations : models and ideal-types

The central methodology of EVALUE is obviously based on the 31 case studies. Why qualitative case studies rather than a quantitative survey on a representative sample of a greater number of universities? In fact, only the case studies (and the interviews on which they are based) are able to gather precise and rich data, to locate and to increase the value of innovative evaluation experiences, to understand the conditions of their emergence, to analyse the dynamics between internal and external evaluation, to measure the evaluation effects (how some universities have succeeded to appropriate the evaluation and to use it as an essential tool for changes?), and at last to give the possibility to the university actors to speak, to give an actual importance to their representations of the phenomena they observe.

The understanding of a lot of data, the comparison of situations between countries and between universities asks for frames of reference. The use of ideal-types is traditional in the social sciences : it allows to classify, to range data, countries and universities. However, we do not have to misunderstand the meaning of ideal-types : ideal-type is an intellectual building; it has an heuristic function; it does not exist as such in the reality. However, inquiries allow to set up that a given university is nearer of a given ideal-type than of another one. Two series of ideal-types have been built during the research : ideal-types of evaluation, ideal-types of universities.

Reference models of evaluation

The evaluation, at the end of the eighties, does not appear in a virginal field. Its reference models are many and are conjugated or superposed in the actual operations of evaluation, run in the universities. Two models are even extremely old - the conformity control and the peer-review - and are linked to the fact that the university is at the same time an institution-administration and a organisation made of professional bodies. The ***conformity control*** pays attention to the strict use of resources to reach objectives : the rules and the procedures have to be respected, eventual wasting and frauds have to be pointed out; the conformity control is conducted by professionals of the public administration (inspectors' bodies). ***Peer review*** is as old as the university itself. The control of the access to the profession, of the promotions, of the teaching and of the research activities, of the application of rules has always been made by the peers (but, as a matter of fact, under the control, more or less narrow, of the public authority). This kind of evaluation controls the academic and non-academic professions, and, at the same time, allows the representation of their interests.

A third model (***managerial model***) is developing in the present period and can be only understood if we consider that the university is not only a public administration and a whole of professional bodies, but also a company which produces services for users and customers with limited resources. In fact, this model borrows to several sources, private or public : management control, financial rationalisation, strategic planning, quality assurance; it also and sometimes borrows to the theories of the extreme liberalism, to the benefits of the market regulation. It needs the development of tools and of statistical models, pertinent and reliable, made by public bodies (national institutes for statistics) or by private bodies (consultant agencies able to lead audits). This model directly links evaluation and allocation of resources (additional or reduced according to the evaluation results); it insists on performances.

These three reference models are concerning evaluations which are specialised, largely decided by authorities (external to the universities), and conducted by external experts. They do not make obvious the role of the internal evaluation and of internal actors, the beneficial interrelation between the different evaluation fields. The results of the EVALUE research demonstrate the pertinence of another model : we call it the model of the ***pluralist, context-sensitive and dynamic evaluation***; this model will be detailed in the conclusion, when the precise results of research will have been presented.

Ideal-types of universities

It is possible to defend the following thesis : a given university does not look like another university; it is totally specific; more, it is looking for being "unique", in a context in which, more than at the beginning of the EVALUE research, the competition between universities is developing more and more. Each university is "unique" for an obvious reason : it is marked by its history and by the choices made during that history; these choices make that the university, with its own manner, conjugates or makes a hierarchy between the missions prescribed by the public authorities; the university achieves its public missions by an original set of degrees and of researches, by an implementation of original structures (faculties, research centres), by specific financial choices, by specific appropriations of the evaluation results... Diversification of the missions, diversification of the partners : universities are able to differentiate themselves by insisting on such or such mission, by grading the missions according to their strategies and to theirs resources; they are able to prioritise collaborations with such or such partner.

However, within the same country and between the investigated countries, we also observe recurrences, constants, similarities between some universities. Each university is « unique », but it has « sisters ». In fact, if we take into account nine features, nine dimensions to characterise the universities (achieved missions, seniority, student population, disciplines and levels of teaching, research, resources in personnel, financial resources, relationship with the territory), the hypothesis is that these features are not conjugated by random, that some associations between the features are coherent (a new university is located in a town of an average size and does not have many students).

With these hypothesis, the observations issued from the case studies have allowed to built - a posteriori - three ideal-types of university : the universities of general character (or universities of full exercise), the profession-oriented and applied-science-oriented universities, the universities of the territorial development. This classification does not mean that the three types are opposed or are differentiated on all the features : all the universities have the same

missions (they are defined by law), have a funding which is mainly public... This classification will be used for several times in the following chapters (evaluations of teaching and learning, of university-territory relationship, of non-academic personnel, of structures.

Main features	***Universities of general character***	***Profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences***	***Universities of the territorial development***
Achieved missions	Ambition to achieve all the missions assigned by the public authorities and to answer all the societal needs	Ambition to emphasise the mission of professional and technological teaching (including under a continuous training system), of applied research in relation with firms	Ambition to emphasise the mission of economic and cultural development of the local territory, by increasing the participation rate in Higher Education
Seniority	old universities	relatively new universities	relatively new universities (recently created or having recently acquired the university status)
Student population	- universities of great size - limited growth of the students number	- universities of varied or average size - student population limited by *numerus clausus*	- universities of a relatively small size - quick growth of the students number - important percentage of students of a modest origin
Disciplines and levels of teaching	- all the disciplines - all the levels of teaching - development of the post-graduation level	- policy of « niches » : specialisation (management, such or such a technology), always degrees of the first level, progressive growth of the degrees of the highest levels - teaching deals with a large range of subjects - frequent renewal of the degree contents	- almost all the disciplines (apart from medicine) - quick growth of the number of taught degrees - important weight of the first level degrees
Research	- fundamental research is priority - many « labelled » research centres	- applied research, R&D - specialised research centres	- new research centres - small number of « labelled » research centres

Structures of teaching and research	- many structures - important role played by the faculties	- limited number of structures - relatively independent structures - structures of partnerships with the economic milieu	- limited number of structures - number of structures increasing with the growth of the number of degrees
Resources : Academic staff	- high ratio of supervision (number of teachers by student), largely linked to a passed inheritance - high number of full professors	- high ratio of supervision - - significant number of teachers coming from firms	- quick growth of the teachers number - potential weak ratio of supervision (particularly for full professors) - significant turn-over - significant number of contractual teachers (with a contract of limited duration)
Financial resources	- large majority of public funding - universities which sometimes have to face budgetary restrictions	- large majority of public funding - significant funding from firms - important expenses by student	- large majority of public funding - significant funding from local public authorities - significant funding from local and regional firms
Relationship with the territory	- universities located in the capital city, in historical towns, in towns with an important population - universities with a local, regional, national, international ambition - privileged co-operation with the universities of the same type	- universities always in narrow contact with the local territory... - ... but able to develop an international ambition about some « niches » - privileged co-operation with the universities of the same type	- universities mainly located in towns of average size - universities with a local and regional ambition - universities developing co-operation with foreign bordering universities - privileged co-operation with the universities of the same type

It is possible to classify the 31 investigated universities according to the three ideal-types. This classification does not take into account of the advertised ambitions by each of the universities for the future : it is obvious that most of the Profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences and of the Universities of the territorial development are looking for becoming universities of general character in the future.

Universities of general character
Erlangen-Nüremberg, Hamburg
Madrid, Barcelona
Helsinki
Aix-Marseille I
Venice
Bergen, Oslo
Lisbon
Glasgow, Wales (Cardiff)
Basque Country
Tampere
Paris XII Val-de-Marne
Catania

Universities of the territorial development

Girona
Littoral
Udine
Beira Interior, Aveiro

Rostock

Savoie
East London

Dortmund
Agder College

Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration
Tampere University of Technology
Polytechnics of Torino
Technical university of Lisbon
Oslo College

Profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences

How to read the scheme

- ***universities of general character*** : in the right bottom, are the universities which have still again some features of universities of the territorial development

- ***universities of the territorial development*** : in the left bottom, are the universities which potentially are looking for a development as a profession-oriented university of education and applied sciences or as university of general character

- ***profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences***: at the top on the left, are the universities which potentially are looking for a development as a university of general character

And the differences between countries?

The universities in Europe share common features and, at the same time, each university has a specificity. The 31 investigated universities can be a to three types of university : the construction of ideal-types, overflowing the boundaries of each country, is a strong and not traditional hypothesis in the international comparisons; traditional international comparisons are rather looking for identifying national specificity, « societal effects ». So, the question is :

are there no more common features in the universities of a same country? Do the British universities share common features? Are not they different from the French and Italian universities?

International comparisons, which are looking for identifying and explaining the national specificity, are obviously able to produce results, but they minimise the tendencies which are common to different countries. So, they identify the specificity of the United-Kingdom (strong university autonomy, but in a constant reduction, linked to the Anglo-Saxon model of medieval universities), the specificity of Germany (freedom of teaching and research for the universities and for the professors, according to the Humbolt University model; for instance, the traditional freedom explains why there is a reluctance to the development of statistical indicators, able to identify precise individuals), the specificity of France (its « jacobinism » and the perpetuation of the centralised Napoleonian university), the specificity of Spain and of Germany (seniority of the regional identity phenomena, particularly based on powerful universities), the specificity of Italy (slowness of the reform process, linked to the weakness and to the inconstancy of the parliamentary democracy), the specificity of Norway and of Finland (because of the small number of inhabitants, the ambition to maintain the ideal of a strict equality is possible; it is also possible because the university world is a small one : everybody knows everybody)...

These comparisons, which insist on the « national », meet some difficulties. The first one is : the oldest universities have not always located in their country; the examples are significant in the EVALUE research (Savoie, Barcelona, Rostock, Venice, Catania...); do these universities have features inherited from their past or have they developed the features of their present country? So, these comparisons face a second question, this of the pertinent territory : is it actually the country? So, the international comparisons are looking for narrower pertinent spaces : the four countries of the United-Kingdom, the regions set up for a more or less long time in Germany and in Spain, the regions, more recently institutionalised as powerful local authorities, in France... Conversely, these comparisons are able to look for larger pertinent spaces : for instance, they will look for opposing the universities of the Catholic world and those of the Protestant world.

In spite of a lack of specific investigation (it was not possible with a methodology based upon the case studies), we can say that there is a national specificity in each country, because each country maintains a national regulation, national policies in higher Education. This regulation and these national policies, even if the European integration is favouring their harmonisation, do not have the same temporalities : some differences are linked to these differences in the political agendas; so the comparison at a precise moment maximises the differences; the comparison which compares the tendencies in the duration avoids the trap.

One of the most significant differences is an opposition between the North and the South. The northern European countries (Norway, Finland, the United-Kingdom, the länder of the northern Germany) have universities which are relatively « rich » (it is enough to observe differences in the supervision rate - number of academic staff and of non-academic staff by student - between the North and the South); it is also in these countries that market logics and financial pressures on the universities are strong. The comparative history of the unequal staff resources, observed in the different countries, is a research for the future.

Schedule of the synthesis report

The schedule of the synthesis report is traditional in the evaluation field. A first part is devoted to the evaluation contents and objectives. Chapter 1 analyses the evaluation of the university activities and results in the teaching and research matters, in the education-employment and university-territory relationships. Chapter 2 is devoted to the evaluation of resources : evaluation of the academic and non-academic staff, to the evaluation of the organisation (university government, financial resources, structures). A second part is devoted to the actors and to the evaluation methods. Chapter 3 is devoted to the actors and to the decision of evaluation. Chapter 4 deals with the evaluation methods, and specifically with the use of statistics and indicators in the evaluation process.

A first conclusion comes back to one of the EVALUE research objectives : which are the effects of the evaluations?

A second conclusion is transferred in the part 5 : conclusions and policy implications for Higher Education. It deals with the pluralist, context-sensitive and dynamic evaluation model and with the conditions of its dissemination.

EVALUATION : CONTENTS and OBJECTIVES

Chapter 1.
Evaluations of university activities and results

EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING

Danielle Potocki-Malicet, Içara Holmesland, Maria Teresa Estrela, Ana Margarida Veiga Simão

The systematic evaluation of teaching and learning is relatively new within the European countries. The movement started growing in the end of the 1980s, and it developed itself in the 1990s.

1. Contexts and Degree of Development of Evaluation Activities within Teaching and Learning

The evaluation of teaching and learning exists within a context of multiple pressures placed on the universities of different countries.

- ***pressure for pedagogical autonomy :*** in the majority of the countries, the universities are responsible for deciding on the establishment and organisation of educational programs leading to a degree. Even if they cannot make the final decision, they are responsible for initiating the procedures <Lundgren, 1990>[13].

- ***pressure from the «masses» :*** the increase in the number of students, followed by its stabilisation, <Bernadet, 1998>[14] without the corresponding increase of the academic staff and the necessary means, has increased the workload of teaching.

---

[13]. Lundgren Ulf P (1990), "Educational policy-making, decentralisation and evaluation", In M. Granheim, U. Lundgren, and M. Kogan (eds), *Education as Policymaking: Introducing Evaluation into a Decentralised Educational System*, London: Jessica Kingsley.

[14]. Bernadet Sylvie, 1998, "Les étudiants inscrits à l'université en 1997-1998", *Note d'information*, 98 (09), mai.

- pressure from the «variety» : the increase in the number of and variety of degrees is a synonym of the diversification of disciplines and diversification of levels: the short time degrees, the doctoral degrees, as well as the degrees linked to a profession have multiplied <Hée, 1997>[15]. The professionalisation by means of alternations has entered into higher education.

- pressure from financial autonomy: the universities have to perform as well or better with the same or, in some cases with, proportionally, less financial means. They have also greater responsibilities regarding an optimal utilisation of funds. The concerns regarding the evaluation of teaching and learning are linked to the economical difficulties of the different countries and the budget re-allocations.

Thus, the universities question themselves, or are being questioned, not only about the quality of their educational programs, but also about their effectiveness <Norway National Report, 1995>[16]. They are looking for answers by examining the relationships between different factors: the number of students enrolled, the size of the academic staff, the size of the administrative staff, the pedagogical means, the financial means. They are interested in the results of the teaching activities in regard to learning. They are, therefore, concerned with dropout rates, repetitions, rate of failures, success in the exams, length of the studies, and the insertion of students with a professional degree in the job market <Lauglo, 1990>[17].

Within most of the countries, the evaluation of teaching and learning has been initiated by central organisms, such as the ministries of education, and other organisations such as, for example, CNE in France, HEFC in the United Kingdom, Council of Research and NIFU in Norway <KUF, 1988>[18], Council of evaluation of FUP in Portugal , Council of the universities and executive committee in Spain, Council for evaluation of higher education in Finland, and the Evaluation Observatory in Italy. This trend exists also within the countries where the evaluation of teaching and learning is the result of a voluntary decision of the universities, such as in Spain where the Council of the universities has adopted an invitation system, and in Germany where the universities are free to initiate their own evaluation actions. The decisions regarding evaluation taken by the ministry, or by a central organism, are executed by the official organisms, and the universities become the terrain for applying these decisions. They have followed the movement and have, since, been integrating, in a higher or lower degree, external evaluations in their development policies. They have, in parallel, supported the internal evaluations, which very often precede and support the external evaluations.

---

[15]. Hée Bernadette, 1997, "Les diplômes de l'enseignement technologique et professionnel", *Note d'information*, 97 (40), septembre.

[16]. Norway National Report (1995), *European Pilot Projects for Evaluating Quality in Higher Education*, Oslo, Norway.

[17]. Lauglo J. (1990), "A Comparative perspective with special reference to Norway", In M. Granheim, U. Lundgren, and M. Kogan (eds), *Education as Policymaking: Introducing Evaluation into a Decentralised Educational System*, London: Jessica Kingsley

[18]. Kirke- utdannings og forskningsdepartmentet <KUF> (1988), *Med viten og vilje*, NOU, 28.

2. Objects of Evaluation

2.1. A double purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation of teaching and learning covers two domains:

- *the practice of teaching*. This practice refers to the themes linked to the organisation of teaching and the related activities: course content, methods, resources, objectives researched, educational programs offered to the student, number of possible programs leading to a degree, diversity of educational programs, gateways for students with poor performance.

It refers to evaluating the process of teaching and, eventually, the competence of the teaching staff in its whole. To evaluate means to know better and analyse the division of time between the teaching and administrative loads, as well as between the different levels of teaching, to increase the co-ordination between the administration and the teachers, to optimise the implementation of new courses, such as review of programs, assessment of systems to evaluate students, organisation of practices, time, theoretical, practical and optional courses. It means, thus, to control the programs and their adequacy to the study plans, to promote actions aimed at the education and improvement of the teachers, to optimise the post-graduate educational programs for continuous education, to propose changes concerning the structures, study plans and courses <Losa, 1992>[19].

- *the students' capacity to learn and the way the teaching is received*, i.e., how learning takes place. This domain includes all themes linked to the students and their learning, i.e., their performance: adequacy of the students' choice with previous studies, understanding of their choice, time invested by the students to attain a degree, re-orientations and progress. It refers also to the measurement of various practices <Potocki-Malicet, 1997>[20], the admissions, the control of knowledge acquired by the students, to follow the students on the proposed educational programs. Another aspect of the evaluation comprehends the guidelines given to the students, the support services (documentation, libraries...), the living conditions <Grignon, 1998a>[21]. Thus, it also covers the placement of students, the national and international contacts with other institutions (exchange programs for the academic staff and students).

All the evaluations of the universities cover these two domains but in different degrees. In some countries, the first category is the most important, while, in others, the emphasis on performance can result in the evaluation of costs of a course, of a program, or of a degree.

---

[19]. Losa Margarida, 1992,"Universidade e Pedagogia: Reconhecimento e Auto-Avaliação", Boletim da Universidade do Porto, 2 (14).

[20]. Potocki Malicet Danielle (1997), "Les règles de scolarité dans l'université: Importance et rôle des règles et des pratiques locales", Sociétés Contemporaines, n° 28, 1997, pp. 57-78.

[21]. Grignon Claude, 1998 (a), La vie matérielle des étudiants: logement, alimentation, santé, Paris, La Documentation Française, Cahiers de l'OVE, 4.

2.2. Three configurations related to the countries

These two objects can be evaluated within the framework of higher education as a whole, including all disciplines, within a university with all its disciplines, within a faculty or a department, within a discipline in the country, within a specific level of the university. We can, thus, characterise the countries into three main groups:

- ***first group of countries: it includes the countries within which the evaluations refer to one discipline within the institutions Portugal, United Kingdom, northern part of Germany, Finland, and Norway*** <Stensaker, Karlsen, 1996>[22]. The evaluation has been carried out periodically. The priority is given to the discipline, the common element that brings together the motivations and competence of the academic staff and researchers. The choice of evaluating a discipline responds to a need of comparing and placing a discipline within a university, within a country, in relation to national and international standards, except in the United Kingdom, where the criteria are characteristic of each discipline within each university. The evaluation of how a discipline is taught within a university, or within a group of universities, gives the teaching staff the possibility to take a position vis-à-vis other teachers of the same discipline taught in other places. It allows also inter-disciplinary comparisons.

Although interesting, this evaluation practice it is not always satisfactory because it does not allow a positioning inside the institution. It is possible to emphasise here the difficulty of constructing an identity of the university when the evaluation is carried out per discipline and not over the whole institution.

Spain
The national plan for evaluation of the quality of the universities, implemented since 1995, is applied to all universities, including the institutions subjected to regional policies. The evaluation of teaching has, as its basis, the degree, or the study programs of first, second, and third cycle. The guide for self-evaluation comprehends five domains: genesis and evolution of a course in connection with the context of its establishment and its changes, presentation of the organisation and articulation between the different courses, functioning courses, presentation of each discipline, and existing reports regarding the job market.

Finland
The evaluations of teaching and learning started to be systematically implemented in 1991 and were carried out on the courses offered: content, structure, organisation. They have become usual to the students, as well as the teaching and administrative staffs. Presently, the evaluations are integrated within a project whose purpose is to create a permanent system for quality assurance. They are in the hands of the project manager.

Norway
The evaluations concern the disciplines (business administration, sociology, engineering, mathematics, music). They are very comprehensive and cover the dimensions related to the quality of teaching: organisation of teaching, the pedagogy, the interdisciplinary co-operations. Other aspects considered in the evaluations refer to the physical environment, reception and follow-up of students, the students' situation and adequacy of chosen educational programs to their previous education. Finally, other domains considered are: management structures, co-operation between the administration and teaching staff, local

[22]. Stensaker Bjørn, Karlsen Rita (1996) Evaluation of Higher Education in Norway, In Smeby J.C.(ed), *Evaluation of Higher Education in the Nordic Countries*, The Nordic Council of Ministers, Nord. 6, Oslo, Norway.

insertion and national and international influence of the university. The external evaluations have emphasised the strong and weak points of teaching <Jordell, 1992>[23].

Portugal

The process of evaluation of teaching and learning has started in Portugal by an evaluation of undergraduate degrees and master degree courses within institutions of higher education – university and poli-technical, public and non-public. It deals with the structure of the programs, the organisation and the functioning of the course, the development of teaching and evaluation of students, the students' characteristics, the accomplishment of study plans, the professional life of the students, the relationship between research and teaching/learning, the education-employment relationship, and the teaching personnel – their profile, accomplishment of their workload, and the material resources <Ambrosio, 1991>[24].

United Kingdom

The external evaluations cover all institutions of higher education. The Higher Education Funding Councils are the main external evaluators. These evaluations use the «fitness for purpose» approach, according to which each institution is assessed against its own aims and objectives. They focus on the content of courses and their organisation, on the students' progress, on the assistance to students, on the learning resources and quality assurance. Besides the evaluations carried out by the HEFCE, the universities visited by EVALUE carry out an Annual Control of Courses whose objective is to allow each department to introduce modifications in the courses as a result of the students performance, opinions emitted by the academic staff, students, and external examiners.

Northern Germany: 5 universities

The universities of Bremen, Hamburg, Kiel, Oldenburg and Rostock have established a Consortium of the universities of whose objective is to evaluate teaching and learning. The university of Groningen gives support to these evaluations that follow the same procedure, i.e., a combination of self-evaluations and external evaluations conducted by a peer-review committee. The members of the peer-review committee work in the universities that are not part of the Consortium. In these five universities, the evaluation of teaching and learning refers to the disciplines and focuses on the organisation of the university, the structure and organisation of courses, content of courses, the general conditions of studies: libraries and diverse support services to the students. It is equally interested in how the students receive information about the courses. Another important element of these evaluations is the assessment about the quality and duration of the studies. There is here an effort in combining an evaluation of disciplines and the educational policies of the institution; the disciplines are engaged in a kind of contract with the rector aimed at the improvement of teaching and learning.

- ***second group of countries : the evaluations carried out refer, in general, to several disciplines within some institutions – France, Spain and Germany***. The importance is attached to the university which is considered as the place where the competence of the teaching staff, researchers, administrators and students are put together. In France, since 1989, the development of contract policies between the State and the University has put strong limitations on the role of the disciplines within the institutions. The evaluation of the university is carried out within the frame of control of its activities. It is necessary to know whether it fulfils the conditions established in the national decisions, if it utilises correctly the means supplied, and if it fulfils its missions. This evaluation can have as consequence the strengthening of the links between the different faculties and departments within a common effort of improved communication and better knowledge about each other. The notions of identity and identification are valued. The focus of these evaluations is on the institution as a whole.

---

[23]. Jordell Karl Øyving (1992), *Nasjonal evaluering av økonomisk-administrativ utdanning. Premisser og progress*, NAVF's utredningsinstitutt, Raport 3/92

[24]. Ambrosio Teresa, 1991, *Pedagogia e Eficiência Universitária*, Lisboa, Actas do II Simposio sobre Pedagogia na Universidade.

France

The evaluation of teaching and learning is, at first, done within the educational programs leading to a degree. The universities send the requests for degrees to the Ministry of Education: the idea is to obtain an approval (right to offer a degree considered "national". The strategy followed by these degrees is defined by the university itself, then it is retaken by the President in his self-evaluation report. The criteria for receiving a degree are not always clear and known by the universities, but the most apparent criteria refer to the rates of success, the development of study programs, the content of courses and the infra-structure for teaching, the supervision of teachers, the pedagogical organisation, the services offered to the students, the international relations, and the participation in international programs. There is a tendency today for establishing a connection between degree and contracts; the degrees are being gradually turned towards regional concerns, or towards what is attractive for a region vis-à-vis the students.

A second form of evaluation is carried out by CNE. It deals with the strengths and weaknesses of the institution, and it comprehends an appreciation of the policies in relation to the existing constraints and intended objectives within the missions of the public service. It analyses the various activities and means put into effect within the frame of scientific and pedagogical policies, the management of services, the life on campus, the reception and follow-up of students, the local insertion, and national and international diffusion. The CNE has also led some evaluations of disciplines (such as the ones described in the first group of countries).

Germany

The evaluation of teaching and learning, to the extent that it is not started by a national organism, may refer to the faculties (conducted in parallel with the evaluation of research and management), to the several disciplines within different universities, to the disciplines in all faculties within a university. The levels are different in accordance with the länder. The objective of the evaluations is to ensure quality and increase in the efficiency of educational programs. The evaluation of teaching and learning takes into account the productivity of the educational programs, which is based on the duration of studies and factors that affect such duration, especially the lack of clarity of course structure, the alternatives offered, the lack of co-ordination between basic courses, the lack of co-ordination between the faculties, the course, the lack of interaction between disciplines and co-operation. Various statistical data are elaborated and utilised within the evaluation of teaching and learning. The attention given to the performance of teaching is related to budget problems.

- a third model : the particular case of Italy. Evaluations of disciplines are not carried out in Italy, which means, here, the evaluations concerning the complex discipline sectors. Neither can one find evaluations of costs relative to each educational program, or partnership and co-operation with other national or foreign institutions. The Internal Units of Evaluation are conceived as control services of the execution of the universities' main missions. It means, thus, an evaluation purely internal that deals above all with learning, considered important because it is more effective for the real transformations. The control pertains less to the professor - clarity, being regularly present and available to the students - and more to what the students learn while at the university, and the amount of time spent to finish the degree.

Italy

The evaluations carried out by the Units of Evaluation deal with the teaching offers, the quality of teaching, and the characteristics of the students. Sometimes, such as at the University of Venice, there are two levels of evaluation. At the first level, the different phases gone through by the students at the university are controlled by their entrance in the labour market. One evaluates the failures, the duration of studies, the performance during exams, etc. Using a metaphor, one can say that it is the process of transformation of the "raw material", i.e., the student, into a "finished product" ready to enter the labour market. At the second level, the focus of the evaluation is on the efficiency of utilisation of teaching resources and equipment. At the second level, the focus of the analyses is on the teaching loads, measured by the number of exams per

teacher, per department and per faculty, the number of theses with laurel, and the participation in courses. The second level appears to be little elaborated.

3. Present objectives within evaluation of teaching

3.1. A double objective

The history, culture, and context within the different countries determine the main objectives of the evaluation of teaching and learning. A general conclusion can be drawn from the case studies: the evaluation of teaching and learning is a response to the universities' desire of having a better self-understanding – to know its components, its students... But, beyond a better understanding, two main objectives stated within the different countries and universities, at levels more or less precise, are: the improvement of quality and reduction of costs.

- ***the improvement of quality.*** This is an objective to be attained and can go from the simple expression of a desire (within the discourse, or within the statement of objectives) to the construction of indicators to measure the quality. This happens at a time when the number of students increase, or stabilise, and the budgets allocated to the institutions stabilise. Within a context of increased autonomy and competition, the universities make efforts to become more attractive by offering the students a better quality teaching <Karlsen, Stensaker, 1996>[25] and, thus, improve their possibilities to attain better results. Efforts are also made to improve the quality of the students' environment and the degrees granted <European Commission, 1995>[26]. The evaluation of the quality of teaching and learning is, thus, an important concern <Jouandeau, 1996>[27].

- ***cost control***. This objective can be clearly stated, barely evoked, or even only insinuated. However, within a context of budget restrictions, as for example in France, where there has been a reduction of extra hours, the universities are being more and more forced to make calculations, to watch their accounts, to restrict expenses, thus, to control the costs. Moreover, the evaluation of costs and financial expenses can respond to a control of conformity: the degrees are granted according to detailed plans with a minimum of requirements regarding hours and means, but also with limitations due to budget restrictions. It is, thus, necessary to be concerned with the costs. Just as in the United Kingdom, a strong control of public expenses is also being developed within all countries, parallel to research regarding quality.

At the ***University of Hamburg*** *(Germany)*, within the department of economics, the results of the external evaluations have made evident the great split between the different institutes. It has been emphasised that

[25]. Karlsen Rita, Stensaker Bjørn (eds) (1996), Kvalitet i høyere utdanning (Quality in Higher Education). In *Kvalitet i høyere utdanning : Teori, empiri og praksis*, Norsk institutt for studier av forskning og utdanning (NIFU), Rapport 1/96.

[26]. European Commission (1995), *European Pilot Project for Evaluating Quality in Higher Education*, Brussels, DG XXII, European Report.

[27]. Jouandeau Alain (1996) «Un système qualité pour l'enseignement supérieur: pourquoi faut-il l'inventer ?» *Gestion de l'Enseignement Supérieur*, 8 (3), novembre, 77-86.

there is a lack of identity and of "esprit de corps" within this department. Therefore, measures have been taken by the department, in accordance with the President of the university, to reinforce the notion of "identity" within the department by means of discussions for defining the strategies for the discipline, and, thus, develop an atmosphere favourable to discussing the modifications to be carried out in teaching.

3.2. Three configurations related to the countries and the ideal types

Even if one of the objectives prevails over the other, they are present within the different universities, but vary in relation to the countries and the types of university.

- ***first configuration*** : countries where quality and cost control are part of the university's policy. These are found in some of the countries – United Kingdom, Finland, Norway – as part of a general policy of higher education and imposed upon the universities. Costs and quality are a concern of the institution as part of the objective of improving the effectiveness and efficiency of higher education.

> ***At the University of Bergen***, a letter sent by the president of the university on September 6, 1996, to the seven institutions of higher education that participate in the process of evaluation, emphasises that Quality Control and evaluations of quality of teaching and research are important aspects for the international development of higher education. This is a permanent concern within the Norwegian universities. The main objective of the program is to create better conditions for teaching and learning, and, consequently, for increasing the quality <Trageton, Utne, 1995>[28].

They refer to the relationships of the university with its environment: to respond better to market demands by determining more precisely the missions of the university regarding the development of education and its future, by adapting the educational programs and integrating them to the job market, by establishing an atmosphere and culture that support the improvement of teaching and learning. In the United Kingdom, Finland, and Norway, the idea of cost has to be enlarged. The evaluation is considered as a necessary instrument "to account for the use of public funds" (accountability).

- ***second configuration*** : countries where the costs, within certain universities, are treated in a less general way, and according to a precise criterion (for example: the amount of time spent by the student at the university, in Germany; the number of repetitions and approvals of students during their period of enrolment, in Italy; the number of failures in the first cycle (undergraduate level), in France, but also in conformity with the costs estimated in the plans and the real costs in France). This situation is a main concern of the universities of general character, which are preoccupied with the number of students to be taught and the difficulties met by these students within the large universities. The universities are becoming increasingly more concerned with the return of their "investments" and with their budgets. They are constantly reviewing and determining the costs of their educational programs. The criterion most often used here is the amount of time used by the students to finish their course. Quality is understood as quality of learning by the students. Such quality is expected to be enhanced by, first, having a better match between the students' educational choices and their previous education, to optimise the amount of time spent at the university for obtaining a degree, and to improve the students' performance and their results.

---

[28]. Trageton Sigurd, Utne Edmund (1995), *Back to basics: Evaluation as an institutional enterprise*, Zurich, 17th Annual EAIR Forum, september

At the ***University of Aix-Marseille 1,*** the internal evaluation on costs has been initiated within the department of Sciences and extended to the department of Languages and Human Sciences. Its main objective has been to control the complementary hours. This has been done by calculating the cost per discipline and per level in each one of these degrees, according to the number of students enrolled, the number of hours attended, the total amount of needed teaching services, the number of hours per student.

At the ***University of Erlangen,*** an effectiveness analysis implemented by the Bavarian State Institute for Higher Education, Research, and Planning attempts to identify the reasons for the different duration of the studies. The lack of clarity of the courses' structure, the alternatives offered, the lack of co-ordination between the faculties and between the courses, the lack of inter-disciplinary co-operation have been made evident. The concern within this analysis is the optimisation of costs of education.

At the ***Polytechnic of Turin***, the introduction of evaluation instruments aimed at the "customer satisfaction" by <CDP> can be considered as an innovative practices within the purpose of quality development. The guidelines are: to identify the possible factors that can disturb the quality of didactic, to elaborate propositions for solving the problems that appear and, immediately, inform the bodies at the university responsible for taking the necessary measures.

- ***third configuration*** : countries where there is a concern for quality and the concern for costs is starting to emerge (Spain, Portugal <Fernandes, 1992>[29]) in order to improve the allocation between the universities and the courses, or are oriented towards the search for additional funds (France, universities of territorial development). The universities for territorial development and/or the profession oriented universities of education and applied sciences direct their educational efforts towards the financing of professional degrees and respond to market demands. The teaching staff is the object of attention of these evaluations which focus on: the improvement of teachers' performance, pedagogical methods, development of curriculum and teaching methods in higher education, promotion of actions to improve the level and the teaching skills of the academic staff in order to increase their effectiveness <UFD>[30].

At the ***University of Littoral***, the CNE evaluations focus on the educational programs offered in the first cycle (at the undergraduate level), on the needs of the labour market, the completion of education in the second and third cycles (at the master and doctoral levels) through collaboration between neighbouring universities, the IUP professionalisation in particular, teacher' education, and continuing education. The university turned towards the adequacy of its degrees to the professional perspectives**.** However, these educational programs must be financed by the enterprises and local groups.

At the ***University of Rostock***, a training program for teachers is maintained within department of Informatics. The Ministry of Culture has included Computer Science as a subject in the courses offered in the winter semester of 1997-1998.

The search for quality and cost control should not be considered two contradictory objectives; to improve the quality of teaching offered to the students is not incompatible with a control of expenses. Improvement does not mean more resources, but it means to use resources in a more effective manner. The control of the utilisation of public funds, especially with the concern to

---

[29]. Fernandes Antonio (1992) Gestão das Universidades e Qualidade de Ensino, *Boletim da Universidade do Porto* (14).

[30]. Utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet (UFD) (Ministry of Research and Education) (1990) Studiekvalitet : Innstilling fra Studiekvalitetsutvalget (Quality of Education : Recommendations from the Committee for Quality Education), Utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet, Oslo.

justify the costs of education and to be a support to budget preparations and decisions, results in obtaining complementary funds. Less than effectiveness or return to investments, this means to the university to be morally aware of the obligation of not only to PREPARE its accounts, but to JUSTIFY the accounts to the contributors. The university has to prove that it deserves its financing by offering quality in teaching.

4. Innovations within evaluation of teaching and learning

4.1 Two areas of innovation

An analysis of the various universities reveals two areas of innovation.

- ***innovation of techniques used to carry out evaluations of teaching and learning :*** utilisation of new technological means and specific evaluation procedures. The objective of these practices is to facilitate and speed up the collection of opinions and the analyses of results of evaluation questionnaires about teaching and learning.

- ***innovations within teaching practices and methods***. It means here to evaluate new teaching practices such as long distance teaching, the utilisation of new technologies by the teaching staff, and the utilisation of new teaching assistance such as tutoring <Montandon-Binet, 1997>[31].

4.2. The innovative practices according to the ideal types of university

Innovations are not in the same stage of development within the different countries and universities. It is hypothesised here that the establishment of innovative practices is linked to the type of university.

- the profession oriented universities of education and applied sciences. Some universities, such as the Politechnical of Turin, the Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration, and the Tampere University of Technology, aim at developing the evaluation of teaching and learning by establishing sophisticated means of evaluation based on high technology. Such measures are expected to increase the effectiveness of evaluation, and, consequently, bring a higher effectiveness to teaching and learning.

> At the ***Tampere University of Technology***, an electronic procedure of evaluation has been established. When a student signs up for an exam, he/she can, at the same time, fill out an evaluation questionnaire regarding the course, by electronic means. Following, all the results are put together and communicated to the person that has taught the course, to the director of the department, and to the management team of the school. Some department make good use of this system, while others use it less. The questionnaire covers the lectures, the practices, the course material, the course objectives, the comments. The first four groups of questions are answered on a scale from 0 to 5. The strengths of this system are: the results are automatically available, thus, a special feedback system is not organised; the results are comparable; the system produces data within a continued data base.

[31]. Montandon-Binet Christiane (1997) « Les paradigmes sous-jacents à la notion de tutorat », *Savoir, éducation, formation*, 1, 17-33.

The weaknesses are reported. Regarding the students, the feedback is attached to the enrolment but they wish to have feedback other times**;** feedback is possible only in courses that have an exam, and the students are not sure whether their comments are taken into account. Regarding the teachers, they think that the OINFO questionnaire does not have sufficient questions, while an organised feedback during a course gives more information; many students sign up for exams prior to the beginning of courses, and, therefore, are not in a situation of evaluating the courses; there might be several conferences offered during a course, and the questionnaire is not sufficiently detailed to identify them; the questionnaire does not comprehend all courses offered at a given time; it is, thus, difficult to make comparisons between the departments; finally, there are several problems associated with the interpretation of questions by the students.

The evaluation of courses needs a renewal because the students are tired of completing the same type of questionnaire after each course or exam. This has two consequences: although the teaching standards have been improved, the scores given during evaluations have decreased. Besides, the courses with a high number of students receive systematically the lowest scores than courses with a low number of students. There have happened modifications, and, especially, an experience within the pilot evaluations at the end of courses, by e-mail, which have had an increase in the number of answers and additional comments.

- ***the universities of general character,*** well established, old, and large, wish to solve their problems regarding the organisation of teaching in order to face the new demands caused by a higher number of students with a wider diversity. The purpose is to improve the management of a higher number of students and meet their needs without great delays. The innovation refers more to an innovation of teaching practices than of evaluation itself.

At the ***University of Paris XII Val-de-Marne***, the evaluations cover the pedagogical innovations specified in the annual objectives. After some years, the CEVU makes a supplementary contract with each UFR, **"**which is a good action lever". The financing is granted in accordance with the attainment of pedagogical objectives, which are submitted to an evaluation at the end of the year. The following question has been asked them: "Which pedagogical improvement have you implemented?" Such practice has stimulated several actions considered innovative: multiplication of Directed Activities, reduction of employees, support services, implementation of information services, practical training, tutoring… The contractual grants for pedagogical objectives have reached the amount of 12 million francs during the period between 1993-96.

The procedure observed is following described. The pedagogical means depend on the contract/objectives established between September and December. In October/November, an evaluation is made regarding the previous year, and new objectives are established. This is done through meetings with the directors of the UFRs, the administrators and the Vice-president of CEVU, who is responsible for Pedagogical Affairs. The contract establishes what the directors of departments can and cannot do. This type of evaluation of pedagogical innovation was carried out between 1993 and 1996. However, the period during which the university had no President was been very difficult, and this experience was interrupted.

At the ***University of Bergen,*** the department of Sociology has been the object of a quite negative evaluation about its organisation, and its specialised disciplines, both regarding teaching as well as research. The effects have, thus, been relatively negative in the first phase of evaluation, but have been favourable towards defining a more clear profile for the department.

Within the university, the process of evaluation and its results are perceived as a unique occasion to obtain information about the development of the disciplines, the processes of teaching and learning, and the general situation of the faculties. This is considered positive not only to people outside the university, but also a source of information that can help the recently elected administrators at the different levels, who have little, or sometimes no time, to examine the different administrative aspects of the university.

At the ***University of Erlangen-Nuremberg*** *(Germany),* a concrete consequence of the evaluation is the announcement of course plan two terms ahead, which allows the students to better organise themselves. It has also been observed an improvement in the teachers' presentations and discussions about minor points

between the teaching staff and the students. However, the importance attached to the evaluations by the students is still weak, as well as within other German universities.

- ***the universities of territorial development*** offer few examples of innovation within one or another domain. One can wonder whether they are concerned, above all, with their implementation and recognition within their milieu. They are going through a period of proving themselves and are, thus, less concerned with innovations within this phase.

At the ***University of East London*** however, one can mention the dissemination of a quality assurance manual through Internet. This manual is used by the teaching staff, as well as by the students. Thus, efforts are made to utilise new technological means for the improvement of teaching.

At the ***University of Beira Interior***, one can mention the importance placed on the processes of registration of course content. In spite of this practice not being new, it has been strengthened in order to develop auto-analyses practices and increase the possibilities for introducing modifications in teaching.

At the ***University of Udine,*** the evaluation has been followed by the introduction of didactic units on European culture, foreign languages, and an increase in the amount of hours for practical training. This initiative has allowed the substitution of some courses. The responses given by the students have permitted to move courses from the first to the second and third years, as well as to carry out adjustments.

The development of innovative practices can take place only in favourable contexts: links with the enterprises, link with an ancient university tradition. It is recommended to the universities that wish to be innovative to open themselves to the external environment, i.e., the enterprises, and invest in new technologies. This can be realised only in agreement with the staff responsible for managing the university as a whole, its departments, and its faculties. If the decision makers wish, the innovative practices can, thus, be institutionalised. If there is no strong support, the obstacles become too numerous and the innovations disappear after some time. It appears, thus, desirable that the innovative practice become the object of special attention, curiosity and receive strong support from those responsible for the management of the institution, as well as of its components.

5. Actors and methods

There are four categories of actors involved with the evaluation of teaching and learning: the professional bodies, the peers, the students, and the universities' instances.

- ***the professional bodies :*** They are mainly involved with course accreditation. By confirming or not confirming the quality of the courses, they are responsible for their quality. Order of engineers accredits courses (Portugal: Engineering), professionals (United Kingdom: their accreditation is more searched than the well succeeded evaluations of HEFCE), counsellors within the programs or members of jury in exams (France). The accreditation of a course by professionals gives credibility to a program of studies, as well as to the learning experiences of the student, both practical and theoretical; it reinforces the users' confidence

At the ***University of Glasgow,*** several of the courses proposed are accredited by a professional body, as for example, at the undergraduate level: Aeronautical Engineering and Avionics, Civil Engineering, Mechanical Design Engineering, Medicine.

At the ***University of Cardiff, Wales***, the teaching staff participates in the accreditation procedures carried out by the professional bodies. They describe it as a pleasant and non-stressing experience as it does not have any direct consequences on the financial resources.

- ***the peers*** are the experts that assess the quality of teaching and learning. They are foreign experts who make observations in-loco for carrying out a better evaluation of teaching and learning, and give their opinions about the quality of the courses (Finland); they can also be external members in the university juries during exams (Norway), external evaluation committees that count with the participation of experts (Spain, Portugal).

- ***the university instances***. The main actors in charge of internal evaluations are those responsible for the management of the university, the faculties, the departments, the teaching staff, and, sometimes, the students, as, for example, the committees in which they are represented. Their main role is to collect information and prepare the self-evaluation reports that are used during the external evaluations. They can also analyse the situations and evaluation reports, external and internal, emit opinions, and, eventually, put into practice the decisions made as consequence of the evaluation results.

- ***the students***. In parallel, it is observed that the universities make efforts to involve the students in the evaluation of the teaching staff, inclusive in the external evaluations. This participation is placed between two extremes: the participation can be "natural" and part of the customs, i.e., habitual; it can be written in the texts in order to make it more effective. The university collects the students' opinions regarding the courses' development, the attitude of the teaching staff during the course, the general organisation of the educational programs, the existing resources, and the existing or desired support services. The students are actors in the evaluation of teaching and learning within the different countries. Their participation is , in some cases, the result of a demand made by the universities (Spain), other times it is due to their integration within committees (colleges and universities of Finland and Norway), within councils (France). The students' involvement in evaluations can also be a consequence of their own initiatives, by means of the students' organisations (Germany) or in collaboration with the teaching staff (Germany, Norway, United Kingdom. They are part of the Evaluation Council and can be integrated within the internal committees. The students are always consulted, even when they are not part of the internal and external committees (Portugal). In the United Kingdom, Finland, Norway and Germany, the students participate in the procedures of quality assurance. In all the cases, these evaluations are not considered as a form of control by the central administration. Instead, they are regarded as the means to give feedback to the teaching staff and a way to stimulate the communication between the teaching staff and the students.

At the ***University of Tampere*** *(Finland)*, the students must be integrated within the projects of self-evaluation. They participate in the preparation of self-evaluation report, and can prepare an evaluation report regarding teaching, learning, the models of teaching, the examination procedures, and the tutoring. They wish to know the effects of their evaluations.

In ***Portugal***, the law establishes that the national council of evaluation and the other councils must be constituted of teachers and students. The latter participate in the definition of evaluation policies.

At the ***University of East London***, the students' union has produced a booklet detailing how students can get involved in quality assurance. The procedures include participation in committees for course critique, feedback about teaching, as well as in surveys that gather students' perceptions about their educational experiences and the university's services.

The methods. The external and internal evaluations are based on the collection of information, and uses, both, quantitative and qualitative methods: analysis of documents, interviews, observations, meetings, assistance from experts, use of data base, use of questionnaires with closed/standardised and open answers <Karlsen, Stensaker, 1996>. This data collection is carried out together with the teaching staff, non-teaching staff, heads of institutions, managers of the universities, faculties, and departments, and eventually the students – those still enrolled and the alumni. It is conducted by the committees, commissions, internal cells (groups) in the evaluated institutions, managers of the institutions, academic and non-academic staff and/or students.

The difficulty most often mentioned is the construction and administration of questionnaires to the students. It has been observed that the practice of applying questionnaires to the students is quite developed within the profession oriented universities of education and applied sciences, and also within the branches of professional or continuing education in other universities (universities of general character and universities of territorial development). This can be explained by the close contact that exists between the enterprises and these branches of education or these universities. A certain tradition to be judged, especially by external evaluators, allows to integrate the judgement of the students.

At the ***University of Paris XII,*** it was said regarding *IUP Transport et Logistique* that "…it is little, one says everything, one sees everything, one controls. The evaluation is very informal. If it is negative, one changes, one modifies, one is attentive…". Within the department of Social Sciences and Education, where there is no evaluation of teaching and learning within the traditional program, continuing education organises the sequences of group evaluation within the course framework for discussing the content of courses and the pedagogy used. The courses are re-adjusted in relation to the students' demands. This procedure, however, is not formalised.

Within the department of Communication, the various modifications are considered in the elaboration of the questionnaire to be completed by the students. First moment: comments on the course – this is not very convincing because the students say everything that the teacher should and should not do. Second moment: it implies writing a free comment about the whole educational program and about each course tried. According to those responsible for the educational program "the general comments are correct, but the comments about each course are quite extensive and detailed. The students feel obliged to say something about all courses. It is then difficult to relate such comments. It is not possible to give the students questionnaires where they can write what they want". Third moment: comments about the re-grouping of courses according to thematic coherence or modules. The re-groupings ought to be well constructed. It is necessary to analyse the disciplines that must be re-grouped. This way, it is considered only what is most important The questions cover the teaching methods and how the students follow it.

The ***Instituto Superior Técnico Universidade de Aveiro***, the questionnaire can be changed in order to be better adapted to the type of students.

Within this context of actors and methods, two evaluation practices for teaching and learning can be recommended:

- the appeal to experts or professionals external to the institution, sometimes also to the discipline. The inclusion of external evaluators appears to be a source of objective judgement which can be perceived more positively by those evaluated.

- the increase in the participation of students in the different stages of the evaluation process. The institutions ought to be aware that the student is a full participating actor, and that he/she can express an opinion about the education received.

6. Evaluation of teaching and learning: the obstacles related to the objectives

The search for quality, within the present context of stabilisation of the number of students, multiplied by the number of institutions, the occasions to evaluate teaching performed by the faculties and departments. Even though the reports (monographs) mentioned a large number of practices of external and self-evaluations, they are more cautious regarding the utilisation of evaluation results in the modification, organisation and content of courses.

The actors are often critical about the lack of utilisation of evaluation results, especially those of evaluations carried out by the students (Udine, University of Provence, Germany, and Norway). It was observed the absence of connection between the negative results from the evaluations and the decisions taken. Also, the positive results might not bring any particular modification within teaching. It has been observed that few indications are supplied regarding the utilisation and destination of information contained in the evaluations. Sometimes, the actors directly involved within the process are informed, and can, eventually, emit an opinion (Portugal). Therefore, there is a lack of interest for evaluations when there is no utilisation of the results.

On the other hand, regarding the evaluations carried out by the students, ***the resistance of the teaching staff*** is related to their opinion that a student cannot judge a course that he/she does not know, and that the student is not able to establish comparisons with courses offered by other teachers. These evaluations show only the degree of satisfaction of the students with their teachers, and they do not correspond, therefore, to real evaluations of teaching. Also, it ought to be emphasised the little importance that the teaching staff attaches to results of surveys carried out by the students. Certain students claim to have noticed negative effects such as retaliations from certain members of the teaching staff that have received low evaluation scores (University of Pays Basque, University of Udine). In certain universities, it has also been observed a lack of interest among the students to participate in evaluations. There are, thus, quite a few reservations regarding evaluation of teaching, which suggests that there is a lack of interest by the teaching staff, as well as by the students to participate in such activities.

Some of the interviewees have claimed that ***the evaluations can increase the level of frustration*** because the improvements to be made depend on financial resources, which are not always available. In addition, the evaluations bring an extra workload, thus an increase in costs, which is a result of the search of information for internal (United Kingdom, Norway, Portugal) and external evaluations, when a request is made to the personnel working at the university. There is then a risk to establish routines and cause lassitude within the evaluations, especially if one considers the fact that the universities, their personnel and the students are requested to fill out many questionnaires, as well as to supply a lot of information (Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration, Girona, Italy, Norway). One aspect receives little attention: the cost of the evaluation, i.e., what is the cost of the evaluation of teaching and learning in terms of time, means and personnel.

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

Daniel Chave, Stefano Boffo, Erkki Kaukonen, Liv Randi Opdal

1. THE GENERAL CONTEXT

1.1. The double growth

Since the '80s all European countries have experienced important and somehow radical changes in the higher education sector. The transition between the "élite" university to the "mass" university in fact has brought about a dramatic growth in the higher education systems, as well as a strong increase in the number of the institutions, of the students and of the teaching staff. This trend has been amplified and strengthened by another phenomenon, which has been developing through the whole century and has grown exponentially in the last decades : the diffusion of knowledge and of the disciplinary differentiation and fragmentation, which ultimately resulted in the enlargement of academic fields and structures <Clark, 1996>[32].

Both trends play a primary role in the ever-growing system complexity and articulation in different universities and the multiplication of basic units, institutes, centers, departments and types of course within the same institution.

This double growth, nevertheless, has been confronted in the last decade with the restrictions caused by the so-called crisis of the welfare state and, more generally, with the remarkable budget reductions that have affected the education sector as well as other sectors strongly dependent on public financing. In all these countries, even if in different forms and with different nuances, such restrictions have ultimately resulted in the need for a more market-oriented approach of higher education. At the same time, this central impulse has had to combine itself with an increased degree of institutional autonomy and self-regulation, which has been considered as an appropriate tool in order to increase the flexibility necessary to face the problems posed by the expansion of higher education <Neave et Van Vught, 1991>[33]. The combination of these needs produced a two-fold effect: a strong push towards accountability, evaluation and the increase of productivity of teaching and research on the one hand and, on

---

[32]. Clark, B.R.: 'Substantive growth and innovative organization: New categories for higher education research', *Higher Education*, Vol.32, No.4, December, 1996: pp.417-430.

[33]. Neave, G. & Van Vught, F.A.: *Prometeus Bound: The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education* in Western Europe, pp. IX ff. Pergamon Press. Oxford, 1991.

the other, the rise of the so-called "evaluative State", i.e. a way to externally drive higher education institutions through evaluation and performance funding <Neave, 1995>[34].

The financial patronage from the State and the private enterprises ask for ever more performances from the universities, both on the side of cost reduction and of quality/quantity of production. As it has been put forward : "Those in government expect more to be done at lower unit cost. The State mantra becomes: do more with less... National and regional government will not support mass education at the same unit-cost level as they did for prior élite arrangements" <Clark, 1997>[35]. Such a framework and the changes in the relationship between governments and higher education institutions have led in a number of countries to measures for strengthening institutional administration <Geurts et Maassen, 1997>[36], and the extension of research evaluation and the refinement of the tools to implement it can be considered among the most relevant effects produced.

1.2. Research at universities: policy, organization and evaluation

Research at the universities was originally connected to their scholastic educational functions which affected the development of disciplinary structures. The 'invasion' of scientific research proper into the universities, starting in the nineteenth century, strengthened the basic research orientation of academic disciplines. Up until now this Humboldtian model has emphasized the close connection of teaching and research within the same university departments.

As a general trend, however, the overall mission of universities has continuously expanded and become more diversified. In addition to teaching and higher education, scientific research has become a basic and increasingly important function of universities. Universities at the same time produce new knowledge and transfer it in different ways, mainly through education but also more directly through research applications and various knowledge intensive services. From a policy perspective this functional differentiation means that universities have become a subject to multiple sectional policies and policy interests. In addition to traditionally important higher education policies**,** universities are increasingly affected by science, technology and innovation policies, or more generally research policies, not to speak about other policy connections (e.g. regional development).

The factual 'double-bind' of higher education and research policies is still seldom manifested as an integrated approach to university development. The two main lines of university policy-making are usually separate from each other, both as concerns the substance of policy and the national bodies responsible for it. The same duality is reflected at the university level, but perhaps to a lesser degree, Since at least the university leadership has to try to integrate the different functions into a coherent policy scheme which defines the university's mission and strategy. At the levels of faculties, departments and research units the functional differentiation of teaching, research and other activities is again more visible in several countries, e.g. in

[34]. Neave, G. «On living in interesting times: higher education in Europe 1985-1995", *European Journal of Education* 30,(4), December 1995.

[35]. Clark, B.R.: *The Enterpreneurial University: Demand and Response*, p.3, paper presented at the 19th Annual Eair Forum, University of Warwick, August 26-30, 1997.

[36]. Geurst, P. & Maassen, P. "Academics and Institutional Governance", in *Inside Academia.* 1997.

France and Portugal where separately organized research structures occupy a major place within universities.

What then is the current position of research at the universities? The role and status of universities as research sites is undergoing major transitory changes which seem to be quite universal <Gibbons M. et al, 1994>[37]. These changes are related to several factors and developments, which may be briefly summarized as follows.

Due to common budgetary cuts and constraints, universities are becoming more dependent on external, non-budgetary sources of funding. In many countries the share of budgetary research funding relative to external funding has declined remarkably. For instance in Finland, currently 41 % of all university research is financed from external sources (e.g. governmental, industrial, international). The current share of non-budgetary funds is highest in engineering (63 %) and lowest in humanities (23 %) which indicates that there are major differences between disciplines and disciplinary groups in this respect <Kaukonen & Nieminen, 1998>[38].

Along with the changing funding structures universities are increasingly assuming new economic and entrepreneurial functions which enable them to capitalize on their research related products and knowledge-intensive services (cf. the notion ‘entrepreneurial university). The accommodation of new R&D functions is clearly broadening the research profile of universities. At the same time, however, it tends to make the academic research practices more diverse and often more fragmented (cf. the notion of ‘multiversity').

In contrast with the Humboldtian model, the accommodation of new research functions all the more often takes place within separately organized research units or centers <Geiger, 1990>[39]. Traditionally this has been the case in France where scientific research is, to a large degree, located into university based laboratories and research centers (especially under CNRS). A similar but more recent trend is visible in other countries as well. For instance the number of research units at Portuguese universities has rapidly grown to a total of 270, and in Norway the University of Oslo has recently established several research centers. On the other hand, in United Kingdom and Italy research is still predominantly done at the teaching departments.

As their funding is increasingly based on external sources (public and private) the new research centers, units and networks typically have an applied, interdisciplinary and problem-oriented character. The restructuration of university based research thus implies a clear shift of emphasis from the traditional disciplinary context of knowledge production to a more application oriented (often industrial) context of R&D. In some countries like Finland the transition from the traditional academic mode of university research to an application oriented and largely market-driven mode of R&D has taken place very rapidly, during past two-three decades.

---

[37]. Gibbons M. et al: *The New Production of Knowledge. The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. Sage Publications. London 1994.

[38]. Kaukonen, E. & Nieminen, M.: ”The Triple Helix from a Small Country Perspective”, *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 1998. (forthcoming)

[39]. Geiger, R.: ”Organized research units - their role in the development of university research”, Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 61, No.1, 1990: pp. 1-19.

From a broader perspective, the transitory processes have changed the relationship between universities and other research institutions. With expanding linkages in research funding and cooperation the whole national systems of research are becoming more integrated <Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 1997>[40]. This also affects the internal academic life of universities as the 'opening up' of their research activities increases competition with non-university research units. A key issue arising here is whether the overall integration tendency will essentially change the traditional division of labor in research where universities have been the main producers of basic research. For example, in Germany the non-university research institutions (like Max Planck Society and the national research centers) are having an increasingly important role in the new strategic areas of basic research.

The accommodation of expanding research functions also raises new issues and tensions within the universities. These involve such as the problem of potential functional overload - are universities trying to do too many different things at the same time? - and the need to rethink the relationships between research and teaching and other university activities which also involve broader questions of university management.

In facing these issues in their strategy planning the universities have some basic options. First, they may attempt to maintain close connection between teaching and research by accommodating them in the same basic units. This is the traditional departmental model which still prevails e.g. in U.K. and Italy. Second, universities may, more or less, differentiate the organization of teaching and research within the university. This seems to be the most common trend in Europe and also in the case universities studied. And, finally, there is the option of differentiating the two functions at the level of the whole university system, with some universities (e.g. colleges and polytechnics) specializing more in teaching and professional training, and some universities (e.g. the old 'general' universities) emphasizing their role as 'research universities'.

As concerns the last option, the distinction between teaching and research universities has been most pronounced in the United States, but it does not seem to be a viable alternative in Europe. The European universities are no doubt most diverse by their profile and also their strength and orientation in research varies greatly. This is clearly visible in our classification between the three 'ideal' types of universities: ***the generalist, the applied/professional and the regional universities***. The generalist universities typically have a broad disciplinary base and long research traditions which make them stronger in their (basic) research function than the new regional universities, which, however, may have active but often more locally oriented research activities. In the category of professionally oriented applied universities, technical universities and business schools are relatively strongest in their orientation to practical and industrial R&D, while the colleges are often still to develop their research function.

Despite the diversity of university profiles, the general tendency among them (including colleges and former polytechnics) clearly is not to give up scientific research and specialize in higher education but rather to maintain and expand their research functions, no matter what the existing level and status of research is. This means that the European universities will also in the future be both teaching and research institutions and compete in both areas. They will thus

[40]. Etzkowitz, H. & Leydesdorff, L. (eds): *Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy*. A Triple Helix of university-industry-government relations. Pinter Publishers. London and Washington 1997.

face the complex task of internally managing the changing relationships between the old and new teaching and research functions. Therefore the double-bind of higher education and research (policies) should be taken more seriously in university evaluations which so far have tended to strictly separate the two evaluation activities or even to neglect one or the other of them.

2. EVALUATION PRACTICES

2.1. Background and key dimensions

The 1980s and especially the early 1990s have witnessed a rapid growth in research evaluation activities, which concern the universities as well as the whole government-supported research system. The increasing interdependencies between science, technology and society, together with budgetary stringencies in research funding, have placed unprecedented demands on universities and their research activities to be accountable, and to prove their legitimacy and contributions to socio-economic development. To a large extent these demands are mediated through science and technology policies, which increasingly use research evaluation as a tool in policy making, i.e. in structural development, priority setting and in resource allocation. The recent boom in research evaluation has brought about a need to develop new kinds of evaluation methods and practices which expand and complement the traditional ways of research evaluation by the academic community <OECD 1997>[41]. Thus one may, at least in principle, differentiate between the traditional mode of research evaluation and the emerging new practices of evaluation.

Based on the EVALUE data of eight countries and 31 case universities one may outline some key dimensions which are essential in analyzing the recent changes and trends in university research evaluation. These dimensions are briefly characterized in the following and then discussed in more detail in the subsequent chapters.

The objects and levels of evaluation. The traditional mode of research evaluation has for long been focused on individual scientists, concerning typically their scientific publications and other academic merits. The emerging modes of research evaluation are expanding the scope of evaluation from the individual to research collectives, institutions and research fields; or from micro-level to the macro-level entities of the research system. The evaluation of university research is increasingly targeted at such entities as research groups, university departments and research units as well as scientific disciplines. From a still broader perspective, university research can be evaluated as a part of national and international research systems and policies as is typically the case in the OECD evaluations.

Internal and external evaluations. The traditional mode of research evaluation has been internal in the sense that the evaluators (e.g. referees of publications) almost exclusively came from within the scientific community. External peers, and especially foreign peers, constitute an interesting intermediary group in this respect as they come from outside the institution, or outside the country, but are at the same time insiders in scientific matters. The new evaluation

[41]. OECD, *The Evaluation of Scientific Research: Selected Experiences*, OCDE/GD(97)194, Paris 1997.

practices are making the internal/external distinction even more complicated as one has to distinguish between the bodies that commission the evaluations and the actors who actually perform them. The responsible bodies can be internal or external to universities, and they can function either separately or in collaboration. As to the actors performing the evaluation, they may be members of the scientific community itself (self-evaluation) or external peers and experts or, finally, a combination of internal and external peers/experts.

Qualitative and quantitative evaluations. The new evaluation practices typically involve a combination of two basic approaches, qualitative judgements made by scientific peers/experts, and the use of various quantitative (statistical) indicators. As a general tendency, it seems that the use of quantitative indicators in research evaluation is increasing, both as a direct measure of scientific performance and as a part of qualitative expert evaluations. Thus the evaluation of scientific quality is typically based on a combination of qualitative judgements and quantitative measures even though there is great variance their concrete application.

2.2. Objects of evaluation

The objects of evaluation of research identified in the EVALUE study range from the traditional level of the individual researcher at one end to more comprehensive modes of research organisation at the other end.

Individual research performance is typically assessed in connection with recruitment processes for academic positions, when seeking promotion or applying for external research funding or for research terms. In some countries this kind of evaluation still constitutes the dominating practice. An example is provided by Spain, where a special national scheme is used for the evaluation of individual research activity. University professors and lectures can ask for an evaluation of their research performance every six years. Positive results produce an increase in wage, the maximum being six times during academic career.

Research projects are another already traditional object of external evaluation. Their evaluation typically takes place *ex ante* when researchers apply for funding from Research Councils and other external sources. Sometimes research projects are a part of more comprehensive research programs which are often evaluated more systematically after their completion (*ex post* evaluation).

In Britain, a rigorous evaluation of ***university departments*** started in 1992 with the introduction of the Research Assessment Exercise, with the aim of selectively allocating budgetary research funding to university departments on the basis of their quality rating on a seven points scale. A key component in the RAE procedure is still the assessment of individual performance of 'active researchers' even though some more collective criteria are used as well.

A quite similar idea pertains to the evaluation of separately organized ***research units and centers*** in some countries. In Portugal, largely influenced by the British model, the evaluation includes a rating of the general quality of the research units on a five points scale (from 'Excellent' to 'Bad') and has effects on external research funding. In France, the institutional evaluation of research (by CNRS and the Ministry) typically concerns the official status and 'labelling' of the research centers which also has more or less direct financial consequences. A slightly different example is provided by Finland where the Academy of Finland <ACAFI> and

the Ministry of Education launched in 1993 a policy of yearly nominating ***Centers of Excellence in Research*** which will receive, in addition to the special status, considerable extra funding for six years. The University of Helsinki has adopted a similar internal policy by nominating its own CEs.

Research activities in disciplines and disciplinary groups have been the objects of research evaluation in some countries, as was the case at Barcelona and at Oslo, where the disciplines of Informatics and of English Studies were exposed to internal and external evaluations. The promotion of disciplinary evaluations has been most systematic in Finland where the Academy of Finland has carried out 21 evaluations of this kind since 1983. Starting in 1995 the Academy launched a still more comprehensive procedure which includes the review and evaluation of the 'state-of-the-art' of all scientific fields in Finland (including four major disciplinary groups and forty sub-groups).

A general conclusion from the 31 studies is that there seems to be a relative decrease in the practice of having the individual researcher as the target of evaluation and a shift of focus on the evaluation of research units, university departments and scientific disciplines. This tendency runs parallel with the fact that an increasing part of the research funding comes from external bodies or institutions. It is more typical also that evaluations cover several objects and levels at the same time, which tends to increase the overall complexity of research evaluation. It should be noted though that the expanding scope of evaluation does not eliminate the individual researcher as the basic unit and starting point of research evaluation.

2.3 Evaluation bodies, actors, and mandates

The bodies responsible for research evaluation as well as the actors practically performing them may be categorized as being mainly ***external or internal.***

2.3.1. External bodies and actors

External evaluation bodies or external bodies *de facto* acting as such exist outside the universities, and are found in all the eight countries. External bodies are established by the authorities of the country, and as such have a formal status. Two aspects are identified as being of particular interest: their ***mandate***, and their ***recruitment of evaluation actors***. Below is a presentation of the analysis of the situation in the eight countries with regard to external bodies and the relevant aspects.

Table 1. External bodies, mandates and actors of evaluation of research at universities in eight European countries

Countries	**Official external bodies of evaluation**	**Mandate**	**Mandate**	**Recruitment of the actors**	**Recruitment of the actors**
		Very important role in the evaluation and in the funding of research	Role in the evaluation and in the funding of research	essentially national	essentially international
Finland	<ACAFI> <MINED>	yes			yes
Portugal	<JNICT>	yes			yes
United Kingdom	<HEFC> Research Councils	yes		yes yes	
Germany	<DFG>		yes	yes	
Italy	<CNR>		yes	yes	
Norway	<NFR>		yes		yes
Spain	<CAICIT>/ <DIGICIT> Regional bodies		yes	yes	
France	Contrat quadriennal tripartite <MST> <CNRS>	yes		yes	

As shown in Table 1, external bodies usually combine the role of evaluators of research quality with the role of assigning funding to research efforts, but in some of the countries, the combined roles are more typical than in the others. This is the case in three of the countries: the *United Kingdom*, *Finland* and *Portugal*, where the bodies in question have a major role both in research evaluation and research funding.

In the United Kingdom, the official external bodies for evaluation of research are the Higher Education Funding Councils for England, Scotland and Wales, which administer the Research Assessment Exercise. The RAE allocates the basic resources for research between universities (departments) on the basis of research quality, whereas the Research Councils provide public funding for specific research projects.

In Finland, the main external body is the Academy of Finland which for 15 years been responsible for disciplinary evaluations of science and currently, together with the MINED, nominates the Centers of Excellency in Research. In addition, the MINED uses research related indicators (especially the target number of doctoral degrees) in allocating annual budgetary resources.

In Portugal, the National Board of Scientific and Technological Research has recently (1997) started new types of research evaluations within the Pluri-annual Research Units Program. The evaluation based ranking of research units has direct effects on their basic funding and they may also influence program financing

In other countries, consisting of *Germany, Norway, Italy and Spain*, university research is also increasing evaluated by various internal and external bodies, but the financial and other effects of evaluation are so far less visible than in the above mentioned countries.

In Germany, no special body exists for evaluating academic research. The German Research Association is the main external funding body for university research and it also acts as an external evaluation body but only in connection with applications for funding. A parallel to such purpose is found in Norway through the efforts of the Norwegian Research Council.

The Italian Consiglio Nationale delle Ricerche (CNR), itself being a research body, also finances external research, and as such also evaluates research applications.

Also in Spain, national bodies (Caicit>/<Digicit) have started to function in area of research evaluation, in addition to regional bodies having a special responsibility to promote research of interest for the region (as documented in the case studies of the universities of Barcelona and of Gerona).

In France, the most important research evaluation process for universities is the Quadrennial Tripartite Contract: the three parties of this process are the universities, the Ministry of Higher Education and Research and the CNRS, the National Scientific Research Center. The contract has two parts : the first for teaching, the second for research. The focus of the Quadrennial process is on the institutional evaluation of research centers and it may affect their status (e.g. relative to CNRS) and structural development. In addition, the Mission of Science and Technology (attached to the Ministry) and the National Committee of Evaluation (CNE) have been involved in institutional evaluation of research.

The nomination or ***recruitment of actors*** of external research evaluation exercises is typically made from national and/or international academic milieus outside the university in question, in one case (France) from bureaucratic groups at higher national administrative levels outside the university.

An interesting feature is the identified tendency in countries with relatively small scale scientific milieus, like Portugal, Finland and Norway, to appoint foreign experts as members of evaluation committees, as was the case with the evaluations at universities of Bergen, Oslo, Tampere University of Technology, Lisbon, Helsinki... The need for independent evaluators may in these countries be experienced as of more relevance than in countries with more extensive scientific milieus. In Finland, evaluation actors have typically been recruited from international research milieus, with the exception of the evaluation of research in education, where the choice of experts, due to the language in the reports, was limited to Finnish researchers. In Portugal, while the actors in the recent JNICT evaluations were groups of foreign scientists, group coordinators were Portuguese researchers. In Norway, NFR has conducted evaluation exercises through committees consisting of international actors, often Nordic, but usually including also Norwegian experts.

In France, The United Kingdom, Italy, Germany and Spain, the evaluation actors identified in our study have been recruited from national academic milieus.

External non-official evaluation bodies include institutions of mass media, such as newspapers and journals, publishing ranking lists of research institutions and universities. In

some countries, like Norway, such ranking lists are hardly made, whereas in Portugal, there may be a certain pressure from newspapers and also from the trade and industry to get more information about teaching quality and diplomas at the universities, but this pressure does not as yet seem to have been there concerning research. In Germany, newspapers do not systematically publish ranking lists, although Der Spiegel, for instance, has done this in the case of teaching at universities. In United Kingdom, newspapers, primarily the educational press, report the evaluation results for teaching and research. In Spain, *El Pays* has ranked universities according to research. France reports that general rankings of universities may be found in media, whereas this hardly is the case in Italy.

2.3.2. Internal bodies and actors

Whereas some of the universities represented in the EVALUE study do have specific internal evaluation bodies of research, others operate with what might more correctly be characterized as internal procedures or systems of research evaluation, sometimes of a rather informal character.

Internal bodies of evaluation of research studied by the teams vary according to how centralized, versus decentralized, their position is at the institution. Below, the universities are grouped according to this characteristic.

Central university level	Decentralized university level
Group A Group B Group C	Group D Group E

Figure 2. Internal evaluation bodies/systems at universities studied by EVALUE, grouped according to their position at the institutions.

The three groups of bodies/systems on the left side of the axis are all operating at the central level of the institution, and as such covering all levels, including the faculty and department levels.

The two groups of bodies/systems on the right side of the axis are active at the decentralized levels of the institution, either at department and/or research unit level, or more generally at «academic community» level.

Group A comprises bodies/systems at two Finnish universities. University of Helsinki has an internal evaluation body, the University Research Grants Committee, operating at the central level, and with an formal status at the institution. In 1994 and in 1996 the Committee nominated Centers of Excellency in Research within the university. In 1996 an Expert Board of recognized Finnish scholars were asked to evaluate all groups in competition. The Helsinki School of Economy and Business Administration, initiated and established an internal system for evaluating research at the end of 1980s, but its functioning has varied according to the interests of the Rector at the time.

Group B comprises bodies/systems at Aveiro, Glasgow, Wales Cardiff, Oslo College, Agder College, and at universities in Spain, France and Italy, which all have some kind of central bodies with the internal evaluation of research efforts as part of their responsibility. Below, short descriptions is given from the relevant case studies.

At Aveiro (Portugal), the Internal Institute of Research has, since 1994, acted as an internal body of evaluation, organizing an annual request to the different research units, and, on the basis of the answers and the fulfilment of a set of indicators, distributed internal financial resources for research, approximately 2% of the Aveiro`s revenue. In addition, many of the research units have their own internal bodies of evaluation, exercising assessments according to some chosen criteria, and then follow up with the distribution of funding to each research group.

Glasgow did, after the 1992 Research Assessment Exercise, adopt a rather centralized internal approach to the review of research, as a «Research Review», linked in terms of timing to the RAE procedure, is carried out at faculty and planning unit level.

At Cardiff, the internal Research Committee was at the center of the University`s research strategy before the RAE in 1996, initiating a series of efforts to secure the research quality and performance at the departments, based on key indicators used at the <RAE> procedures. The Research Committee also assessed submissions and actually acted as an internal evaluation body for this period.

At Oslo College and at Agder College (Norway), the central R&D Committees, on mandate from the Boards, have the responsibility for the evaluation of research applications and the allocation of money for grants to academic staff member research activities. This funding is then added to the approximately 20-25 percentages of the regular working time which the academic staff is supposed to apply for research activities.

At all the four Italian universities in the study there is a centralized research evaluation system, where the criteria are made on consensus between the Rector and the departments, and then the very evaluation is carried out by the Evaluation Unit.

In Spain, every university has some kind of internal body of evaluation of research. At the University of Barcelona, the Vice Rector is in charge of research and of the scientific policy, and sometimes also decides what funding is to be given to the research groups at the university.

In France, official internal bodies of research evaluation do not exist. Nevertheless, the own research units of CNRS and the units associated with the same are subjected to the obligation to write an Activity Report every four years.

Group C comprises bodies/systems at Hamburg and the University of Paris XII Val-de-Marne, where rather informal internal bodies of research evaluation operate on the central level of the institution.

According to the case study, there are at Hamburg no special internal bodies aiming to improve and evaluate the quality of research in general. A reason for this is said to be the variety of

courses and areas of research, which makes it not possible to define or "measure" the quality of research inside the University, as the diverse areas are not comparable. The External Advisory Commission for Structure and Development Planning of Hamburg has, however, invested time to the research activities, aiming at developing a profile for the departments at the University, and may as such act as an internal body of evaluation.

At the Paris XII University there is, as reported in the case study, an internal informal evaluation body of research which prepare the external evaluation scope of the Quadrennial Tripartite Process.

The two groups at the right side of the axis were Group D and Group E. ***Group D*** comprises of bodies/systems at University of Lisbon, Beira Interior, Oslo, Bergen. In the cases of Lisbon and of Beira Interior, external research funding is given directly to the separate research units at the universities. The research coordinator at the unit is elected by and among all the members of the research unit, and is personally responsible to the external funding body. The internal distribution of the research funding is done either by the coordinator himself or by the voting in the internal research unit, and as such, both alternatives may be regarded to act as an internal evaluation body/system and actor.

At the Universities of Oslo and Bergen, members of the academic staff are supposed to apply approximately half of their working time for research activities, such activities are reported in the annual budget reports and in scientific publication reports of the departments. In addition, academics have the possibility to apply internally for research leave, in such cases the quality of the projects is usually evaluated by an internal scientific committee. A prize may be given to the best research milieu.

Group E comprises universities where the systems of research evaluation, according to the case studies, so far have been slightly less formalized and specified. East london University has not imposed any internal prescriptive system of monitoring research across the University, but individual monitoring systems operate at department and faculty level, with the results communicated to the central level and monitored by the Research Committee that reports to the Academic Board. At the University of Tampere, there have so far been no systematic internal evaluation directed at research activities, but the university Steering Group has recently developed and applied a set of research indicators for the internal allocation of operational funding. For one of the universities, the University Rostock, in the former GDR, no specific internal evaluation bodies or systems for evaluating research were identified in the study.

2.3.3 Combinations of internal and external bodies and actors

The EVALUE study has also identified approaches where internal bodies of evaluation cooperated with external evaluation bodies and / or actors. Two approaches were identified:

***** The internal body, which might be a department, an internal research committee/council, or the Senate of the university, may conduct or initiate an internal evaluation effort as a preparatory step for an external research evaluation exercise. Such approaches were identified for instance at Oslo and at Bergen, in connection with the external <NFR> research evaluations of Informatics and of English Studies, where internal status reports were prepared by the departments as a support activity for the external evaluation exercise.

***** The other approach included the use of internal bodies of evaluations applying international and external national experts, sometimes in addition to internal actors, as was the case at <UHEL>, where the internal evaluation body, the University Research Grants Committee, in the 1994 nomination process for Centers of Excellency in Research, appointed exclusively foreign evaluation experts. A parallel was identified at Oslo, where the Center of Biotechnology itself has acted as an internal evaluation body and appointed a group of international experts to conduct a research evaluation of the activities of the Center every second year from 1990.

2.4. Evaluation methods, criteria and quantitative indicators used

As concerns the methods, all countries, except Italy (excluding the <CRE>exercises), have introduced external research evaluation practices. The character of these evaluations, however, varies from 'desk' evaluation conducted by peers (Spain), to a combination of desk work and interactive investigation in situ, conducted by peers (Finland, France-CNRS, Germany, Norway, Portugal and the UK), and to evaluations by bureaucrats (France, for the part related to CNE). Typically, the evaluation procedure involves two main stages. First, a self-evaluation by the research community which, in addition to descriptive reporting on research activity and its results, may also include the use of quantitative indicators and other relevant data. The second stage then consists of site visits and interviews by the evaluation panel (peer review) and of writing and publishing the evaluation report. Finally, there may be specially organized feedback and follow-up procedures with the aim to improve the effectiveness of the evaluation.

The first aspect relates to the ***mandate of defining evaluation objectives, methods and criteria***. As we have already seen, the research evaluation can be internal, external or a combination of both. In the case of external evaluation, the main mandatory source for defining evaluation objectives and methods is external. As concerns the actual evaluation, if it uses the typical peer review method, this implies that the evaluation panel may rather independently decide on what counts as valid criteria of research quality and performance in the respective field. If the evaluation is more administrative by nature, also the criteria and indicators tend to be more externally defined. But even in this case a certain degree of consensus on evaluation criteria should prevail between the evaluators and the research community to make the procedure legitimate and consequential. Therefore the criteria used in internal evaluations are often quite coherent with and similar to those of the external ones, even though the latter may involve broader and more far reaching science policy objectives (e.g. concerning priorities and strategic development of research) to which the actual evaluation by peers may not provide answers.

It is obvious, however, that the criteria, and furthermore their quantitative indicators, may become a controversial issue in another respect. This is usually the case when evaluations aim at comparing and ranking different disciplines and disciplinary groups and there is a need to use commensurable criteria and indicators. The conceptions on what is good research may differ greatly between various disciplines and hence it is difficult to reach consensus on them. In such a situation it is possible that the stronger and more strategic disciplines dominate the selection of criteria and also the science policy bodies may affect their choose. In the Finnish case (e.g. Tampere University of Technology), the discussion on internationally as the main criteria of scientific excellence is an example this dilemma.

As to the ***criteria and indicators*** themselves, the survey on the 31 cases shows that there are some main common items considered as reference for evaluating research quality and performance. Among the ***inputs***, the ability to attract external funding seems to be highly considered, even if the adequacy of research posts and equipment is often included in this category as well. Among the ***outputs***, or more broadly outcomes, the most common criteria refer to publications, international cooperation, and post-graduate education for research. In addition, in some cases the criteria refer to the research ***process***, the organization and development of research activities. The concepts of criteria and indicator are interconnected and are here understood so that an indicator is a quantitative (or statistical) measure of a criteria which basically refers to quality.

The ***ability to attract external funds*** is an important item in most research evaluations. Due to the general "philosophy" prevailing , this point is a crucial part of the criteria used in systems like the British or the Finnish one, it is becoming important in Germany and is quoted in some of the Italian, Norwegian, Portuguese and Spanish case studies, while, on the other hand, it is not mentioned in France. Beside this ability, the adequacy of research posts and equipment is often emphasized (see, for example, Germany and Spain). On the other hand, ***the management, organization and coordination of research*** (including the number of research posts and the equipment) is seen as a meaningful aspect of research process in most of the surveyed countries, except in Italy and the UK.

As concerns ***publications,*** in general different items are taken into account as, ranking top-down: articles in international journals with/without referees and relative impact factor, books and articles in national journals with/without referees, papers presented to conferences etc. Some of the cases show a strong general disciplinary differentiation between humanities and natural sciences in accepting such a ranking of publications. Not in all the disciplines publication have the same status and interviewees in Finland, France, Italy, Norway and Spain argue that many fields and sub-fields in humanities, such as history, literature, arts, languages, education, law and architecture, cannot be properly evaluated through a classification where publishing articles in international journals with referees ranks first. Some of the interviewees in University of Tampere stress that in certain subfields, like urban planning or architectural design, publication in itself could not be an appropriate criteria of research activity, while the planning activity could. Moreover, even in applied sciences the criteria based on publications could pose some problems: one of the interviewees in the University of Savoie stresses that frontier research and interdisciplinary research sometimes fit with difficulty in established disciplinary journals. In general, it has to be stressed that such concerns seem only to arise in connection to internal evaluations which compare departments referring to different disciplines in order to allocate funds. There is little evidence that such concerns are related to external evaluations and to a disciplinary evaluation. As these types of evaluation are conducted by peers, it seems that there is little space to complain about criteria, which ought to be, by definition, homogeneous and acceptable discipline by discipline. On the other hand, the case studies also show that where there is a long-established "culture" of evaluation, like in UK, the comparison of different departments within the frame of internal evaluations with allocation aims generates rather little discussion about the criteria.

Moreover, many interviewees in most countries pointed out the bias that an evaluation of research strongly based on a "rush for publishing" could cause on the quality of publications: the risk of a downgrading of quality seems to be quite high. Some institutions, like Wales

Cardiff and Glasgow, show a good awareness of this risk and ask individuals to submit only the four best publications. It has to be added that the risk seems more generally connected, in the opinion of the interviewees, with the use of quantitative evaluation criteria, which by definition cannot directly reflect the quality. As a Norwegian academic expressed it, a quantitative indicator is like ”a shadow, not the real thing”.

As for ***international cooperation***, it refers to conference organization and attendance, participation in international projects and associations as well as to the ability to attract foreign scholars. Despite included in all the experiences examined, not all the countries and universities give the same consideration to all these items. For instance, due to a choice of internalization made by national science policy, this is a main point in Finland and includes also the involvement, even if for visiting purposes, of foreign scholars, which is considered high-scoring whereas in most of the other countries it is not. Finland also expresses some remarks on this point: some interviewees stressed the risk that such a criterion could be easily manipulated (Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration, Tampere University of Technology); case study recalls that incentivation of international cooperation implicitly means a reward to those disciplines which have a universal cognitive basis and a strong tradition of group working *vs.* disciplines focused on domestic problems and traditionally functioning on an individual basis.

The activity in the field of ***post-graduate education and training for research***, which is another of the main criteria used in research evaluation, is mostly seen under the point of view of doctoral theses and PhDs given. Again, the case studies and the countries show different weights attributed to this area. For example, when the two items are taken into consideration in the cases analyzed in most of British, Finnish, French and Spanish universities, only some of the German, Italian, Norwegian and Portuguese institutions refer to this point.

In both France and Finland, ***thematic coherence*** between research and the main axes of national science, technology and innovation policy is seen as one of the crucial criteria. In particular, in Finland a clear shift of criteria has taken place from the traditional criteria of scientific quality to industrial relevance and orientation to applied results, with explicit reference to national strategies in innovation policies. Some criticism has been applied to the criterion of thematic coherence: in the university of Savoie, for example, an interviewee stressed the risk to sacrifice the excellence to the conformity.

A point which should also receive some attention is the fact that an additional criterion is used in the UK for supporting the new universities (the former Polytechnics), given the fact that for the reasons already mentioned these institutions are objectively disadvantaged *vis-a-vis* the traditional universities. The so-called “Developmental Research” has been established, as a quota (2.5%) of the overall funding foreseen for research to be assigned in a further bid based on projects and reserved to those institutions which rank in the lowest two grades of the <RAE> scale.

A contrary example of rewarding the very top units in research is provided be the Finnish case. The Ministry of Education and the Academy of Finland launched in 1993 a policy of yearly nominating Centers of Excellence in Research which currently receive, in addition to the special status, extra funding for six years. The number of CEs at the moment is sixteen but will increase in the near future. Based on a nation-wide compassion the CEs are nominated by using international peers as experts. The CEs may consist of research groups, research centers

as well as of larger umbrella organizations and networks. The main criteria used in the selection process are: 1) the national and international position of researchers, 2) the scientific significance, innovativeness and effectiveness of research, 3) the quality, quantity and focus of scientific production, 4) patents, 5) the national and international mobility of researchers, and 6) the number and level of foreign researchers in the centers. Interestingly, during the current nomination round the Academy has for the first time emphasized that the disciplinary differences will be explicitly taken into account so that the general criteria will be adjusted to the disciplinary profiles.

As concerns the quantitative indicators more specifically, they are typically used in connection with qualitative evaluations as well as with university policy activities in general (e.g. in planning and strategy development). Usually the indicators serve as a background information which, however, may have crucial policy implications and indirect impacts on funding. But there are also countries in our study, United Kingdom, Portugal and Finland in particular, where quantitative indicators are used more deliberately and directly in allocating research resources. In United Kingdom, as part of the Research Assessment Exercise <RAE> the key indicators used include the number of PhDs and the income from research contracts. In the Portuguese evaluation of university based research units a broad set of indicators is utilized, the most important of which concern research quality and quantity, the socio-economic relevance of research and the degree of internationalization. In both countries, the evaluations have a direct bearing on research funding.

Finally, In Finland quantitative indicators have two kinds of direct linkages to research funding. According to our data, Finland is the only country where basic budgetary funding for universities is at the national level allocated on the basis of result indicators. Budget funding is based on a calculative model, which is gradually introduced and will be fully effective in 2002. In the model the target number of PhDs is used as an indirect indicator of research performance and it has a weight of 30 % of the total budget (the respective share of MA degrees is 60 %). Additionally, ca. 3 % of the budget is allocated on the basis of direct result indicators which include such as international and other external funding and efficiency in post-graduate education and international exchange. At the university level the quantitative indicators are also significant, but to a varying degree. The share is especially high at the Tampere University of Technology which internally redistributes 15 % of all operative funds on the basis of result indicators, several of them related to research.

The criteria and indicators described above are rather common for the eight countries studied, but there are still major differences in their actual use and importance as was pointed out. In general, across the countries, the output indicators - especially publications, but increasingly also other, more applied results - have had the highest weight as criteria of research quality. More recently, also the input indicators (especially external funding) have become more important, while the aspects and indicators related to research process and activity are still seldom taken into account in the evaluations.

Another conclusion to be drawn from the study is that the evaluation of scientific quality is increasingly based on a combination of both qualitative judgements and quantitative measures, but their specific role and contents vary depending on factors such as the objects and levels of evaluation, the policy interests involved, and the evaluation cultures. As a general tendency, however, one may observe that when the scope of evaluation increases and the evaluations involve comparative aspects, the more there is a demand to use quantitative indicators. When it

comes to macro-scale evaluations, the qualitative evaluation by peers and other experts becomes increasingly complicated and work consuming. Also, as the expertise represented by peers becomes more limited relative to the task, they need to base their work increasingly on the use of quantitative indicators, other background data and lower-level evaluations (self-evaluations, status reports etc.).

3. EFFECTS OF EVALUATION

Those aspects are various ones, but we will only keep the most important ones : financial effects on the one hand, universities structuration effects on the other hand.

3.1. Financial effects

In the eight countries studied the link between research evaluation and allocation of research resources is most direct in U. K. but the link is becoming stronger also in other countries, especially in Finland and Portugal. In some countries, most notably in France, research evaluations appear to be a part of pluriannual contracts between funding establishments and researchers or research units. The evaluations concerning research projects (e.g. by Research Councils) are already quite traditional and take place in all countries. They also may have direct but more limited financial consequences.

In UK, the RAE procedure is used to allocate in a selective way budgetary research funding to university departments, whereas the Research Councils provide research funding for projects. In Finland the national policy of allocating and concentrating funds to *centers of excellence in research* (CER) is currently gaining increasing importance. In addition, teaching and research based target indicators are used in defining the basic university budgets, both at the ministry and university level.

Universities both in U.K and Finland have a system of differential funding for research and a strong emphasis on "research excellence" system. However in the cases studies (Wales Cardiff, Helsinki) one may notice critical concerns about the effects of these policies, especially as concerns the consequences on teaching quality. In Finland there has been some critical discussion on the concept and criteria of the CER policy as well as on the conditions of basic research at the universities.

3.1.1. The concurrential allocation of research amounts

The RAE is a collaborative exercise, between the three Funding Councils (FCs) of England, Scotland and Wales and the Department of Education Northern Ireland, which is currently run every four years The government’s aim in establishing the RAE is explicitly that of seeing selectivity, in the allocation of public funds for research, based on quality. In the 1996 exercise it will rank the research submitted by Higher Education Institutions according to a 7 point rating scale and the assessment panels will include appropriate specialist members including a variety of end-users of research including commerce and industry. However, the main criterion for appointment of members to an assessment panel will be pre-eminence in research (HEFCE 1994c).

The UK’s RAE's aim is to share, a selective way, the amounts for research, in particular salaries and premises for research. It's been led by the HEFC since HEFA law in 1992. It's realized every four years. The first RAE was 1992's one. It's proceedings appear through our British case studies.

The formula has been made up of a volume factor, a quality factor and a relative cost factor reflecting UK average ratings.

RAE rating	1	2	3b	3a	4	5	5*
Research funding multiplier	0	0	1	1.4	1.96	2.744	3.293

Timetable for the various stages of the 1996 RAE

* Autumn 1994 :
Publish definitive list of Units of Assessment. Invite nominations for panel membership.
* Spring 1995 :
Appoint panel Chairmen and panel members.
* Summer 1995 :
Publish Assessment panel decisions on how they will conduct there business and what criteria they will use in forming their judgements. Publish names of panel chairmen and panel members
* Autumn 1995 :
Reissue RAE guidance. Issue detailed instructions on the details of submission.
Regional workshops to explain how submissions should be made.
* 30 April 1996 :
Receipt of submissions.
* December 1996 :
Publication of outcome.

In the University of East London, which succeeded well in the first RAE, we can still assume the evolution of the 1996's one. Actually, let's note the constitution of an expert committee, by the Government Department, the publication of the unit of Assessment's list, which is reduced from 72 to 69, the preference for a scale of evaluation of 7 points instead of 5 with a multiplier system for each mark. The classing method is the same for the three cases but the process to compute the financial amount is different from a province to another.

Concerning the Finnish cases we can see the whole realization of the external, academy of Finland's evaluations to name centers of excellence in research, created by a 1993's law. As we have said latter, Finland is the only country where basic funding for universities are allowed on the basis of results indicators, through two mechanisms : 30 % of the budget depends on indirect criteria (number of degrees) and 3 %, on direct ones.

Concerning the « centers of excellence » naming, the status is separated from the University’s one. Names are done each year, and centers chosen are allowed, for a six-year period, extra funding. The University of Helsinki, the first university of the country, has had several units, centers and department named, out of 16 "centers of excellence in research" named at the moment by the Academy. Otherwise Helsinki is the only one which names itself it's own "centers of excellence in research", through an self-evaluation, led by foreign experts.

In Tampere we note the increase of funding for results and a new use of peer-reviews to select centers of excellence, collaterally with a higher criticism against quantitative indicators : if the

evaluation is bound by allocating money then a department might be well noted here and bad there.

The first focus of the evaluation : rivalry between universities to grant a part of the funding for research, may rally the seven cases around the fact that their wish and efforts to be highly classed are relatively successful : for example two cases (Glasgow and Helsinki) are long tradition in research matters universities. Their long time traditional position is strengthened. In another case (Wales Cardiff) the university enters the competition of RAE and improves from an RAE to the other. In a fourth one (University of East London) a newly created university succeeds in RAE.

Roughly, these universities enters, more or less hardly, in the concurrential funding system. Universities, in U.K and Finland, have both a system of differential funding for research allocations, and a "centers of excellence" system. However in the cases studies (Wales Cardiff, Helsinki), remarks have been made about an increasing concern, in the two countries, about the effects of a voluntarian policy toward research, to the detriment of teaching quality.

Although, the new liberal conditions of the evaluation is not as well accepted in Finland as it is in UK There are in Finland many criticisms against the evaluation, the criteria chosen, and the intervention of the Academy in University. They underline the hardness of applying standard criteria to social sciences.

3.1.2. "Little financial consequences" group

We shall put together in this second group the other countries of our study : those which have a contractual system (France, Spain, Portugal, and even Norway) and Italy which has no external evaluation, but has in common with the other the financial question and many other characteristics. In this group, the amounts at sake in the evaluation are far lower than the first group's one.

Here the margin goes from little financial consequences (skilfully differentiated nevertheless, in the Portuguese case), to no consequences at all, like in France, except for research projects answering calls for tenders. There are individual bonus at the University of Pays Basque as well as in the Ca Foscari one.

In France the evaluations by the CNE and the CQ (quadrennial contractuatization) have been the most central in our study. The CNE has but little concern with research, but interferes however in a case (University of Littoral). Even though there is little rivalry between universities in France, the CQ process sustains a real part of evaluation when examining activity reports of the research units, and estimating research projects of the laboratories and in defining their institutional status (e.g. relative to CNRS). In Spain, where the major evaluation is CRE, research evaluation happens in the contracts between university and JNICT. This is quite similar to Portugal, where collaterally to CRE exists a system evaluating at regular intervals the research units financed by JNICT (precisely described in UNITLY case, an engineer school in which an element owns 26 research units financed by JNICT). The final report of this procedure includes a proposition for financial repartition (for units especially recommended by the panel.).

This proceeding follows five steps :

* naming of a coordinator in the discipline , who finds foreign experts in the subject,
* analyses of activity reports by the experts,
* signing of the contracts whit the units,
* visits of the experts,
* final report including a proposition for the financial repartition (a multiplier of 3 values, on the number of last degree students, and funding based on programs, for units especially recommended by the panel.).

In this group, situations and practices vary considerably. In France there is no classing between universities, which exists in Spain for example. The Spanish universities make evaluations of research teams and attribute bonus, contractually. In Portugal the financial sanction for research units is the biggest within this group.

The Italian case does not follow a contractual system, they have a internal evaluation system, with individual bonus and funding for departmental projects. This is shown in Ca'Foscari, where the bonus are rather rare at the departmental level. In the university of Oslo, Norway, there is a prizegiving for the different branches of research.

So there is a direct financial sanction in UK and to somewhat lesser degree in Finland, but it is more indirect in the countries with a pluri-annual contracts, like France and Portugal, which accredit research centers through CNRS or JNICT experts.

3.2. Structural effects on the research potential

3.2.1. Constitution of research structures

One of the element structuring the scientific potential is research centers, installed in several countries, like UK, Finland, Norway, Portugal. We have seen that they are positioned around a relatively strong and competitive financial mechanisms' policy. For instance, the University of Helsinki encounters a dilemma of conciliating one's own priorities and selection of ***centers of excellence*** with the national ones. These dilemmas are classical ones in France, too, in the use of BQR in Paris XII, for example.

Despite Portugal allows a system adjusting the departments' financial resources to their scientific results, Portuguese research units, nevertheless, looks more like French CNRS' proper or associated units, than British or Finnish models. We actually can notice a progressive, increasing demand for activity reports from the research laboratories and units. This is especially the case in France, where CNRS research units evaluation system has been extended to universities - not concerned yet with contractualization. In Norway, the university of Oslo has newly created six research centers which have to submit to an evaluation made by SAG every five years. The first center created, feminine studies, has been evaluated twice: in 1992 and 1996.

3.2.2. Emerging university policies

One of the structural effects of research evaluation is the appearance of scientific policies concerning the universities. On the basis of our national and university cases they are diverse but may often imply:

- concentration policies of research units and centers (University of Savoie, and University de Provence, France are following a national guideline from CNRS; University of Oslo)

- strategic priority policies (e.g. University of Helsinki research centers' role in defining priorities)

- voluntary policies to reconfigure research strictures

The university of Wales Cardiff has defined an ambitious and voluntary policy related to RAE, the internal policy serving the external science policy and planning according to RAE's calendar. It is led by a Research Committee, seconded by scientific management mentors, who set apart 10 % of the research budget, at the central level, so to share it between best noted departments which will use a part of it to replace those who retire. A part of this policy consists of scientific workers' management, which can as a result close a badly noted department, and profile the scientific work.

The last structural effect of evaluation could be the way it is accepted in higher education establishments. Some have been volunteers to submit to evaluation (East London, Wales Cardiff) and some have not. Most have submit rather unvoluntarily but without fearing it neither. As experts have not been especially criticized (except Helsinki) conflicts appeared here and there (Helsinki and Udine) about evaluation's criteria because of the weight of quantitative ones compared to qualitative, and position of social sciences compared to hard sciences.

There is another disagreement : how institutions, teachers-researchers, deal with teaching, administration and research? Revelation of it appears through criticisms against scientific productivity's heavy criteria, especially reports publications' criteria compared to other criteria (University of Tampere, University of Savoie).

There might be a third disagreement, rather implicite in our cases: what happens when a university badly fails, partly or in the whole evaluation? Most of the evaluations we have studied do not involve severe sanctions. Although, in the British cases we have only seen successful RAEs, and there are losers nevertheless... Besides, evaluations which have the severest impact brings to introduce stress between the departments and elements well noted and the others (University of Tampere, University of Wales Cardiff) and even in the choices inside the departments (Venice Ca Foscari).

4. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES RELATED TO RESEARCH EVALUATION

The evaluation of research is not just a technical matter. Rather it is a complex, multi-dimensional issue which also involves potential problems and problematic consequences especially when looked upon from the perspective of the research community and university activities in general. Based on EVALUE data and especially on the staff interviews some of these issues are discussed below.

In several countries the evaluation activities have raised the issue of the relationship between teaching and research activities and how it is affected by the evaluations. In some case studies

(Agder College, Oslo College, University of East London) the interviewees show a great concern for keeping a proper ***balance between teaching and research***, as they perceived teaching as a primary duty and feel therefore de-privileged in being evaluated for their research productivity. Such a concern appears also in several new universities that cannot rely upon a solid 'history' of research (University of Littoral) and it seems to be present even in some consolidated universities, where there is a not irrelevant concern that there could be a serious contradiction between teaching, administrative duties and research, finally resulting in a de-privileging of research. For example, at the University of Bergen some interviewees stressed that the teaching workload reduces time for planning and doing research; therefore, research evaluation could not be done without taking into account the teaching and administrative duties. A similar view has been expressed by some interviewees in the University of Lisbon, and one interviewee in the University of Savoie stresses in particular the relative disadvantage of newly appointed lecturers, who have a higher teaching workload.

Under another perspective, the UK and some Spanish case studies show a great concern that research evaluation and the efforts to achieve an upper ranking could imply for both institutions and individual professors an underestimation of teaching duties. In UK, the <RAE> procedure may have lead to an intensive, and possibly unhealthy, competition between universities in their strive to head-hunt highly competent academic staff, who will enhance their reputation in terms of their research record and the research income they bring with them. As a result, other universities may risk losing research expertise and a high ranking position and hence external funding from the <RAE>.

Evaluations initiated by administrative bodies are often seen to involve more control than the traditional self-evaluations as they tend to emphasize the comparable and quantifiable aspects of research performance, an approach which differs from the qualitative self-evaluations by the research community. Hence, overly administrative evaluations may produce unintended and even counter-productive effects. For instance, if the number of publications is used as a criteria, less attention may be paid to qualitative standards as researchers aim to maximize the quantity of their scientific products. The research communities may also react defensively and rhetorically to evaluations if it is felt that emphasis is more on control than on developing the research activities. In order to eliminate the problem of double standards and manipulative effects in evaluation it is therefore important to emphasize the active role of the research community both in defining the criteria for scientific quality and in carrying out appropriate self-evaluations. What is actually at issue here, is the possibility of developing a constructive dialogue between the old and new evaluation cultures.

Another problem in the evaluation practice concerns the ***concept of science and research quality***. In external evaluations, e.g. by <ACAFI> in Finland, scientific research has been usually understood as a relatively monolithic phenomenon without paying much attention to the ***disciplinary differences***. The 'ideal type' of good research practice typically has its origins in basic natural science and medicine. This is visible, for instance, in how the internationality of science is emphasized in research evaluations. In Britain, the most important criterion in <RAE> ratings is 'international excellence' while the 'national excellence' is only on the second place. This science driven definition of quality is clearly problematic from the point of view of humanities and social sciences which by their very substance put more emphasis on the national aspects and orientations of research.

The actual criteria of research quality thus seem to differ considerably among different scientific fields, depending on their substance and research orientation (e.g. basic/applied). For instance, the great variety in ***publishing patterns and citation practices*** can be largely explained on the basis of disciplinary differences which decreases the validity of bibliometric indicators as a tool in comparing research performance across different kinds of disciplines. Therefore, in the evaluation of research it is generally important to pay attention to the diversity and multidimensionality of the research system. The questions about the quality, internationality and social accountability of science are not self-evident but most complex issues which presuppose an analytical approach. Instead of being seen as a deviance from the 'ideal' type of science the diversity of scientific fields can also be taken as a valuable resource.

A more practical problem which is raised in some case studies concerns the ***question how much time, money and effort*** should be reasonably used for evaluations and what kind of evaluation practices would be optimal in this respect? As is well known, evaluations are both costly and time consuming activities, whose justification beyond the value of a purely academic, or bureaucratic, exercise is that they serve some useful purpose. Some academics already speak about 'evaluation fatigue' as they feel that the time remaining for the main activities (research and teaching) is getting all the more scarce.

Finally, the research evaluation issues are related to the very ***concept of university***. A traditional image of universities is that are self-regulating, autonomous institutions which now are confronted with the threat of becoming externally controlled organizations. This dualistic view, however, does not necessarily tell much of the actual development. From an other perspective, universities can be seen to gradually develop towards network like institutions which accommodate and fulfil a growing number of different tasks in interaction with their societal surroundings. In the area of research these range from traditional ´curiosity oriented´ basic research to 'customer oriented' research services. If this position is accepted, the growing diversity of research activities would imply a need to develop more interactive and pluralist evaluation practices.

5. ELEMENTS OF CLASSIFICATION

5.1. Distribution per country

The Finno-British couple is special for it's the only one practising funding by results, with major financial consequences. It's not opposed to the other countries geographically but because of the peculiar research policies of those two countries, as we already saw.

In distributions per countries, there is often a « height effect », in a number of cases, for little countries fear an endogamous default when evaluations are led by peers from the country, national peers.

We've noticed too a « Europe effect » : The newly arrived in Europe often submit to OECD's advice and actions, and European rectors conference' methods of evaluation. This could become, long-term, a factor of homogenization of these cases.

Some differences between countries

Despite the general trends in research evaluation, there are still also major differences between countries. These include such as :

* Some countries have been relatively late in institutionalizing the peer-review practice, e.g. Portugal in the late 1970s and Spain only in the 1980s

* Academic careers are a special focus of evaluation in Spain, Italy and France

* Large scale (national) research program analysis and evaluation is typical for Germany where the universities enjoy a high degree of autonomy and are not directly evaluated

* The institutional evaluation of research centers and universities dominates in France; the university departments are most intensively evaluated within the British <RAE> procedure

* Evaluation of disciplines, major disciplinary groups and Centers of Excellence is most actively pursued in Finland

* Quantitative performance indicators are used especially in Finland and in the UK, and to some degree also in Portugal and Germany

* Evaluations have explicit links to funding at the national level in the UK in particular, and to a lesser extent in Finland and Portugal; at the university level also some other countries like Italy

* In smaller countries (Finland, Portugal, Norway), there is an active use of international experts in evaluations

5.2. Distribution according to the universities characteristics

How are the universities in question spread over the three university types: generalist, applied, and regional?

British cases belong to generalist universities, except for East-London. There might be a size effect by which Cardiff is less central than Glasgow. East-London is interesting because it is a university where transition imposes stress. And for Cardiff, the stake is not to reach a generalist status, but to become the scientific university of Wales.

Some of the most interesting cases are on the border-line between regional development and generalist universities (Cardiff, Littoral, Paris XII, East-London). This revels a trend to move from a project to another. The common point between the trend to become generalist and other universities on the borderline, is the heavy weight of their scientific project. For Cardiff the aim is to become a newly born scientific university, for Paris XII to distinguish itself from the other mass-universities of the Paris belt, for Littoral to build a profile so to keep strong areas in the regional metropolitan rivalry.

Logically, major universities, with an highly assessed scientific position, do not worry about evaluations as much as the others

In the University of Savoie, there is a tension between the orientation toward exact sciences, it expresses in its project, and applied sciences departments, in which staff complains about the evaluation's conditions they have to bear.

We have noticed the same hiatus along the interviews in the University of Littoral. And so many elements explain how universities with scientific policy are either newly born, growing universities, or recent universities looking for differentiating from their sisters.

6. CONCLUSIONS : GENERAL TENDENCIES

On the basis of our study some, more or less general, trends in research evaluation can be outlined.

1. The change of emphasis from an internal, traditional evaluation to a more external one. This trend is visible often, but not everywhere. Italy is a country where there is no external evaluation of research at university, except for Contract with CNR which allow the funding of the project and where then the evaluation is made by external organisms, classically.

On the whole, there is a development and a strong rise of contractualization process, for a number of years, usually, and even when there is no contract, a rising of external evaluation of research. If external evaluation is strongly articulated with internal evaluation in the countries practising selective and variable allocations of research funding, according to the results, external evaluation keeps on growing in many cases, and bring universities to search for coherence inside their internal orientations.

However, this mixture, and the historical superposition of several evaluations, in some cases, can produce a trend to complexification of the whole system through the multiplication of the proceedings, In France for example, with the double evaluation of the quadrennial contract.

2. The change from an individual, traditional evaluation, to a more collective one in most cases studied. In Finland and UK departments and research centers are valued by disciplinary committees. In Italy, too, university departments are assessed in an internal way. But there are also countries (France, Portugal) having a long time experience of laboratories' collective evaluation (projects, activity reports); this collective evaluation is, classically, an external, one, led in the disciplinary field in question, and for several years contracts. In these cases it is not a new situation, but rather the diffusion of evaluations methods toward the academic world, which had not used it before (Norway).

3. The change from qualitative to quantitative criteria is not easily identified as criteria vary from a country to another, and even from a case to another. But a very common criteria is the number of publications, with a classing of the supports, the best being a publication in an international review with reading committee.

4. Most of the evaluations we have seen underline their ***analyse of the quality of the research, and not only its quantity*** - it is even the crucial aim of ACAFI and RAE. But we have seen also that the weight of publications criteria puts a pressure by which quantitative criteria are privileged, in fact.

5. We have also observed ***the trend to refer to an international standard of research evaluation,*** made of two aspects. Firstly, there is a bonus for publishing in foreign language, like in France, Portugal, Spain, Finland and Italy. Secondly, expert pools become more international, as we have seen especially in Finland, Portugal, Norway and Spain. This trend concerns small countries in particular

6. By another way the rising part of big European or foreign programs' funding in countries where, traditionally, universities did not receive much of them, brings to ***criteria's homogenization.***

7. We had also anticipated a trend to ***the increase of the financial impact of the evaluation***. Despite the fact that the selective and concurrential funding mechanism have an increasing impact as measured by universities variable part of budget, we can now assert that this impact is not necessarily systematic, and such a type of funding entails also problems.

8. We also made a hypothesis that ***research evaluation could modify researchers' publication policy***, bringing them to prefer riskless research instead of more risky one, by choosing systematically certain themes or publishing supports, or running for short-time researches, for example. At this point, we cannot deduce a general trend from our cases, but this problematic phenomenon is visible in some cases.

9. The hypothesis of ***an increasing role of applied science criteria*** (patents, researchers moving toward companies, creation of small companies around research centers) in research evaluation was not systematically assessed in the cases of our study. However, this trend is visible especially in the applied technical universities, while even the opposite trend may be true in some cases, where the change is taking place from applied toward basic science criteria (this may be the case in former polytechnics and colleges which strive to strengthen their scientific profile).

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

EVALUATION OF THE EDUCATION-EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP

Annette Jobert, Mariana Alves, Agnes Simonyi, Teresa Ambrosio

1. The context and particularities of this area of evaluation

The evaluation of the relationship between education and training on the one hand, employment and territory on other was developed later than other domains of evaluation. The growing interest in this domain can be explained by many elements :

- sensitised by the context of the rising rate of unemployment, the difficulties faced by graduates to integrate professionally and their precarious status to find employment. National governments and the authorities in the European Union are urging this kind of evaluation.

- the professional bodies and employers intervene in the same sense with the objective of transforming qualifications of employees so that they can easily adapt to the changing productive system.

- this kind of evaluation is also encouraged by authorities insofar as they help to direct policies in favour of the economic and social development

- they are found under the categories of decentralisation, training and pedagogical matters to territorial communities mainly in the regions where the autonomy of political power is reinforced. Since the beginning of the eighties, France, Spain and Italy were affected by this but at different levels. In Germany and in Nordic countries the policy of Higher Education is traditionally under the region and yet in Great Britain it is found at national level (England, Scotland and Wales).

- the interest in this kind of evaluation comes from the immense research studies which were consecrated on the labour market and the transition between the educative and productive systems. This research is different in its approach, scope, methodology and content. It uses national or international statistics and even aims at elaborating data and building up pertinent indicators.

- inside the educative systems, several actors make up disciplinary groups, such as students and heads of universities who encourage this kind of evaluation but with different objectives (rationalisation and control over higher education, drafting the costs, improvement of professional integration, reinforcement of disciplines and channels).

- and finally, the development of adult training and the way it is partially taken care of by universities. This widens of the concept of education to the acquisition of knowledge and abilities which were considered before as being irrelevant to education. This kind of evolution encourages the relationship which exists between education and training and their evaluation.

The legal context of this evaluation is variable depending on the country. In the United Kingdom, France, Finland and Portugal, it is taken under formal evaluation and institutionalised by the university. In other countries it is optional and it is often limited and informal.

It can be taken as a pluralist evaluation which is characterised by five elements :

- ***the growing number of external actors*** who are implied in these relationships. It doesn't only concern the labour market but also political, cultural and professional institutions at local, regional and national levels.

- ***various methods and instruments which were used*** : surveys in general or targeted soundings of the labour market on graduates ; observatories for professional integration, studies made per sector, surveys done on former students, employers, politicians and other social actors .

- ***the variety of subjects and objectives***. They concern the creation of new channels and degrees, the content of teaching curricular, their methods of assessment (training period, sandwich courses) the tendencies of the labour market, adult training, the valuing of professional acquisitions, participation in economic, social and cultural development.

- ***the necessity to simultaneously take into account three dimensions*** : education and training, labour market, social environment, economic and cultural dimensions of the universities. The subject of evaluation is thus the relationship between these three dimensions, which makes it difficult to identify the themes and the analysis of the processes and the results. This characteristic necessarily needs other to disciplinary approaches and appropriate methodologies.

- ***the vagueness of the space*** in which evaluation takes place constitutes the last specificity. Is it necessary to privilege local, regional, national or perhaps international space ? The space for research is not defined in advance but depends on several parameters depending on the training, the level, the possibility to be or not to be able to be transferred in and outside the national space.

On the whole these specificities explain the importance of informal evaluation, less formalised or the diversity of these methods with regard to formal evaluation and the way it is organised in other domains.

2. Three fields of evaluation of the education-employment-territory relationships

Case studies have shown three categories of evaluation in this domain. 1. The creation of degrees /diplomas and the contents of training. 2. Professional integration of graduates. 3. The role of Universities in territorial space

2.1. Evaluation during creation of Degrees in view of transforming their contents

There are different degrees in different countries which, go hand in hand with the professions the later is the first element during the creation of professional degrees, such as short term degrees which last between 2-3 years (as it is the ease of DUT in France and the DU in Italy), or in the third cycle (post graduate, Masters). The development of continuing education for adults and the distribution of sandwich training is part of this movement.

The diversification of the professionalisation leads to extra costs, that is to say the rise in the number of students enrolled with regard to the restriction of public budget which is directly allocated to higher education. Nevertheless they allow access to other resources : public funds (central or territorial) when they are linked to the employment policies which are private (mainly companies).

One can distinguish two types of evaluation, either it is formal and institutionalised or it is informal.

2.1.1. Institutionalised evaluation

The point of view of the world-wide economic authorities (representatives of employers who are part of professional associations, independent employers and economists) is required in order to create professional degrees/diplomas and the transformation of their contents. In some cases, for example Portugal regarding the engineering degrees/diplomas and in the United Kingdom a large number of professional degrees and professional titles is even put under explicit agreement of the professional bodies through procedures of accreditation , when it is necessary or there is need to take one's point of view the one taken is that of the economic partner at local and regional level. In the case of accreditation it is the professional body which is organised at national level (or the commission engineers in the French case) which delivers them.

In France, the creation of vocational training should be justified by the employment that it offers. The projects insist on the fact that this training should satisfy the qualifications and competencies which the existing training would not have satisfied and favourable welcome from the professional milieus concerning projects that need « habilitation ». Also, representatives of professional and statutory bodies give their points of view during decision taking in Universities as that is where the creation of degrees is discussed before it is transmitted to the Ministry of education.

In Italy, concerning the creation of the DU ,the point of view of the professional and statutory bodies is counselled but it is not obligatory.

In the United Kingdom, where there are 65 professional bodies that deliver accreditations (Professional and Statutory bodies), these are given in function of the contents of courses in relation with professional training and work prospects. The organisations which are responsible for quality evaluations (HEQC) have studied 26 PSB's for better understanding of the role of the differences between the procedures of accreditation and those which are done during quality evaluation by the HEQC and the funding Councils. The Quality Assurance Agency for

Higher Education which was created in 1997 to replace the HEQC hopes to coincide the calendars and commit themselves in the unification of the two procedures.

The evaluation of the relationship between training and employment is not only exercised during the creation of degrees/diplomas but can also concern the general methods of teaching assignment . In certain countries (Great Britain, Finland and Portugal) evaluation is an obligatory criteria, yet in other countries like (Spain, France, Italy, Norway and Portugal), this criteria intervenes in vocational training and/or short term training. In many Universities the reports of internal evaluation (for example that from Universitas Renovata Continuata of the University of Helsinki) underlines the necessity of Faculties to take into consideration programs of the needs of society and the changes in the labour market.

In Wales and Scotland, following the terms of the 1992 law the HEFC (Higher Education Funding Councils) where agent members of the professional milieu and statutory bodies evaluate the programs and the curricula with regards to social and economic environment. They also attach the adaptation of objectives to the needs of industries and the economy while following the regulations of the relationships of Universities and the economic circle, as well as developments which are considered to be central (core skills) which present transferable characteristics. These bonds can be equally evaluated by internal organisations as it is the case at the University of Glasgow which confides this mission to an industrial connection committee.

2.1.2. Informal evaluation

Concerning the content of the methods of training, less formal evaluation dominates. Nevertheless this type of evaluation can also be done during the creation of degrees/diplomas as it is the case in Norway and Germany.

In Germany, the education-employment report is not systematically evaluated, but there are optional surveys meant to modify the content of the curricula of certain channels/subjects. At the University of Dortmund a department did several surveys/soundings among employers and former students in order to adapt programs and teaching methods to comply with companies.

Concerning training which comprises training period in a company, sandwich courses and continuing education (which are meant for wage-earners or the unemployed who are on reconversion). There are inevitably some links between the professional circle and territorial political authorities on the one hand and the University on the other. As long as companies and territorial communities take part in financing, welcoming students, remunerating them in forms of grants/scholarships or contracts, take part in teaching ,they proceed to University evaluations or their components.

Concerning informal evaluation based on the multiplicity criteria that strengthens mutually. They are a result of the state of relationships that exist between companies, professional circles and Universities. Thus the facility for authorities of professional disciplines to have a good number of companies that welcome students for internship, testifies a positive evaluation from the companies. It also comes to the same when companies send regularly its employees for continuing education in a University or again when a considerable part of the University resources comes from the industrial sector (faculty of science of Bergen).

2.1.3. The case of Continuing Education

If continuing education, and adult training are not considered in all countries as being assignments of the University, case studies have shown that a lot of materialising innovations that have taken place are notably part of the set up of the (University-company) programs for training of adult wage-earners. This training takes place in private institutions (schools) which have less autonomy from the two protagonists (or three if the local community takes part). Let us note that at Tampere Institute for Extension Studies, the COREP in Turin, which is an associate of the Polytechnic University of Turin work hand in hand with big companies like Fiat, Telecom and territorial communities, the *Institut Supérieur de l'Entreprise* works in co-operation with the IUT of Savoie University. The Ford Scheme carried out between two faculties of the University of East London. In the case of classic internship in companies, in-house training in the University there is a link between the financer (private or institutional), the University should justify a formal evaluation of the results for different partners. In the French case, case studies show :

- if the cited organisation shows active co-operation between the University and the labour market, their activities are not included in the university evaluations and they do not do their own auto-evaluation. In this case everything goes on as if their existence is enough to prove the quality of existing relationship between the University and the labour market.

- some in-house training services are marginalised by the University this can be explained by different methods of management of in-house training with regard to "normal" channels (deduction of the number of hours, the cost of the training) and the inadequacy of the adaptation of the indicators to new forms of continuing education : individualisation of provisions, engineering (computer-assisted engineering).

- the results and the functioning of continuing education services are less taken into consideration in internal and external evaluations of the University. The later often forgets how the resources and means are used in in-house training.

- companies rarely formalise the evaluation of in-house training. Trainees are rarely given a questionnaire to fill in after training. And the analysis of the questionnaire is not systematic neither.

- the territorial communities and the State do ex-post evaluation of the expenditures which are related to administrative control.

In-house training authorities are generally dismayed by this situation where by public communities show little interest towards this activity which is valued as a University assignment and which is part of the major axis of the European policies concerning training.

The procedures of valuing professional acquisitions which are developing here or there (Germany, France, Italy, Great-Britain) which allow by one to register at the University without having the required papers for registration either being allowed not to sit for some of the exams does not seem to give an evaluation or a written assessment. The use of these procedures seem to be variable from one University to the other, yet in France it depends on

personal judgement of those who are in charge. Following the 1992 law, professionals in France take part in the jury which is responsible for these procedures.

2.2. Professional integration of students

This theme on evaluation is one of those themes which incites a lot of interest in Universities as well as in the Central Administration (Ministry of Education and Ministry of Labour). Where training leads to various and numerous practices only three countries have legal texts that take the university as part of the evaluators (Portugal, Finland, Great-Britain) <Teichler, 1997>[42].

The case of Finland is very interesting : in this country the number of jobs meant for qualified students is determined by the Ministry of Education on the basis of the University performance. Since 1992 the ministry gives complementary finance of about 2 to 3% according to 8 statistical indicators among which is the figure of professional integration for qualified students. This financial incitement has incited universities to set up recruitment and career services but they are also meant to encourage the development of in-house training institutes (Institute for Extension Studies, Open Universities ….).

The development of this field of evaluation varies according to countries, Universities, main departments following the following factors :

- ***the state of the labour market*** : there is stronger evaluation in countries where unemployment of qualified students who have difficulties in professional integration has risen considerably over the past few years, which is the case of France, Finland, Portugal and Spain. Norway on the contrary is the only State which satisfies labour for qualified students, this is just an example to show how weak many States are on this question

- ***the age of universities*** : new universities are more interested in this aspect than the old ones because their relationship with local and regional communities is closer than that of the old universities.

- ***the nature of the training offered by Universities*** : there is a bond between professional orientation disciplines and the development of the follow up of students and their professions . This signifies that these practices can be limited to the domains which are of this characteristic. The fact of being a general curricula University does not stop the development of this kind of evaluation (like in Barcelona, Madrid and Tampere).

The ***evaluating actors*** are many : students' associations and former students, employers, professional associations, pressure groups, ministries, local and regional authorities, public institutions for research and studies <Mora, 1996>[43]. Case studies have underlined the important role of these various actors who often associate in order to perform better surveys on professional integration as it is the case in Venice (Ca Foscari) and in Helsinki (Economy

[42]. Teichler Ulrich, 1997, "Graduate Employment : challenges for Higher Education in the twentiest-first century", *Higher Education in Europe*, XXII (1), 75-84

[43]. Mora José-Ginés (1996), *University Graduates in the Spanish Labour Market***,** Universidad de Valencia, rapport de recherche pour EVALUE

and Business Administration) for professional associations and those regrouping University graduates. Inside the University, it is necessary to underline that career and placement services for students are not really bodies for evaluation even if they sometimes take part in surveys. In France the observatory and information services and the career one make up the two distinctive structures.

Evaluation mechanisms and methodologies. The case studies show three different types :

- ***limited surveys*** in a department or in a new channel which are carried on under the initiative of the authorities of the department, professors and career services. It concerns occasional surveys which are done by means of questionnaires to graduates after their University exit. In addition to this is another questionnaire which is sent to a sample of employers. That is the case of the Faculty of Social Science at the University of Helsinki, of the Economic Department at the University of Venice and Rostock and of the Faculty of languages at the University of Savoie.

- ***The internal observatory of the University*** which does the follow up of students after their graduation and it also does surveys on employers. To the difference of the precedent type, the observatories are permanent services inside the Universities which have budgets and personnel. So they can do wide research which can be systematic and they are able to follow the cohort of existing and graduating students. Beira Interior, Madrid, Barcelona and the Littoral Universities do have this kind of observatory. Statistic surveys which are of questionnaire type can be completed by other quantitative studies on a particular aspect. In the case of Littoral University the survey is carried on the students' University entry, their internal course (route) and their situation a few months after their graduation. These studies do not concern all the disciplines of the University.

- ***the external observatory of the University***. Even if most European Countries give statistics on the integration of degrees of higher education, through national institute (ISTAT[44], INSEE for example), all of them do not have permanent observatory like the CEREQ in France <Martinelli, 1997, 1998>[45]. And links between National observatory and Universities are still considered as exceptions. Two case studies in France have also shown the importance of regional observatories in Universities like the common observatory to 8 universities and the Regional Council give a data on statistics on the University disciplines and do some relevant studies on professional integration of students three years after their graduation. Also to give the academic course of the student and other relevant information on education. They collaborate with the CEREQ and the same applies to the Northern Region, there is an observatory which is situated in Lille with which the internal observatory of the Littoral University collaborates .

---

[44]. Tronti Leonello, Mariani Paolo, 1994, "La transizione universita-lavoro in Italia. Un'esplorazione delle evidenze dell'indagine Istat sugli sbocchi professionali dei laureati", *Economia e Lavoro*, 2, Aprile-Giugno.

[45]. Martinelli Daniel, sigot Jean-Claude, Vergnies Jean-Frédéric, 1997, "Diplômés de l'enseignement supérieur. L'insertion professionnelle se stabilise mais les écarts s'accentuent", *Bref*, CEREQ, 134, septembre.

Martinelli Daniel, Stoeffler-Kern Françoise, 1998, *Cheminement de formation et insertion professionnelle des étudiants*, Marseille, CEREQ, Document 134, Série Observatoire, avril.

The effects of such evaluations are many : the opening of new disciplines on the one hand or the limitation of access to other disciplines in view of labour and employment perspectives on the other hand; redefining the programs and the curricula, creating recruitment and career services, helping students, setting up links between universities, companies and territorial communities. Sometimes the lengthy periods between the time of the survey and the publication of the results (Rhône-Alpes Observatory) limits the use of the surveys by Universities and their integration in the process of internal decision.

In a total of about 6 to 8 countries concerned by this research (Norway and Germany are exceptions) evaluation of professional integration is considered to be a major theme even if it does not give systematic and complete surveys in every domain. Norway is certainly the country which puts a lot of effort in this domain as it is incited by its Ministry of Education and is given a lot of means. In France two out of four Universities have observatories but the CEREQ and the INSEE which have been doing surveys on professional integration for many years, so this explains the passivity of the other two.

2.3. Evaluation of the university-territory relationship

2.3.1. The university-territory relationship

Participation in economic development and more specifically in the social and economic dynamic of their environment is officially among the missions of the universities <ARESER 1997, Court 1997, Davies 1997, Dubet 1994, Filâtre 1998, de Gaudemar 1997, Godard 1997>[46]. This mission is reinforced by the fact that local communities (towns, urban districts, departments or regions) are contributing more and more to the finances of universities; in the form of land, buildings and offices, technical equipment, research contracts, scholarships, subsidies of maintenance costs, etc. are assured by them to universities. (According to OECD data published in 1995 regional authorities on average fund a third of final expenditure on higher education. This is even higher in OECD countries like Canada and the US, or in those European countries, like Belgium, Germany, Spain or Switzerland that follow a decentralized model of higher education)

---

[46]. ARESER (Association de Réflexion sur les Enseignements Supérieurs et la Recherche), 1997, *Quelques diagnostics et remèdes urgents pour une université en péril***,** Paris, Liber-Raisons d'agir.

Court Stephen, 1997, "Développement d'un rôle régional pour les établissements d'enseignement supérieur au United-Kingdom, tout particulièrement dans la région du sud-ouest de l'Angleterre", *Gestion de l'Enseignement Supérieur*, 9 (3), novembre, 49-72.

Davies J.L., 1997, "L'université régionale : problèmes d'élaboration d'un cadre organisationnel", *Gestion de l'Enseignement Supérieur*, 9 (3), novembre, 30-48.

Dubet François (ed), *Universités et villes*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1994.

Filâtre Daniel, 1998, *L'université face à ses territoires*, Toulouse, Université de Toulouse le Mirail, dossier pour l'habilitation à diriger des recherches, janvier.

De Gaudemar J.P., 1997, "The Higher Education Institution as a regional actor", *Higher Education Management*, 9 (2), July, 53-64.

Godard J., 1997, "La gestion de l'interface de l'université et de la région", *Gestion de l'Enseignement Supérieur*, 9 (3), 7-30.

The university-territory relationship is characterized by their strong interdependence. Local communities on their side are intervening in higher education while educational, scientific and cultural activities of universities are exercising an important influence on their surrounding environment. This way assessments of this relation are taking into consideration both sides.

What are the effects that local communities might expect in return to their interventions and what contributions from these communities are expected by universities to realise their mission of local and regional development? In which terms (and by what means) do local communities evaluate their relations with universities and vice versa?

The case studies show that this type of evaluation is not part of the official evaluation of universities, it is not the main concern for most of them and there is no systematic follow up of the university-territory relationship. At the same time this issue has been very often mentioned in the interviews not only with university personnel, but with extern actors as well belonging to local communities in the environment of higher education institutions.

This relationship is defined often in terms of resources; human capital for research and for teaching, student populations, infrastructure and finances offered by the territory and human resources and services provided by the university to its territory. Usually these later resources and their utilisation are evaluated while analyzing the universities` impact on their region <DATAR, 1998>[47].

It is important to mention that the territorial contexts in several case studies were not limited to national territories; many universities have a transnational „radiation" and contribute to the animation of cultural and scientific poles in an area that often overlap the frontiers of their countries. That was the case of the University of Savoie for which the important relations with the Italian region of Piemonte and with Swiss localities represent a major axis of orientation. The French University of the Littoral makes use of its vicinity to Belgium and to the United Kingdom and develops joint projects with these two countries increasing this way its international vocation.

2.3.2. Multiplicity of objects, objectives and actors engaged in this evaluation

The case studies underlined how diversified are the objects and objectives of the – often not even official type - evaluation of this relationship: the increase of the level of competencies of the local young populations, the stabilisation of young educated people in their regions avoiding their emigration towards big cities, the contribution of student population to the enlargement of local product and service markets, cultural and social animation of the territory connected to various academic activities, job creation within the university organizations, partnerships between universities and firms in research, in technology transfer, cooperation between higher education institutions of the same regions. These were the most often referred objectives to be evaluated and at the same time to be supported by evaluation.

It must be mentioned that some of these objectives are realized through the creation of diplomas and/or the modification of their content, others through the integration of graduates

[47]. DATAR, 1998, *Développement universitaire et développement territorial. L'impact du plan Université 2.000,* Paris, La Documentation Française.

in local labour markets or through the research activities of universities. These aspects are more formalized and already more accustomed fields of universities` evaluation.

Professional training in the frameworks of higher education institutions is considered to be a resource not only for the local firms, but also for public institutions who are important employers of graduates. That is the reason why many of the interviewees in our case studies have insisted to pay attention to the „social pertinence" of education and professional training in the process of evaluation. This concept has been present in the evaluation of the education-employment relationship in certain Finnish (like Tampere University), Italian (like the universities of Ca Foscari Venice and Catania), Spanish (Girona, Pais Vasco) and Norwegian cases.

Other aims are realized through the relations of the universities with their scientific circles that help peripheral territories to intensify their cooperation with national and international centres. These research ties may open access to information's, to finances and to networks important not only for the universities but for their local partners as well. That is the case of the Italian University of Catania which is an attractive science pole for national and international projects in basic and applied research and the international reputation of many of its science departments makes its territory interesting for high-tech investments.

The case studies made clear other objectives and mechanisms of multidimensional cooperation between universities and local political and social actors independently of the strictly educational and scientific missions of higher education. This cooperation manifested itself in a rich variety of forms related to the specificity of faculties and studies at each university:

- Humanities and social science faculties play an important role in the cultural animation of towns and regions. This function has been strongly emphasized in the Italian case of Catania University, in the French case of the University of the Littoral and in the Spanish case of Girona University as well as in the four Portuguese and Norwegian cases.

- Certain studies in social sciences have social and cultural functions on national level, like for example the Women Studies Centre at Oslo University.

- The faculties of architecture often participate in urban development of their towns and in restoration of medieval centres like we have found in the Italian case-studies of Catania, Torino and Venice.

- Scientific and engineering faculties – at the head of the chain of innovations - are often taking initiatives and diffuse technological innovations in their environment. This phenomenon was demonstrated in the Italian (Catania University, Torino Technical University), in the French (universities of the Littoral and of Savoie), in the Norwegian (Bergen University and Agder College) in the British (East London University) and in the Portuguese cases of our research.

- Cooperation between higher education institutions of the same regions utilising better local resources and infrastructure is also an important factor of local development. We have seen initiatives in this direction in the cases of Norwegian universities, in the Italian cases of Catania and Torino and in the French case of Aix-Marseille University.

Finally, universities as employers were also often mentioned to be evaluated in relationship with their local community. In many cases universities might be important employers of small or middle size towns and their surroundings offering employment perspectives to different categories of employers. This was the case for example of the Italian university of Venice and the French university of Savoie.

Taking into account the diversified character and the complex meaning of the university-territory relationship we see very different actors participating in the evaluation of this field. They might be consulting organizations, research centres, professional associations, employment services. They might be joint bodies of universities and their local partners; firms, associations, small communities. The organizations and/or associations of former students, the „alumni clubs", in close contact with different local institutions are or might be solicited by their „alma-mater" to participate in the evaluation of the university-territory relationship. (This was the case in some German, Italian, Norwegian and Spanish universities in our research.) Sometimes the organizations responsible for European programs of regional development (for example the CAMPUS project) are making assessment on this field. In other cases international organs of evaluation, like the European Rectors` Conference pay attention to these aspects of evaluation that has been cited in the cases of the Italian University of Ca Foscari Venice and of the Portuguese University of Aveiro.

2.3.3. The weakness of the evaluation of the university-territory relationship

The weakness of this field of evaluation, despite the efforts to measure certain aspects of this interactive relation, is due to different reasons.

Several indicators have been utilized to measure the intensity of the university-territory relationship: the number of contracts between universities and local communities, the amount of financial contributions from local communities to university spending and their share within the financial resources of universities, the comparison of local and regional R&D expenditures to national average figures (calculated for example in the Technical University of Torino and in the University of the Littoral), the rate of students of local origin in local higher education institutions, the rate of teaching and research staff in the local active population, etc.

At the same time strong political will of the universities` management, of the local communities and of the national organs is essential to assure personnel, means and funds for this rather complex type of evaluation.

The systematic and rigorous evaluation of the impact higher education is exercising on local and regional development has not been really undertaken. Occasional interdisciplinary – economic, sociological, urban and regional – studies were often cited (for example in the cases of the town of Torino in Italy or of Tampere in Finland) that were not part of the precisely regulated evaluation of universities. These occasional research experiences underlined the necessity of pluralist, dynamic and contextual evaluation of universities.

2.3.4. National and/or university specificities in this field of evaluation

As one of the aims of the EVALUE project was to compare the different university evaluation systems and to discover national (societal) or organisational specificities, we tried to give an

overview of differences and similarities in the evaluation of the university-territory relationship as follows:

The legal and institutional context concerning the university-territory relationship does not manifest national specificities. There are no rules, procedures, methods, prescribed institutions for this field of university evaluation that might be compared.

Differences were found between the countries as to the specific national contexts of graduates' labour market. In the countries where the national labour market situation is less favourable or shows deep regional segmentation – that induces weak local and regional demand for graduates of given local higher education institutions – local actors emphasize the importance of universities` social and cultural role in the long run justifying demands for funding. In these cases – despite the employment difficulties of their graduates – universities want to be considered as factors of economic development. This was observed in several Italian, Portuguese, Spanish case-studies on universities situated in peripheral areas of their countries and in the case of the French University of the Littoral.

In those countries where the ***participation of economic and professional organizations*** in university life is institutionalised in the creation of diplomas and degrees concerning study programs and curricula (United Kingdom, Finland), this is a way to express their engagement in the university-territory relationship. In other countries (like France or Italy) the demand for professional degrees and diplomas is evaluated from the point of view of the territory through contacts with the local professional bodies. We have to add that there forms and institutions to engage economic and social actors in the government of the European universities are however different. In Spain for example the universities' Social Councils with important decisional rights at universities integrate extern members from among employers and trade unions representatives. In other countries these circles are represented in other different organs of university government and administration.

In countries where ***partnerships with economic, social and cultural actors*** of local communities for R&D and/or for the diversification of training and education are widespread (like in Germany, in Finland, in France, in Italy and in Norway), the intensity of the university-territory relationship can be observed in this cooperation and in its influence on local development.

Strong financial pressure on universities often leads to the creation and consolidation of such partnerships between higher education institutions and local communities. This was very much the case of British, Finnish, Italian and Norwegian universities in our research.

In certain cases the creation of these partnerships is stimulated by political intentions, like in the British and Finnish cases or in France specifically in the field of creating diplomas and of continuos training. The German, Italian, Norwegian, Portuguese and Spanish universities are autonomous to establish direct contacts with firms as users and clients of higher education.

In certain countries (like in Spain) a political will to decentralise the university system has been found, in others (like in France, Italy and Portugal) new universities with clear territorial development missions were created on the basis of political intentions. These policies make the evaluation of the university-territory relations actual and important.

In the case studies we have found that the importance of this – formally and officially rarely evaluated - relationship for both sides, for higher education and for local communities have been stressed in a variety of cases. Not only new universities situated in remote areas of their countries with the clear mission of territorial development were interested in this field and integrated it in their auto-evaluation. Representatives of old universities with long traditions of education and research also called attention to their universities` social, cultural and economic impact on their environment (like in the several hundred years old University of Catania). Very often this territorial aspect of their functioning has been contrasted with the less favourable outcome of their activities (like the low employment level of their graduates). Higher education institutions of professional training (technical universities for example) are also conscious of their role in local development through their intensive cooperation with local economic networks wherever they are situated.

Confronting our experiences concerning this field of evaluation with a typology that classified the 32 universities involved as ***1. generalist universities, 2. higher education institutions of professional training and applied sciences, 3. universities of territorial development***, we did not find sharp contrasts in this aspect between them. The territorial mission was underlined in universities belonging to the category of „territorial development", like the Portuguese cases of Beira Interior and Aveiro universities where external evaluation of the European Rectors` Conference or other international and national organs carried out evaluation. But even in „generalist universities" like the Spanish case of Girona University or in institutions of applied sciences and technical studies like the Italian case of the Torino or the Finnish case of the Tampere technical universities, the territorial mission was strongly emphasized.

We have found two factors that can explain the lack of characteristic differences among the otherwise clearly different types of universities. First, the geographic situation and social and cultural embeddedness of higher education institutions might distinguish even generalists universities according to their territorial engagement. Second, the disciplinary structure of studies and degrees of the different universities, the nature of their diversification and complexity might be responsible for differences in the intensity of relations with the surrounding environment.

Generalist universities situated in peripheral regions of their country, distant from cultural and economic centres of development exercise economic, social and cultural development functions in their environment. This tendency is illustrated in our research by the case of such „generalists" like Catania and Udine universities in Italy, the University of the Littoral in France or Tampere University in Finland. The territorial mission of „generalist universities" is more explicit in the cases of institutions with diversified study and research structure, where student population is heterogeneous and there is a wider range in the levels of degrees. When „generalist universities" have technical, technological faculties or degrees in applied sciences, when they can assure economic or social expertise for the surrounding environment, when they can offer short cycle studies or continuous learning (adult education), post-graduate specializations, their ties with their territory are more intensive and their interactions are evaluated by the partners participating in them. This is the case of the French university of Paris XII, the Welsh university of Cardiff, the Italian university of Ca Foscari Venice and the German university of Dortmund.

In the ***universities of applied sciences and professional training*** independently of their geographic situation their relationship with their surrounding economic environment is evident.

These institutions were created to satisfy local, regional employment demand in qualification and expertise. This is true for universities with technical faculties (like East London University), for technical universities (of Torino and of Tampere) as well as for universities and other higher education institutions with degrees in economics and in social sciences (like the Italian University of Ca Foscari Venice, the Norwegian Agder College, the French University of Savoie and the Finnish University of Tampere in our research). Their relations are inherent and organic with employers and professional circles concerning the creation of diplomas, the contents of study programs, the practice periods of students or R&D.

The evaluation of universities as actors of regional development is becoming part of their evaluation especially in peripheral areas (like Agder College in Norway) or in those economic and social centres that have less developed localities in their surroundings (like in the Case of the Italian Technical University of Torino).

3. INNOVATIVE PRACTICES

While this domain is still in the infancy of evaluation it has informal characteristics which are either occasional or delimit a particular aspect. The determination of these innovative practices are not easy to determine. What ever the case may be the setting up of instruments and the presence of organisations shows a certain degree of stability (repetitive surveys, permanent observatories, institutions such as university-company co-operation) can already be considered as an innovating practices. We shall qualify as « innovating » any practices which are known to be so in any given country. Also the creation by any University of a students' professional integration observatory is not considered as an innovating practice in France where these innovating practices have existed for about ten years but in Italy and Germany they are considered as innovating. We shall limit ourselves here by showing three distinctive examples on different aspects.

The University of East London is studied here because of its relationships with the professional circle. This University has several programmes which were jointly done with employers and one of them is Ford : training programmes which are meant for company executives and lead to a University degree, a 4 year apprenticeship training in accordance with a University degree which gives the theoretical part of the training, post-graduate training in toxicology which leads to a degree/diploma delivered by the company but validated by the University.

The University of Dortmund : is a town planning institute which is out of the University, it indirectly evaluates the degrees/diplomas by evaluating its own members most of them who are from the University. It has already done three surveys in co-operation with the University where the results were discussed in the University's town planning discipline in order to adapt the programmes and the methods of training.

The University of Barcelona took part in the 1995-1996 experiment concerning degrees/diplomas in social work which was done by a committee of external experts from the professional and academic circles of the analysed sectors. The objective was to be able to come up with a redefinition of the professional profile and the career path, to develop information and suitable instruments in view of the connections between training and the labour market. The creation by the same University of social council underlines the aim of this mechanism (which can be evaluated) to reinforce and establish links between the University and its social and economic circle.

4. CONCLUSION

The crucial character of the development of the evaluation of the relationship between the University, the labour market and the territory should be underlined in the first place. It is justified by the progression of these relations the variety of the forms which they cover and the interest given to them by the actors. Such an evaluation demands the participation of many institutions at different levels. The commitment of territorial political authorities, which comprises the financial plan, appears particularly necessary in order to obtain the best results.

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

EVALUATION : CONTENTS and AIMS

CHAPTER 2. EVALUATION of RESOURCES

EVALUATIONS of ACADEMIC STAFF

Marie-Françoise Fave-Bonnet, Roberto Moscati, Maria Teresa Estrela, Ana Veiga Simao

The evaluation of teachers is certainly the oldest evaluation in the University : it is about the reputation of the lecturer, and also, it has been for many decades the "notoriety" of a researcher. But, besides the evaluation of individual assignments of research other collective evaluations have submerged. Here we shall only deal with formal evaluations, by first analyzing those which are career linked (recruitment and allowances, etc.), and then the evaluations which are linked with the institutions in view of improving teaching and research, etc.

1. Career Evaluations

1.1. The recruitment

Like in all University systems, in Europe teachers are essentially recruited on the basis of their research (even though certain countries recommend teaching like Norway and Finland). From this point of view, the first common point is that, academic staff is evaluated during recruitment by their colleagues from the same discipline.

The second similar point is that they are part of the Public Service, except for Great Britain. Apart from this country, states mainly regulate recruitment, status, salaries, assignments and obligations <Musselin, 1996>[48]. The board of teachers is always made up of qualified teachers (lecturers, senior lectures, etc.) and temporal teachers (an assistant for example).
Besides these two essential points, real recruitment and the recruiting methods in the University market varies from one country to another.

[48]. Musselin Christine, 1996, "Les marchés du travail universitaire, comme économie de la qualité", *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 37 (2), 189-207.

Contexts

The ***state of any University system*** determines the number of recruitments, in particular by the creating vacancies :

- increase in recruitment, because of the increase in number of students (Norway), either on retirement (France and Germany), or just to increase the potential of new Universities and finally to apply the policy by "excellence" in research or teaching (Finland and Norway).

- Stagnation of creation of posts because of financial constraints (Great-Britain, Germany and Portugal).

- Reducing the number of posts to equilibrate East Germany in favour of the West Germany.

The real power of recruitment can be found on national, University, faculty and departmental level, that is to say the discipline. There are at least two levels of decision-making : the department and the University (Spain), faculty and University (Finland, Spain, Portugal), department, faculty and University (United Kingdom and Norway), discipline and national commission (Franc) or the University and the ministry (Italy). We shall see that this aspect determines the essential differences in recruitment in different countries.

The composition of the recruiting Committee : it is an indicator of the recruiting policy : the local commission (mono-disciplinary or pluri-disciplinary) which is composed of intern (home) or external people who are not from the University, the national commission which is composed of researchers from the same discipline, etc. The members can be designated by the University or the ministry which is elected by colleagues from the same discipline or in the case of Spain, it is by random draw. In local commissions it is interesting to examine the respective weight on the internal and external expects. The disciplinary commission can be composed essentially of members of the discipline who are external to the University (Norway) or internal members in the University who are from other disciplines (France) or internal and external members of the University.

The size of the recruiting Commission is also variable. At Oslo, it is made up of three colleagues from the discipline (one internal and two externals), and in Spain, it is made up of five colleagues (two from the University and five who are random drawn on national level) that can go up to 20 permanent members and 20 supply members i.e. in France.

The recruiting procedures of the lowest status in the hierarchy is done at local level. That is the case of researchers in Italy and "assistants" in Portugal. The contract staff status is renewed (every year, every 3 years and every five years), only after evaluation. These local evaluations are less formalized in the case of recruitment of a professor (lecturer) and it often takes into consideration the assignments of the teacher (Norway and Portugal).

Two axes seem to direct these disparities : the recruitment policy and the way the posts are financed.

The first distinction concerns the desire of the University to promote the ***policy of recruitment***, in view of the power of the faculties or departments' University commissions can or can not base their recruitment on the basis of its priorities either on research or teaching. In

this case, the power of the institution over the profiles of the posts and its right to veto is essential. They may also want to reequilibrate certain sectors of the University by the redeployment policy, the policy which consists in the displacement of teachers' vacant posts to other faculties that are under furnished.

Another different way is the ***financing of the posts*** of teacher-cum-research. As far as the majority of the countries in question that is concerned, the creation of posts is determined by what the Ministries grants and so it depends on the auto-evaluation of the needs of the University (indicators per discipline to establish a list of priority posts). In other cases, it is the University that finances salaries of teachers-cum-researcher : so it has to determine its priorities (United Kingdom, Germany). In Italy, combined methods are used.

Evaluation and labour markets

Evaluations that are done during recruitment vary in function of the kind of post. One can distinguish different variations of the University market <Friedberg, Musselin, 1989>[49].

Quantitative differences and disciplinary : in most countries we can see that the reduction in number of posts and the rise in the number of candidates changes the selection and the hierarchy of the evaluation criteria (Norway, Germany, France). Yet other disciplines are more affected than others.

On the contrary, other countries lack candidates because certain disciplines have better advantages inside the University or because the University does not attract the best candidates : that is a good example in Norway in mathematics and science domains, this example also exists in Portugal in science, engineering, law and medicines.

Geographic markets : the University market is unequally open to universities which offer a lot of posts and those that offer less : that is the case of new universities (for example the University of Littoral in France) and universities that are under staffed in (that is South of Italy). Small universities have difficulties to attract good candidates because of heavy assignments in teaching and in administration. The same applies, to universities, that are situated near big prestigious universities. They have difficulties in keeping their teachers.

The obligation or the necessity of a teacher to change University in order to accede superior status (e.g. professor) has big influence over the University market of different countries and regions (for example Germany and Italy). The implicit and explicit rules concerning the geographic transfers are extremely variable regarding disciplines and universities : that is the case in France for the up grading of a *maître de conférences* to become a professor.

The financial market : if the salaries are on the whole fixed by national regulations or "convention collective", they can be partly negotiable. They are also linked to the evaluation of assignments in the United Kingdom, Norway and Finland, which is not the case in other countries (France, Portugal). Germany seems to be the only country where lecturers are part of the public service and where a permanent lecturer can negotiate his/her salary during

[49]. Friedberg Ehrard, Musselin Christine, 1989, "Le marché des professeurs", *Sociologie du travail*, 31 (4), 455-476.

recruitment to a certain point, that is if another University wants him/her (FRIEDBERG, MUSSELIN, 1989).

A market of periodic variables : the evolution of careers and the possibilities of promotions are organised in two systems which lead to more or less frequent evaluations. In certain countries (Italy, Great-Britain), the career promotion leads to the change, in status, which leads to the individual diversification in career. In other cases (France, Germany, Portugal), the necessary period before acceding a grade or class is fixed so that uniformises the career. Like in most countries, the promotion or access to different "inferior" status is evaluated locally, the beginning of the career is heavily linked to the evaluation of counterpart.

The chances of recruitment are also determined by the "periodicity" of publications of vacant posts : they can be published immediately (in Great Britain et Portugal), every year in France, every two years (in reality 4 or 5 years) like in Italy.

Objectives of evaluation

The essential criteria of recruitment is, as we have seen, research. But one can note the emergence of other criteria (pedagogical competence, investments in administrative or collective assignments, etc.) that can, more or less, be taken into consideration, depending on the situation. For different status levels (professor, lecturer, assistant, etc.) different profile is asked for each post : considering research for professors, teaching for inferior status. At this point, the necessity of having a doctorate (or not) or habilitation to postulate for a position depends on the country, this is already in itself the first criteria for recruitment evaluation.

The recruitment criteria can be more or less formal, or more or less explicit, with regards to the post, legal foundations and definition, which can be just a simple nomination (France), a precise description of the scientific profile and to the teaching assignments (Norway). They vary from country to country, from University to University and from one discipline to another :
–adequate research, of the person, or of the existing staff,
–the recruitment of a science researcher in this domain,
–the knowledge of the teaching "content",
–the desire to promote a local candidate,
–the certainty to recruit someone who would invest himself/herself in the collective assignments.

The modalities of evaluations are good indicators of the required competence. In most cases its about one’s research file and an interview but there are also other modalities : written exams (for associate teachers in Italy), teaching exercises in front of student (professor in Germany), a file and an oral exercise (i.e. in Spain), a lesson in front of the Commission "portfolio" on teaching assignments and a demonstrations of teaching sequences in Finland (etc.).

Effects of evaluation during recruitment

Professional investments are heavily determined by recruitment methods. If the criteria of recruitment and of promotion is only carried on research, the teaching assignments are not valued. On the contrary, the methods of evaluation which are linked to the teaching and research assignments leads to different missions of a teacher-cum-researcher.

The institutional "loyalty" is conditioned by the type of contract which is contracted during recruitment. This can be conditioned by different factors :

– the distance between the time of recruitment and the final working place : recruitment by national disciplinary commission (Italy), can lead to a sentiment of "being" an external of one's University.

– the "means" of the offered job : the contract of which entails having a teaching post and doing research (Norway) encourages professional investment. On the contrary, the possible dissociation between a teaching post and the laboratory (France), "disperses" the assignments. Similarly, the possible negotiation over the "means" (finance and posts) during recruitment of a professor in German can result to extra investment vis-à-vis the recruiting University.

– The state of the University market : high selection among adversaries leads to gratification vis-à-vis the recruiting department. On the contrary, the possibility to exercise other lucrative assignments outside the University leads to less investment. Lets note that in this connection lower salaries with regards to the private sector begin to have effects in certain scientific disciplines.

Autonomy and professional dependence are also conditioned by the recruitment methods. When they are done exclusively internally, they lead to waiting lists which result in situations of dependence <Bourdieu, 1984>[50]. One can equally notice that, the monopoly of recruitment at one go can result in unjust situations : that is the case of certain local "nepotisms" in Great Britain, or certain disciplinary mandarin at a national level in Italy.

Configuration essay / Display chart

The recruitment of academic staff, in the eight mentioned countries, differ by their numeric importance, their criteria, their modalities and their effects. One can not distinguish a principle organiser, that is the **power of recruitment.** As we can see, it determines, who composes the commission and its size, the policy, the criteria and the "methods" of recruitment. This power is always shared among a lot of decision-taking steps. One can also distinguish recruitment at local level and at national level :

Department (discipline)	*Faculty* (UFR, etc.)	*University*	*Region*	*National*
United Kingdom	United Kingdom	United Kingdom		
	Finland	Finland		
	Portugal	Portugal		
Spain		Spain		
Norway	Norway	Norway		
Germany	Germany	Germany	Germany	
France		France		France
		Italy		Italy

[50]. Bourdieu Pierre, 1984, *Homo Academicus*, Paris, Les Editions de Minuit.

Great Britain (department, faculty, University), Portugal (faculty and University), Spain (department, faculty and University and "Länder", France (discipline, University, national commission), Italy (ministry, University).

1.2. The "*titularisation*"

The "titularisation" after one or many years of recruitment can be subject to some kind of evaluation like in France or formalized evaluation like in Italy, or at second level evaluation which is done after three years of professorship. This kind of evaluation can be developed at risk by "la remise en question" of civil service : in Germany for example, certain politicians question themselves over opportunities of keeping the status of civil service, and the look for to temporary work for one, two and finally five years.

1.3. The premiums

Allowances, that is to say, an additional sum of money that is granted to an individual for specific missions, this is done in most of the mentioned countries (except for Germany).

The grant may be subject to evaluation or can be automatic :

-There are allowances that are granted without evaluation : research allowances in France (reduction of professional expenditures ; exclusive allowances in Portugal (for those who only teach in universities) : allowances for administrative responsibilities or pedagogical responsibilities (director of a department or a faculty) in France, Italy, Portugal. There are also discretionary allowances. At the University of East London for example, the director of a department can give a discretionary subsidy of about (£ 500 to £ 1000) to a lecturer on demand : this decision should be ratified by the dean of the faculty.

- When the evaluation is done in order to obtain an allowance, this can only be carried out on research (France), or on all the an assignment (Norway, Finland and Great Britain), or separately, on teaching and research (Spain), or on administrative responsibilities (University of East London).

Evaluations can be situated at local level or at national level. Spain summarises the ambiguity of the award of these allowances well. The allowance of individual assignments is done by the national commission (which is composed of Spanish experts and foreigners) every six years. A negative evaluation may result into, no research allowance for six years. And yet the evaluation of teaching assignments is done every five years at local level but the allowance is granted in most cases.

We can also notice ***periodic*** variables : at the University of Cardiff the evaluation is done every two years. In Spain, research can be evaluated every six years and teaching every five years. In Norway it is the report of the annual assignments research and teaching that saves as the basis of evaluation.

In the studied case studies ***the effects of these allowances*** are often presented in a negative way. Certain people criticise the power of the deans in these local evaluations (With passage of time, the allowances have led astray their objective of valuing and rewarding. That is the case

in Spain, (for example), whereby whatever the results of evaluations are, the lecturers receive their allowances : this discredit these evaluations.

We can anyway underline some ***innovative practices*** :

- Question of « influence », of the reputation do not form the subject of formal evaluation, but to in cultural, trade-unionist or political life participation, the valuing and the popularisation of research the international relations etc. are beginning to be taken into consideration, there are dysfunctions in most countries at national level the price of « Academy of Sciences », medals, etc. Today, we can see the emergence of internal rewards in universities in Germany, Finland and Norway to teachers who have good marks in the evaluation of their teaching service : this is the price given after students evaluation to physicist in Hamburg ; or to scientists in Bergen, or another price for pedagogical performance at Oslo College. At Helsinki since 1991 the board of directors can reward good teachers/lecturers by substantial allowances.

Some universities tend to react against the granting of allowances without evaluation at Aix Marseille, for example, the board of directors have installed original criteria to grant the pedagogical allowances clearly showing their good will to reward those who are involved in the assignments of the institution. The pedagogical allowance is not given in accordance with the real number of hours taught, or addition hours, but for such assignments as training, orientation, receiving and having meetings with students, tutorial, etc.

These innovations can lead to a few suggestions. The existence of allowances without evaluation makes the allowance lose its sense of being an allowance, it becomes an additional salary necessary for social needs. In this case, the rise in salaries would not have sense, we can doubt the generalisation of allowances which tend to lead and to extinguish the idea of the work of lecturers which is diversified (researches, training, collective responsibilities, etc.) in valuing some of them to the disadvantage of others

If they are any allowances that these should compensate the additional charges, (the dean for example) or compensate the exceptional teaching assignments in research, etc.

These « successes » are rarely individual. The development of collective allowances would introduce justice. Lets note that allowances can only have « incentive » value if they are of significant value. Furthermore, the expertise of files needs specific competence regarding differences in the assignments to evaluate. The legitimacy of the expert’s specialisation is essential.

Learning to evaluate administrative responsibilities was put into practice at the University of East London.

1.4. Continuing education

Continuing education of teachers training, if it is available (Norway), can be tested on the aims of the training, that is to say, it becomes an evaluation.

We should keep in mind this specific situation of the profession of the academic staff, at this point, if training to be a researcher is done during one’s thesis and then though out the career,

it is not the same training as vocational training. Besides a few other initiatives, initial training in (CIES) in France or in-house training in Norway there is no pedagogical training in Europe.

The development of evaluation reactivates this specific need, because academic staff is evaluated on assignments on which they were not trained and that in case of negative evaluation nothing is proposed for better performance.

1.5. The sabbatical leave

It is generally granted after an evaluation. This can be founded on an assessment or otherwise on a project. Evaluation is rare after this period.

2. Evaluations bound to institution

The academic liberty is a tradition which is confronted with the idea of evaluating assignments. Academic staff is subject to a lot of evaluations.

2.1. Subjective and objective evaluation

2.1.1. The evaluation of Teaching assignments

The collective evaluations on teaching (as they are analysed in « teaching evaluations » of this report) sometimes include individual pedagogical evaluations and « performances » of teachers (like in certain universities of Portugal). This can begin with the phase of auto-evaluation of the work conditions, the time consecrated to the preparation of courses, the working conditions with the students followed by a questionnaire.

Most of these evaluations are questionnaire type, but are often adapted to each department or to each faculty. In certain faculties it is the students'commission that elaborates the questionnaire (University de Aveiro in Portugal, Agder College in Norway). at Tampere, this type of cooperation exists since 1980.

The evaluation by students can be of different sorts :
- suggested by the teachers (by a meeting or questionnaire). In this case, this is an auto-evaluation and the results are not published.
- suggested by the institution (department or faculty or University) they are registered under the overall evaluation of teachers (Norway and Portugal).
- suggested by the students' associations in the science department in Lisbon. 500 copies of the results of the questionnaire are circulated. There are even « Hit parades » displayed in certain faculties in Portugal and Germany.

2.1.2. Accredit of Degrees, among other examinations the curricula evaluation is necessary for teachers and their qualifications. This procedure can be generalised (for the accreditation of all national degrees in France), or specific to vocational training (like the degree of engineering in most cases). In this case a lately defended thesis that a lecturer would have directed, his/her personal publications and those of the group are meticulously examined.

2.1.3. Collective evaluations on research (to obtain finance and grants) in most cases they begin the curricula examinations and research publications in the journal of the readership committee, the international relations etc. These are the essential elements of evaluation (see chapter on Evaluation of researches).

It is worth noting the ambiguity of collective files. Even if they are presented as group files, individual work of every member of the group is precised.

Procedures of this type could even be more individualised at Ca Foscari University in Venice the research fund of the University are distributed with regards to the number of teachers and researchers who would have published at least one article during the year.

2.2. The level of development of these evaluations

As we have just seen, these evaluations are rather sporadic and are developing jointly with other evaluations. So, they depend on the level of the development of teaching evaluations (Portugal, Spain, Norway) or on research in Finland.

They could become systematic like at Agder College in Norway where the first years of teaching are systematically evaluated (questionnaire and inspection) by the teachers, commission or students' commissions. This is equally the same thing at Oslo College, Turin and Venice.

2.3. The effects of these Different Evaluations

There are different reactions regarding evaluation in different countries, discipline and the recognition that one gets after evaluation.

The evaluation of teachers by foreign experts, in particular is well accepted only if it is as old as is in Norway. Also these evaluations are most welcome if they start with the auto-evaluation procedure like in Norway, Germany or Portugal. On the contrary it can be exacerbated if it becomes a subject of competitions as it is at the Centres of Excellence in Finland.

The heavy charges of the procedures of internal evaluation of teacher in the United Kingdom (and the absence of foreign experts) can lead to bureaucratic and time consuming practices which can be considered as productive. Also, there can be problems in evaluation in a small group where everybody knows everyone (Finland and Norway).

In general, the evaluation of the teachers'assignments is not valued in the teaching career. At Helsinki, the faculty of Medicine, the faculty of Medicine has decided to consecrate 10% of its budget to reward teachers who would have well scored in students' evaluations.

In fact one of the main evaluations today is that one expects (finance and promotion) advantages or some kind of change after evaluation. When student participate in the evaluation, they expect changes in pedagogical practices of the evaluated teacher, that is the case in Norway, Portuguese students also ask for creation of teaching posts of teachers. Anyway the changes appear to be very difficult to apply.

Sometimes there are effects on the teachers side : at Beira Interior they take great care during the preparation of programs and bibliographies, and student are most available to take part. At Bergen teachers ask the department to publish the evaluations in order to ask for increments in salaries.

On the institution's side, the evaluation of teachers can lead to certain changes : in Turin, after an evaluation of teachers, they set up a didactic « recyclage » for teachers.

To summarise this, we can distinguish two types of evaluation in this domain. On the one hand, institutional evaluations on national or University initiative which aims at external recognition and this can have impacts on the quality of teaching and research, etc. On the other hand, there are no institutional evaluations which are centred upon internal efficiency and have little or no effect.

2.4. A few layouts

We can also distinguish two categories of evaluation of teachers and their pedagogical assignments : one is attached to personal evaluations of teachers in general with the participation of students (Norway, Germany, Great Britain). The other one is centred on the collective evaluation of teachers based on the institution's, department's or section's initiative that is to say, in Portugal and France.

Another opposition concerning all the surveyed countries : the subject on the quality and the efficiency to the subject concerning the control of teachers. One finds here the classic opposition between formative evaluation (Norway and Germany) and basic cursory evaluation (France, United Kingdom).

2.5. Innovations practices

The first series of innovation concern being able to be « remediable » in case of a negative evaluation in teaching practice. It is a current practice in Norway : since 1997 in-house teacher training has become obligatory at Oslo College (a term) and a pedagogical University degree is systematically proposed by Oslo University (50 h of which, part of the units are optimal). In general, the initial teacher training on the one hand and in-house training on the other to different assignments of the profession (administration informatics languages, etc.) on the other hand it becomes a necessity for a profession which is changing.

Another innovating practice concerns the annual report in Norway which values the overall assignments (teaching, research, collective responsibilities, etc.) and by not increasing the elaboration of files which is a source of a considerable waste of time. As we have seen, teachers are often evaluated but it is only partial.

Finland's «portfolio» experience values the teaching assignments. It is a description, a formality and an analysis of pedagogical assignments which is necessary for both training and evaluation.

The students' participation in the elaboration of teachers' and teaching evaluation questionnaires (Germany, Spain, Portugal and Norway), followed the reception of the results of the questionnaires to teachers and to the pedagogical superiors in order to discuss the

evaluation with the teacher , this procedure seems to be both efficient and rather lightweight. Otherwise it preserves the pedagogical liberty of the teacher. This makes us understand better what the students go through. This procedure can only be efficient after in-house training of evaluators to elaborate instruments and to analyse the datum.

We can finally note the presence of « resort » people. That is the case in Turin of the « Commission des sages » (commission of the old and experienced people) in which can be seized by students and teachers. That is also the case at Ombudsman in Barcelona which can demand the evaluation of a lecturer if probably 50% of the class ask for it in order to solve difficult cases at department or faculty level.

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

EVALUATION of NON-ACADEMIC STAFF

Pierre Dubois

There are two kinds of evaluation dealing with the engineers, technicians, administrative, and workers working in the universities. The first deals with the individuals and the key-moments of their trajectory (recruitment, training, establishment, promotion, mobility); the evaluation organises individual flows according to available jobs in the administrative structures, according to the regulations and to individuals' demands. The second evaluation, more innovative, deals with the collective contribution of non-academic staff in the efficient and effective functioning of universities

If the first kind of evaluation is present in all the countries, the second one is only beginning. The evaluation of these personnel, called « non-academic » in comparison to the « academic staff », is the poor parent in the evaluation field; they have an uneasy feeling of the situation <Dieterlé, 1998>[51]. In the same way, the statistics do not deal with them, particularly in the OECD and Eurostat publications. The non-academic staff population doe not always counted in all the countries <Chevallier, 1996, Bideault, 1997, Malègue, 1998>[52]. However, Administrative people are an indispensable resource for teaching, research, services to the students; they also represent an important cost.

The assessment of the non-academic staff evaluation is referred to two configurations of countries, emphasises some innovative evaluation practices, explores the factors and the obstacles to the evaluation. Two recommendations (comparable statistical indicators, quality service indicators) are mentioned in the part 5 of the final report.

1. Two configurations of countries : identifying the evaluation objectives

In the general context of an increase in the university workloads (growth of the students' number), two configurations of countries can be obviously identified according to two criteria : the number of non-academic personnel and the financial situation of universities. The first configuration amalgamates the Northern Europe countries (Finland, United-Kingdom, Germany, Norway) : the non-academic personnel are relatively many, but the financial pressure

[51]. Dieterle Nicolas, Merceron Stéphane, Catin Jean-Michel, 1998, "Personnels IATOS : les raisons du malaise" *Vie Universitaire*, 4, mars, 14-21, et *Vie Universitaire*, 5, avril, 14-23.

[52]. Chevallier Bernard, 1996, "Le personnel de l'Education Nationale et de l'Enseignement Supérieur au 1er janvier 1995", *Note d'information*, 96 (1).

Bideault Marc, Rossi Pasquin, 1997, "Les personnels de l'enseignement supérieur 1995-1996", *Note d'information*, 97 (29), juillet.

Malègue Claude, 1998, "Le personnel du secteur public de l'Education nationale et de l'Enseignement supérieur au 1er janvier 1997", *Note d'information*, 98 (13), mai.

on universities is high; in the two first countries, a link is set up between evaluation results and funding. The second configuration regroups the Southern Europe countries (Spain, France, Italy, Portugal) : the non-academic personnel are relatively not so many, but the financial pressure on university is not so strong. When the number of the non-academic personnel is the best and when the financial pressure is high, evaluations dealing with the non-academic collective contribution in the university functioning are made. The important differences about the supervision rate (number of non-academic staff by student or by teacher), observed but non explained, would merit a further research, a socio-historic one.

In the first configuration of countries, the evaluation objectives are rather : measuring the effectiveness of administration, utilising in the best way the people to achieve the university missions? setting up performance and quality indicators of the delivered services, reducing or re-allocating the number of people, simplifying and rationalising the administrative structures, finding the best compromise between centralisation and decentralisation, clarifying the hierarchical lines. In the second configuration of countries, objectives are rather : describing the population characteristics, controlling the implementation of regulations, setting up individualised payment systems, setting of equitable and standardised workloads, professionalising and responsibilising the personnel, opening new functions.

Countries with a high supervision rate and with a strong financial pressure on universities

Finland. The economic crisis of the first half of eighties generated huge consequences in universities : budget restrictions have been compulsory in each of them; restrictions have essentially concerned the number of non-academic people <Universitas Renovata, 1993>. The University-State relationships have changed : from now, they are based on consultations and performance agreements, on objectives and results to achieve, on funding more and more based on quantitative performances, duly observed. Objectives and results are included within a plan for a number of years, but they are revised every year. The same principles are set up within each university, and some measures are envisaged or set up : merging or suppressing structures, decreasing the number of levels in the organisation. The measures have evidently consequences on the technical and administrative personnel who work in the concerned structures.

United-Kingdom. The huge development of external and internal evaluations, often close to the management methods of the private sector, is inscribed in the context of a relative financial crisis and of accountability. The non-academic staff are recruited and paid by their university, are concerned by an internal system of individual appraisal (under the frame of a national pay agreement of 1987, re-negotiated several times after job conflicts). The procedure can involve an interview about tasks, performances, results; the problem is the link between the appraisal and the wage increase. Collectively, the non-academic personnel, particularly those working in the central services of the university, are concerned by internal and external procedures of evaluation. To measure quality and performance of the delivered service, the customers (students, firms, teachers) are mobilised to set up standards. Quality and performance are related to the personnel' characteristics, to the organisation and to the resources. After the evaluation, the service has to take into account the recommendations : the objectives are consigned in a reference document; every customer can consult it; the achievement of objectives is controlled after a couple of months. All those procedures seem effective to improve quality of the delivered services.

Germany. Traditionally, German universities do not have a great possibility to evaluate the non-academic personnel (they are civil servants of the Land or they are regulated by collective agreements as in the private sector). On both sides, the evaluation of the individuals has to respect a lot of regulations and it is enough formal. The financial crisis obliges the autonomous universities to set up an enlarged evaluation process in order to improve the effectiveness of the administration : until which point and how to reduce, re-allocate or externalise the non-academic resources, particularly those employed in the central administration and close the professors? To rationalise the administration, a call to consultancy agencies is sometimes organised in a

first time, but it is a failure. The tendencies, which are observed in the recent period, are : recourse to a strategic planning (it involves an evaluation of the administrative functioning and of the different jobs), setting up of new functions (management control for instance), development of performance indicators (they are used to allocate resources). However, those methods are slowed by the reluctance of the personnel and of their trade-unions.

Norway. The evaluation of non-academic staff is inscribed in the more general context of an evaluation of the administrative functioning (efficiency and effectiveness) <Alfredsen, 1995>, <Stensaker, 1997>[53]. That evaluation has developed for two essential reasons ; the first is linked to the necessity to save financial resources, the second one is more specifically linked to the reform of higher Education structures, implemented from 1996 (merging of the regional High Schools). The evaluation process is initiated by the universities themselves and it is essentially an internal process (external supports - public or private - are mobilised if necessary). The process is progressive, very participative and maybe contradictory (divergent viewpoints); quantitative indicators are not many in the process; the core is a strategic planning, aiming the clarification of hierarchical lines, the professionalisation and the responsibilisation of the personnel, the decrease of the consultative committees (there are many at all the levels and they are time-consuming).

Countries with a less high supervision rate and with a less strong financial pressure

Spain. Universities, under the frame of their statutory and financial autonomy, set up the conditions of recruitment, of training, of payment and of career of their non-academic staff; however, they have to respect legal regulations (for the civil servants) and those of the collective agreements (for the people with a contract); recruitment and career are directly linked to the personnel degrees (diplomas). The general situation is a shortage of non-academic personnel and a lack of external evaluation. Some universities have set up individual appraisals to give wage improvements : job quantity and quality, degree of responsibility, autonomy, ability to work in a group are concerned. However, because of trade-unions pressures, the same premiums are delivered to all the administrative personnel (it is a bureaucratic dysfunction). We observe a more managerial functioning (attention paid for the quality of services and for the performance) in the Foundations set up by universities to manage research contracts, continuous training and technological transfer.

France. The most of non-academic staff are civil servants, recruited by national or regional competitions, distributed in two « corps » and in three « grades » <Crozier, 1993>[54]. They are allocated by the State to each university according to quantitative criteria and to objectives, defined in the contracts signed for four years. The trade-unions control is still strong for the management of career and of mobility. Problems are common to all the universities : a shortage of civil servants personnel (of managers, particularly), a too high qualification of the recruited people in comparison to the occupations, a weak possibility to award the efficient people, an increasing administrative workload for the teachers, problems with the working time rules. About the positive evolution, we observe a training effort made by universities, a development of the computerised information systems. External evaluations (<IGAEN, 1992>, <CNE 1995c>, <MESR,

[53]. Alfredsen André, Härvik Jan Albert, 1995, *On the right course? Evaluation of the training program for administrative personnel at the welfare office*, Oslo, UNIKOM, Rapport n°2.

Stensaker Bjorn, 1997, "From accountability to opportunity : the role of quality assessments in Norway", *Quality in Higher Education*, 3 (3), november, 277-284.

[54]. Crozier Pierre, Petitbon Francis, 1993, *Fonctionnaires au quotidien. Les nouvelles pratiques des cadres de l'administration*, Paris, Les Editions d'organisation.

1995>[55], Chambres Régionales des Comptes) paid attention for problems and proposed reforms. Internal evaluations to rationalise the administrative services are developing in some universities : identification and restructuration of administrative functions according to the university assignments, setting up of priorities, job re-allocation between the different services. Conversely, the setting up of individualised evaluation procedures to make easier the mobility and the career, of individual payment systems is much more rare.

Italy. The lack of financial pressure can explain the weak development of the internal evaluation of the organisation and of the non-academic personnel. However, the conditions for a further development are met: financial autonomy of universities, planning for a number of years, insertion of wages in the lump sum budget, centralisation of the university government and of the information systems, setting up of internal evaluation units. The most often, evaluation is initiated at the external : a law devoted to the public employment (1993) obliges the universities to elaborate « maps » dealing with the situation of their administrative and technical personnel (number of personnel for each management level, tasks, workloads); the national collective contract (1996) introduces the possibility of contracts with a limited duration and of part-time contracts, allows to allocate an additional payment based on the productivity and the achieved results. The lack of actual changes is explained by several reasons : plurality of the possible references to set up workloads (experiences of the private firms, statistical inquiries, professional standards, standardised costs set up by the National Observatory for the Evaluation of Universities), difficulty to define quantitative and verifiable objectives.

Portugal. The non-academic personnel, who are essentially civil servants, are concerned by the general principles of the evaluation of civil servants, particularly in the career field. The evaluation of their role in universities does not appear in the external national evaluations; devoted to teaching and research; those evaluations consider the administrative personnel as a resource; as such, personnel are counted (number, categories, age, degrees, places of allocation). Three among the four investigated universities had called for an evaluation of the European Rectors conference : it questions, particularly, the performance and the quality of the delivered services, pushes the universities to set up a strategic planning and management, and to develop their capacity of change. Practices, actually innovative, are not met in the four investigated universities, even in the university of Lisbon which set up an internal evaluation unit in 1995. Some interviewees are in favour of evaluations which integrate teaching, research and organisational management.

2. Innovative practices referred to the ideal-types of universities

In spite of common tendencies in the non-academic staff evaluations, we observe a great variety of situations within each country. So, the non-academic staff evaluations and the emerging of innovative practices also depend on the type of university. We have chosen to expose the most innovative case of evaluation in each country and it is interesting to observe that we do not find actual innovative practices in the universities of the territorial development. Maybe, those universities, which have a relatively small size and which have been recently created, do not know worrying or priority problems in the field. So, the innovative practices appear in the profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences and in the

[55]. IGAEN, 1992, *La part des agents : place et rôle des personnels ATOS*, Paris, La Documentation Française, Rapport général 1992, 219-239.

CNE, 1995, *Les personnels ingénieurs, administratifs, techniciens, ouvriers de service dans les établissements d'enseignement supérieur*, Paris, Rapport du groupe de travail présidé par Marcel Pinet.

MESR, 1995, *Enquête sur les personnels IATOS des établissements d'enseignement supérieur*, Paris, Délégation à la Modernisation et à la Déconcentration, rapport, mai.

universities of general character (in that case, two situations have to be distinguished : a more or less strong financial crisis).

Two cases in the profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences

The Polytechnic of Turin and the Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration obviously look for achieving an international recognition. They have a lot of partnerships with firms and they are close to firms according to the evaluations they set up.

Polytechnic of Turin. 24.000 students, 600 technical and administrative personnel. The Polytechnic is an advanced university in the evaluation field : a planning and development unit exists since a lot of years. A unit for the evaluation of administrative and technical activities is being set up in 1997 (it is one among the three units of the internal evaluation unit set up in 1995) : it is managed by two external personalities who have a great experience of the administrative management. The evaluation objective is to understand, to rationalise, to optimise the office functioning, according to the entrepreneurial world but in taking in count the university specificity. In 1997, according to the national collective contract (1996) and with a view to allocate the premium of collective productivity, the first evaluation of results achieved by the personnel was set up; each people in charge of a structure has to write a report; the evaluation and the ranking of structures have been made by the internal evaluation unit. In spite of a relative distrust of trade-unions, the non-academic staff accepted the procedure.

Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration. 3.700 students in initial formation, 3.200 students in continuous training. The School has set up a lot of evaluations since the beginning of nineties. Some of them have been integrated an crossed evaluation of teaching, research and support-functions (three audits of the European Foundation for the Management Development, accreditation-certification by the MBS International Association, surveys close to employers and previous students. Other evaluations have been internally decided and have been more focused (working group on the administration in 1994, Quality Project in 1996 based on the customers' judgements) : how do the administrative activities have to be developed to support the core School activities. In 1994, the working group has proposed a more flexible organisation of the administration, new working and recruitment methods; people could be allocated to projects for a limited duration (and no more to permanent tasks). Any among those evaluations seems to have produced obvious improvements. So, for the end of the century, one among the School objectives is, once again, to reorganise its administration. A possible explanation of the previous failures : performance indicators, more and more used to allocate funding, are only dealing with teaching and research; they do not concern administrative activities.

Three cases in universities of general character facing financial pressures

The universities of Hamburg, Oslo and Wales Cardiff have many non-academic staff personnel and look for reducing their number and to rationalise the tasks

University of Hamburg. 44.000 students, 7.500 technical and administrative personnel (5.300 in medicine). Evaluations of the organisation begin from 1993-94 because of budgetary restrictions decided by the City of Hamburg. At first, they are punctual, then they are progressively institutionalised and integrated in the decision and rationalisation process. The Development Project, launched in November 1996, is a pilot operation, funded and advised by the Volkswagen Foundation (introduction of new forms of management). The project looks for strengthening the responsibility by the way of decentralisation, for increasing the efficiency of the administration and of the university government at all the levels. It includes sub-projects : implementation of strategies and of management by projects, decentralisation of the financial management and of some tasks of the central administration towards the departments and institutes, setting up of cost

and performance indicators, programmes to increase managers' skills. At the same time, the university has set up an office dealing with the organisational matters : it develops evaluations of functions, calculates job requirements for the different structures, makes the individuals' appraisals every two year, organises meetings to improve the everybody's work.

University of Oslo. 35.000 students, 2.000 technical and administrative personnel (260 in medicine); their numer increased more rapidly than the teachers ' number during the last 20 years. The Project « Effectiveness and Efficiency » is detailed in the part devoted to the evaluation of structures (see infra).

University of Wales Cardiff. 13.000 students, more than 1.100 technical and administrative personnel. The university was born in 1988 from the merging of two institutions knowing a financial crisis. After the merging, the Higher Education Quality Council still observes in 1993 some difficulties which are not resolved, a lack of quality insurance (personnel' turn-over, inadequate or lacking procedures in some services). In the internal evaluation field, an Internal Quality Review is set up since 1992. Since 1994, the administrative central services are scrutinised by an Administrative Quality System (the main procedures are formalised in a handbook). The evaluation of quality is made every three years; it insists on the validity and the pertinence of objectives and standards, on the performance (ability to satisfy the users' requirements). At the end of the review, changes have to be planned for the following three years. A third procedure deals with teams' projects and quality circles; every project associates for a year personnel and users; it analyses the service functions, defines performance standards to achieve, and indicators to measure their achievement; then, a quality circle, made of personnel of different ranks, decides the required changes. Some interviewees observe actual improvements due to the external and internal evaluations. At last, the university has set up in 1996-97 a system of individual appraisal (definition of the job content, objectives to achieve, required learning).

Two other cases in universities of general character

The universities of Barcelona and Paris XII are characterised, in comparison with the previous described universities, by a smaller number of administrative personnel according to the students' number.

University of Barcelona. 68.000 students, 1.750 technical and administrative personnel. Non-academic staff is regulated by the legal status or by a collective agreement, and, in all cases, by the university status (university autonomy about recruitment and career rules in the respect of some principles : equality of treatment, taking in count of the individual merit and ability, transparency of procedures and advertising for the vacant jobs, right to learning and promotion). The university activity in the evaluation field is important; two types of evaluation deal with the non-academic staff. The evaluations of the support services are integrated in the teaching and research evaluations (Quality Plan, Strategic Plan, National Quality Evaluation Plan...) : their results are limited (for instance, information systems have been reoriented in order to identify the points to improve in the institution). Other evaluations are centred on the non-academic staff or on their tasks : the most ambitious evaluation is in progress; set up in 1995 (synthesis of all the statistical data about the non-academic staff), it looks for identifying and modifying all the existing jobs.

University of Paris XII Val de Marne. 21.000 students, 440 administrative and technical personnel. The university has set up, from the beginning of the nineties, the conditions to have a human resources policy : in a first period, the university mobilised external supports (contractualisation, private consulting agencies), then it has set up permanent organisational devices (human resources office, learning unit), statistical tools (social balance sheet), evaluation procedures; it is going on with efforts to improve the personnel learning, to allocate individualised premiums. The most innovative experience deals with the yearly managers' evaluation in order to encourage their mobility and to set up a better link between their skills and their job content. Managers are concerned by an evaluation interview dealing with their job, the service functioning, the achieved results, the career evolution, the required learning, the resources, the objectives. The managers' opinion is very diverse : feeling of self-valorisation and self-recognition, or feeling of hierarchical judgement or of uselessness. Sometimes, the interviews have generated self-evaluation projects

within services by the managers themselves (task allocations within the service, description of tasks and relationships, proposals to improve the quality of service). Interviews could be the basis to analyse management functions and organisational forms.

3. Processes, objects and evaluation effects

From the innovative practices, previously described, we may precise the objects of the evaluation, identify the processes, question the evaluation effects.

Time is required to set up an evaluation process

The process to evaluate the non-academic staff and their role in the organisation is progressively implemented : ***it requires several years and successive stages***. In some universities, it is scarcely set up; some evaluation devices are set up but they do not still work. In other universities, the process is already institutionalised : integration of the evaluation in a strategic programme, formal structures devoted to the evaluation and to the follow-up of the decided changes, use of evaluation tools (dashboards, cost and performance indicators, survey close to the users...). When the process is not a lot advanced, the object of the evaluation is not well defined and the assigned effect can be to only set up permanent evaluation devices and tools; the actual organisational changes cannot be identified. When the process is institutionalised, the objects and the effects of evaluations are obviously identified : the objects are the same from an evaluation to another one; an evolution is measured; the objectives to achieve are set up.

The process requires a large participation. Its actors are, at first, the non-academic personnel; the analysis of tasks, functions, relationships have compulsorily to involve them. The process also mobilises the users of the different services (teachers, students, external partners). The mobilisation of private consulting agencies, rather frequent at the beginning of the process, is often not satisfying. Conversely, the quality guidelines (made by the European Rectors Conference - CRE) and the co-evaluation (several universities organise their own evaluation process) seem to be effective and efficient evaluation tools.

Four objects to evaluate

From the case studies, we may observe that the evaluation of the non-academic staff deals with many objects, linked with efficiency and effectiveness questions. ***Tasks and job contents***. Which is the number of jobs? Is it or not satisfying or not, and according to which criteria? Do new jobs have to be imagined? Do some jobs have to be restructured or do some jobs have to disappear? Is the division of tasks, within a service or between the different services, optimal? Do the tasks match the university missions? Are redundant tasks made at different levels? Is the centralisation or the decentralisation required? Do some tasks have to be externalised (private subcontracting)? How much time is required to achieve the tasks? Do all the personnel have the same workload? Is the working time respected and controlled?

Task allocation. Who makes what? Who has to be allocated to the different tasks? Which skills are required to hold the jobs? Do the more skilled people have to be allocated in the university central services or in services close to the users? How is made the division of administrative tasks between non-academic staff and academic staff? Do non-academic staff

have to be allocated to specific structures or to pools, common to different administrative services?

Relationships. Is the non-academic staff well controlled? Is the length of hierarchical lines optimal and is there a unity of authority (does an administrative people depend on one or on several chiefs?) How are managed the conflicts between the non-academics themselves? between non-academic and academic staff? between non-academics and students?

Wages. Which is the payment system? Are the payment levels stimulating? Are there payment systems by merit? In some cases, individual appraisal systems (they require individualised interviews) are set up and are used to pay premiums, to organise learning actions, to define mobility projects.

The effects of evaluations are uncertain and are differently appreciated

The actual changes, issued from precise evaluations, are not always clearly identified in the case studies; the interviewees' opinions are often contradictory. The most frequent effects or the clearest ones are the development of the personnel learning, the clarification of responsibilities, the reduction or the re-allocation of the personnel, the development of information or management systems, the creation of internal evaluation units, the setting up of cost and performance indicators.

The procedures of quality insurance, set up in the British universities[56], seem to be pertinent to improve the quality of the services delivered to the users. These procedures are described in the part devoted to recommendations (see part 5).

4. Evaluation of non-academic staff : factors and obstacles

Five dimensions of the university context seem to favour or to brake the evaluation of the non-academic role within the university organisation.

Changes in the students' number

[56]. HEQC, 1994, *Guidelines on Quality Assurance*, London, HEQC.

Billing D., 1996, Managing quality policy and projects in a university, *Total Quality Management*, 7 (2), 203-212.

Prichard Craig, 1996, Making managers accountable or making managers? The case of a code for management in a Higher Education Institution, *Educational Management and Administration*, 24 (1), 79-92.

Harvey Lee, 1997, "Quality is not free! Quality monitoring alone will not improve quality", *Tertiary Education and Management*, 3 (2), june, 133-143.

Watkins Trevor, 1997, "Total quality management in Higher Education : myths and realities", *Tertiary Education and Management*, 3 (4), december, 285-291.

Lundquist Robert, 1997, "Quality systems and ISO 9000 in Higher Education", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 22 (2), june, 159-172.

Fincher Cameron, 1998, "Cooperative strategies in administrative leadership", *Tertiary Education and Management*, 4 (1), march, 28-37.

The growth in the students' number, observed in the recent period, has been accompanied by an increase in the number of non-academic staff. It could have been an occasion of reflections about their role in the organisation, about the division of work between the different services. The case studies do not mention internal evaluations issued from such circumstances : how to manage in the best way the increase of non-academic staff? Evaluations are only set up when the increase does not allow to face all the tasks (shortage of non-academic staff).

The entry in a phase of stabilisation (or of decrease) in the students' number, phase already observed in some countries, can generate a higher competitiveness between the universities. As a consequence, the universities could want to strengthen their attractiveness by an quality improvement of the services delivered to users. That tendency could accelerate the evaluation processes of the non-academic role within the university organisation.

The university autonomy in a regulated environment

The university autonomy in the statutory field is obviously a necessary condition to develop the internal non-academic staff evaluation. Autonomy is never complete : evaluation is slowed because, in all the countries, a set of public regulations is applied to the civil servants, to the people regulated by public contracts, or to the employees regulated by a collective agreement. The universities are obliged to take into account the external regulations (modalities of recruitment and mobility, ranking and payment systems, promotion and career, working time, job security...). So, the internal evaluation cannot set up illegal regulations : lengthening of test periods for the new recruited people, *ad hoc* job contracts, dismissal of not satisfying people, negotiated and totally individualised wages...

However, in some countries (Norway for instance), some administrative tasks, previously managed by the State central administration, have been decentralised in universities; it favours processes of evaluation learning and their diffusion. That decentralisation increases the non-academic workload (obligation to make university balance sheets, projects for instance). In that new context, the State wants to know the performance of the university administration : the universities have to challenge that new form of control, by a development of internal evaluation tasks.

Lump sum budgets and potential financial difficulties

We observed, in the part devoted to the evaluation of financial resources, a tendency to allocate lump sum budgets to universities. In all the countries apart from France, the lump sum budget involves the personnel' wages. In that context, the universities do not set up the payment systems, but they have an autonomy to put the non-academic staff all along the payment rankings. They also have an autonomy to decide on the number and quality of jobs, particularly when jobs are vacant because of dismissals, of external mobility, of retirements : do they have to reproduce the same jobs, to suppress some of them, to change their ranking in the payment system, to share two full time jobs in two part-time jobs...?

A second financial factor favours evaluation : it is a difficult financial situation (decrease of financial resources for instance). How, in that context, to set up priorities to allocate the non-academic personnel in order to save resources? The decision supposes to set up tools, to

elaborate criteria : allocation according to workloads[57], to objectives, to standards, to achieved performance? Such a rationalisation is not much met in the case studies.

Diversification of structures and strengthening of the university central administration

Higher Education reforms have diversified and increased the university missions. In the case studies, we have observed that the universities have answered the challenge by the diversification of their administrative and technical structures, by the creation of new services, by the strengthening of their central administration (more personnel and more units). That centralisation is explained by many reasons : a will to develop unified university strategies and to make scale savings in a situation of financial pressure, a reluctance from the unskilled personnel to take responsibilities, limited skills in the decentralised services, cost and lack of professional skills (higher skills are required to make the new tasks at the central level).

Such a context - centralisation of the administration and professionalisation of the tasks in the new central services - is rather in favour of the development of non-academic staff evaluation of its role in the university organisation; evaluation is seen as a condition for a decentralisation and for an increased responsibility in the decentralised services.

Uncertainties about the administration government

The government of the administration is characterised by three features : lengthening of the hierarchical line, lack of unity in the control, keeping of a trade-union control. Because of the growth in the number of structures, some universities have developed until three organisational levels in which the administrative personnel work; the lengthening of the hierarchical line does not favour the evaluation development, apart when the administration is governed by a strong personality, a personality which has high skills and who narrowly works with the Rector. Some case studies show that the administrative director can play a key-role to develop evaluations of the administration, of its personnel.

The administrative chiefs, who do not work in the central administration, depend, at the same time, on the university administrative director and on the faculty/ department director (they have to work with him). Conflicts are possible in that context because of potential divergence in the criteria which measure the effectiveness. The lack of unity in the control can brake the development of evaluation of the non-academic staff.

If the number of non-academic staff is always a minority in the university councils, it is a majority in the bodies which directly concern them (bodies which deal with recruitment, stabilisation in the job, promotion, mobility). The weight of trade-unions in those bodies is traditional and still strong; it is able to limit or to block the evaluations which would generate a strong rationalisation of non-academic resources.

---

[57]. In France, since 1995, the allocation of non-academic jobs to each university is calculated according norms, set up after a survey in universities (mission Silland). Seven functions have been identified, and norms have been decided for each function : students services (1 non-academic job for 200 students), help to teaching (1 job for 100 students in medicine and sciences, 1 for 450 in law and humanities), help to research (1 job for 0,4 doctorate in sciences, 1 for 1,8 doctorate in laws and humanities), general administration (1 job for 550 students), financial management (1 job for 5 millions francs of budget), management of human resources (1 job for 60 teachers or non-academic jobs), real estates (1 job for 1.500 square metres built).

At last, we can make the hypothesis that the evaluation of non-academic staff can be developed only if a model of administration government and control appears. The main value of the model would be the quality of services delivered by professionals more and more skilled and by professionals able to make positive discriminations in favour of the users who do not have many resources.

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

EVALUATIONS of the ORGANISATION

1. EVALUATION OF UNIVERSITIES' GOVERNMENT

Josep M. Rotger

1.1. Government Systems, Academic Positions

Universities are facing considerable and complex challenges, in particular the increasing demands from the society in combination with reduction of public funding. The universities are now requested to be internally efficient and accountable towards their stakeholders (authorities, employers, students, civil society... This new demands put the university leaders and the whole university community under high pressure if they wish to maintain and strengthen the institutional autonomy.

The recent legal reforms produced in the European university systems have introduced collegiate instances of deliberation, decision and consultation, as much at University level as at the level of the faculties or the departments and institutes. Many of them had traditionally existed in the university, but with the recent reforms, they have been given real decision-making power within the new autonomous university framework.

All the cases studies count on representatives who exercise control over the unipersonal academic posts and, in one way or another, some of them incorporate representative elements of the various social sectors. Further to common principles of democratic functioning, the way of functioning of these organs varies from country to country and even between the universities in the same country, seeing as university autonomy laws can only concede to each institution standard capacity in this respect. However, these instances have to put into practice the principles prescribed by the laws of participation and representation «balanced» by the different tasks and categories of lecturers or of students and administrative and personnel staff. In spite of this, the specific weight of the academic staff in relation to other sectors with regards to government organs, may be determining in all the cases. Further to common principles, the way of functioning of these organs varies in a notable way between one university and another, as much as in what the directional team, which is of varying size, does, as to the deliberative instances, meeting with varying frequency and participation, agendas and orders of the day. Another difference would be in the varying technical assistance of commissions and structures ad hoc (commissions and reflective and prospective groups more or less technical), by internal teams of statistic support, of study, of evaluation units, and even by external consultants, whether private or public.

All these tasks generate collegiate dynamics which mean that decisions taken have to be the result of agreements and consensus and that, in theory, involve the larger part of the university community with varying degrees of participation. In practice, though, these processes can only

be slow and frustrating. The intermediate level posts, elected by their peers, take risky decisions with great difficulty as they can go against the interests of the peers who elect them. The predominance of the collegiate-bureaucratic model, though, does not impede that certain services or even certain positions have a working model closer to that of a corporation or even to business models.

At the hour of analysing the issue of the government of the universities, it must be remembered that the most extended posture among the university staff towards management and the government institutions of the university seems to be close to what Partington[58] describes*: "many academic staff initially recoil from the proposition that they are not only teachers, researchers and consultants but also managers, suspicious that such descriptions presage an increase in workload, unjustifiable 'job creep', and an intrusion into their academic autonomy. Those academics who initially reject the managerial label, we would argue, take too narrow a definition of the term manager. Academics have always been required to carry out a number of management roles, but management has often been seen a relatively unimportant adjunct to academic matters, as a constraint on academics' freedom and as a low status activity. Management is often equated with 'managerialism' and confused with unhelpful (even unnecessary) administration and bureaucracy. In a self-regulating academic community, the control paradigm associated with management is seen as inappropriate. The lack of a systematic and progressive structure of preparation and development/training for management positions and for management elements which are part of all roles in higher education has not helped matters."*

As a matter of fact, members of all staff groups in a university contribute to its management. That is not to diminish management as an activity; rather the reverse. It is to emphasize that it is a collective activity and not the exclusive preserve of a small group labelled 'the management'. Anyone who has responsibility for resources, finance, staff, curriculum organization, student guidance, equipment, systems, and/or processes, is a manager in a wider definition.

The system of government is based on unipersonal positions (Rector, Vice-rector, Deans, Centre Directors, General Secretary...) and collegiate organs (Faculties, Government Board, Faculty and Department Boards...). In most European universities, the high-level Government posts are through an election process : Rectors, Presidents, Vice-Chancellors, Principals… They are chosen by representative entities of the university ranks, even though there is a clear predominance of the teaching bodies.

The Rectors, once elected, are in some cases obliged to present a report on their annual activity in front of the University Senate or Assembly (Spain, Germany..), but in others there is no obligation in this sense (Norway, France, Italy; in Italy there is obligation to do an annual report in front of the Ministry, even though the minister does not have the power to dismiss them if they do it badly…). However, deliberation organs exist presided over by them and to whom they often must account for expenditure when it comes to making decisions, as in most cases the proposals require their approval.

---

[58]. Partington P. (1996), "Leadership and Management Development for Academic Staff in Higher Education", in Rodriguez S., Rotger J.M., Martinez F. Formacion y desarollo para la docencia y gestion universitaria, Barcelona, CEDECS.

Around this, however, there appears the importance and the strengthening of the figure of the rectors in determining University politics, something that prepares for the autonomy gained by the universities with the most recent reforms and, to its growing discredit, caused by the ineffectiveness of the traditional collegiate system in decision taking. The leadership and organisational ability of some rectors, together with their ability to delegate, has started positive, innovative dynamics in some of the universities analysed. In some cases, there has existed a policy expressly for strengthening the rector's power. This is clearly illustrated in Germany where appears the willingness to professionalise their role.

What does seem quite clear is that in the majority of cases it has lengthened the term of office for rectors in harmony with the quite contrasting hypothesis that the length of the term of office correlates with their strength and decision-making capabilities and performance …

1.2. A complex organization which needs administrative and services support

Given the enormous variety of jobs to be developed on the part of the university, many of them are carried out by non-academic staff. This has meant that in all the universities there is a clear division of functions between academic staff and those people responsible for all other tasks and services, without academic personnel losing their pre-eminence. For all these responsibilities, there is only one post that is concerned with managing economic affairs : Gerente (Spain), General Director (Norway), Secrétaire Général (France), Chancellor (Germany), Administrador (Portugal), Direttore Administrativo (Italy), Administrative Director (Finland).

In most of the cases analysed, the management figure depends on the Rector or the academic responsible for this, even though there are cases where a higher degree of independence is relied upon. In the case of Spain, France, Germany and Italy, they are nominated and suspended by the Rector, even though in the case of Germany and Italy, they have to be civil servants. In the case of Norway, however, the management figure is elected by the Committee Director, having a great deal of independence in his election.

Administration and services personnel, in occupying themselves with basic but diverse jobs, are not organised, like the academic staff, by professions. Their influence is always less when it is not subordinated with respect to the academics. However, they are in the centre of the rationalisation of the organisation of the academic work. It is not surprising that, between administration and services personnel and academic personnel, there is, on occasion or over particular issues, a certain level of more or less obvious tension… In whichever case, the usual tendency is that the dependency of administrative and services personnel is normally subordinate to the academic estate.

1.3. The professorship corporation

The academic staff, made up of a corps set of organized professionals, divided according to academic teaching and research areas, has acquired a peculiar set of characteristics and behaviours which on occasions follow the purest mandarin tradition. The professors have the monopoly of university access, and they establish the limits between areas of study, determine the pass levels of the academic curriculum, create the requisite structures that are necessary to obtain a degree, negotiate with the controlling authorities and are internally and externally

organized, creating national and international networks in order to develop research and share areas of study. In most European countries it is an integral part of the public domain.

This brings about a subtle, but perfectly hierarchical, power structure, where the professors exercise their influence and control seeing as they are the key to access the different levels of the profession, and certain academic posts are served for them in an exclusive way.

Academic prestige normally comes from competence in the scientific field, and is manifested in the first instance through research and publications, and in second place through teaching. Academic management, especially that which is developed by intermediate level posts, normally requires a lot of dedication and work which, in many cases, does not count on the legal capability of decision making nor the necessary administrative support.

Time dedicated to management, therefore, is often considered on the part many academics, as a responsibility that takes up time from research and teaching tasks, for which reason they are not very popular. This happens most often in the intermediate level posts which do not offer the same possibility that the highest level posts have to access certain »productive relationships» so they end up being occupied by the last newcomer who does not have many possibilities for succeeding in research and teaching. This could, in some of the most extreme cases, become a means of selection by exclusion or, what would be worse, incompetence…

This complex framework of university decision making , which has certain aspects of democracy and participation, but which in short is clearly conditioned by the power of particular bodies and mandarins, results in a great discretionality to the top managers of the university institution.

The intermediate level posts, who are normally not involved in the taking of conflictive decisions, make sure that the greater part of compromising topics end up on the Rectors or the President’s teams tables. This means that these people are decisive in political dynamics and government of the university, especially in the small or intermediate size or newly created universities.

The tendency to leave responsibility for decision making in the hands of the rectorate has considerably strengthened the tendency to reinforce central power in the university and, in practice, has weakened collegiate management, even whilst these maintain quite high validity in certain cases (specially when the president is «weak» and does not have enough prestige, or leadership capacity).

From what we have just stated, a growing difficulty occurs in covering certain elective posts, specially at the lower and intermediate level. The reason is that they are not prestigious positions, they do not facilitate "useful relationships" and, what's more, they are inconvenient for the development of academic tasks which give "academic profit", such as research and publications, or money, as in the case of consultancy work. Also, they are a potential source of conflict with work mates in the case of wanting to exercise authority. As a result of all this, the most extended position is a certain neglect of functions concerning decision making and control for which the majority of the conflictive cases end up at the highest academic level.

This neglect of functions on the part of the intermediate level posts should have brought about a certain strategy directed at reinforcing the centralisation of decisions and the decentralisation of their application by means of existing structures (mainly Faculties and departments)

In this organisational context of collegiate characteristics, in decline but still alive, and conscience of the need to achieve greater effectiveness, efficiency and quality in management, what is the reality with regards to the evaluation of government within the universities? The system of functioning of university government is that of «politics nature», very tied to corporatism. As much the unipersonal posts as the collegiate ones are chosen. The electoral bodies are composed for the greater part of peers with partial participation from the other two elements: students and administrative and services personnel…. Can these electoral processes be understood as an evaluation process? They would not be in the true sense of the word, since fundamentally in elections interests of many different types and largely of a corporate and political character are played out. One can not be sure that there is an «objective» evaluation of the processes, although there is certainly, an evaluation of the developed job and of the candidates' virtues. This is not an evaluation as such, and even less a pluralist evaluation, but posturing by the electoral bodies towards a person, a program, government options or ideological, political, or corporate position alternatives... The elections are based on assessments of the programs and the candidates but could hardly be called evaluations as such.

In the case of all the analysed countries, the principal characteristic of the government of the universities, with difference to other institutions, is participation : the intervention of all implicated levels (lecturers, students, administrative and service personnel) in the day-to-day workings of the institution. They do not participate equally in this process, as we have seen, since the role of the academic staff is clearly hegemonistic while that of the students is weak, but all are principal actors. In some cases there has been participation from other actors present in university activity, mainly such as businesses, institutions, professional bodies, unions..., and in some cases by way of specific bodies of participation and decision making.

1.4. The evaluation of the government in the eight countries

Of the revised cases, we can only speak properly of institutional evaluation of the government of the universities in the French case.

Of the others, the United Kingdom and Finland have made an assessment of the university government in function of economic results. In the Finnish case, an evaluation has been carried out over the development of the reorganisation program of the whole university.

In the rest of the countries, those whose universities have been subjected to the CRE evaluation (Italy, Portugal, Spain…) have had a certain evaluation of the government. In the rest of the cases no government evaluation was made.

The universities of Hamburg and of Oslo have evaluated the new forms of management and, in the case of Hamburg, the relationships with the government of the Land.

The other types of assessments which have been made over university governments have been the electoral processes to which academic directors have been subjected, which can not be considered as evaluations per se.

France

The CNE carries out an institutional evaluation about the set of the missions, of the functioning and results of the institution that it is evaluating. There is an evaluation, therefore, of the government of the university. In the evaluations, the CNE pays attention to the degree of centralisation and/or decentralisation of the university, to the coherence of the direction team, to the stature of the president, and to democracy and participation (ways of functioning of the councils, representation of users, absenteeism of students and of the external personalities), and to the balanced representation in the government of the different teaching areas and places (in case of multi-polarity). Certain experts demonstrate a certain inclination towards the strong personality of the president : they value their voluntary nature and their charisma, the clarity of their strategic vision, the successful mobilisation of a dynamic, coherent and dedicated team, their capacity of conviction for obtaining the adhesion of the people to their projects, their role of arbitrator and their integrity.

At any rate, government evaluation is quite weak. There are various possible hypotheses as to why this should be so. The governments have little influence over the results of their universities and, therefore, it is useless to evaluate them. The leaders when they take the initiative of an external evaluation, are in a position to exclude the government because it is they themselves who will have to carry out the imposed changes and recommendations. Evaluating the governments can lead to destabilising some of them and this is not desirable at times when finding teachers who accept the assumption of responsibility for decision making is made difficult. The governments, on the other hand, are elected for a fixed period and this election, even though it is not an evaluation, is an assessment and an option taken and, in this sense, replaces it.

Italy

In three of the four universities, the evaluation of the CRE detected the tendency towards strengthening of centralisation as the necessary answer of the government due to the lack of preparation by the self-government and the reluctance to assume responsibility on the part of the personnel and, particularly, the administrative personnel. Centralisation seems to respond fairly to the demand to confront the necessity for taking responsibility, of cohesion and promptness in the management dominion, which come from the new powers obtained from budgetary autonomy. In the four cases examined, the Rector is a "strong" figure. In the course of their term in office, he does not have to account for their activities even though numerous decisions formally taken have to be ratified by organisms of collegiate governments.

As an effect of autonomy, each institution has adopted, in more or less explicit or accentuated ways, a strategy designed to change the existing balance between the centre and the periphery through a process of transference of responsibilities and autonomisation relative to the structures. In spite of this, it must be realised that this process of decentralisation in the transition phase can last a long time, and seems to resolve itself, in all the cases studied, in an increase in centralisation. It is stronger in the case of Venice and Catania and less marked in the case of Torino and Udine, although for opposing reasons. In Torino the process of decentralisation has a longer history and was more implanted while at Udine the aspect of decentralisation was adopted with more care than at the other universities as a result of the decision taken by the rector to proceed slowly and always with the consensus of the disciplines.

The process of decision taking seems to have evolved along a two way path. On the one hand the essential path which comes from the rector and his team and with more or less strong support from the representatives of the disciplinary dominions and the research of the relative consensus. On the other hand, the formal path that anticipates -by statuary imperative- the decisive competencies of the Academic Senate and the Administration Council.

Spain

In Spain there are no government evaluations as such, unless we understand for them the periodic elections of single person or collegiate organs that are carried out mandatorily by law and by the statutes of each university. There is, however, the obligation on the part of the rectors to account periodically for their management by means of a report to the Faculty of each university, which is the statutory organ which elected them. This report, which is put to the vote, must count on the majority approval of the University Assembly in agreement with the law.

The only experience of self-evaluation has been the collection within the framework of the Experimental Programme of Evaluation of the University System's Quality. This experience has brought to light the necessity of counting on information systems which collect periodic data useful in the evaluation of management and services. The most important conclusion from the cases participating in this experience has been that the information systems were orientated towards daily management, but that they do not facilitate the process of reflection on aspects which could be improved. The difficulty of formalising the processes of decision taking at whatever level -university, faculty, management- was detected, as well as the lack of procedure manuals in the majority of management units.

There exists in three of the universities involved in this research (Girona, UPV/EHU, Barcelona) the Grievances Syndic (Ombudsman) which produces a periodic report addressed to the responsible organs of the respective universities in which complaints that have come about in the different fields are considered. These reports form a certain type of evaluation -even though it is negative- as a result of the complaints received, and shed light on some of the dysfunctional elements of these institutions.

Finland

In Finland the economic crisis has brought about contractualisation. All universities have adhered to the system of consultation of returns, which fixes the relationship between a quantity of sources supplied by the State and certain objectives which each institution has to fulfill in a determined time period. This activity is being developed at each university through internal consultations of returns. This fact has brought about the prince of regulation done by the State, based therefore on heteroregulation leading to the principle of self-regulation, by means of defining objectives and control carried out by means of evaluation. This has also provoked individual institutions to behave according to management logic based on the results.

All this has brought about strong interaction between government structures of the university in the different levels and external agents (from the Ministry and the CHE), and has promoted, as a consequence, the role of transmitters - internal agents such as academics and administrators - who find themselves in a position where they can constitute the communicative and bi-directional drive belt, on the one hand, towards the internal academic web and, on the other hand, towards external organisms. In general this process has brought about an accentuation of the processes of centralisation whose protagonists are these same transmitters, and an increase in the power of decision making of those concerned (Rectors, vice-rectors and Deans) at the expense of the representative bodies.

United Kingdom

In the case of Great Britain, started by the conservative governments in the era of Thatcher, and with the intention of controlling some institutions considered «too autonomous» and with the aim of making them account for their economic returns - efficiency and accountability -, the evaluations do not establish the assessment, as such, of the government of the universities. However, from the results of the economic evaluations and from the fact that they assure or otherwise «value for money», they in fact infer the need to present strategic plans and economic forecasts which compromise the government teams of the universities. It would be an indirect evaluation of the efficiency of the government by way of the evaluation of their economic results, acting as pre-established objectives.

Norway

In Norway there is no evaluation of university management in any of the universities analysed. However, there are different approximations of various aspects related to management structure, many of which are tied to the evaluation of the structures <see 2.3. evaluation of structures>.

One interesting situation, however, is reported on from the Vice-President of the University of Oslo. The Senate makes an annual internal evaluation of its functioning, organised as a two days seminar : how to manage oneself, and how to organise the administration of the university are the main issues in such evaluations. Further he argued that this internal evaluation was the most useful the first year, and continued: "the next year we found that what we said the first year was still pertinent. We should have had an external support to improve. We were discussing the possibility to involve <CRE> in this type of evaluation, but we were neither convinced that a <CRE> involvement would help us to solve our problem, nor we were sure about the political effect of such a project.

Portugal
In Portugal the evaluation of the efficiency of the organisation and the management of the universities is established by law. In spite of this, the evaluation of government bodies and of the process of decision-making is low. The processes of self evaluation have allowed for the start of a change of mentality towards responsibility and autonomous and decentralised decision making. This evaluation demonstrates the inefficiency and weakness of the administrative models of the institutions, of the rules and regulations of public university management.

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

2. Evaluations of financial resources

Stefano Boffo

2.1. Allocation of public resources : a tendency to a globalisation

Public resources are essential for the universities is evident, in all the observed countries. However, an evolution is sure and allows to understand the evaluations of the financial means, their orientations. Until the end of the eighties, the allocation of resources, in most of countries, was based on a budget with specific and rather rigid items; the only exception was observed in the United-Kingdom : the university autonomy involved the principle of the lump sum budgeting. In the other countries, it is only with the nineties that an important part of the university budget is allocated by the State as a lump sum : the universities, as autonomous and responsible entities, may decide the use of their financial resources according to their strategy. At present, that tendency is observed in most of countries and with small differences between countries : a lump sum budget is allocated, even if, sometimes, a certain amount of the money is devoted to specific expenses.

Because of its federal structure, Germany presents a transitional situation and with differences from land to land : resources are allocated to some universities of the North according to a lump sum; in other universities, resources are allocated according to a budget with fixed items. In France, the tendency to globalisation is weaker. In all the other countries, the wages are included in the university budget : in spite of that, the universities do not always have an actual autonomy to decide the wages, because the level of wages is fixed either at the national level (Italy), either at the regional level (Germany, Spain). Symmetrically, when the wages of the civil servants are outside the university budget, like in France, the additional hours of teaching and the wages paid to the contractual people may give to the universities an actual financial latitude.

The allocation of resources, according to the principle of the lump sum budget, does not exhaust, in most cases, the State funding. In fact, in some countries, the lump sum budgets involve the functioning expenses, but not all the investment expenses. For instance, Italy, Spain, France, Norway and Portugal have a public funding system which has a specific item for investments relative to buildings, expensive equipment. Germany presents a situation which

varies from land to land. Conversely, The British and the Finnish universities have a lump sum budget, including the expenses for real estate.

Which are the criteria to allocate financial resources to each university? One of the tendencies is the allocation of financial resources on the base of contracts. In a first phase, those contracts fix the goals to reach; in a second phase, funding is also linked to the performed objectives reached in previous period (funding according to the performance). In Finland, the allocation is based on bilateral processes, on a bargaining and a contract between the ministry and each university; it concerns a period of several years. Catalogna is introducing contracts between the region and each university, which also take into account the performance. In France and in Portugal, a part of the State funding, even if it is not too much, is linked to a contract between the universities and the State; the contract is funding the objectives which should be reached during the following period. Norway has a funding system based on the number of students. That system is also used in UK, but, in that case, it can also be considered as linked to the performance : the number of students should be neither lower nor higher than the number fixed with the Funding Council (research is funded according to the performance). In Germany, public funding is allocated according to the performance (Dortmund and shortly Erlangen), or it is not; the principle of the contract is not used (however, we find contracts inside the university of Dortmund for the internal allocation to the departments). In Italy, the contract only exists in some and rather limited cases : the allocation is based on the number of students and on the whole amount of wages of the previous year; the part of the funding based on the performance is limited and it is referred to standard-costs.

Italy
The universities receive an yearly budget called « funds for the ordinary funding ». It is allocated according to some principles : the most important part is based on the expenses of the previous years; another part is called « encouragement » : it is linked to the performance, to the standard-costs to produce « laureati » (students which have obtained their degree), and to the objectives of research improvement. More, two other funds exist : one for the building of real estate and for the great expensive equipment, and another one to fund specific initiatives and projects (including the experiences in the didactic field). Universities have to apply contracts with the ministry for the allocation of all those resources; however, until now, the use of that form of funding is relatively limited.

France
The case appears the same as the case of Italy : however, the contractual funding is more systematic. The universities receive three kinds of allocations : a yearly allocation, called “dotation générale de fonctionnement”, based on the number of students and completed by an allocation to balance the lack of academic and non-academic staff; an allocation for investments; a contractual allocation, set up for four years and based on a contract bargained with the State; the contract takes into account performance indicators (evaluation of the objectives of the previous contract : have they been reached or not?), but essentially it funds the projects of the future period. At last, the universities receive specific allocations, but those allocations are more and more rare.

Spain
The resources allocated to each university are yearly fixed by the regional government : they are allocated as a lump sum budget and take into account several criteria : the size of the university, the number of students... Another part (particularly for investments) is bargained on a yearly basis or for a number of years. In Catalan, a system of contract-programme exists : the universities which realise specific objectives receive an additional funding.

Norway
The State has been the last public entity to establish a budget according to a management by aims and the Education sector has been the last public sector to implement that system. The universities have some freedom to use the budget allocated by the state : they may decide on the distribution of funding between the

expenses for functioning and expenses for wages. The great investments are always funded in a specific way. At present, the only indicator for the budget allocation is the number of students (and for a small part, the number of graduates - it is a kind of performance indicator -). discussions are in progress concerning the possibility to have a specific budget for research.

Germany
The present situation is dominated by a budget allocated according to specific financial items. Universities do not have the possibility to change the allocations and to use the money for other purposes. However, the situation is changing. Dortmund (and soon Erlangen) receives a budget shared only in great categories. Performance is considered as a partial reference for funding at Dortmund and Hamburg.

Portugal
All the resources for the daily expenses are monthly transferred from the Treasure ministry to the universities; the Rector may use them in an autonomous manner. The budget is calculated from a formula issued from an agreement between the rectors' conference and the ministry of Education : it is based on the structure of the budget, the ratio students/academic staff, the expenses of the central administration... Funding for investments is bargained between the ministry and each university on the basis of several years; in that case, the Rector may not change the use of the allocated resources.

Finland
In 1990, the State Council decided that all the public administrations had to pass from a budget with fixed items to a lump sum budget : that decision obliged them all the public entities to change, within five years, their budgeting system and the internal system of government. All the resources, apart from those linked to research, are included in the budget which is bargained between each university and the ministry : objectives to reach within several years are fixed.

United-Kingdom
From 1993, the Funding Councils are going on with funding the universities according to the traditional form of the lump sum budget. The formula is the number of students : it is fixed by the Funding Council. concerning research, objectives of performance are fixed and they have been reached during the period between two Research Assessment Exercises. The two types of funding form only one lump sum budget.

2.2. Evaluating university resources and expenses

Evaluating the financial means is at first evaluating the resources and the expenses of each institution or of its components (faculties, departments or research centres), regrouped in a budget (prevision of resources and expenses) and in a balance sheet (actual resources and expenses for a previous period). The budgeting process in itself, during its preparation and because it has to be discussed and decided by the university council, is an internal evaluation activity of the financial means. At the same time, the budget and the balance sheet are the tools which allow an external evaluation by specific bodies. A clear presentation of the balance sheet is the necessary basis for accountability, which, from now, characterises Europe and not only the Anglo-Saxon evaluation systems.

Which are the informations within the budgets and the balance sheets. At first, we have to insist on the point that they seem to have a very different structure not only from one country to another one, but also from one university to another within the same country. Even if there are national rules to present the balance sheets, the financial documents, given to the university councils, can vary strongly from one university to another : so, the comparisons between universities are difficult or impossible. That observation seems to reflect the diversity of the strategic choices, the actual differences of behaviour which characterise each institution.

In most of cases, a traditional distinction is made between the resources and expenses for functioning and those for investment; that distinction does not actually marks the concrete choices. Some cases (Oslo College and Agder college) present budgets and balance sheets which are particularly synthetic and which only indicate differences between State resources and resources coming from external contracts; in Norway, the remaining resources, at the end of the year, have to be given back to the State. In several cases, and particularly in Italy, France and UK, universities make obvious different items : State resources, external contracts, research grants, students fees, and sometimes, resources coming from the local authorities (University of Savoie, Venice, Politecnico di Torino).

Other differences appear among the observed cases. Sometimes, universities give importance to ***some figures, tendencies, ratios***. In some cases, State resources have increased less than the number of students (in Germany and in some Norwegian cases); more, in Finland, they have globally decreased. State resources vary from a minimum of 43-44% in some British cases to a maximum of 88-89% (Oslo College, Catania). Nevertheless, it is clear that the specific characteristics of each university have an influence on the amount of money of the different items : in France in which State resources are very important, the differences between universities are linked to their seniority (new and old universities)

In the same way, the weight of ***student fees*** inside the whole budget (they are significantly different from one country to another one and discussions are more and more engaged about the question : how much money the students have to pay for the public service?), can take obvious a significant difference in the same country (in Italy, the State decides on a minimum and on a maximum) : in Catania, students fees represent 7% of the university resources; in the Politecnico di Torino, 16%; in the UK (Glasgow and Wales-Cardiff), student fees (they are not directly paid by the students) represent 16% and 24%. Naturally, the item is not pertinent in the countries in which students fees are equal for all the students or are transferred to the student associations (Germany, Norway).

More, the situations are very different for the ***research resources and for contracts granted by external bodies***. In the UK for instance, the research money represents 14% of the whole resources in Wales-Cardiff and 23% in Glasgow. In Norway (Oslo College and Agder College), the figures are only 3% and 3,6%. In Italy, the external contracts with non-public entities vary from 9% (Politecnico di Torino) to 4% (Venice).

The ***resources brought by the local authorities***, only clearly presented in some university balances sheets, vary. In France, they are 7% in the university of Savoie; in Italy, they are 3,7% (Politecnico di Torino), 4,3% (Venice), 4,1% (Catania); in that university, the local authorities become a more and more important source of funding; at the same time, funding from private sources and from the European Union is limited. At last, in a Portuguese case (Technological University of Lisbon), resources other than those brought by the State are not given importance, and, more, are considered as confidential.

Controls of conformity and controls of relevance

In most of countries, the financial balance sheet of universities is bound by traditional rules of the public accountancy. One of the most diffuse forms of the evaluation of resources and expenses is the control of conformity : it is an external evaluation made ex-post by authorities devoted to the economic and financial control of public institutions. In some countries, some

public bodies, which have the control of conformity in charge, make, more and more, a control of the relevance of the expenses. The conformity control, which is typically an external control, is also made inside the universities by official internal bodies (internal auditors in Italy, internal department for public accountancy in Norway).

In the last years, some countries have looked for partially releasing the university finances from the rules of the public accountancy (Italy, Spain). It is not because of an important change in the financial resources; it is a clear and a voluntary choice to favour the university autonomy in the field of expenses.

France
The public control on the university expenses is increasing. It is made by auditors, who are full-time inspectors. It is a conformity control (conformity of expenses to public rules), and more and more a control of relevance. The points which are particularly scrutinised are : reserves and funds, wages paid for additional hours of teaching for the civil servants, wages paid for non-academic staff who are not civil servants. Those evaluations are looking for rationalising the expenses, for locating lacks of efficiency. Some student organisations have use official reports (Inspection Générale de l'Administration de l'Education Nationale) to criticise the university wasting.

Italy
The Court of Accountancy and its regional components make more and more controls of relevance of expenses (medical activities of Policlinico). It is not still clear if that extension of the activities of the Court is concerning other university activities.

Spain
University of the Basque Country : the Tribunal Vasco de Cuentas Publicas made an audit of the university. It made obvious the necessity of improvements in the management, the existence of practices which were not conform to the official rules for accountancy. That audit made a lot of conflicts with the university.

Norway
The national Court for public accountancy pays a clear attention for the links between universities and foundations. Foundation is a way, which is used by the universities, to have more flexible rules to spend money and to have the possibility to keep money for projects (otherwise, money has to be given back to the State at the end of the year).

It is interesting to observe how the rigidity of the different external controls has induced, in most of countries, the creation of ***Foundations*** or Associations, promoted by universities. Those structures, which are of a private nature, have a greater flexibility for accountancy; sometimes, they are looking for escaping, at least in some activities and particularly in the field of research, to the rules of the public accountancy. It is the case in France with the "associations 1901" : they are accused and sometimes condemned by the national Court of Counts for their activities. It is also the case in Norway with the research Foundations, linked to the universities of Bergen and Oslo : according to the specific rules established by the Ministry, they may keep the money for projects during all their duration. In Italy, the Consortiums between several universities allow the use of the private rules for accountancy : so their budget is flexible. At last, two Spanish universities (Barcelona et Girona) have built Foundations : they implement in them their activities of continuous training and of research.

United-Kingdom
In the context of the policies of the conservative government towards the public sector, strongly oriented by the principles of "value for money" and of "accountability to the tax payer", the introduction of procedures of external evaluation looked for a greater efficiency and efficacy, in a context characterised by three points: an increasing of the number of students, a severe pressure on the expenses, a will to make Higher Education

Institutions more transparent for their different stakeholders. For that reason, the different Higher Education Funding Councils have, according to their status, the responsibility to monitor and to evaluate resources and expanses of the institutions. They exercise that responsibility on the basis of strategic planning and of budget estimates, regularly presented by the universities. They have to evaluate the financial risks of each institution (evaluation is confidential); in some cases and when the validity of budget estimates is not satisfactory, the Funding Councils prescribe periodical audits (University of Wales Cardiff).

Finland
The economic and financial health of each institution was one of the first and constant preoccupation of the public policies of the end of the eighties. Beyond the decision of the State Council about lump sum budgeting, a law approved in 1993 makes obligatory for all the administrations the formulation of performance objectives. During the financial restrictions and the structural reorganisations of the last ten years, the financial heath was essentially heard as an economic efficiency, based on indicators. Every year, the ministry makes an evaluation of that kind, during the performance consultations et by using indicators issued from the data base KOTA.

At last, another important object of evaluation is the ***internal distribution of resources*** : it clearly shows fundamental differences in comparison to the formalist evaluations.

Technological University of Tampere
With the reductions in the university resources, one of the actual results of evaluation was : university has been obliged to re-allocate resources in favour of some priority sectors of teaching and research. The management found an agreement with the ministry, in the context of the performance consultations, to re-allocate 10% of the resources to teaching and research, resources previously used for administrative activities. In the same way, teaching and research departments have had to concentrate 5% of their allocated funding to high priority fields.

University of Oslo
The possibility to reduce administrative activities in favour of the primary functions of the university (teaching and research) has been explored. The aim was to give the possibility to the academic staff to have more time to do research, to teach, and to disseminate research results. In that context, the university Council looked for saving 90 administrative positions, by using as a basis the calculation and the analysis of the financial situation about the resources used for the primary functions and those devoted to central administrative activities.

2.3. Tendencies

The ***diversification of funding sources*** (increase of resources other than State resources) is a tendency which characterises all the observed countries, in the context in which the sum by student brought by the State is sometimes decreasing : however, the university balance sheets do not allow to have a clear vision of the phenomena; they do not give all the necessary data. That diversification can be taken into account by the external evaluation, interested by the performance : in that case, evaluation seems to encourage and to award the ability to catch other resources as resources brought by the State, the Region or the Funding Council. It is not a surprise if the phenomena is observed in the UK and in Finland, i.e. in the countries which push the orientation to introduce elements of competition and of market in the Higher Education sector. Within the universities, the diversification of funding sources can also be appreciated : it is the case for instance in Italy.

Politecnico of Torino and University of Catania
The internal allocation of resources to faculties and departments takes into account, besides the traditional elements as the number of students and the number of teachers and researchers, their ability to catch

external contracts : at present, that element is not again important, but, according to the managers'declarations, it will be more important in the future.

Another tendency, linked to the university autonomy in the financial field, is met in a lot of the observed cases : it deals with ***resources for a number of years***, allocated by the State or by the Region the most often for investments in real estates and in big equipment. However, even if in the case when that orientation is not externally imposed and when it is a free choice of the university (Politecnico of Torino and University of Catania), resources for a number of years are a key element for the rationalisation process, imposed by the financial pressure and by the budget « globalisation »; they represent a moment of evaluation and/or of monitoring of resources; they are of a decisive importance for the autonomous institutions.

United-Kingdom
The budget estimates and the budget for a number of years are the reference for the evaluation of the financial health of each university. The period concerned is four or five years, but the budget is presented every year. Budget and budget estimates are revised during the year (mid-year updating).

Finland
From 1994, each university implements a process of strategic planning in order to define objectives, profiles and resources. Budget estimates, by year and for four years, are a significant part of that strategic planing which is prepared to realise the performance consultations.

A tendency, common to almost the observed cases, is the strengthening of ***the centralisation of the management of resources***. It is an answer to the situation of financial uncertainty and of responsibility of the autonomous institutions; it is also a pragmatic answer linked to the lack of non-academic staff able to confront the new situation of autonomy. That tendency is also linked to the greater role and power of the central government bodies of each institution. It is observed in all the countries, apart from Norway (nevertheless administrative central committees have been implemented in Oslo and Bergen). The centralisation is seen as a step before the decentralisation, which supposes a good information system.

University of Catania
The central management of the university has implemented a co-ordinated management of resources gained by each component (research departments...). The management has decentralised the information system, but, in order to realise the decentralisation, all the peripheral units and all the accountancy systems have been integrated in the system. So the personnel has seen the new information system as a new form of control from the central management.

University of Savoie
In a context of an effort to have a better use of its resources, the university implemented in 1995 a budget unit, distinct from the financial service and from the accountant agency. The unit, directly attached to the president, prepares the budget, elaborates ratios of resources and of expenses. It has a kind of political role and, informally, it makes evaluation.

One aspect of the strengthening of the central administration seems to be the recourse to ***external consultant agencies*** in order to make punctual evaluations of such or such dimension of the administration, in order to legitimate the activity of the university management and/or to guarantee it in front of the external evaluative authority. So, evaluations have been committed to external private agencies for different topics : real estates (Provence and Paris XII), wages for additional hours of teaching and balance sheets (Paris XII), personnel activities (Venice), financial situation (Hamburg), quality certifications (Barcelona).

The process of centralisation has been accompanied by a process of internal decentralisation which has concerned the elaboration of the faculty budgets, department budgets... With a notable exception for France and for some aspects for Italy (Italian universities try to define cost centres), we observe, in a lot of cases, important ***internal policies of decentralisation of the budget***. They do not seem enter in conflict with the policies of centralisation, because they are based on the principle of « co-responsibility » of the peripheral units to attain the institutional objectives, including the financial objectives; more, that co-responsibility has a function of apprenticeship. Also in that case, the elaboration of a decentralised budget has an obvious evaluative value : it obliges all the peripheral structures to lead a reflection on their own life (also at the financial level) and to accept to be scrutinised by the other structures.

Modalities of the internal allocation of resources are diverse. In some cases, resources are linked with the realisation of performance objectives. In other cases, universities allocate resources, according to the same calculation as the national ones.

University of Dortmund
The internal allocation of the lump sum, allocated by the Land, refers to a key-distribution by the way of indicators. The whole sum is divided in three parts : one for the general expenses (they depend on the size), one for teaching (partially linked to performance indicators), a third for research (totally linked to performance indicators).

Technological University of Tampere
A significant part of the resources is internally allocated on the basis of performance indicators. More, a specific aspect has to be emphasised because it is a radical solution : it is the internal invoicing. The university has promoted that tool which considers transactions between departments like transactions on a quasi-market, in which every department invoices its provisions to the others. Actually, the system has been very criticised because it complicates the department functioning and because it increases the bureaucratic controls, with limited benefits. In fact, that quasi-market is of a monopolistic nature : departments have no possibility of choice between different producers; they cannot discuss the prices.

University of Oslo et University of Hamburg
They allocate a lump sum budget to each faculty or department. The idea is : the financial decisions have to be taken in the places in which they have to be implemented. In fact, these two universities do not believe in the process of financial centralisation, described previously.

2.4. Similarities between some countries rather than between some universities?

The heterogeneity and the character, sometimes incomplete, of information gathered in the financial field, as if the interviewees have considered that matter less important than the others, make difficult the classification of the observed cases : nevertheless, we can try to make some comparisons and some aggregations. The most obvious tendencies deal with national features more than with ideal-types of universities (universities of general character, profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences, universities of territorial development).

Obviously, the observed cases can be aggregated by countries or by groups of countries. It is sure for the external evaluation of the financial means. It exists, under an explicit way, in the countries in which bodies of financial control are organised to lead the task (United-Kingdom, France, Finland). It also exists in the countries in which the public authorities traditionally determine the choices of every university institution : in spite of the impulsion towards autonomy, it is obvious that the centralist tradition leaves some marks which do not disappear in a few years; the compulsory rules for the presentation of the balances sheets, the conformity audits ant the tendency to transform them in relevance audits seem to associate all the

countries which have for a long time a ministry which controls Higher Education (countries of the southern Europe and Norway). On the opposite side and, at first for reasons of financial pressure, there are the United-Kingdom and Finland (this later country because of a choice in favour of the autonomy which puts the universities in a private logic). Germany seems not to have conformity controls. In the same way, we have to refer to a national context when we examine the fact that a lot of universities, in the countries with conformity controls, implement Foundations, in order to overcome the difficulties which are issued from the lack of an actual institutional autonomy.

There are also similarities, even if it is at a lesser degree, between universities which belong to the same ideal-types. Profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences seem to confirm a greater tendency to the diversification of funding sources (contracts with private entities and with the local authorities), probably because of their disciplinary characteristics. Two universities of this type - Dortmund and Technological University of Tampere - have strongly developed the process of internal allocation according to the performance, maybe because they belong to a kind of university which is ready, more than the other universities, to accept market logic's.

Conversely, the universities of general character do not have the same procedures to allocate the financial means. The university of Oslo and the university of Hamburg have transferred to the faculties the responsibility to distribute a lump sum budget : we could make the hypothesis that the situation is depending on the presence of a lot of disciplines and on the will of the management to give to each discipline the responsibility for the allocation. However, such an hypothesis seems to be uncertain : two other universities of general character (Paris XII and Catania) have strongly centralised the management of financial resources; they interpret in a different way the pressure of their numerous disciplines.

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

3. Evaluations of structures

Anne-Lise Hostmark-Tarrou

This chapter refers to the evaluation of structures, understood here as the organisational sub-systems established in order to permit, to improve, and to facilitate the functioning of the university as a whole as well as within its different components. The evaluations aim at the efficient and effective functioning of the universities. This is a relatively recent phenomenon for the majority of the universities, more recent for some than others. Within a context of an increasing number of structures, the problems dealt with by the evaluations can be summarised in the following questions: Do we have to create new structures, and carry out division or merge of existing structures? What is the optimal number of structural levels? Which tasks should be devoted to which structures, and do we centralise or decentralise some of them? How is the responsibility for carrying on tasks assumed by various structures, and, are the frontiers for distributing the tasks clearly delimited?

Three main types of structures have been characterised in this analysis: the traditional academic structures (faculties, departments, research centres), the academic structures of support to teaching and research (libraries, information technology services, centres for statistical services)[59] the non-academic structures (administrative and technical services, the most often centralised, such as personnel, finance, and study related issues). The academic structures are headed by elected academic staff members; it is the same situation for the academic structures of support (but the member of the academic staff can be appointed by the university's leadership; on the other hand, the non-academic structures are directed by an administrator employed for the position).[60]

The evaluation of the academic structures refers, first of all, to the evaluation of management and decision structures. They cover the following themes: performance control (within all Finnish universities), re-design of faculties (Provence, Savoie, Agder College, Oslo College, Bergen), new forms of management (Hamburg, Oslo), development of a re-organisation program for the whole university (all the Finnish cases). The evaluation refers also to how the study programs are run: quality assurance of the studies (all the British cases, Oslo College, Bergen), internal permanent evaluation structures (Glasgow, Hamburg, Bergen, Oslo) reorganisation of academic activities (Oslo College, Agder College, Erlangen-Nuremberg, Hamburg), establishment of minimum requirements in terms of administrative personnel per professor (Erlangen-Nuremberg).

---

[59]. It would perhaps be possible to identify the "political-type" structures, structures of direct support to the leadership of the university: evaluation section, ad hoc committees, management control, Rector's cabinet, study, planning or forecasting units.

[60]. Mintzberg (1993) identifies five basic components within an organisation: the operating core, the strategic apex, the middle line, the technostructure, and the support staff. According to Mintzberg, the organisations «...are structured to capture and direct systems of flows and to define interrelationships among different parts» (p. 9)

The evaluations of support structures linked to the academic activities refer to: the common services (Paris XII, Madrid); the role of central services with regard to the implementation of procedures for quality assurance including the students' environment (University of Wales, Cardiff, University of East London); and the evaluation of the libraries (Glasgow, East London, Paris XII).

The evaluations of non-academic structures include the evaluation of: non-academic staff, costs, administrative staff, work organisation, workload and administrative functions (Paris XII), re-structuring of administrative services, particularly the central services (Provence, Oslo, East London), comparative self-evaluation of the management of academic and administrative activities (Oslo/Stockholm, Savoie/St. Etienne):

Four hypotheses. The legislative context of the universities, and, especially, their degree of autonomy and their internal decision processes, reflect the national and political culture of the country, and determine, in a decisive way, the character of the evaluations of structures. There exists a relationship between the degree of autonomy of the universities and the existence of evaluation bodies that aim at their development. The number of evaluations carried out within the different types of university can be an indicator for measuring the flexibility of the university to face challenges they are confronted with. However, the economical situation is, within the universities, probably the most important element determining the use of evaluation.

This part of the chapter sums up the evaluation of structures made. It regroups the evaluations according to the types of structures, of initiators, and of universities evaluated and highlights a number of innovative practices. It concludes by recommending the establishment of actions to identify and describe criteria to promote a pluralist, dynamic, and context-sensitive evaluation of the structures.

3.1. Three configurations of countries : a first identification of evaluation objectives

The increase of the workload at the universities (increase in number of students, financial constraints of various degrees, and the higher demands emanating from the university environment) constitute a common context for all the European universities today. The synthesis made for each country supports the formulation of this hypothesis. It permits also to identify the objectives of the evaluation of structures, and relate these objectives to the three key elements of the national contexts: the degree of autonomy, the financial situation, and the existence of national evaluation bodies.

Three configurations of countries might be possible to identify, based on the degree of autonomy of the universities, the existence or not of national bodies for evaluation of structures, and the financial constraints.

Two countries with great autonomy allocated to the universities and with national evaluation bodies, but different degrees of financial constraints (France and United Kingdom).

France. Within the bounds of the statutory autonomy, the universities determine the number and the composition of their structures, both academic and non-academic, which comprehend: the units of teaching

and research, the institutes and the schools, the administrative services, which consist of several types (central services headed by an administrative employee**;** common services – information and students orientation services, continuing education, library services, informatics services **–** headed by an academic staff member. The universities can establish commercial subsidiaries, foundations, and inter-university co-operation structures. The National Committee of Evaluation (CNE) conducts an institutional evaluation, and deals in particular with the functioning of the structures. These evaluations can lead to modifications of the organisational scenery, however the CNE's recommendations regarding the structures are either little explicit or with little constraints to the universities. The CNE experts pay attention to the degree of centralisation and/or decentralisation of the university, to the eventual fragility of certain structures, and to the advancement of new managers**.**

In the ***United Kingdom***, The Higher and Further Education Act has become, after 1992, a common law for higher education institutions. The higher education system is not centralised. The universities are autonomous, have their own laws, and create the desired structures. The size of the universities varies considerably. The Higher Education Funding Councils (HEFC), one per region, conduct external evaluations of teaching and research, which constitute the basis for the allocation of resources. The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) has the purpose of ranking the research published by the institutions of higher education in a scale from 1 to 5. The Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) has the mission of carrying out audits of the measures implemented for quality assurance of the studies, and it has assessed the three universities that participated in the EVALUE study.

The large statutory autonomy of the university and the existence of national evaluation bodies are common features of the evaluation systems in the two countries. However, they differ in other central aspects. In Great Britain, the national evaluation system of higher education is very centralised and well developed indicators are used for measuring performance and costs. In this country, there is also a close connection between the results of evaluations and the resource allocations. In France, the evaluation system of higher education tends to greater diversification, with the results less directly applied, i.e., applied in manners that differ from one university to another, and also between different sectors. Different economical constraints of the universities within the two countries, in addition to different political cultures (though this societal effect is not made explicit in the case studies), all these factors seem to have played an important role as a determining factor of the impact of the evaluation of structures in the two countries.

Three countries with great autonomy granted to the universities, no national bodies of evaluation, and under less economical constraints (Italy, Spain, Portugal).

The universities in ***Italy*** have, since the implementation of Law 537/93, had financial and statutory autonomy. The multiplication of the number of structures is a consequence of the need to disseminate decentralised educational sites in order to face the high demand for degrees and specialisation courses. The demand for development is first submitted to the universities' regional co-ordination committee and, after, to the Ministry. In order to verify the congruence between the need for resources and the supply, the Ministry requests the opinion of the National University Council, and of the National Observatory of evaluation of universities, and, afterwards, sends the report to the Parliament committee, which makes the compulsory and final remarks. In the case of favourable opinions, the expected establishment of the new university unit is inserted in the Ministry's program called Triennial Plan for development of the Italian universities. There is no need to receive a formal authorisation from the Ministry to establish new structures for internal services, or to create structures for establishing consortium with external organisations such as enterprises or other universities. The conditions for future development of evaluation of structures initiated by the university itself are combined into: financial autonomy, multi-annual planning, centralisation of the government**,** of the information system, and of the internal evaluation unit.

In ***Spain***, the Law of 1985 has awarded the university the right to be an institution of public service in charge of teaching, studies and research. The functioning of the university is based on the principle of

academic freedom, which allows the institution to establish its statutes and other regulations for internal operation, its budget allocations, and the management of its properties. The constitutional university law gives the university the right to establish its internal structure, except the right to establish faculties or institutes. Foundations are created by some universities in order to manage research contracts, for continuing education, or for transference of technology. Certain universities, especially the University of Barcelona, have established programs to enhance quality.

In ***Portugal***, the Law no. 108 of September 1988 has awarded statutory autonomy to the Portuguese universities with regard to scientific, pedagogical, administrative, financial, and educational issues. The multiplication of public universities, the diversification of courses offered, and the acquisition of autonomy constitute the most remarkable aspects of the development observed in the last three decades. The evaluation of organisational effectiveness and of management of the universities is written down in the law for evaluation of higher education (Law no. 38, November 1994). The first evaluations and self-evaluations have permitted to start a change in the mentality towards responsibility for autonomous and decentralised decision making. They have, for example, shown the ineffectiveness and the weakness of the institutions' administrative models, of the normative framework for their public management, of their data banks, and the lack of modern management tools. Three of the four case studies, have recurred to an evaluation conducted within the framework of the Conference of European Rectors (CRE), which has encouraged them to implement a strategic planning and to develop their capacity to change.

Besides the autonomy of the universities, another common trait uniting these three countries is their interest to put on the agenda the importance of a better understanding of the use of evaluation actions. The evaluation of teaching and the evaluation of common and administrative services have, before anything else, been the main concern for evaluation. None of these three countries have yet implemented national, formal and external evaluation of the universities. The absence of a strong financial pressure might explain the weak development of the internal evaluation of structures.

Three countries with less autonomy of the universities, and on their way towards the establishment of an evaluation body external to the universities (Finland, Norway, Germany)

In ***Finland,*** the new general law for the universities, will be put into effect in the summer of 1998. This law defines the missions, rules, and principles which constitute the basis upon which the universities shall define their acts, which always must be approved by the State Council. This new law does not replace the other 20 laws for the universities. The new law tends to give a larger decisional power to the universities, as for example regarding the establishment of new structures at the faculty level. A Program for the development of the universities' structures has been established with the purpose of advancing the evaluation of cost-benefits for control of public funds in heavy decrease. This program is formulated as nine projects of evaluation, and it comprehends detailed propositions for the reorganisation of each university. The Council for Higher Education is in charge of operating the plan by means of a global evaluation of the higher education system, and by supplying recommendations for this reorganisation

In ***Norway,*** the law for universities and colleges of 1995 determines a main structure common to all institutions of higher education, which consists of: a Steering Committee (which has the total responsibility for the decisions), a University Council, an elected President and an elected Vice-President, a nominated General Director, and two obligatory levels of management (with autonomy to create a third level of management). The universities can decide about the number of committees, the type of departments at the central level, the types of academic and non-academic positions to be created within the budget limits. A national evaluation of the College Reform has been implemented by the Ministry of Education. This evaluation focuses on the functioning of the Steering Committee and the Councils of each institution, on the division of work between the elected academic bodies and the administrative managers. The University of Bergen has established an evaluation system of courses/studies, research, and of the administrative services, which is highly participative. The University of Oslo has effectuated an extensive evaluation of the functioning of the total of the administrative services.

In ***Germany***, the federal law of 1976 defines the general framework to be respected by the government of the *Länder***.** The financial crisis (reduced and lump sum budgets) has urged the autonomous universities to increase their effectiveness and to carry out extended evaluations. As a consequence, there is a development of strategic planning, performance indicators are established, and new functions are created.

Among these three countries, Finland has gone farthest in their direct mode of conducting a process of change of the universities by means of evaluation. Germany and Norway have experienced considerable reduction in their budgets, but nothing if compared with Finland, where the evaluations also lead directly to economical sanctions. The various models of external evaluations seem to develop within these three countries, and the autonomy of the universities seems to increase, however within a framework of limited economical resources. In Norway, a national body of evaluation is probably going to be established following the evaluation of the State College Reform. It seems that the initiative taken by the universities in Northern Germany to establish an evaluation body for the evaluation of structures, within the universities, can be a particularly interesting strategy for responding to the increased external demands.

The existence of external evaluation structures within the countries seems to have a different influence on the functioning of the universities in countries under strong financial pressures, than in those that are not submitted to important financial constraints. There are, however, within these three countries, great variations regarding the effects of external and internal evaluations. This fact has led us to ask whether the type of university plays a more important role regarding the effect of the evaluation of the structures and the functioning of the university, than the country in which the university is located.[61]

3.2. Profiles of evaluated structures, number of evaluations, and sources of initiation of evaluations, in relation to the types of universities

The evaluation of the structures of the universities varies not only from one country to another, but also within each country. Can evaluation be related to the three types of university? It is important to recall here the three types of universities, which are: the universities of general character, with a large number of structures and great importance attached to the faculties of disciplines; the profession oriented universities of education and applied sciences (limited number of relatively independent structures, structures of partnership with the economical milieu); and the universities of territorial development (limited but rising number of structures, dependent upon the increase in the number of degrees offered).

61. P. Dubois (1997). L'organisation des universités: complexification, diversification, rationalisation, évaluation. *Société contemporaine*, no. 28, octobre 1997.

Number of evaluations of structures in relation to the types of universities

All the initiatives for evaluation of structures[62] have been re-grouped according to the three types of universities. Within each type of university, it has been possible to re-group the evaluated structures in three categories: academic structures of teaching and research (34 initiatives, 55%), academic structures of support (10 initiatives, 16%), and non-academic structures (18 initiatives, 29%).

We observe that more than half of the evaluations of structures reported within the group of universities of general character have been carried out on academic structures, that more than a third of these evaluations have been made on non-academic structures, and that only a small part of the evaluated structures have been effectuated on academic structures of support.

Within the profession oriented universities of education and applied sciences, a little less than half of the evaluations of structures reported have been carried out on academic structures. The rest of the evaluations is equally divided between evaluations on academic structures of support and non-academic structures.

Also, within the universities of territorial development, only a small part of the evaluations of structures are carried out on non-academic structures, while the rest of the evaluations of structures are equally divided between the other two types of structures. In order to get a better "view" of the profiles constituted by the three types of universities regarding the evaluation of structures, a preliminary exploration of the data shows the following image of the types of evaluated structures[63] within the three types of universities (see Figure 1).

---

[62] An *evaluated structure* = an initiative taken to evaluate a structure reported within the 31 case studies. When the large and comprehensive initiative of evaluation comprehend, at the same time, academic structures of teaching and research, academic structures of support, and non-academic structures, they are counted among all the categories concerned.

[63] It is important to note that the structures evaluated, and reported within this study, do not constitute a representative sample. To select a representative sample is impossible, prior to the inquiries in this type of research. The case studies were selected a priori, according to the following criteria: age, size, geographical localisation, experience with evaluation. The re-grouping of the universities was done a posteriori, based on the information given by the 31 case studies. The universities were re-grouped along two dimensions: the types of structures evaluated, and the types of initiators of evaluations. In certain cases, it has been difficult to make a distinction between evaluations and strategic plans, and, also, between evaluations and organisational development actions. The evaluations of structures and the political regulations are also, sometimes, intertwined in a way that makes the classification rather difficult. The total number of structures evaluated is 62. This number is particularly low within the profession oriented universities of education and applied sciences and the universities of territorial development, with seven structures evaluated within each type. The number of structures evaluated within the universities of general character is 48, i.e., more than three quarters of all the evaluated structures reported within the case studies. These facts explain why one has to be cautious when examining Figures 1 and 2.

Figure 1 : Types of evaluations carried out on the structures in relation to the types of universities.

Structures evaluated and sources of initiation of evaluation as related to the types of universities

This first attempt to explore the data allows, also, a re-grouping according to the source of initiation of the evaluation of structures. If one assumes that the evaluation contributes to the development of the organisation, and that it facilitates the strategic planning, the number of evaluations carried out within a university can be an indicator of a flexible and dynamic organisation, on the way towards development and ready to face the new challenges from the society. But the source of initiation of the evaluation can also be a determinant factor for the success of the evaluation.

This is the reason behind the interest to identify the number of external evaluations of structures initiated by the external authorities (18 initiatives (27%): external evaluations, but initiated by the university (22 initiatives (33%)), internally initiated evaluations carried out with the help of private consulting firms (only 4 initiatives(6%)), and total internally initiated evaluations by the governing body, or by the President of the university (22 initiatives (33%)).

A distribution of the evaluations of structures according to the type of initiator shows three different types of evaluation profiles identified in the three types of universities (see Figure 2).

Figure 2 : Types of initiators of evaluation carried out on the structures in relation to the types of universities.

Within the universities of general character, four types of source of initiation have been identified. Only a small number of the evaluation of structures (less than a tenth) has been carried out with support of a private consulting office in these universities. All the other evaluations of structures within the universities of general character are more or less equally divided between the other three types of initiators. Within the profession oriented universities of education and applied sciences, more than half of the evaluations of structures have been internally initiated by the management group, and, among these, more than a third have been external, but initiated by the university itself. Within this type of university, none of the evaluations of structures have been initiated by an external authority, and only a small part of the evaluations of structures have been initiated with the help of private consulting offices. Within the universities of territorial development, half of the evaluations of structures are external and initiated by the authorities; one third are external evaluations initiated by the university itself. Within this type of university, less than a fifth of the evaluations of structures is initiated by the management group, and there has been no report of evaluation of structures carried out with the support of a private consulting office.

3.3. The innovative practices related to the types of universities

The evaluations within the universities of general character

It is important to recall that the universities of general character have mostly carried out evaluations of academic structures, followed by a smaller number of evaluations of non-academic structures, and have had relatively few evaluations of the academic structures of support. This type of university appears to have had few evaluations implemented with the support of private consulting offices. One can relate this observation to the fact that the large universities have numerous structures and attach great importance to the faculties of disciplines.

Large universities of general character show a varied approach to comprehensive evaluations of structures, which are highly participative but have different sources of initiation

University of Hamburg. Evaluation of the structure of the whole university by an external committee "structure, development and planning of the university", is based on a permanent structure in Hanover. This project comprehends associated sub-projects (systematic or integrated evaluation approach; incremental approach: no targets or pre-determined models to attain; organisational learning is practised, and consensus is searched, if possible. More detailed presentation of this case is made under the evaluation of non-teaching staff.

University of Wales, Cardiff. The non-academic divisions have been evaluated by means of an administrative system of quality formalised by the Quality System Manual produced in 1993, and implemented in 1994. This case is presented in greater detail within the evaluation of non-teaching staff.

University of Glasgow. The HEQC carried out an audit in 1993, which focused on: the design and provision of programs, teaching, learning and communication, academic staff, assessment and classification practices. The university has been praised for implementing adequate procedures for quality assurance of its activities, which were validated by the establishment of a quality assurance office. The practices mentioned as positive are: engagement of the university in the identification and diffusion of good practices, introduction of a control schema for the new staff members, procedures for the promotion of personnel, involvement of departments in collecting feedback from the students. The responses from the university to recommendations made by the auditors have been positive and have resulted in the establishment of an Academic Service Audit Unit. The reactions of the personnel interviewed to the audit have been varied: little knowledge about the procedures (something that does not concern others than the government of the university), auditor's report considered as just and non biased, limited utility of the exercise (the university has learned little about itself, even if the evaluation has allowed a quicker implementation of actions in problematic areas) heavy workload (auditing that has come in addition to the evaluation of SHEFC). Thus, according to two interviewees, a second evaluation of this type would not add anything new to the first one.

The University of Glasgow shows an innovative external evaluation of the libraries (academic structure of support) which implies a system of network relations established between all the concerned partners.

The University of Glasgow has initiated an external evaluation of its libraries, which, during 1994-95, had implemented the following strategies: establishment of written service agreements with some academic departments, development of an academic department/library liaison policy, of procedures for library inputs, of course design and development, the improvement of the communication chain between students and academic staff as library users and library management, introduction of a standardised questionnaire to elicit views of students and academic staff on the library service. In the Spring of 1996, the libraries established a service agreement with the academic departments and students' representatives (to supply the necessary material to the discipline concerned); this agreement is controlled every year by a group

representing the three partners, followed by the faculty's library committee, and finally by the university's libraries committees. In general, the staff appears to be satisfied with the system of discipline oriented librarians. Some of the interviewees think that the university has introduced internal evaluations of central services for two reasons. First, because the Secretary of the Court has decreed that the quality of some of the services needed to be regularly scrutinised, because the existence of evaluations within academic departments led to the issue of the evaluation of the administration being raised.

The University of Oslo and the University of Paris XII represent two examples of comprehensive evaluation of non-academic structures carried out by two different strategies. Both universities have used private consultants in the first phase of the process.

University of Oslo. The project «Effectiveness and Efficiency», initiated by the university, is part of the Strategic Plan 1995-1999, and is inserted in a context of financial pressure. It has been implemented according to a participative model. In order to facilitate the involvement of staff members, it has been guaranteed that nobody will be forced to resign. The project aims at the improvement of effectiveness and efficiency in the support functions of the basic activities of the university: teaching, research, service to the students and to the environment. It has resulted in numerous propositions, among which some have already been applied: a clarification of the division of responsibilities and workload between the different levels and units (to have only one administration and not three, to do in each level what is the most pertinent to do), reduction of redundant tasks (tasks carried out both by academic and non-academic staff, or at various levels of the organisation), reduction of the number of advisory committees at all levels (their secretariat occupies full-time non-teaching staff, development of information systems, improvement of professional qualifications and of mobility. 90 non-teaching position have already been re-defined for basic activities at the university. A new budget model is under development, and it focuses on: determination of levels and of types of employment positions needed to meet the needs of administrative services at the different levels. The proposition of closing the permanent committees at the central level has been, postponed, but a merge of administrative services of the units of studies, research and international relations has taken place. The reactions towards the project registered in the interviews vary in relation to the interviewees' working level, and according to the type of position occupied and functions carried out. The negative reactions have been considerable. A surprising effect of this project is that the departments which were supposed to gain resources by the reduction of the number of non-academic staff were, nearly, without exemption, defending their own administrative positions of heads of department. This result can be interpreted as a desire to reduce the administrative costs elsewhere, but not at home. Within a context of increased centralisation, the desire to reduce the number of central services can be explained by the will to counterbalance this centralising development.

University of Paris XII. The university always takes the initiative for evaluations, even when it participates in national operations. The university sees itself as pioneer. In spite of this, the great difficulty is to perpetuate the evaluation devices and follow up actions. In 1992-93, it was decided to re-structure the services of personnel and of remuneration, following an informal evaluation that identified a weak performance of these services, in order to face the new demands resulting from the "de-concentration" and transference of a certain number of operations from the Ministry to the institutions. The two services were merged into a direction of human resources, and the scattered operations were re-grouped by type of "clientele": a sub-unit manages all operations concerning the IATOS, another one deals with the academic staff, and a third one deals with the personnel paid by the institution's budget. This operation has been carried out with the assistance of the group Bossard Consultants. The approach has been considered authoritarian and has created bad feelings among the staff members. Four people have requested a transference. This difficult operation has allowed a reduction of two permanent positions.

In 1993-94, a re-structuring of financial services and of the accounts was made also after the identification of some kinds of malfunction and lack of efficiency identified after the implementation of a new data based budgeting system. A de-concentration of financial operations to the academic components has been carried out. In 1997, a professional analysis of the main administrative functions was started according to a «professional job approach». This analysis, which is inscribed in the institutional project, aims at resulting in a new definition of the role and profile of the services and positions, and of decisions regarding the

distribution between internal benefits and external sub-contractors. Two functions will be analysed in 1997: the support functions and the students support.

The evaluations within the profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences

These universities have carried out mainly evaluations of academic structures, and less evaluations of non-academic structures and of academic structures of support. These evaluations have been mostly initiated by the management group of the universities. This type of university can be characterised as having a limited number of relatively independent structures, and might, therefore, be quite transparent, and, perhaps, perceived by the authorities as less interesting for evaluation.

The University of Dortmund and Agder College give examples of evaluations that result in a re-structuring within the academic field. The University of Dortmund gives also an example of internal evaluation of non-academic staff leading to a greater transparency and to a development of the education.

University of Dortmund. As a result of the reforms decided by the Land, and following reductions in the budget, the University has established two types of internal evaluation: an integrated evaluation of the faculties, and an evaluation of the internal distribution, to the faculties, of funds allocated by the Ministry to the University. The first one examines the organisation, research, and teaching within each faculty and applies a unique procedure. The objectives are: to increase efficiency, to give a bonus of extra resources to the faculties with the best evaluations, to introduce a competition between the academics for resources, which are becoming increasingly scarce, to pose the problem regarding heterogeneous faculties (should there be a merge?). Other objectives are to re-define academic and non-academic positions, and, if possible, to reduce their number. The evaluation ends with recommendations. The faculty ought to prepare a plan and take the recommendations into account. A committee has been established to implement the recommendations of the internal evaluations.

In 1991/92, an evaluation of the administration was carried out by a consulting office: evaluation of tasks, of competence, of responsibilities, of workload, and of information systems. The results have been accepted by the administrative personnel: development of course programs (education), computerisation (in view of a future decentralisation and greater transparency), reduction of staff members (imposed by the Ministry, but not followed!). Certain changes (for instance, within the administration of students), would not have been possible to carry out without a change in the law.

Agder College. An evaluation has brought about a re-organisation of a certain number of departments, a re-examination of the role of elected academic positions, and the establishment of the department level as the lowest in the organisation, and 10 as the minimum number of academic staff members within a department. This evaluation has had a high participation of employees. A high number of interviewees have made comments about this evaluation – very contested by those who had been concerned and appreciated by others, first of all by the central level. Results: the administration of teacher's education and training was included in the central administration of studies; the music conservatory was organised as a department within the faculty of art. The opinions regarding this evaluation are often mixed with the opinions expressed about the merge between the six previous Regional Colleges. The staff at Agder College has perceived a strong and direct relation between the process of re-organisation and the evaluations carried out.

The evaluations within the universities of territorial development

The universities of territorial development are ahead in the number of evaluations of structures of academic support. They are, to a greater extent than the other universities, involved with external evaluation. But no evaluations have been carried out with the support of private

consultants. These observations can perhaps explain the recent character of these universities, with a growing number of structures, following the increase in the number of degrees.

The University of East London shows an example of an external and comprehensive evaluation of the quality of studies, which has led to the establishment of required measures, which has been positively perceived by the concerned personnel. The University of Savoie has established a co-operation with another university for evaluating how the administration is functioning. This university has met difficulties due to the co-financing between bodies external to the university. The University of Littoral experiences to validate a derogatory model for its academic structures by means of an evaluation.

The University of East London was, in June of 1994, audited by HEQC. The audit focused on the system, the arrangements for quality assurance, the design, approval and review of study programs, teaching, learning and the student experience, student assessment and classifications of award, feedback and enhancement processes for students, staff appointment, development, promotion and reward, content of promotional material relating to academic provision. The positive results are: the university has been commended for its efforts to re-structure the steps taken to assure quality and for the establishment of a multi-cultural community that reflects the mission of the university. Points to consider are: reviewing current standards and practices for monitoring the thoroughness of, and the level of variation across faculties, reviewing the process for annual review of courses, and further development of university wide procedures for quality enhancement and dissemination of good practices. An action plan to respond to these recommendations has been established. In general, the staff members at the university found the procedure of the HEQC audit to be accurate and fair. It was also perceived as less threatening than evaluations, because it was felt more as a collective exercise, which made failures less attributable to individuals.

An evaluation of central services has been introduced every 3 to 5 years in the University of East London. It has been initiated by the university, but includes external panel experts. Objectives: continuous quality improvement, dissemination of good practices, accountability of the provision of an effective and efficient service vis-à-vis client groups within the university. The reasons for such evaluation are: to assure a high quality for the whole of students experiences («The Total Quality Management Approach shows that even your recruitment policies have an impact on the quality of your final product»), to legitimate the role of central services, which, in the eyes of the teaching staff is a big consumer of resources.

The University of Savoie decided, in 1996, in co-operation with the University of Saint-Etienne, to launch a comparative study of management practices in the two universities. The objective announced is to determine the degrees of desirable decentralisation. The approach developed within the contract is voluntarily managerial «to develop structures, behaviours and representations in order to make them more coherent with the expected performances, to clarify the managerial rationale and measure the performances, to propose a diagnosis, to formulate and carry out the changes with highest priority" (according to the expected performances and the capacity for development). The procedure aims at associating a maximum number of actors from the university to collect information to the process of the diagnosis, as well as in the formulation and setting up of the changes given priority. A financing has been obtained from the Region according to a contract on objectives, but this attempt of co-financing has turned out difficult because the Region has not wanted only to pour out money and let the university make the choice regarding the operation of the evaluation. The Region demands the intervention of an external auditor: the academic staff in management, referring to their own qualifications in the discipline, refuses to accept this external intervention and plans to disengage from the project. The comparative study has not really taken off before 1998.

University of Littoral. In terms of structures for teaching and research, between 1991 and 1997, the government team did not want to create the Units of Education and Research (UER). To establish such unit headed by an elected director, in each of the three towns, would have created the risk of establishing three independent mini-universities. The exceptional solution chosen to be implemented was the establishment of management structures (and not of decision), separately for research and teaching; these structures permit a local administration; their director is nominated by the temporary administrator. The conclusion from the

evaluation by CNE emphasises the originality of this organisation at the university and its character adapted to the multi-polarity ("it guarantees the coherence of the university's actions in each site"); it validates the strategy followed by the government team: "we have to watch over when elaborating future statutes to avoid the emergence of local bastions." After the end of the exceptional statute of the universities in 1997, the university succeeded in maintaining its original management structures. In order to respect the democratic principles, the government team, however, has to accept the establishment of teaching departments within the management structures, headed by an elected director.

Conclusion

This analysis shows that the degree of autonomy of the university plays an important role for the establishment of new structures within the university, and for the movement towards greater complexity and diversity of its structures. However, the study does not show that there are more evaluations of structures within the universities with greater autonomy than in the universities with less autonomy. But it seems that there are more external evaluations where the universities have greater autonomy.

The character of the decision process in the universities seems to play a determining role on the evaluation process chosen within the different universities. The degree of decentralisation of decisions appears to constitute an interesting asset for the development of a pluralist, dynamic and context-sensitive evaluation. The evaluation bodies established in the universities seem to play a leading role for the development of pluralist, dynamic and context-sensitive evaluation, and also for modernising the functioning of the university. However, the observed cases show that the factor which seems to be most effective for establishing an evaluation of the universities' structures, is the economical situation, be it an external or internal evaluation. But the long term effects on the efficiency of the university are not yet known.

As a result of the rapid changes in the environment and the world of work, a search for more flexible structures and more dynamic ones, more ready to respond to the needs of the users, seems to be at the heart of the observed evaluations of structures. At the same time, the study shows that various universities have put on board evaluation initiatives approaching an evaluation of structures, taking into account the context in which the evaluation it to take place, following a plan to know better the role of the evaluated structure (content and functioning) within the university.

The number of evaluations carried out, the number of evaluated structures, and the type of initiator of the evaluation in relation to the three types of university might constitute indicators to estimate the degree of development of an evaluation culture within the different types of university, but do not explain what kind of innovative character the evaluations of structures carried out in the universities might constitute, that is, whether the evaluations tend to be pluralist, dynamic and context-sensitive or not. If one reads Figures 1 and 2 as a summary of the profiles of types of evaluated structures, and of types of initiators of evaluations of structures within the three types of universities, it seems that this first attempt to quantify the structures evaluated in the 31 case studies of universities in Europe, might constitute a first sketch of a terrain for future investigation.

The trend identified within the different types of universities, i.e., to give varied weights to the evaluation of different types of structures, could correspond to distinct interests of the universities vis-à-vis the renewal of the functioning of the university, or said in another way:

Does there exist a different degree of possibilities, of capacities, of willingness in the different types of universities to respond to new demands coming from the environment, from the world of work, and from the society?

An attempt to analyse the evaluation of structures of the universities, according to the four perspectives evoked by Bolman and Deal (1996)[64], might be another approach that can contribute to a better understanding of which strategies to choose as the most adequate to assure the good functioning of which type of structure within the universities. These two researchers have undertaken the task "of helping the managers and leaders to enlarge and enrich the range of ideas and approaches on which they rely to carry out their functions" (p. 14). Is there here a track to be followed in order to improve the understanding of the role of evaluation of the universities' organisation?

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

[64]. Bolman and Deal (1996) evoke four perspectives for a new perception of the organisations and discuss four «approaches»: structural, human resources, political and symbolic. (L. G. Bolman and T. E. Deal (1996): *Repenser les organisations*. Paris. Maxima.

Part Two

EVALUATION : ACTORS and METHODS

Chapter 3. The Actors of Evaluation and the Decision to Evaluate

Albert Gueissaz, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, Karin Fischer-Bluhm & Karoliina Snell

Introduction. The actors in the context of changing university policy

The partners in the evaluation processes of the universities can be regarded as actors who serve a variety of scientific and socio-economic aspirations. Their modes of action, networks and contributions to the elaboration and implementation of university policy are highly dependent on how the political system conceives the role of the university among other societal institutions.

In recent decades the nation-states in Europe have increasingly regarded the universities as contributors to socio-economic reform and to economic growth. The strategies by the European Union point to similar aspirations. The use of economic theory to formulate the basic concepts and programmes of government policy has strengthened the impacts of general political outlines on university and science policy. At the same time the penetration of government authorities to the issues of the universities has become more evident. Along with the fluctuations of the economy the governmental actors have began to be interested in the input-output relations of academic performance as well as in the cost-effectiveness of all types of university activities.

Irrespective of the attempts by the governments to deregulate academic issues, impacts from socio-economic policy have tended to favour vertical structures of communication. This tendency has become increasingly evident also in the countries where the autonomy of the university has not been traditionally questioned (as in the former Western Germany). In the countries where it has been questioned, the laissez-faire type of action has been compensated by a more or less normative type comprising new constellations of contracts between the primary and intermediate actors and new conceptions of collective responsibility.

In all eight countries in this study, the State's socio-reformist efforts have changed the university's societal importance and relevance. Academic freedom has become dependent on the ways the socio-reformist goals have been implemented. In the 1960s and 1970s the efforts

to expand the university system have been responses to growing number of secondary school graduates and to the needs to promote equal opportunities in higher education. In France, Finland and Norway the state-run decentralization process of the universities was a response to the demands to democratize and rationalize the university system and the relevant decision-making structures. In Spain, Portugal and Eastern Germany the democratization process resulted in a revolution that broke the monopoly of the State in university issues and introduced a new political and academic establishment. In principle, both types of reforms have made the State more responsive to new groups of actors and to horizontal patterns of communication, even though the traditions of the participatory model and the infrastructure of free academic action are weaker in the countries where this kind of revolution was accomplished very late. It is also worth of noticing that in the cases where the reformist policy has been regionally oriented, the horizontal ways of action and new configurations between local and university actors have become visible.

From the viewpoint of old and new universities the processes of expansion and reorganization are important. Renovations at the old universities and the establishment of new universities reflect the aims to adjust the developments of the universities into the ongoing socio-economic transformation. Are the new universities new in the proper meaning of the term or new as a result of a regional or disciplinary merging process is not the key issue. More important is to know what kinds of actors have been responsible for these decisions and how the university personnel has been integrated in the evaluation of the renovation efforts.

Today the political aspirations to renovate the university system have increasingly been focused on solving the problem of limited and decreasing public funds. In general the resulting saving programmes have been state-regulated projects introducing old types of normative and vertical structures between the actors, even though the new political terminology argues for responsibility, competition, quality assurance and the elaboration of various strategies of commercialization. As the political authorities have marketed deregulation as an evidence of new academic autonomy, the government-initiated efforts to deregulate and rationalize university activities are contradictory. Reorganization in the form of savings is a controlling political programme where the degrees of freedom for the universities are limited and where even the most liberal forms of contracts easily reflect vertical modes of action. Deregulation is a call for autonomy with a full respect of horizontal negotiations.

1. CONFIGURATIONS OF ACTORS : THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

From the perspective of the actors in evaluation and of the decision to evaluate, two criteria can be used to elaborate typical configurations and to make a comparative analysis of the links in the evaluation process, its main characteristics, problems and outcomes and of the local and global contexts.

The first criteria refers to the need to identify ***the initiator of the evaluation process***, i.e. the actor or group of actors who make the decision to launch an evaluation process or to set up an evaluation procedure and who define the goals and terms of references, the modalities and destination. Our hypothesis is that the whole configuration of the evaluation process, its dynamics and outcomes, are conditioned by who the initiator is.

The case studies indicate a wide variety of initiators in the above-mentioned sense. This variety reflects the growing diversity of the university activities and of the interplay and dependencies between the internal and external actors. To simplify, six main categories of initiators can be identified: the State (central or regional), the university (its leadership), the faculty and local actors at the faculty level (academics, non-academics, students), and finally the partners (professional bodies, local authorities, business firms), users and their spokesmen (student unions, parents, the press).

However, our analysis of the configurations between the actors in evaluation indicates that the classification should also comprise a second dimension : evaluations initiated by the State, or by the head of a university, or by any other actor may have different outcomes depending on ***the system of the authority, power, dependency or autonomy*** between the key actors becoming evident in the ***type of connection between the evaluation, decision, negotiation and action.***

1.1. Controlling evaluation I.

In this type evaluation is compulsory, its aim being to elaborate or legitimize decisions of financial, statutory or organizational nature which are made by the initiator on behalf of his position of authority. The controlling evaluation I typically corresponds to the State's initiative (e.g. in Finland, Germany, UK), but it can also originate from the directors of a university, or a faculty, as long as they are in a position of authority (as in the case of non-academic staff), or are able to use power relationships grounded on the power to decide the attribution of financial means, e.g. because of the lump sum allocation of funds to the universities.

In controlling evaluation I, the link to the decisions is strong or even automatic. It is based on the results of evaluation rather than on the process. Evaluation can be a vehicle for the implementation of a policy. The use of common indicators allows broad comparisons. Participation is restricted at each and every stage of the process, because of its targeted character and short duration. The process is sectoral, because decision-makers are specialized. Results are broadly published. Evaluation processes are highly discontinuous, because the decision to evaluate depends on a political agenda, on a sporadic interest, or on a temporary involvement. The learning process is weak, because of non-integration and weak participation, because the goals have not been clarified and because the threat of decisions taken by others may act as a deterrent, thus favouring concealment of information or opportunistic adjustments.

1.2. Controlling evaluation II.

In this type, evaluation is compulsory or optional. The aim is to make decisions which rest upon a mechanism of pressure, a credible threat of exit or a dependency of the evaluee on the initiator of the evaluation (a client, a partner or an institutionalized professional body). The decision will be made by the initiator as well as by the evaluees themselves. In the case of an evaluation by a student union, or by the media, the decision is up to the evaluees. It is also up to the initiator in the case of evaluation by professional bodies or business firms. Controlling evaluation II presents most of the characteristics of the type I . However, the sanctions are more diffuse, and may be ignored by the evaluee for a certain period of time.

1.3. Autonomous evaluation

It results from an initiative by the evaluees themselves. It can originate from a university, from a faculty or laboratory, or from a local actor. It is related to a perception of a problem, to dissatisfaction or ambition. It is not articulated with decisions which are to be taken by an authority or by influential partners, but with a myriad of micro-decisions which are going to be taken by the evaluees themselves, in a dynamics of change, of the construction of a project, of collective learning. In fact, this type of autonomous evaluation seldom develops by itself (e.g. Oslo College, Universities of Oslo, Aveiro, East London, Paris XII - Val de Marne). It develops more often from the initiative of the head of the university, as a reaction to or anticipation of a controlling evaluation I (Universities of Dortmund and Hamburg), or of a controlling evaluation II (when a university starts an evaluation with the aim of propagating its image, gaining access to various networks, etc.).

In the context of autonomous evaluation , development, learning and quality enhancement are stressed. Evaluation is « more a tool of development than an instrument for control » (University of Tampere). Evaluation activities « should be a part of normal everyday activity » entangled in a « spiral movement with target setting and development of basic activities ». In this type of configuration, the terms of reference are self-defined, there is no comparison with other situations (but comparisons through time are allowed) and evaluation is highly contextualized. The link to a policy, to decisions taken by internal or external authorities, is weak or non-existent and so are the resources that can be put at the disposal of the evaluees to upgrade their performance. This can lead to replacing of accountability by culpability (University of Tampere). Participation is broad, but motivation may be weak, because of the absence of a link between the decisions and the means. The results are not broadly published (except if the addressees of the evaluation are stakeholders or financing partners), periodicity is longer, and the learning process is central.

1.4. Cooperative or contractual frameworks

They imply joint initiatives by the government and the university (or university and faculty). This type includes contracts or negotiations, where the performance and results of the university are reported and evaluated. The universities commit to the goals and policy set by the State (or faculties to the university's goals) and receive funding according to their performance or fulfilment of the goals. This type also includes cooperative ventures between two or several universities.

2. THE INITIATIVE OF EVALUATION

2.1. Simple configurations of initiation

2.1.1. Political authorities as initiators

Even though there are wide variations in the timing of the institutionalization of evaluation of the universities, there is in all eight countries a tendency to regulate the process of university reform and the system of official evaluations by passing a new university law or a specific law

or statute on evaluation. In these cases the political authorities are the key actors although they have not always been the primary initiators of the process. However, they have become increasingly responsive to the demands to stabilize the judgements of university performance and to act as the guarantors of their institutionalization.

It has been customary to think that the passing of a law demonstrates a turning point in the institutionalization process. As the experience of Italy illustrates, the implementation of a law is not an automatic process: it took over six years to start the activities of an official evaluation body.

Irrespective of the official aims to promote the autonomy of the university system, the State's activity as an initiator of an evaluation has in all eight countries been linked to general political aspirations. The socio-reformist guidelines have been launched in Cabinet programmes and the universities are integral partners of this project. In these cases evaluation is a politically purposeful activity.

In the countries where evaluation efforts have been systematized earlier than in the others (UK, France), the government authorities seem now to be active in renovating and rationalizing the official evaluation system. The aim is to elaborate a more integrated system where the political authorities, experts and representatives of the university and business world act on a more participatory and contractual basis.

In general the configuration where the State takes the initiative of the evaluation process can be identified in all eight countries, and in each and every field of evaluation. Depending on the priorities of university policy, the goals of evaluation vary. In most countries the State's initiatives are currently linked to the redefinition of the public sector and public services. In particular in the UK, Finland and France the origins of new university reform are documented in Cabinet programme. Irrespective of a change from a conservative Cabinet to a leftist one, there is no notable change in the primary political orientation. Many of the reforms are based on market-driven ideas of performance. One can also notice a more direct link between the results of evaluations and financing. In the UK, Finland and Portugal government authorities will set sanctions if the performance of a university is below the average standard.

According to the goals of renovation the state-run initiatives have in recent years been oriented: 1) to reduce costs and develop accountability and to set up a new form of regulation (UK, Finland, Germany), 2) to strengthen selectively the higher education system in a context of internationalization (Portugal, Finland, UK), 3) to harmonize and rationalize the higher education system (Portugal, Finland, Spain), 4) to preserve the unity and quality of the universities in the face of decentralization and development into mass universities (Portugal, Spain, France) and/or 5) to establish new universities (UK, Norway).

Along with the above mentioned goals, evaluations initiated by the State are linked with financial or structural decisions, i.e. the central initiative is of a controlling type. This kind of control has become evident in the countries where there is a strong budgetary pressure and/or a strategic plan to promote higher education and/or to accomplish structural transformations (decentralization, reorganization, trimming down, new law, etc.; Finland, UK, Germany). It can also be noticed in the context of the evaluations of research and administration.

Another situation appears when State-initiated evaluation is a part of a national programme combining self-evaluations with peer reviews. The aim is to upgrade the university system without any direct link with the decisions (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Norway). The initiative can be delegated to a Rectors' organization (such as CRUP in Portugal). This type of approach is close to horizontal cooperation which will be described later.

Finally, the initiatives by the State result in contractual or negotiated initiatives (France, Finland).

2.1.2. Initiative from the University (direction)

This configuration can also be found in all countries and in various fields. It used to be infrequent in research evaluation, but exceptions are becoming more numerous: University of Paris XII - Val de Marne, University of Helsinki, Tampere University of Technology , Cardiff - Research Committee and Aveiro -Research Institute have set up their own procedures for the evaluation of research activities. This trend is linked to a closer integration of research into the universities.

The goals of evaluations initiated by the universities themselves are as follows: to promote the elaboration and assessment of quality; to reach international standards (University of Catania, Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration); to change internal organization and culture (Universities of Paris XII, Catania, Helsinki); to legitimate the direction of the university; to gain access to professional or institutional network resources and to sharpen the university's image, to augment its visibility in a context of competition (cases of Italy: Universities of Venice, Udine, Catania and Portugal, where the EU and the CRE are called in; Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration) and to keep control of the process in the face of the State's initiatives (Universities of Dortmund, Hamburg, Helsinki, Oslo, Politecnico di Torino).

In most cases, the initiatives by the university management are centered either on quality enhancement, development of evaluation or on strategic evaluation, the autonomous type of evaluation. However, these elements can be combined with elements of internal controlling evaluation in the cases where the rector or president has the power to allocate funds on the basis of lump sum budgets, or on the basis of quantitative performance indicators. More frequently, one finds a combination of both types in the framework of contracts (Universities of Helsinki and Hamburg).

There are a few cases where the initiative from the university is spontaneous : Paris XII, Udine, Catania, Lisbon, Barcelona. Such an initiative is often linked to a strategic plan, to new statutes, new legislation, or to a reform of programmes. In most cases, however, the initiative by the university results either from a counter-movement (Universities of Dortmund, Hamburg, Politecnico di Torino), from a continuation (internal reviews in Universities of East London, Glasgow, Cardiff), or from a consequence of state-initiation (Universities of Aveiro, East London - subject reviews, Oslo College, University of Oslo; more generally in all the cases of voluntary participation in national programmes).

Which factors tend to promote the initiatives of the university? It may become more evident if there is competition between the higher education institutions (Tampere University of Technology), and if the university is relatively homogeneous by its internal structure. But in

many cases, the initiative at the level of the university is due to the personal efforts of a rector or president who is at the same time deeply involved in the activities of national or international organizations. The development of evaluation practices owes much to the key role played by such actors.

It seems that very old universities are not very willing to initiate an evaluation process, because they do not need to, since they are supported by their assets, their networks and their manpower. But irrespective of a long tradition and a culture of their own, they may have to do so in order to maintain autonomy in relation to the State-initiated evaluations (Universities of Helsinki, Dortmund, Hamburg, Oslo). The young universities (less than 15 years old) are caught in a process of rapid growth and structural change (Universities of Savoie, Littoral), which leaves little room for evaluation; University of Cardiff being an exception. Their need for resources lead them to begin external evaluation procedures. The most active universities are middle-aged: they have settled down, but need to find resources on the basis of their specific quality and performance (Politecnico di Torino, Universities of Udine, Paris XII). More generally, the initiative of evaluation is taken only in a context of middle-range changes (contra: University of Savoie, Oslo College, Tampere University of Technology, where far-reaching restructurations or projected reorganizations are negotiated or implemented without any kind of evaluation).

Given the variety of reasons which can lead the direction of a university to launch evaluations, it seems difficult to classify the initiatives of evaluation on the basis of the university type (generalist, applied, territorial).

2.1.3. Decentralized initiatives at the level of the faculties, laboratories and local actors

Decentralized initiatives can develop: 1) spontaneously (Tampere University of Technology, Universities of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Helsinki, the SODA project in the University of Oslo, Politecnico di Torino, Technical University of Lisbon); 2) as a counter-move towards an initiative by the University or by the State (University of Helsinki, Faculty of Science); or 3) under constraint from the professional world (Tampere University of Technology, Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration).

Initiatives by the faculties have been made in a heterogeneous group of universities, having a weak center, and / or by the faculties or departments which have strong links to their economic environment and to professional organizations.

Local initiatives by academics or students are particularly frequent in the evaluation of teaching and learning. These decentralized efforts are often the most innovative ones. In Erlangen (« Prüf den Prof ») the students (i.e. the student unions) have taken the initiative of the evaluation of the courses, and they organize it themselves (also in Universities of Lisbon (Faculty of Sciences), Hamburg, Tampere, Tampere University of Technology). Students' initiatives depend on student unions' strength and position. The problem of these evaluations is that they can be easily delegitimized or reduced into an immediate consumerist dimension (satisfaction enquiries to be filled up at the end of the course provide excellent evidence of an approach where the students are considered as consumers of a product), or just fade away, if they are not supported by institutional bodies, if there is no opportunity to participate in the decision process, and if they are not combined with other types of evaluation.

2.1.4. Initiatives from external partners or stakeholders

Today the media is paying more and more attention to the universities. There is a tendency (except in Norway) that specialised or general newspapers or magazines publish « league tables » where the universities are compared and ranked on the basis of specific indicators and enquiries: in France (Le Monde de l'Education, L'étudiant, Le Nouvel Observateur, L'Express, Le Point, Capital), in UK (Times League Tables), in Finland (Helsingin Sanomat) and in Germany (Der Spiegel, Stern). Their methodology and the information they obtain from the universities or from the ministries is often highly questionable from the viewpoint of the academic community. The reports look at the universities from a distance. However, these rankings are examined with a curiosity.

As the initiatives of the press are restricted to the evaluation of teaching and learning, they are generally aimed at the students, their parents, the employers, or the public opinion. The media fills up a gap providing information to the new generation about the possibility to access to the university and about the rules of the game; league tables are officially intended to serve the needs of the students, but their real aim is at having an impact on the parents' anguish and on public opinion. Finally, the rankings published by newspapers and magazines highlight some aspects of university life that are considered as irrelevant by the academic community: working conditions for the students, campus life, cultural activities, etc.

The professions and their organizations have intervened in the evaluation of teaching through accreditation procedures; the national bodies such as the Finnish Association of Graduate Engineers or international associations such as the European Foundation for Management Development in economics and business administration and the Visitation Programme of the EU in veterinary medicine. In the UK there are 65 professional bodies participating in accreditation procedures. Their goals are to strengthen the profession, to develop markets for it and to keep up professional standards.

Although there are some cases where industry makes analyses of the higher education system (Cardiff, Ford in East London, Federation of Industrialists in Finland), business firms only seldom initiate evaluations. In their recruitment policy they have adopted the « filter theory » (e.g. Universities of Cardiff, Paris XII). It is the image of the university that counts, more than quantitative success rates.

2.2. Complex configurations : contractual and cooperative systems

The simple types of initiation can be combined within a variety of complex relationships illustrating interesting and potentially progressive configurations between the actors.

2.2.1. Contractual or negotiated initiatives

Initiatives made by the government authorities or by the universities, the faculties or by the local actors can be combined into vertical contractual forms, such as the ones existing in France and in Finland. Characteristically , this type of configuration comes from the State's initiative. It is a part of public policy, and therefore sensitive to political fluctuations. Evidence of a contractual system without the State's participation can be found in the Federation of Universities of Northern Germany (VNU).

The contractual vertical configurations are used at two levels: a) contracts between the State (or the region) and the universities; b) contracts between the university and the faculties or departments. In France, the four-year contracts that are negotiated between the Ministry, the CNRS (National Scientific Research Center) and the universities comprise research and non-academic staff (« contrat unique d'établissement »). They are elaborated on the basis of self-evaluation, an external evaluation and the presentation of a « projet d'établissement ». In some universities (University of Paris XII - Val de Marne), the contractual procedure has been reproduced inside the university. In Finland, « performance negotiations » and « performance agreements » are conducted between the Ministry and the universities, as well as between the rector and the faculties. In the case of Northern Germany (VNU), some contractual procedures have been set up between the evaluated disciplines and the Rector of the University, without any corresponding mechanism at the State-University level. This deprives the internal contractual system of some of its interest, since the necessary means are not available.

Vertical contractual agreements make it possible to insert the evaluation process in a dynamic participatory setting and negotiation. Both elements allow a broad participation and a flexible dialogue between evaluation and decision. However, the degree of participation is highly dependent upon the way the head of the university organizes internal evaluation and project construction processes. Moreover, the content of the negotiation depends on the willingness of the ministry (or the university) to favour global rather than dispersed negotiations (for the French experience <C. Musselin, 1997>[65]), and on its capability to honour pledges on a long-term basis. It also depends on the possibility to increase the resources if the results of evaluation are favourable. This contractual form is highly unstable, as it combines contradictory elements: devices which correspond to the logic of controlling evaluation I, such as the use of quantitative indicators triggering off automatic decisions of resource allocation on a global basis (« distribution keys ») along with the approaches which favour negotiations on a project (see the Finnish case studies). The correspondences between the goals defined by the ministry and the goals defined by the university and between the projects of the university and the specific projects of its parts, are not well-balanced. This instability leaves however, room for evolution.

The problem of how the two approaches can be combined seems to be left open in the countries or regions where no link exists between evaluation and the allocation of funds, except for research (Italy, Spain, Portugal and Norway).

2.2.2. Cooperative initiatives: bilateral or federate

The case studies demonstrate several experiments in « benchmarking » between two or several universities: the University of Oslo with the University of Stockholm (SODA project in 1995 that centered on the administrative support functions and their link with teaching and research); the University of Helsinki with the universities of Stockholm, Amsterdam and Oulu; the University of Lisbon with the University of Amsterdam; the University of Savoie with the University of Saint-Etienne, etc. These experiments have been based on joint initiatives of two or several universities providing interesting examples of participatory « cross-evaluation ».

---

[65]. Musselin Christine, 1997, "Les universités à l'épreuve du changement : préparation et mise en oeuvre des contrats d'établissement", *Sociétés Contemporaines*, 28, 79-102.

Bilateral configurations allow an opportunity to establish a climate of confidence, especially if two or three participating universities or faculties are not competing with one another. Comparisons are expected, but the fact that the units compared are not embedded in similar contexts, promotes dialogue and a collective reflection about the relationships between context and performance. The result is a contextualized evaluation, where each partner plays the role of an « external evaluator » for the others. However, the problem of means is left open.

In the light of the case studies, the most sophisticated system of evaluation within a framework of multilateral federate cooperation is the Federation of Universities of Northern Germany (VNU), which links together the universities in the Northern Germany and the University of Groningen in the Netherlands. This effort was made in order to circumvent direct evaluation by the ministries of education of the Länder. Although the federation has also elaborated other forms of cooperation between the member universities (for example the student exchange), an important part of its activity is to organize and support qualitative evaluation of disciplines, based on a system of self-evaluation, peer review and follow-up. An important feature of this arrangement is that it includes universities which depend on several regional governments (Länder). This allows a cross-institutional evaluation of disciplines that is comparative in some degree but also contains built-in safeguards against decontextualized comparisons. Moreover, the absence of a direct link with the ministries has made it possible to include a university from the previous GDR (University of Rostock). It was severely hurt in the beginning of the 90's by government-controlled « evaluations » as it became a focus of radical renovations and therefore was highly suspicious of any kind of judgements.

Horizontal multilateral cooperative forms of the federate type make it possible to disconnect evaluation from decisions, which means a less threatening process for the evaluees. At the same time they allow a greater credibility vis-à-vis external actors, giving access to larger resources and a stronger institutional anchorage. But the problem of the attribution of means to implement the conclusions of the evaluation (Hamburg), as well as the problem of implication of decision-makers (Rostock) are not solved.

In the so-called « Dutch model », and more generally, in the various types of autonomous evaluation, the definition of the terms of reference, e.g. the quality standards, is left to the evaluated units, to the professionals of the discipline themselves. A spiral of a progressive definition of quality is supposed to be set into motion. Each stage of evaluation starts with a definition of quality being related to the results of the previous stage. Nevertheless in most countries, this kind of evaluation process is still in its initial phase, the evaluation process is in reality left without terms of reference. This problem has been discussed by the VNU.

The Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) in the UK, and in a less institutionalized degree, the Consortium of the Universities in Northern Italy, as well as the programmes of the CRE (Conférence des Recteurs Européens) in Italy (Universities of Venice, Udine - consortium, Catania), of the CRE and of the National Conference of Rectors in Portugal (Universities of Aveiro, Lisbon, Technical University of Lisbon), of the CPU in France (Agence de Modernisation) may be considered as ***multilateral cooperative ventures*** which are disconnected from State decisions, even if most of them proceed from an initiative of the State. Such is also the case of many international programs (DG XII, XVI, XXII, cf. Savoie).

It is difficult to find examples where cooperative ventures include external stakeholders, clients or partners. There are none for the media, except in Helsinki (Helsingin Sanomat). There are

some examples where representatives from business firms (or local authorities) take part in evaluations as participants in the councils, in evaluation bodies (Politecnico di Torino), in the definition of curricula (accreditation by professional bodies) or of diploma (« validation d'acquis » in France <see the report on education / employment relationship>).

2.3. The dialogue between initiatives and the problem of coordination

It seems that a combined set of evaluation initiatives is not the most frequent initiation, but an uncontrolled accumulation of evaluation ventures, launched independently by the various actors and/or bodies from whom evaluation tasks have been commissioned or delegated to. This reflects the plurality of activities in the universities and the plurality of the stakeholders and goals. Three problems result from the situation: a problem of priorities, a problem of timing (calendar), and a problem of coordination (coherence). These problems have been emphasized in several of the case studies: Aix-Marseille I, Glasgow, Tampere University of Technology, Tampere, Oslo. The head of the university, or a special body may be able to master these three problems, but this is not generally the case. The piling up of evaluation procedures with heterogeneous time-tables, terms of reference, methodologies, and so on, leads to heavy work-load, confusion, and demotivation of the actors. Moreover, there is some evidence of initiatives at the level of a university or a faculty which have been hindered by an initiative taken at the national level (University of Aveiro).

It may happen that an initiative triggers off another initiative, or is strengthened by an another initiative. A top-down effect can be observed in many case studies: in some cases, a central initiative leads the heads of the universities to jump into the process in a proactive way, in order to keep control of the orientation (Universities of Dortmund, Helsinki, Hamburg, Politecnico di Torino). In other cases, the university takes a reactive counter-initiative (Tampere, Erlangen-Nuremberg, Aix-Marseille I, Savoie, Littoral), when it does not succeed in mastering the framework of the evaluation. In other cases initiatives at the university level develop in the wake of a central initiative (Aveiro, East London -subject review-, Oslo College, University of Oslo) or of the development of contractual procedures between the State and the universities, leading to the development of contractual procedures inside the university (Paris XII - Val de Marne, Tampere University of Technology, University of Helsinki).

It thus appears that the universities do not take initiatives in a default of the State - a possible exception being Italy. This would mean that central initiatives in the field of evaluation are not necessarily a hindrance to the development of the initiatives at the level of the universities.

A bottom-up dynamic effect can also be observed in some cases: for instance local initiatives by academics or students, or even by non academic staff may be supported and followed up by the head of the university, or by permanent bodies. They may also be left alone, in which case their duration is rather short (e.g. the initiatives by students, in Erlangen-Nuremberg). In the same way, the government authorities can propagate and support experiments made by « pilot universities », or not. And finally, a process of diffusion of evaluation initiatives can be taken by the universities which are capable of taking the leadership.

It would be very useful to investigate the crucial role played in these diffusion processes by « transversal » actors, such as the rectors and presidents, chancellors or general secretaries of the universities, who are active in various State commissions, professional bodies, networks

linked with Rectors' conferences, etc. This would require another framework of analysis and another methodology (see proposals for further research).

These various configurations should now be examined through the successive stages of the evaluative process. Given the restricted space, only cursory observations will be made, underlining the main implications and outcomes of each type of configuration on some key points.

3. THE OPERATORS AND AGENTS : WHO ACTS IN THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION AND HOW ?

3.1. The evaluation bodies

Apart from the autonomous evaluations, the actors of commissioned or delegated evaluations are expert operators or bodies. They work on a permanent or temporary basis with issues that are relevant from supranational, national, academic or commercial viewpoint.

In this chapter we do not illustrate the activities of traditional statutory bodies which are regularly established, either on a project basis (Germany) or on a permanent basis, in order to assess applications for teacher, researcher or administrative posts, or for the accreditation of diplomas (Italy, CUN, France, CPU). They have been formed at least partially on the basis of a decision made by a group of peers. We do not either discuss traditional inspection and control bodies (such as the Cour des Comptes in France). They can act on their own decision, even though they are frequently called upon to intervene by other actors (students included). The role and the composition of these traditional bodies are progressively transformed along with new evaluation procedures.

In the case of a central initiative the evaluation can be delegated to:

- ***the administration of the Ministry*** or a body which is under its direct authority as a regular institutionalized procedure, or as an ad hoc operation (France-DEP, directions of the Ministry, Mission Scientifique et Technique, Cereq, OVE, OC).

- ***official evaluation bodies of their own standing***, specialized in the management of evaluation, having some degree of autonomy in the configuration of the evaluation procedure, having power to decide whether to evaluate or not or even power to decide upon the consequences of evaluation. These bodies can be set up by the State itself (the CNE in France) or through an agreement with the Rectors and Presidents of Universities (UK: HEFC's and Research Councils, Portugal: Conference of Rectors-FUP-Evaluation Council, Spain: Consejo de Universidades, ANEP for research, Finland: Council for Higher Education Evaluation and Academy of Finland, Norway: NIFU and NRF, Bavaria : Strukturkommission), or with the representatives of a profession or the Research Councils <see org.nfo>.

- ***a consulting firm***: Dortmund: Land Nordrhein-Westphalen - Mummert und Partner, Savoie: Quaternaire.

- ***the university itself***, in the form of a self-evaluation report to be elaborated as a specific stage in a national evaluation procedure: France (CNE), Portugal (CRUP), Spain (National Plan of the Consejo de Universidades) or the faculties and the departments.

In the case of an initiative coming from the leadership of the university, the operation may be commissioned to an agency set up by a Rectors'conference or an international body (Oslo: NIFU; Germany: HRK); to a management consulting group (Hamburg: BCG; Technical University of Lisbon; Barcelona: Bossard; Paris XII: Bossard, Oslo University: partial commission to Kearny International in the EEP) in a « strategic management » perspective. Equally, it can be delegated to an internal body (see below, institutionalization of evaluation processes), or to technical units, mainly at the level of the universities or of the faculties.

Moreover, apart from evaluation bodies elaborating judgments under a broad mandate, part of the task is also delegated to support bodies, which elaborate statistical data, make a diagnosis of the situation, or provide methodological guidelines. These instances are:

- meta-evaluation bodies, i.e. bodies which are serving as service or resource centers, which define methodologies, organize training sessions and try to harmonize evaluative procedures. They are being set up at the national level (Thematic groups in Portugal, CHEE in Finland), sometimes on a local level (Bilbao, Hamburg).

- observatories and statistical offices (at the national level, as in Italy, France, more rarely at the level of the university).

The specific functions of these actors should be carefully defined. However, there is a strong tendency to delegate evaluations, conceived as « technical operations » to statistical bodies. The complex combination of political judgments and technical procedures which are characteristic of « evaluation » is then dissociated with political decision, which goes back to the Ministry and technical, statistical work, that will be delegated.

These specialized bodies, offices, firms or institutions employ or commission individuals who can be qualified experts, statisticians, IT specialists, administrative staff, coordinators, consultants (see 3.2), or the evaluees themselves, when these evaluees are called upon merely to collect information, to fill up questionnaires, etc.

There are several problems connected with the commissioning processes. These problems are not specific to a given configuration of actors, but they take much more weight when the agency is a central body, commissioned by a State initiative:

- The initiator has difficulties to make the complex terms of reference sufficiently explicit for the commissioned agency, or for the commissioned agency to the experts. The risk is that the agent introduces his or her own terms of reference, as in the case of the evaluation of the new universities by the CNE in France. The experts evaluated with reference to general standards, while the CNE agreed with the evaluees upon a dynamic evaluation, taking into account the young age of the universities being evaluated. The HEFCE in East London provides a similar example. There are numerous examples of contradictions or divergence

between the goals and terms of reference of various evaluation bodies, or between the evaluation bodies, the experts and the evaluee: Helsinki, East London, Aix-Marseille I, Littoral, Bilbao, Lisbon. There is no simple solution to this problem, since it is rooted in the very nature of the institution. The multiplicity and diversity of goals, as well as their instability throughout the time, can be traced back to the multiplicity of initiators and stakeholders and the multiplicity of the missions of the university. However negotiations between the various actors should clarify the definition of goals and criteria.

- There is a risks of bureaucratisation of the agency, especially if it is established on a long-term basis. It tends to produce its own routines, calendars and to develop activities without due consideration of the needs of the outside world, etc. The result may be a lack of absence in coordination and harmonization of the various evaluative procedures, an overlapping of evaluation periods and an overload for the evaluated units

- The commissioned agency or experts, who may lack responsibility if they are not considering the consequences of the evaluations they produce. Often they are not even informed of the consequences. This can lead to irresponsible and decontextualized evaluations or to loose, unstructured and consensual evaluations which are not very useful.

The « state of play » reports illustrated the recent multiplication of official bodies, the complexity of their relationships and the heterogeneity of their reference points and called attention to the problems that were to follow. There was also an emerging tendency towards the rationalization of the system at the national level. Some evaluation bodies have been closed (Observatoire des coûts, DEP in France), the role of some others (Council for Higher Education Evaluation in Finland), has been redefined from an actual evaluator to a meta-evaluator being focused on giving support and advice in the issues of evaluation (methodology, training, resource centers and service centers, coordination). On the other hand, the development of contractual procedures between the State and the universities seems to imply a more direct role of the Ministry's subdivisions in the evaluation (France, Finland).

At the same time, the need for support provided by resource bodies, service centers such as observatories, statistical offices, « meta-evaluation agencies », etc. is growing. Since the universities do not have the means to set up such expensive institutions, the trend is to set them up at an intermediary (e.g. regional) level. However, there are a few cases where the faculty or department of pedagogy has provided « meta-evaluative » support for the evaluation of teaching/teachers by the students (e.g. in Hamburg).

The « state of play » reports also demonstrated the lack of permanent evaluation bodies in the universities, and the key role of the State in their promotion. The case studies do also confirm that the creation of local evaluation bodies and quality assurance units is a slow process, that several universities still do not have such bodies (especially in France, Germany, Italy and Finland). They also indicate that the movement is gaining some momentum (UK, Spain, Portugal, Norway), and that the position of local evaluation bodies is strengthening (institutionalization, professionalization, duration).

3.2. The institutionalization of evaluation at the universities

In a number of universities an internal evaluation unit has been set up, under the direct responsibility of the Rector to coordinate and monitor evaluation processes and to supply

logistical and methodological support. This has been done mostly in the framework of national programmes or plans, or of a CRE evaluation (Udine, Catania, Aveiro, Lisbon, Barcelona, Bilbao, Helsinki). In a second group of universities (Rostock, Torino, Madrid, Glasgow), internal units have been created without institutional support. In a third group (which represented about half of the universities), evaluation processes, whether they have been initiated by the government authorities or by the university, have been monitored and set up by existing bodies, such as the councils, the rectorate, or administrative departments of the university or of the faculties (Hamburg, Technical University of Lisbon, Savoie, Littoral, Aix-Marseille I, Paris XII - Val de Marne, Tampere, Tampere University of Technology, East London, Oslo College). It can be noticed that in France, only one of the four universities of the survey has set up an internal evaluation unit (for research: Paris XII).

The case studies demonstrate the crucial importance of permanent structures, ensuring coherence and appropriate timing of the various evaluation procedures in the university, and maintaining continuity. Evaluation is a long-term construction, with a strategic dimension. It makes sense only if it is linked with planning, learning and accumulation of experience. Permanent structures are also important because they can provide support for decentralized initiatives. Even though decentralized efforts are often the most innovative, their duration may be short as they have been established to solve a specific problem, as there is a high turnover or as other actors are not receptive.

The permanent internal evaluation units seem to be efficient only if they are tightly linked with the direction on one side and with the faculties on the other. This does not mean that they must necessarily be composed of persons who already enjoy a strong institutional position. The experience of Universitas Renovata at the University of Helsinki seems to show the contrary: new people, who are not members of the various councils or directions, can be innovative. This example can be taken as an evidence of the needed flexibility in the structures.

The link between the evaluation procedures and elected councils seems to be highly problematic, even if the councils are called upon to approve the results of evaluation procedures. The case studies do not show any sign of a strengthening of the role of the elected councils along with the evaluation.

3.3. Experts and expertise

Evaluation in all of its configurations mobilizes a variety of experts. ***On the basis of the case studies four categories can be identified:***

- ***Expert-decision-makers***, who are well-known figures and have been nominated by the ministry. They make up the political side of an evaluation body and can be distinguished in the cases where an official evaluation body has received delegation from the State.

- ***Professionalized experts***, who are salaried full-time and work on a permanent basis. Their role is to give impulses and to coordinate the various phases of the evaluation process. A redefinition of their functions seems to be under way emphasizing their role as meta-evaluators. This type can only be found in national bodies of evaluation.

- ***Occasional experts***, who are recruited on an ad hoc basis for a specific evaluation or who are members of a commission or council of « peers ». They can be called upon by government bodies or by university level agencies.

- ***University counsellors*** (in the French contractualization system) or mentors (in the Cardiff system) who mainly give advice to the evaluees, help them elaborate relevant information for the ministry or a central evaluation body and facilitate communication and negotiation procedures between the evaluee and the evaluator. The French counsellors have a long-term relationship with the universities they are advising. They are the only experts who are informed of the results of evaluations or recommendations and who take some responsibility for them.

Other types of expertise tend also to contribute to the evaluation processes: statisticians and administrative staff that mainly collect qualitative and quantitative information, IT personnel, evaluees, consumers (satisfaction inquiries).

Internal experts who are members of the internal evaluation units or commissions of the universities and faculties in the context of national programmes or the university's own initiatives are generally elected by their peers or nominated by the head of the university on a representative basis. This is not necessarily the best strategy: in the comparison of Universitas Renovata to Universitas Renovata Continuata at the University of Helsinki new people giving a certain dynamics to the process were in the second case replaced by a commission that represented the interest groups of the university. A wide representation was adopted by Politecnico di Torino, where the « Nuclei di Valutazione Interna » was composed of two professors of the Politecnico and of several external experts: a French professor, the ex-Rector of the University of Amsterdam, the Rector of the University of Pisa, a delegate from the CRUI, a professor from Chicago, an ex-assessor to the Mayor of Torino, an architect and a lawyer. This combines the advantage of linking external expertise with the follow up and adds the familiarity of the university.

External experts are recruited from a wide area, although in most cases they are still being recruited from the « peers » at the national level. This is typically the case in France, Germany and the UK. In small countries, the size of the academic world makes the use of international experts almost compulsory in order to avoid partiality. International experts are also called in to get correspondence to international standards (Portugal, Finland, Norway). The recruitment of experts outside the academic world is still used seldom (Barcelona).

The external experts are generally nominated out of a list proposed by the peers of the discipline, by the initiator of the evaluation (i.e. by the ministry: France, Spain, Finland; by the central evaluation agency: Portugal; by the head of the university: Dortmund, Paris XII; by the consortium of the VNU in Northern Germany). The evaluated units (faculties) have a veto power, but they do not choose the experts.

The procedure mentioned above is different from the more traditional peer review, where access to academic or research posts is controlled by the commissions of elected peers (France: union lists). It is interesting to observe that these commissions are increasingly being staffed with nominated members.

Usually the criteria that are used in the nomination of external experts are as follows:

- ***criteria of competence*****:** competence on the scientific and disciplinary level, experience of the university´s management, knowledge and experience of evaluation practices and an ability to facilitate communication and cohesion in working groups (Madrid).

- ***criteria of objectivity:*** the expert should not be too acquainted with the unit to be evaluated, and he or she should not have a conflicting or competitive position with the unit. But even when these criteria are respected, there is no guarantee that biases are prevented.

The experts receive in general little or no specific training. The longest training period mentioned was for three days in the HEFCE). Their mission, goals and terms of reference are not often well-defined. This may result in a disagreement between the expert, the evaluee, the evaluation body or the initiator of the evaluation about the aims and criteria of evaluation (Littoral, East London, Dortmund). The modes of operation are also highly variable, and left mostly to be defined by experts who generally work individually, with little exchange of information with other experts in the same evaluation process and no exchange with other experts working simultaneously in other evaluation processes. Some experts are very interventionist (visits to courses, direct discussions with the students: Dortmund, Aix-Marseille I). Others are satisfied with an interview or even with documentation. Some interpret their role as being a judge, others behave more like counsellors or mediators.

The legitimacy of experts can originate from the legal basis of the evaluation procedure, from the statutory position of the authority that nominated the expert or from the expert's own scientific reputation or institutional position. This is an important factor for the acceptance of the expert's role and conclusions in configurations which we have called as controlling evaluation. But in autonomous evaluations, initiated by the university or the faculty, the relevant issue of the relationship with the external expert is trust rather than legitimacy.

The rules of anonymity and non-publicity of the reports, which have been traditionally respected by the peer review bodies that have evaluated candidates for a teaching or a researcher post and have been extended to new controlling types of evaluation, cannot be maintained in the case of autonomous or negotiated evaluation.

Moreover, there may be problems with the responsibility. In most cases the experts are not informed about the consequences of the evaluation and they are not called upon to come and see what has been accomplished on the basis of their recommendations. This points to a necessity to consider the problem of the recourse to experts, especially when the initiatives are made by the universities themselves.

3.4. Participation

The degree of participation in the evaluative process has an effect on the acceptance of the results, on the fate of actions or decisions which can be taken and on the conditions of long-term learning processes.

As a rule participation is very differentiated. Controlling evaluations initiated by a ministry or a central body, allow little participation, because they are targeted and must be realized in a short period. Participation is also differentiated depending on the faculty or department, where the

level of interest for evaluation is very unequal according to the categories of actors. Two kinds of actors are weakly associated with evaluation processes: administrative staff and students.

Most case studies indicate that administrative staff is only called upon to give information, to fill up formulas, etc. Their analysis is never asked for and they are not met by experts, except when the evaluation is directly linked with a plan to reorganize the administration of the university (Oslo, Paris XII).

As for the students, their participation is often restricted to the filling up of questionnaires at the end of the courses. Students lose their interest after a short period, because no changes are made (Bilbao, Girona, Helsinki School of Economics and Business Administration, Rostock) and because the filling up of questionnaires can become a fastidious task. The situation looks more favourable when the students themselves have taken the initiative to set up an evaluation of teaching (Tampere, Tampere University of Technology, Erlangen-Nuremberg). But these initiatives can have long term effects only if:

- they are supported by « meta-evaluation » body (such as SEZ in Hamburg) which gives advice and helps to analyze situations, to study the feasibility of an evaluation project, to help to set it up, to publish the results, and which gives training to evaluation methods and problems, etc.

- they have an anchorage in the institutional and decisional process.

Moreover, some more general remarks are worth making. The launching of an evaluation process often creates expectations. Therefore, participants can be demotivated by the experience of evaluations which have led to no visible decision or change, or which have led to decisions which are not related to their own experience. They can also be demotivated because of the workload which is needed to accomplish several evaluations.

The expected link to the outcomes of the decisions is another important point. If such a link is conceived as a threat, the trust of the evaluated actors will be low; this is especially true in a context of budget reductions or trimming down of posts. It means that any combination which requires such a participation, i.e. a model of joint evaluation, will be extremely difficult to maintain. Conversely, the absence of link to a decision may indicate that the evaluee will get no additional means to ameliorate his performance. This can lead to another form of control.

The quality of participation will also be different if the decision is seen as an open one to be taken on the basis of the results of the evaluative process, or if the evaluation appears to the actors as being set up to legitimize a decision which has already been taken (this is especially important for structural decisions, such as the intended fusion between Tampere University of Technology and Tampere University, or the reduction of administrative posts in Paris XII).

3.5. Sectorial division and integration

Sectorial division is one of the most striking features of evaluation practices in all the eight countries. It is deeply anchored in the universities' activities between teaching, learning, research and administration, corresponding to a variety of sectoral professional statuses, interests, bodies and organizations, as well as to subdivisions within or between the ministries and disciplinary fields. This sectoral approach is reproduced by evaluation procedures and by

the design of evaluation bodies. It is characterized of having a clear distinction between evaluation of individual competencies or performance and institutional evaluation. Each of these sectoral evaluations is guided by its own logic, methods and experts, constrained in a specific way by the degree to which objectives can be defined, means and results can be measured and actions can be decided on the basis of evaluation.

To give an example of the sectoral division, administration is generally not evaluated. When it is evaluated (Germany, Paris XII - Val de Marne, University of Oslo), it is done separately, often by a commissioned consultancy firm. There have been only a few attempts at integrating the evaluation of the administration into a total evaluation of the university or into a field of activity. University of Oslo's EEP is an example but it went only halfway towards this type of integration. The « total quality management » approach of the HECQ and of the HEC in the UK are closer to the issue with the concept of « total student experience », integrating all types of activities to the quality of service to the students.

The implications of this sectoral approach are as follows:

- overload
- impossibility to link evaluation to a larger project and to a coherent strategy at the level of the university. This is contradictory with the tendency of lump sum budgets.
- impossibility to engage in the learning process, comprising a collective discussion about the links between the various activities which contribute to the realization of the goals of the university
- opportunistic adjustments: activities which are subject to precise evaluations or in which the link between evaluation and financing is strong, will attract all the attention of the actors at the expense of other activities.

For all these reasons, integration of diverse proceedings is a very crucial question. It should occur at an early stage in the evaluative process. It is only possible if it is monitored at a decentralized level. However integration is not systematically favoured by the configurations. Controlling evaluation models are not very conducive to such an integration.

The « total student experience » concept of total quality management in the UK is one possible approach. Based on peer review, the FUP / Consejo de Universidades / VNU approaches point to similar direction, but are limited by the discipline by discipline approach. University of Oslo, with the SODA comparative evaluation and with the EEP experience, did make some progress in integrating administration and teaching / research in the evaluation process, however, it still kept support activities separated from research, teaching and learning activities. (Paris XII: experience <Bonnafous, Dizambourg, 1997>[66]. The contractual approach (France, Finland) offers some scope for integration, because an integrated project must be elaborated by the actors of the university and negotiated by the rectors of the university with the ministry, but the degree of integration is highly dependent upon the way the direction has organized the internal evaluation and project construction processes, as well as on the willingness of the ministry to favor global rather than partial negotiations (for the French experience, see < Musselin>).

[66]. Simone Bonnafous, Bernard Dizambourg, Gérard Mendel, Moreau Jean-François, 1997, *Changement et participation à l'Université, modernisation administrative : l'exemple de Paris XII*, Grenoble, Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.

4. THE DECISIONS ABOUT THE CONSEQUENCES : WHO MAKES THEM ?

From the perspective of the actors and of their interrelationships, it is clear that the question of the effects of evaluation depends on what kind of projects and decisions the various actors are engaged in on the basis of the evaluation.

4.1. The decision to make the results public and the participants in the discussion

The attitude of the various actors towards the diffusion of the results of evaluation can be considered as a good indicator of the degree of acceptance of new forms of accountability, development of a « culture of evaluation » or of the depth of the learning process. However, diffusion of the results of evaluation is subject to major difficulties in all the eight countries.

Seen from the supply side, diffusion is mostly understood as free access of a more or less extended circle of interested persons to the written reports on the results of an evaluation (in some cases the reports may be consulted on Internet: France (CNE), Portugal, Finland). This is particularly the case in controlling evaluation, where the decision to publish the results is not taken by the evaluated unit.

In the case of government initiatives, publication is favored when no link exists between evaluation and financial decisions. This is the case of CRUP in Portugal, of CNE in France, of the Cour des comptes and of HEQC in the UK, but it is also the case of HEFC's. When controlling evaluation is exercized by the consumers -students- or their spokesmen (the media), publicity is the main tool to produce effects. It is of the essence of « League Tables » to be widely published. In Lisbon, the results of evaluation of teaching by the students are publicized in the students' newspaper. But it is usually resented as public exposition and rejected by the evaluees. Thus it can have adverse effects on learning processes or on the future of the evaluation procedure itself. This is why the SEZ in Hamburg, for example, does not recommend broad diffusion of the results of evaluations by the students. In most cases, the diffusion of the results of students' evaluations is strictly controlled. Only in Helsinki has a compromise been found between these two hostile worlds, academia and the press.

In autonomous evaluation, diffusion of the results is generally restricted to the inner circles and it is up to the evaluee to decide. This rule is applied by the CRE for its higher education quality programmes. So the results are not published because the direction of the university disagrees with the conclusions of the evaluation report (e.g. in Politecnico di Torino).

In contractual procedures, diffusion is heavily restricted, as the results of evaluations are perceived as « hot stuff », as the universities are competing for resources, and as the rectors of the university are afraid of being an hostage to the results of evaluation vis-à-vis own faculties and laboratories, or vis-à-vis staff unions and organized professional interests.

But the problem of diffusion should also be seen from the side of demand. Are people interested in reading boring reports? Do they have time for that? The weakness of the diffusion and discussion of results of evaluation is perhaps attributable to disinterest, rather than to the restrictive strategies of the decision-makers. « Free access to reports » is no major point for an active and broad discussion of the results.

4.2. Decisions and negotiations on the basis of evaluation

The link between evaluation and decision varies a lot according to the model of evaluation. This issue has already been documented in the preceding parts of this report. The most important points are worth of recalling:

Controlling evaluations I may become destructive if the complex field of negotiations and political decisions is eliminated by automatically connecting the indicators to the decisions. If this issue is denied, it will reappear like « retour du refoulé », underground negotiations, etc. The contractual models acknowledges the importance of negotiation on the basis of the results, linking it with a negotiation on the project which is being set up by the university (or a faculty) in exchange for allocations.

Nevertheless, the link to actual decisions is an important component of motivation among the evaluees, as well as a factor of responsibility for the experts. This is a weak point in autonomous evaluation, and also to some extent in controlling evaluation II. In particular two situations are frustrating: a) the decision has already been made when the evaluation begins and b) there will be no decision, or the decision has no consequences.

An overly tight link between the evaluation and decision can inhibit collective learning if the decision appears as a threat of sanction to the participants. At this point, an important distinction should be drawn between the cases where the decisions affect individuals, and the cases where they affect collectives. This point cannot be developed here <see the report on research>.

4.3. Who benefits from the evaluation ? Who are the losers?

The balance of power structures is related to the ministry's ability to strengthen the position of the university (contractual procedures) or to weaken it (discipline by discipline State-initiated evaluations).

Wherever the allocation of public funds on the basis of performance indicators has been utilized (France, Finland, UK, some Länder in Germany), this has strengthened the position of the direction of the universities. It is left free to a certain degree to reallocate the funds inside the university. Either it can define the criteria for this redistribution (University of Helsinki) or keep a working margin for a redistribution (Dortmund, Paris XII - Val de Marne, Cardiff). A strengthening of the rector´s or president´s position is even greater when the allocation of funds depends on a contract negotiation (France, Finland), at least if the ministry pursues a specific policy for a long period. In this case the contractual procedure strengthens simultaneously the position of the ministry (more precise information and control, competition between the universities) and the position of the heads of the universities. Therefore a combination between contractual systems and cooperation between the universities may bee useful <see recommendations>.

Inequality in the consequences of the evaluation is another important aspect that changes the balance of advantages and power: inequality between the various fields of activity (research and teaching), and inequality between various groups of actors (e.g. between academic and non academic staff, who are liable to displacement).

4.4. Aspects of individual and collective learning processes

Individual and collective learning can be described in terms of better performance, of getting more information about the university´s issues and the surrounding world, if an ability to communicate and discuss and to make a diagnosis of the situation. In the whole process cumulative knowledge and memory are important. As many evaluators have practical and strategical aspirations, the learning process has to comprise critical scrutiny of the aims and outcomes of the evaluation by all relevant actors.

The learning process can be inhibited by a tight link between the evaluation and decision (controlling evaluation I), if the decision appears as a threat of sanction to the participants, who might engage in strategies of concealment or in opportunistic adjustments. It can also be inhibited by the absence of any link between evaluation and decisions (autonomous evaluation or controlling evaluation II). Combined models seem to provide a more favourable framework. But the experiments that have been described in the case studies have not been very successful in integrating external experts or external partners of the universities into the process of collective and mutual learning. However, some best practises are worth of pointing out.

Best practices

- ***Education of the « external eye »***. In Hamburg a special training is given to students in evaluation. This is a way to overcome the obvious limitations of opinion polls which very often summarize the entire process of students' evaluation. Service centers for internal evaluations, especially for evaluations by students, are to be found in Hamburg (SEZ) and Bilbao (ISE).

- ***Internal redistribution of resources*** and help to various institutions and groups of the university: in Cardiff the Head of the University gives financial help to some departments which have difficulties in making their applications ready for the Research Assessment Exercise, and provide « mentors » to help them get better ratings in the RAE.

- ***Constitution of a network of external experts*** by the University itself: Paris XII - Val de Marne. This has been a part of a more general scheme which has been set up by this University in order to make its own evaluation of research projects. The scheme also comprises an internal evaluation commission that has functioned more than ten years. It assists the University in the negotiations with the ministry and the CNRS, and is also a tool to allocate resources internally.

- ***SODA project*** (Stockholm-Oslo Dokumentasjons- og Analyseprosjekt 1994-95) was a co-operative effort carried out by the faculties of Social Sciences at the Universities of Stockholm and Oslo. It was an internally initiated project, which comprised six disciplines of the two faculties, namely the departments of education, psychology, museums and social anthropology, sociology, political sciences and social economy. The evaluation was carried out in parallel with internal self-evaluation and external evaluation made by the other institution's staff.

The initial reason to carry out this project was a need of having an overview of the whole program of Faculty of Social Sciences in the University of Oslo. It had three main objectives: a) to insure the quality of the faculty's activities, b) to increase the visibility of the faculty's activities, and c) to gather information for a new strategic plan. The main purpose was to carry out a comparative analysis of the administrative support systems provided by the faculties for carrying out education and research activities. Thus, <SODA> can be classified more as a comparative experiment than an ordinary evaluation project, but still having important results of an evaluation type.

This configuration gives elements for comparison and makes it easier to establish a climate of confidence, especially if the units are not in competition with one another. Like in the VNU experience, the fact that the units to be compared are not embedded in similar contexts favors the development of discussion, of a collective reflexion about the relationships between context and performance, thus favouring a contextualized evaluation, but with an external and critical eye, each one of the partners playing the role of an « external evaluator » for the other.

- ***The evaluators of the NVI in Politecnico di Torino*** comprised several kinds of external experts as well as professors from the Politecnico.

- ***« Total student experience »*** in the HEQC procedure in the UK. This approach leads to a reflexion upon the role of each one of the various components of the university system from the point of view of the quality of service to the students.

- Discussion of the reports between experts, internal commissions, G7, etc. (Dortmund).

5. CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis of the actors illustrates a wide variety of configurations where the partners look after different interests. As the actors represent national and supranational government authorities, professional bodies, scientific organizations and associations, the whole hierarchy of university personnel, regional administrators and commercial firms, it is necessary to demonstrate what kinds of consensus or conflict of interests may arise. In the words of the official argumentation, all partners in the evaluation process act for the benefit of the university. When general government policy and economic policy have come to dominate the elaboration of the outlines of the university policy, it is not clear what the benefit of the university actually means.

Although national strategies vary in all eight countries, there is a tendency to establish permanent structures for evaluation. The growing number of contractual and participatory evaluations also reflects a push towards a more standardized forms of negotiation. As both controlling and autonomous types of evaluation have become more evident, the problem of the effects and outcomes of evaluation has become important. Up until now the purposefulness and relevance of control have not been discussed in a systematic way by the representatives of government authorities and the universities. Anyhow this kind of discussion is obligatory to

accomplish the idea of deregulation. Now the most usual strategy of liberalization points only to a increased decision-making in the context of internal allocation of limited public funds.

Currently there is a growing demand for promoting a dialogue between the primary actors in evaluation. Before more open and transparent forms of action can become functional, it is necessary to discuss the conditions of negotiations. A government-initiated ability to make a self-analysis has no meaning before also critical estimations of the relevant situations from all partners' viewpoint become normal practice of evaluation. Only artificial modes of cooperation will be established, if the structures of power and the conditions for mutual trust in the evaluation process will not be considered.

General recommendation

It seems that vertical contractualization and horizontal cooperation provide many opportunities to cumulate the advantages and limit the defects of the controlling and autonomous evaluation models. They are worth promoting and supporting. However, horizontal cooperation cannot be established if additional means are not taken into account. Therefore, it should be linked with vertical contractualization formula including regional, national and European authorities. On the other hand, since contractual procedures tend to strengthen simultaneously the position of the ministry (giving more precise information and control over the universities and competition between universities), and the position of the heads of the universities (centralization of internal power), the negative effects might be counterbalanced if these contractual procedures are associated with diversified cooperative ventures, bilateral and multilateral, academic and non-academic, at the national and the international levels. This would diminish dysfunctional competition between universities and encourage a broad participation of all types of actors.

Some other recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

Chapter 4. EVALUATION, STATISTICS and INDICATORS

Anne West, Rainer Trinczek

Introduction

In all the countries in our study (Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Spain and the UK) statistics and/or indicators form part of the process of evaluation at either national, regional or university level, or indeed at all three levels. It is important to note that they are only one part of the process; nevertheless, the relevance of statistics and indicators is growing in all countries. This is, perhaps, not difficult to explain as statistics and indicators promise two things that are essential for evaluation. First, they can make complex issues appear simple; so for example, the quantification of a complex issue such as the teaching or research performance of an academic becomes possible. Second, they allow comparisons to be made in two distinct ways. On the one hand they enable comparisons between the performance of an academic and/or department and/or university with the performance of other academics, departments or universities at a given point of time ('synchronic' perspective). On the other hand, they enable comparisons between performance over a period of time ('diachronic' perspective).

At the outset, it is important ***to define how we are using the terms 'statistics' and 'indicators'***, as these terms are often used interchangeably. However, there is a clear distinction insofar as statistics unlike indicators are purely descriptive. So, for example, the total number of students enrolled in a university is an example of a statistic. Indicators on the other hand are generally conceptualised as having some reference point. Thus, the percentage of a particular cohort entering higher education is an example of an indicator. Indicators unlike raw statistics can assist with making a range of different sorts of comparisons as a result of having a common point of reference (Nuttall, 1992)[67].

At present, ***there are statistics/indicators produced at different levels***. At an international level, the OECD as part of its project on international Indicators of Education Systems (INES) has developed a set of indicators that are produced in its publication 'Education at a Glance' (OECD, 1997). A number of indicators that relate to higher education are included. The most significant for the current purposes relate to expenditure on higher education and to participation in higher education (OECD, 1997)[68]. At a European level, Eurostat produces a

[67]. Nuttall, D. (1992) *The OECD International Education Indicators: A framework for analysis*, Paris: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD.

[68]. OECD (1997) *Education at a Glance*, Paris: OECD.

range of statistics and indicators relating to enrolment in higher education, participation, field of study and so on. However, none are related specifically to evaluation (Eurostat, 1997)[69].

At a national level, in all the countries in our study, a ***vast array of statistical data*** relating to higher education are produced if not actually published. In some countries educational *indicators* are also produced. A notable example in this regard is France, which, in the recent past, developed sophisticated indicators addressing a wide range of different educational issues.

At university level many statistics are produced in most countries; these serve multiple purposes – they may be used for internal purposes only and/or on behalf of political bodies and/or by official statistical bureaus. Given the vast array of data produced it is crucially important to be aware of the enormous comparability problems that exist not only between countries, but also between universities within a country in terms of the statistics and indicators that are produced.

Despite the obviously growing relevance of statistics/indicators in evaluation in general there is ***considerable variation*** in terms of the way in which statistics and/or indicators are actually used at a university and /or national level in the different countries. There are, for example, differences in terms of which are regarded as more important than the other ones, how they are constructed and so on. One such example relates to participation rates in higher education.

> Notwithstanding *numerus clausus*, individuals who have succeeded in their examinations at the end of upper secondary general education (e.g. Baccalauréat, Abitur) are able to enter university in Germany, France and Italy. This is in contrast to the situation in Finland, Norway, Portugal, Spain and the UK where there is selective entry to university for which upper secondary examination success is a necessary but not sufficient criterion to gain entry. In virtually all the countries statistics on the number of students/ registered students are considered to be significant in the debate about evaluation. In the UK, where there is a selective system, the participation *rate* is a significant part of the evaluation debate. Interestingly, the participation *rate* is also considered to be of importance in France, where there is no selection for university entrance. Whilst in France, the participation rate may be seen as part of the process of democratisation, in the UK, the desire to improve participation rates in higher education was driven by a need to increase participation rates in order for the country to remain competitive.

In the following five sections we examine first of all, the aims of statistics and indicators in the process of evaluation; second, the fields in which indicators are actually used; third, the problems associated with their use in the process of evaluation; and fourth, the trends in terms of the kinds of indicators produced. The chapter concludes with some recommendations for the sorts of indicators that might be considered in relation to evaluation.

1. Aims of statistics and indicators in evaluation

Our study enables us to distinguish five different aims in terms of the ways in which statistics and/or indicators are actually used in the countries and universities in our study. However, it is important to note that they are not all used in these different ways in each of the countries.

---

[69]. Eurostat (1997) *Education across the EU: Statistics and indicators*, 1996, Luxembourg: Office of the Official Publications of the European Communities.

Information

This is the classical use of both statistics and indicators. In this case, an institution or organisation simply wants to know what is actually going on in the institution and tries to obtain an overview of important developments in order to identify existing or potential problems in the near future. It is thus not surprising to find that in every university in our study statistics and indicators are produced - partly for its own use and partly to meet the information requirements of the Ministries or other bodies (e.g. statistical bureaus, evaluation agencies). In a number of universities, special administrative units are responsible for the collection of statistical information. A wide range of statistics and indicators are produced to meet anticipated political and public demands – clear examples of this relate to student numbers, student completion rates and research income.

Quality assurance

In the universities that participated in the study, statistics and indicators were rarely the *focus* in the quality assurance process. Nevertheless, there are several examples where statistics and indicators are considered to be a reflection of 'quality', for example:

Comparative statistics on the labour market performance of students from different universities are often thought to help universities improving the quality of their courses and teaching;

Comparative statistics on the research performance of departments are thought to have the effect of increasing the effort of these institutions to improve their research activities (e.g. in Finland and the UK);

Peer review processes usually contain some form of self-evaluation of the department/institution as their first step. A considerable part of this self-evaluation is concerned with producing and gathering systematic information about the department/institution, students, teaching and research, administration and so on. The information thus obtained is frequently illuminating in its own right. Once such statistics are available, weaknesses can be identified and the need for quality assurance processes becomes apparent. In Germany, for example, institutions have been alarmed by high drop-out-rates of students. These have resulted in universities trying to establish reasons for this – both within the university context and outside it. In other countries (e.g. Portugal, the UK) the provision of statistical information has enabled self-evaluative 'feedback loops' to be established in an attempt to improve the quality of teaching, administrative services and so on.

Reduction of expenses

In some countries (e.g. Finland, Norway, UK, parts of Germany) statistics and/or indicators are also used in efforts to reduce expenditure and make 'efficiency savings'. The main information sources for such efforts are comparative data on 'costs per student per subject per year'. As there are sometimes considerable differences in this indicator between universities it may be used to help the 'expensive' universities/departments to find possible areas of cost reduction. In some countries such comparisons are also carried out to evaluate the administrative units of universities.

Distribution of resources

A growing tendency can be observed to link evaluation results with the distribution of resources. In some countries this has been linked to the marketisation of higher education, with governments 'rewarding' successful universities/departments, so installing democratic control over the higher education system. In some countries there is a direct link between the indicators and the resources (e.g. in Finland, for a small but growing part of the budget; in Italy; in the UK more than 90% of the research budget is allocated on such a basis).

Finland
In the evaluation of research in Finland, there are five dimensions - quality, activity, impact, activity in producing post-graduate degrees and activity in the service of the academic community. Each dimension consists of two to four indicators which are weighted. The indicators form the basic information for the evaluation. Quality of research consists of three indicators, publications in international journals, books and articles in books by international publishers and number of citations by other researchers. Activity of researchers is composed of three indicators, publications of a certain quality, other articles and conference papers. The dimension impact consists of three indicators: the number of citations, invitations to conferences and international co-operation partners. Activity in producing post-graduate degrees consists of two indicators, the post-graduate degrees produced in the subject and the number of students supervised. Membership of editorial boards of international journals, edited books, expert duties and arranging conferences are the four indicators of activity of service in the science community; data for the fifth dimension (service in the science community) has not yet been collected. The evaluation can be carried out at the level of the individual, the subject and departmental level and the School level. Data are collected from individuals and departments annually. The data collection is still being developed.

In other countries, the indicators are mainly used in the budget bargaining process between the university and the ministry (e.g. France, Norway). The same logic can be observed *within* universities, where there is also a trend towards linking the internal distribution of resources using internal indicators.

University of Dortmund (Germany)
At the University of Dortmund, statistical data and performance indicators are very important. There is an indicator-based resource distribution of some funds within the university. One faculty introduced its own quantitative measurement to research with specific indicators. There has been some discussion of suitable indicators in some faculties; external grants and publications have been a key focus. Performance indicators were felt to be more applicable to some areas than to others - for example, in theology, there is no attempt made to obtain external grants. There has also been a debate about the extent to which all external grants can be considered equal.

Marketing

In some countries, especially those with more advanced and systematic systems of evaluation (Finland, UK, France), indicators are also used as instruments to 'market' the university. In France, firms can give a certain amount of the obligatory 'apprenticeship tax' to private and/or public institutions of higher education to provide professional degrees or continuing training for their staff. Companies can choose the institution to provide this training and universities (with academic staff who are able and willing to organise such programmes) use statistics and indicators to bargain with companies to attract this money. Indicators may also be used to attract either well-qualified students (e.g. in the UK) or to attract research money from industry or public funds.

In conclusion, statistics and/or indicators have traditionally been used for the purposes of providing information. The various other aims highlighted – quality assurance, reduction of costs, distribution of resources and marketing are all closely linked with 'new evaluation' procedures.

It is thus not surprising to find that those countries with a longer tradition and/or a more advanced system of evaluation use indicators not only to provide information, but also in the various ways outlined above. This competition between universities for public and private resources is greatly assisted by statistical information which seems to provide the quickest and most transparent procedure for the distribution of resources according to publicly defined aims.

2. Fields in which indicators are used in evaluation

In all the countries included in our study, statistics and indicators are produced in various fields. Four fields can be identified where indicators are typically used as part of evaluation processes, namely, teaching, research, costs/resources and the relationship between education and employment.

Teaching

In the field of teaching, statistics and/or indicators are designed to measure both quantitative and qualitative aspects. Quantitative aspects usually are based on the number of students (per subject, per university, per year, per age group etc.). They are important for three reasons. First, they enable the calculation of participation rates. Second, in those countries where no strict restrictions exist for the number of students universities admit (France, Germany, Italy) they can be seen as an indicator of students' demand; they are also used to monitor demand in those countries where more market-oriented systems exist (e.g. the UK). Third, they can be seen as indicator for the workload of the staff in different subjects, departments or universities. Typical indicators in this context are 'number of students per professor', 'number of students per member of academic staff' or 'number of students in relation to the teaching capacity of a unit'.

The measurement of the quality of the teaching process may be based on output indicators. Thus the number of students who are successful in examinations and the grades that they obtain is of considerable importance in this area. The assumption underpinning this is that good quality teaching has an effect on the results obtained by students. In countries such as Germany, where the student (within certain limits) is able to choose when to take his or her examinations, a connection between the quality of the teaching and the average duration of study may be assumed to exist. In this case, the prevalent view is that with better teaching, the student will feel able to sit the examination after a shorter length of time.

Research

There seems to be widespread consensus amongst evaluation institutions in the countries covered by our study that the number and size of research grants attracted by an academic or

by an institution is a valuable indicator of the quality of the research undertaken. This is likely to be related to the fact that research grants – in particular public research grants – are usually given on the basis of a peer review process of research proposals submitted. Moreover, the view that is generally expressed is that the better the former research record, the higher are the chances of getting a research grant. Thus research grants are thought to be a reasonable indirect measure for the quality of the (past) research record.

In some countries differences are made between the sources of the research grants. This is because there are differences between the procedures for the allocation of research money by different type of funding bodies. Whereas public research funding bodies – and some other bodies – adopt peer review procedures, private companies generally follow different rules.

The rating given to the kind of research money that is obtained appears to be dependent on the function the university/research institution. Thus, the more it has concentrated its activities on 'applied sciences' the better relations to the business sector are thought to be and in these cases 'private' money is likely to be regarded as at least as important as 'public' money. However, the more the university's activities are focused on 'basic' research, the more important it is to get public money which seems more under control of the academic research community.

'Publications' is the second major indicator used to evaluate research and is particularly important in countries with more market-oriented philosophies, such as Finland and the UK, where it is associated with the distribution of financial resources. The rationale for this indicator is two fold. First, research results only contribute to the progress of knowledge if they are published and thus be made public to the scientific community. Second, the fact that a publication by an academic is accepted, either by anonymous referees or by peers or publishers, is thought to indicate that the research from which the publication arises is of a high quality. Because of the different 'quality' attributed to such publications these may be split up into different categories in some countries: articles, book chapters, editorships, refereed versus non-refereed, national versus international and so on.

Finland
In Finland, publications have an important role in the evaluation process. Scientific publications published in Finland and abroad are grouped according to articles that have been the subject of academic refereeing, chapters or articles in compiled works or conference proceedings, monographs and universities' own series (approved by an editorial board). This statistical information is used to monitor research activity. At present it has been used mostly in university self-evaluations at the university or departmental level, and in external research evaluations by the Academy of Finland. Some universities are allocating minor proportions of funds on the basis of publications.

In some countries, notably Finland, the *impact* of publications within the scientific community is considered important. The rationale for this is that given the multitude of articles and books published, it is not unreasonable to proceed on the assumption that some are better than others. As 'higher quality' research is supposed to be more often cited than 'lower quality' research, citation indices are thought (in some countries and in some disciplines) to be a reasonable instrument to evaluate the quality of research via its impact on other researchers.

Apart from citation indices, other statistics/indicators are used in an attempt to measure the impact of research – and so hopefully the quality. For example, in Finland, which seems to be

the country which is most advanced in the use of indicators in evaluation 'invitations to conferences' and 'international co-operation partners' are also used.

Costs/resources

For obvious reasons, the major focus of evaluation – and therefore of the use of indicators in evaluation processes – are the traditional duties of universities, namely teaching and research. Nevertheless, as a general trend, one can also observe the growing importance of 'controlling' the use of resources within the universities. This is clearly connected to the general move towards a reform of the public sector as a whole as demonstrated by widespread cuts in public expenditure in most countries of the European Union. As one of the major aims of this reform is to make the public sector more efficient, to get more 'output' for less 'input', the inefficient use of resources becomes a major focus of this process.

In addition to spending money on teaching and research, university costs include the provision of equipment, books, buildings, cleaning and so on. Such expenditure is increasingly coming under scrutiny in evaluation procedures at universities, particularly in some countries. Statistics/indicators are used in these fields mainly to identify possible areas of 'waste' or 'inefficiency'. The major examples identified in our study referred to the administration of the universities, which is increasingly becoming the object of evaluation procedures with statistical information on such costs being collected in a number of countries.

Education-employment relationship

The education-employment relationship is becoming an increasingly important part of the evaluation process – at least in some countries. The logic behind this is threefold. First, public expenditure on higher education is linked to the fact that the system promises to produce relevant qualifications for the labour market which might eventually help the economic system to become or stay competitive in the globalised markets. If universities provide individuals with qualifications for which there is no demand on the labour market this might indicate inefficient allocation of public resources.

Second, if graduates from one university have significantly better opportunities on the labour market than graduates from another university this might indicate a difference in the quality of the courses and/or the teaching of these two places. (It may, of course, merely indicate that one university has a better 'reputation' than another from the point of view of employers.)

Third, knowledge about the 'success rate' of students of different courses might be relevant for students' choices about which university they should apply to or attend, so introducing or strengthening the competition amongst the universities for the 'best' students. As market principles seems to be prevalent as the ideological guideline of university reform in Europe at the end of the 20th century, this idea of creating or improving the institutional conditions for competition amongst the universities seems to be great attraction to various political actors.

These statistics and/or indicators appear to be designed to measure the success of students, of a certain institution, or with a qualification in a certain discipline on the labour market. Therefore a common indicator is the percentage of students in employment after a certain period of time after they have completed their examinations. To get a clearer picture of the

'success', this measure may be related to whether the employment is at an appropriate level given the training that the graduate has received at university and what kind of employment contract he or she has – full-time or part-time (through choice or necessity), fixed-term or short-term contract and so on.

3. Problems

There are clearly tremendous problems associated with the production and interpretation of statistics and indicators – especially in relation to international comparisons using nationally produced statistics (cf. West et al. 1994)[70].

Therefore, it is far from surprising that there also are some major problems linked with the use of statistics/indicators in the evaluation process despite their growing relevance. The three most important difficulties correspond with the classical problems known in statistics.

Reliability

The statistics/indicators that are produced may not be reliable. Sometimes this can be explained by either ex-post corrections of former provisional statistics or by the fact that the basis for the calculation of statistics/indicators has changed over time so preventing proper time series being produced and thus not enabling comparisons over time. More generally, there may be a conflict between the university and the Ministry in terms of definitions used – for example, a student who is registered for a degree organised by the university may not be counted by the Ministry although he or she will be counted by the university (e.g. in France).

Université Paris XII - Val de Marne
There is a lack of reliability and coherence in certain databases that are used in the evaluation process. For example, the database on the number of students that reflects the diversity of the systems of registration within the university. This makes the use of such performance indicators problematic. There are, moreover, problems with the figures produced and concerns about the rigour with which they are collected. One interviewee noted that in law, when a student registers, even if she or he drops out one month later, she or he stays registered. In science and technology, the registered student is the one registered for the examination. The IT service has worked with the literature (*lettres*) department as there was no IT system at all. Medicine has not even used the same terminology.

There seems to be one special field in evaluation where the reliability of the data produced is heavily questioned, at least by some academics, namely, students' evaluation of teaching. As the students are usually only questioned once per semester it was noted by some academics in our study that students' responses probably depend heavily on their recollection of only the last few seminars or lectures. Thus if those sessions did not go well, the lecturer may get a poor rating no matter what the rest of the course was like.

There are also arguments about the reliability of peer review data. Nowadays, nearly all disciplines are confronted with a pluralisation of their theoretical (and sometimes

[70]. West, A., West, R., Pennell, H. and Thomas, S. (1994) *Community Educational Indicators* - Phase Two: Report to Member States, Luxembourg: Statistical Office of the European Communities, DOC OS/E3/94/ED03.

methodological) basis. If peers are chosen in the evaluation process who are strongly anchored in particular schools of thought, peer reviews of those who belong to a different school of thought may differ from those who are from the same school of thought. Even if these differences are not the result of conscious processes, the reliability of the overall evaluation result may be questioned.

Validity

There are often severe validity problems connected with indicators that are used. Just to give a few examples: Do drop-out rates of students really measure the quality of the course and/or of the teaching? Could it not be the case that the decision to drop-out might also be influenced by anticipated problems on the labour market which could make it a rational decision for a student to leave university or to change to a different course?

Do citations by other academics which are the basis of citation indices really measure the quality of the research of a scholar? Could it not be that there are functioning citation networks with special rules of inclusion and exclusion according to particular schools of thought? In fact, nearly every single indicator used in evaluation processes of universities in Europe could be questioned in a similar way.

Interpretation

This is the major reason why it is often so difficult to produce an adequate interpretation of statistics/indicators used in the course of evaluation. Sometimes indicators allow completely opposite interpretations. Such is the case in Germany with the indicator 'length of study per subject'. This is a highly debated aspect of the present discussion on university reform and is applicable to both Germany and Italy. In relation to Germany, Alewell and Goebbels-Dreyling (1993)[71] note:

'The duration of studies is regarded as one the major problems of German higher education. Therefore the *Wissenschaftsrat* has compiled information about the average time of studies in every subject at each university and polytechnic and compares these data with the total average in this subject. This indicator may be looked as ambiguous (a long duration may be the consequence of high standards, different concepts of selection of contents or of a lack of resources, of poor teaching or poor organisation of studies). But nevertheless, it is information that is now discussed intensively.'

In both Germany and Italy, there is no strict course system for most of the subjects, thus students may take shorter or longer periods of time to finish their studies. The longer a student stays at a university the more expensive he or she is for the public purse and the more he or she contributes to the problem of massification and overcrowding – and such students join the labour market at a relatively late age.

[71]. Alewell, K. and Goebbels-Dreyling, B. (1993) *Performance Indicators in the German Higher Education* System. Ms.

It is thus in the interests of Ministries of Education to reduce the average length of study of students. If we take the case of Germany, how is one to interpret the fact that the average student in engineering in Munich takes 10.83 semesters to finish his or her study whereas his or her colleague in Berlin takes 9.96 semesters? Does this mean that the teaching is worse in Munich than in Berlin or - just the opposite - does it mean that the professors are more demanding in Munich than in Berlin? Or is it simply the case that life is more expensive in Munich so forcing more students to both study and work as a kind of unofficial part-time student? Or is the equipment worse in Munich than in Berlin? These are clearly difficult issues that cannot be resolved by merely producing indicators. However, the fact that statistics and/or indicators are produced does enable pertinent questions, such as those noted above to be addressed.

These three problems - reliability, validity, interpretation - lead to the conclusion that there is no such thing like an ideal statistic or indicator in the field of evaluation. This does not necessarily mean that one has to object the use of statistics/indicators in evaluation processes at all; one simply has to take these possible difficulties into account when using them.

4. The trend from input to process and output statistics and indicators

If one analyses the statistics/indicators produced for evaluation matters at universities in Europe one can distinguish between three kinds of statistics/indicators: input, process and output statistics/ indicators. Typical examples are:

Input	Number of students, number of academic staff, number of administrative staff, financial resources etc.
Process	Student progress, student drop-out rates etc.
Output	Examination results, employment rate, publications by staff, research output etc.

What can be observed as a trend in Europe at present is a shift of emphasis from input to process and output. In the past, the number of students in an institute/department/university was of utmost importance for the allocation of public money to these institutions; the number of students was used as a general indicator of the workload of an institution for which it has to be adequately resourced. The research side of the university was not a focus in the same way.

With the political pressure for reforms of the public sector highlighted above – the desire for more efficiency and the introduction of market principles, with their focus on ‘outputs’ and ‘outcomes’, universities also came under scrutiny. What are their ‘products’? Are these products up-to-date? Is there a demand within the labour market for these products? How are they produced? Is there a more efficient way to produce them? Are there universities which are ‘better’ than others? These ‘new’ questions forced the universities to collect new statistical information. The relevance of the ‘workload’ indicators has thus been reduced and indicators have been introduced that might help to measure the ‘success’ of a university in all its relevant functions. It is not surprising that in the course of this development, a process and output orientation has become increasingly important in evaluation; Finland is the most radical example of that change with 90% of the basic operational budget being related to the number

of master degrees (60%) and doctorates (30%); the other 10% are also distributed result based with the fulfillment of negotiated goals being the primary criterion.

Conclusions

Our empirical analysis of the ways in which statistics and indicators are used in the evaluation process highlights three essential features. 1. Statistics/indicators are of a growing importance in the evaluation procedures of the universities. Indicators have a number of different aims – to provide information, to assist with quality assurance, the reduction of expenses and marketing – and is concentrated in four fields: teaching, research, costs/resources and the education-employment relationship. 2. There is a trend from 'workload' to 'success' orientation observable within the university systems in Europe which results in a shift of relevance from input to process and output indicators. 3. Parallel to the growing relevance of statistics/indicators and their increasingly widespread use in evaluation several problematic aspects of statistics/indicators (e.g. reliability, validity, interpretation) have also been highlighted.

Despite substantial criticism of the use of statistics/indicators in evaluation there is a legitimate interest of the public to get concise and precise information about what is going on within the universities and how the tax-payers' money is spent, by whom and for what purposes and whether this is being done in an efficient way; this interest can only be met by using statistics/indicators.

Besides, linking evaluation (at least partially) based on statistics/indicators with the distribution of resources means that the public can indirectly influence the policies of a university via the democratically legitimated political bodies. Thus, if the Ministry for example, believes that universities invest too little in teaching, it simply has to strengthen the 'teaching' part of the overall formula for the distribution of public money to universities; if it wants to see more efforts on the research side it simply increases the relative relevance of the 'research' part of the same formula. Therefore statistics/indicators might help to keep universities under public and democratic control.

Finland
In Finland, for example, the political system wants to promote lifelong learning; therefore an indicator is produced concerned continuing and open university instruction and is defined as the number of students in open university instruction and in institutes for extensions studies in relation to the number of undergraduate students in a given university. The aim is to monitor the development of this type of education as a result of the policy guidelines in Finland on lifelong learning. Indeed, the Ministry of Education is using adult education as one indicator of effectiveness in the allocation of performance-based funding.

At present, the university systems are quite differently organized in Europe. This is why the indicators used in each country often are only understandable in the context of each national system of higher education. This is one of the main reasons why it is difficult to produce a single set of recommendations for statistics/indicators that we believe it would make sense to produce at a European level. Nevertheless we think that a mixture of input and output indicators might best fit the requirements of the universities as well as the public/political

system. Indicators should also cover all of the four most important fields: teaching, research, administration and the education-employment relationship.

Some recommendations are proposed in the part 5 of the final report (pp. 209 and ss).

General conclusion : the effects of the evaluation

Pierre Dubois

The external evaluation, managed by many official bodies in all the countries, is sometimes a recent phenomena, but, from now, it is an irreversible phenomena. Universities accept to be accountable to the society, to account for the funding they receive. After an experimental phase, the main stake of the external evaluation is, today, the development of the internal evaluation : external evaluation and internal evaluation interact in order that the universities, within the frame of their strategy, succeed in improving the quality and the performance of teaching, of research, of services delivered to the users.

The following conclusion, based upon the different previous chapters, tries to synthesise the evaluation effects within universities. The identification of the effects is essential. The evaluation is not free of charge, and this in a double sense : it represents a cost, it has an objective (to change the universities). How to characterise the effects? How to identify them when changes are also linked to other factors? Which are the conditions of short and long term effects? The identification of these conditions is essential : identifying the conditions is a way to make the evaluation more effective.

Three approaches of the evaluation effects are discussed : the approach in terms of causality, the classifying approach, the approach in terms of processes. This last approach seems to be the most pertinent, because it allows to identify the steps and the conditions of an effective and efficient evaluation.

1. The difficulties of an approach in terms of causality

In the field of evaluation, the approach in terms of causality (one cause and one or several effects) is difficult for several reasons. In order to attribute an effect (an action which is implemented) to one cause (for instance an evaluation), we need to verify that all the other dimensions of the concerned situation have not been changed. The problem in universities is that the « things » never stay « equal ». The evaluation generates recommendations at the end of a process which consumed some time; when the recommendations are produced after a more or less deadline, they risk to be applied to situations which no more exist; so, they have no impact.

In other respects, it is usual that several evaluations are managed in the same period : so, it is difficult to identify the effects of each of them; they can produce « crossed » effects. It is also usual that one evaluation (it is the case for the evaluation of teaching in several countries) deals with only one university sector : so, it is difficult to identify general, global effects. More, the evaluation can be one tool of a general strategy of change among others; in that case, it is difficult to identify the own effects of the evaluation.

At last, during the period between the realisation of the evaluation and the delivery of its conclusions, the external and internal university context can have significantly changed; maybe, the context has generated changes which are not imputable to the evaluation. As changes in the

context, we can mention : reforms decided by the State, budgetary restrictions, reinforcement of the personnel workloads, change in the university government, decisions taken by the university council or by a faculty, merging or split of some faculties, strikes...

To summarise, there is no a « mechanical » effect produced by the evaluation; one evaluation is able to have differentiated effects according to the university context in which it has been realised. The general idea is that the evaluation results have to be appropriated by the university, that they have to be the object of internal decisions in order to be durably transformed in « effects ».

2. The classifying approach of the effects

The second possible approach is a « classifying » one. For the evaluated university, the evaluation has direct positive effects (an increase in resources for instance), direct negative effects (sanctions : the closure of a degree). Among the negative effects, there are « perverse » effects (effects which are contrary to the waited ones). Some effects can be prescribed by the evaluation body (obligation to make a change in a given deadline). Some effects are indirect (not obviously linked to a precise evaluation), or are uncertain (the university agrees on the problem identified by the evaluation, but it has not still taken a decision of action). Some effects are only apparent (effects without a profound incidence in the university or temporary effects). At last, and this case is not rare at all, the evaluation has no effect.

We can also classify the effects according to the evaluation fields :

In the ***teaching evaluation*** field, the effects can be : innovations in the techniques which are used to realise the evaluation, innovations in the academic practices (teaching contents and methods). However, in comparison with the aimed objectives (quality improvement, cost control), the evaluation meets obstacles : insufficient use of the evaluation results, academic staff oppositions, frustrations when some needed improvements depend on financial resources which are not available.

Research evaluations have important financial effects in some countries (competitive allocation of financial resources), but they also are structural effects : creation of research structures, research centres formed in a hierarchy, starting up of university scientific policies. Conversely, the research evaluations can produce negative effects : some teachers, because they estimate that teaching is their first duty, are afraid of being penalised if the evaluation only judges their scientific productivity.

In another field (***university - external partners relationships***), the evaluation, which deals with the starting up or the change of the degrees, has many effects : opening of new degrees or, at the contrary, limitation of access in some specialities according to the labour market opportunities, changes in the programmes and curricula, creation of services for the student employment and orientation, setting of partnerships with firms and local public authorities.

The evaluation of the student insertion in the labour market and the evaluation of the university-territory relationship (in which terms do the local public authorities evaluate theirs relations with universities, and how do the universities evaluate their relations with their territory?) meet many obstacles to be developed : weakness of the employers' promises, lack of political will, reluctance of some teachers (they refuse to privilege some degrees, only

according to the employers' needs), lack of specialised evaluation bodies, juridical protection of the individual data, diversity of the geographical spaces which are concerned and pertinent.

Academic staff evaluation, at the time of recruitments, has important consequences : professional investments, professional autonomy and dependency are strongly influenced by the recruitment modalities. Reactions to evaluation are different according to the countries and to the disciplines, according to the recognition obtained after the evaluation. The academic staff evaluation is well accepted if the evaluation practices, particularly by external experts, have a long tradition.

The effects of the ***non-academic staff evaluation*** are sometimes uncertain and are appreciated in various ways. The most frequent or the most obvious effects are the development of the personnel training, the clarifying of responsibilities, the reduction of the non-academic staff number, the change in task allocation, the development of management computerised systems, the creation of internal evaluation units, the launch of cost and/or performance indicators. In some cases, quality assurance procedures are implemented (in that case, statistics and indicators are an important element of the process)

3. The approach in terms of process and of apprenticeship

A third approach seems to be still more pertinent than the classifying approach : it puts the question of effects in the perspective of the development of the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation. The analysis of effects can be or has to be one of the stages of this evaluation model; it has to be written down within an historical process, within an agenda. The evaluation takes aim at the organisational and cultural change for a greater university performance : so, the evaluation effects to measure is this change. More, we make the hypothesis that the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation, decided by the university under the frame of its autonomy, is a general condition for the impact of evaluations; this also means that the preliminary condition, in order to the evaluation reaches maximal and varied effects, is the strengthening of the university autonomy in the context of the maintaining of a public control. So, the question becomes : under which conditions the universities are able to appropriate the evaluation results, to decide changes after an evaluation which conjugates an external evaluation and an internal one? Which obstacles and which assets can be met in that process of results appropriation and of implementation of new actions.

The case studies allow to identify four sets of conditions in order to the evaluation has significant effects. These conditions can be ranked according a double order : a chronological order (the four conditions are four stages which have to be got over successively), an order of difficulties (from the easiest condition to the most difficult).

First condition : the preliminary of the cognitive, learning, cultural, identity, legitimating effects

The first stage-condition is generally filled or is being filled, however under the condition that the evaluation methodology largely mobilises the personnel concerned by the evaluation, that the evaluation results are disseminated in all the university.

Cognitive effect : by the first evaluations, the university learns many things that it ignored on itself, its strong points and its weak points. Sometimes, evaluation produces quantitative data

for the first time. Producing statistical date seems to be a guarantee of objectivity and is able to be largely accepted by the university personnel and by the external university partners.

Learning effect. The evaluation exercise learns to analyse situations with a methodology, to count, to clarify, to make the opaque situations more transparent, to make programmes, to synthesise and to disseminate information. By the evaluation, new reflexes, new schemes of thought (« analysing, deciding, acting ») are acquired

The effects of individual and collective learning can be described as follows : an improvement of the performance, a better information about the university problems and about its environment, an increased ability to communicate, to debate, to bargain, and to diagnose situations. The cumulative character of the knowledge and of the memorisation are an important element of the process. Because the participants in the evaluation have practical aspirations and different strategies, all of them have to be involved in a critical exam of the evaluation objectives and of the evaluation impacts

However, the learning process can be slowed down when the complex field of negotiations and of political decisions is not taken in count, because of the introduction of automatic links between indicators and decisions. If the decision is perceived by the participants as a threat of sanctions, they are able to engage themselves in strategies of information dissimulation. Nevertheless, the evaluees are largely motivated by the link between evaluation results and actual decisions; that link is also a factor which makes the experts more responsible.

The learning evaluation sometimes weakens the behaviours which are not in favour of the changes, behaviours of a *volontariste* type (« we have to change »), of a protest type (« the strength is better than the evaluation »), of a *clientéliste* type (« if you are well introduced in the ministry, it is possible to have more resources than the average of universities »), or of an individualist type (« it is possible to find solutions in a face-to-face relationship »).

Cultural effect. The evaluations introduces changes in the values. One of the observed effects is that the evaluation exercise is able to contribute to disseminate values reached by consensus (accountability for public money, transparency, opening to outside, equity, autonomy, responsibility, ability of self-criticism, co-operation, economic development, social progress, good student insertion in the labour market)? The evaluation is also able to launch debates ion much debated questions (ranking along a hierarchy, competitiveness, performance, productivity, profitability, excellence, marketing, market orientation)

Identity effect. The evaluation sometimes contributes to change the belonging identities. The belonging to an institution, to a precise university can become more important for people, and counterbalance the belonging identity to the traditional and immediate belongings as the faculty, the discipline, the research department the administrative service. It is possible to think that this effect (identity of belonging to an university) is fundamental when it is reached; it can be a condition in order that the effects, described in the following parts, have a chance to be reached. When evaluations only deal with teaching, and more when teaching evaluations are shared along the time (evaluations of some disciplines, then evaluations of other ones), the identity effect (to be a member of the university) is not always reached.

Legitimating effect. At last, the evaluation is able to strengthen the legitimacy of the internal actors who initiated the evaluation, and particularly the legitimacy of the university direction board. Conversely, the legitimisation by the evaluation is not always looked for.

Second condition in order to have effects : the nature of the evaluation results

The conclusions, written in the evaluation reports, are of diverse types. So, the possibilities of effects are differentiated.

The uncertain effects of the descriptive evaluation and of the recommendations. Sometimes, the evaluation report is only a descriptive state of play of the observed situations : it possibly describes strong and weak points, identifying problems; some evaluations make comparative rankings between universities. In those cases, effects are never automatic. If the evaluation notes favourable points, some universities use its results for a strategy of internal and external communication (the universities which participated in European evaluations have transformed that exercise in a international advantage); within the university, departments and faculties which have the best evaluations can look for weakening the less well evaluated ones). It is the minimal strategy to use the evaluation. In some countries, and particularly in the countries which have the most advanced and systematic evaluation systems, indicators are also used to « marketise » the university : having a better image in front of the external partners, a better attraction (attracting new students, new resources), a better capacity of negotiation and contractualisation with respect to the external partners (local public authorities, firms, foreign universities, European Commission). In that case, effects are waited from the evaluation, but they are not under the university control; they are uncertain; they depend on the offensive or defensive university strategy.

The conclusions of some evaluation reports include more or less precise ***recommendations, wishes, suggestions***. In case of very general recommendations, the university has a large potentiality of initiative : it interprets them as it wants, principally when the evaluation body do not make a follow-up (it the case in France for the CNE). So, the effects of such an evaluation are problematical; they have more chance to exist when the recommendations are enough precise, when they are largely disseminated within the university (internal communication of the evaluation results).

The injunctions. Some evaluations are concluded by injunctions : the university has to make actions in order to be in conformity with the public regulations in a given deadline. This case is traditional for all the evaluations about the financial matters (financial audits)...

The financial effects of some evaluations. The conclusions can generate, more or less automatically, decisions, internal or external decisions. In that case, the effects are obvious. The case is traditional in the « ex-ante » evaluation of research projects (as a result, they are funded or not). A conclusion is able to induce an automatic decision : a precise link is set up between the evaluation results and the resource allocation (or the opening of some rights); bad evaluation results generate the closure of a degree or the impossibility to open a new degree, the reduction or the lack of allocation of financial resources (or of staff resources). Another evaluation result is to make compulsory a negotiation about resources; a « good » evaluation makes easier that negotiation, but it does not make certain its results.

An increasing tendency is observed : to link evaluation results ands resource allocation. In some countries (UK, Finland), this fact is linked to the introduction of market mechanisms in the Higher Education, to the political will to allocate more resources to the universities which are the most successful; so, a kind of democratic control is introduced in the Higher Education system. In some countries, there is a direct link between the level of some statistical indicators and the amount of allocated resources.

Third condition in order to have effects : the university and its actors appropriate the evaluation results

When the university is reaching this third stage, the probability of evaluation effects is increasing. The conclusions of external evaluations are the starting point of a dynamics within the university itself : analysis of the evaluation report and of its recommendations, setting up of commissions to elaborate a plan of precise actions, decision on the plan by the university councils (they may set up a hierarchy between the objectives to reach), fixation of deadlines to realise the actions, allocation of resources or setting up of incentive provisions, follow-up of the changes thanks to the implementation of pertinent statistical indicators, mobilisation of external experts if necessary, potential adjustments during the following period, balance sheet in a given deadline with a new evaluation (internal and external if necessary). So, the university is entering in a dynamics of management by project and of changes initiated under the frame of its autonomy; it opens the door to the improvement of teaching, of research, of delivered services (we have to note that the word « quality improvement » is much more used than the word « rationalisation »).

Several contextual factors make easier such an approach after some evaluations. The first is: a powerful board of directors, a coherent and a legitimate one (we have observed a key-role played by the university rector). In the countries (Finland, United-Kingdom, some of German Länder) in which the resource allocation is a lump sum budget and is index-linked to performance indicators, the university government is strengthened, particularly when it has a certain degree of freedom to reallocate resources within the university.

Another contextual element is important : an equal responsibility of the university components (faculties, departments, administrative services) and of its actors is necessary. It is not easy to reach because the evaluations have unequal consequences on the diverse categories or groups of actors (academic staff, administrative personnel). The responsibility can be reached by the way, for instance, of a decentralisation of some decisions and by a contractualisation between the direction team and each university component.

At last, we have to mention other contextual elements : financial pressures (the reduction of resources paradoxically constraints universities to make actions), reforms decided by the public authorities (lump sum budgets, contracts of development negotiated between the ministry and the university).

Fourth condition in order to have effects : setting up of permanent devices of internal evaluation

When the dynamics, described in the previous paragraph, are set up, additional conditions are needed to make them permanent (they do not have to be given up when the mobilisation reached during he evaluation period is landed). In order that evaluations have durable effects,

the most advanced universities set up permanent organisational devices : internal evaluation units (they are able to elaborate performance indicators, consensual criteria to allocate resources within the university), statistical units (they elaborate sets of statistical indicators and regroup then under the form of dashboards which give guidelines for the process of decision-taking), observatories of the student trajectories within the university and on the labour market, management control, quality insurance...

Several conditions are needed to make these organisational permanent devices effective and efficient. They have to be able to make a scientific work : so, their staff's professional abilities have to be increased (professionalisation of the management). They need resources (financial and personnel resources). They have to be able to make an relatively independent work and it is a difficult problem to solve : their dependence in respect to a scientific council or to an orientation council seems to be better than a direct link with the university director board;

The logical continuation of such a process of organisational setting is the dissemination of a ***logic « costs/advantages »***. The evaluation and its organisational effects (setting of new organisational devices) have a cost : cost linked to the time passed by individuals to gather information and to have interviews with the external experts (in some universities, we observe an « evaluation fatigue » when there are several evaluations at the same time; it is an obstacle for future evaluations), cost linked to the time devoted to many meetings, expenses for the external experts' payment, cost to allocate some people in the new evaluation organisational devices, expenses to allocate resources to those devices (budget, computerised equipment, computerised networks, personnel training, real estates...)

Because of those financial costs and in a period of financial pressures, the permanent evaluation devices have to generate improved performances, savings, financial profits, decreasing deadlines to implement decisions, new forms of administrative functioning. These devices, because they approach the university realities in terms of objectivation and quantification, have an advantage in order that savings or better uses of resources are accepted without a great conflict. So, some evaluations have as results : a better use of the real estates, a rationalisation of the tasks or sometimes a reduction in the administrative staff number, a setting of new forms of organisational management (horizontal and multidisciplinary co-operations between faculties).

4. DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

The strategy of dissemination has been organised from the beginning of the research : all the associated researchers have immediately understood and accepted that EVALUE is a targeted research and that the results have to be largely disseminated. It was and it is important to make clear the changes in Higher Education in the different European countries, to make clear the role of the evaluation practices in these changes, to make clear that the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model has to be developed at the expense of evaluation models, until now implemented in Higher Education and not totally satisfying.

The dissemination strategy took and will take different forms : more than a hundred dissemination actions have been realised.

A first field of dissemination deals with the research results. It is a traditional form of dissemination in all the sciences, including social sciences :

- presence in the conferences devoted to Higher Education and to Evaluation
- publications : a special issue of a specialised review and two books are planned; first papers in scientific reviews have already been published
- integration in the national and international networks, specialised in Higher Education and Evaluation.

In that first field, two actions show the researchers' interests for a durable development of research in Higher Education and on evaluation

- learning of young researchers
- a CD-ROM with all the research raw materials is at the disposal of the specialised scientific community.

A second field of intervention is less traditional : the action. Some EVALUE researchers are looking for being direct actors in the Higher Education changes and in the dissemination of the « good evaluation practices » which have been identified within the research :

- organisation of an international conference for the university rectors
- direct participation of some researchers in the councils of their university, in national institutions or in reform committees in Higher Education; discussion of the research results in the investigated universities
- interventions in the media.

A precise list - publications, communications in conferences, university memories prepared by the young researchers, interventions in the evaluation bodies and in the university councils, and, at last in the media - is given in the Annex (see the point 6. Annexes)

4.1. Interventions in the research field

Participation in conferences...

The EVALUE researchers have presented or will present in the next months 29 papers in national or international conferences, and particularly in the conferences devoted to Higher Education and to Evaluation. Some of them have been or will be responsible of sessions in the conferences.

The participation in the ***14th World Congress of Sociology*** is particularly significant. This congress is organised in Montreal from the 26th of July 1998 to the 1rst of August. Marja Alestalo[72], secretary of the Research Committee in Sociology of Science and Technology, has organised one among the ten sessions of the Committee, in relation with the Research Committee in Sociology of Education. The session has as secretaries two EVALUE researchers (Stefano Boffo and Erkki Kaukonen) : it is devoted to the topic : "Evaluating the university development : approaches in Sociology of Science, of Education, of Organisation".

Publications

38 papers articles have already been published or are prepared for scientific journals.

More fundamentally, the collective strategy of publications is organised all around a special issues of the European Journal of Education and two books.

Eight papers will be submitted in September 1998 to the ***European Journal of Education***, for a publication of a special issue during 1999. The issue is co-ordinated by Marie-Françoise Fave-Bonnet. The abstract of the issue is as follows :

Evaluations of the university activities and results

MALICET Danielle, **HOLMESLAND** Içara, **VEIGA SIMAO** Ana Margarida, **ESTRELA** Maria Teresa
"Evaluation of teaching and learning "

CHAVE Daniel, **BOFFO** Stefano, **KAUKONEN** Erkki, **OPDAL** Liv Randi
"Evaluation of research"

JOBERT Annette, **ALVES** Mariana, **AMBROSIO** Teresa, **SIMONYI** Agnès
"Evaluation of the education-employment relationship"

Evaluations of the university resources

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise, **ESTRELA** Maria-Teresa, **MOSCATI** Roberto, **VEIGA SIMÃO** Ana Margarida
"Evaluation of academic staff"

HOSTMARK-TARROU Anne-Lise**, BOFFO** Stefano, **DUBOIS** Pierre, **ROTGER** Josep
"Evaluation of the university structures"

WEST Anne, **KAUKONEN** Erkki, **NIEMINEN** Mika, **NODEN** Philip
"University financing and evaluation : the UK and Finland compared "

Evaluations : actors and methods

[72]. She has been elected as the President of the Research Committee during the Congress.

ALESTALO Marja, **FISCHER-BLUHM** Karin, **GUEISSAZ** Albert
"The evaluation of universities in Europe : a sight on the actors"

TRINCZEK Rainer, **WEST** Anne
"Evaluation of Higher Education : statistics and indicators"

Two books will be published. Some of EVALUE researchers will be the editors.

BOFFO Stefano, **TRINCZEK** Rainer, **WEST** Anne **(eds), 1999**
Evaluation of Universities in Europe. Strategies, fields and objectives

In almost all European countries, 'evaluation' is one of the major catchwords in the current debate about reforming the university system. Despite the fact that there are surprising similarities in the overall strategic positions in higher education policy across Europe different national approaches toward evaluation may be observed. This can be considered to be the result of different national trajectories in the development of systems of higher education.

The editors of this book thus aim to provide national reports that do not only give the reader up-to-date information about the situation concerning evaluation in the university sector but also illustrate the extent to which the policy of evaluation is embedded within the specific national context. Thus, issues pertaining to the democratisation of higher education and the adoption of market principles in specific countries will be examined.

The individual chapters with a maximum length of 20 pages each will follow a uniform structure : 1. National context (7 pages); 2. Evaluation: fields, actors, institutions, strategies, objectives (10 pages); 3. Conclusion and outlook on future trends (3 pages).

The selection of the countries is based, in the main, on two main criteria: Historical differences of the university systems and different approaches to evaluation. To provide a thorough review of 'Evaluation of Universities in Europe', 12 European countries will be included: Austria, England, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Sweden as member countries of the European Union, together with Norway and Switzerland as non-EU-countries. In addition, a review article about the situation in the countries of central and eastern European countries will be included.

There will be an introduction and a final chapter by the editors. The introduction will outline the rationale and content of the book whilst the final chapter will provide a synthesis: using a cross-dimensional perspective, similarities, differences and common or diverging trends will be identified.

Considering the growing Europeanisation of Higher Education, the book is targeted not only at researchers in this field but also at students, both undergraduate and graduate, across the EU/EEA and, of course, at policy makers in Higher Education. There is a growing demand for Higher Education courses relating to comparative education policies, and this publication will be invaluable in this context.

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise, **GUEISSAZ** Albert, **HÄYRINEN-ALESTALO** Marja, **HOSTMARK TARROU** Anne-Lise, **SIMONYI** Agnès (eds), 1999
Evaluation of Universities in Europe : actors and institutions

The objective of the book is to synthesise about the evolution, the projections, the obstacles to the evaluation development in European Universities from the point of view of the institutions actors.

The editors will analyse, thanks to the subject reports and the case studies, the way in which the different actors (teachers, students, administrative personnel...) are participating in the different evaluation systems.

They will study from one part the evolution of their modalities of participation, of their relationships, of their investments, in the traditional evaluations (research evaluation, recruitment of the academic staff),

and, in another part, in the most recent evaluations (evaluation of the university organisation, relationships with the environment, audits...).

Deadline : 1999. Discussions are in progress with a French publisher specialised in the Education matters. An English version is planned.

At last, we have to point out that three French researchers (Marie-Françoise Fave-Bonnet, Albert Gueissaz, Annette Jobert) have used, according to a more or less degree, some EVALUE research results, in order to prepare or to defend a "***habilitation à diriger des recherches***, a title which in France the needed condition to become a full professor.

Participation in national and international networks dealing with Higher Education and Evaluation

Contacts and/or co-operations have been tied with :

- CRE (Association of the European Universities)
- Programme IMHE (OECD)
- Quality Support Centre (Open University of London)
- CHEPS in Netherlands
- CHEP in Germany
- *Direction de l'Evaluation et de la Prospective* in France (before its closure in December 1997)
- International project SUN (Service University Project), coordinated by the University of Oslo and by SUNY Buffalo. The project deals with the following questions : which relationships do the universities have with partners at the regional, national and international levels? Which organisational developments in universities? Which individual intellectual freedom for teachers and students?
- Research Institute in Higher Education (University of Hiroshima). The institute is the main research centre in Japan about Higher Education questions. It is the core of a network of 11 Japanese universities, conducting researches in the field.
- International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education. The direction of the network is located in New-Zealand.

Learning young researchers

Nine young researchers (in France, in Finland, in Italy, in Portugal and in the United-Kingdom) have been associated, directly or indirectly, to the EVALUE Research. They have defended or will defend research memories to obtain a degree (master, *diplôme d'études approfondies* or doctorate).

CD-Rom EVALUE and Internet

The content of the Infobase EVALUE is described in point 3 (introduction of the part 3). Let us remind that the infobase is a hypertextual data base of more than 7.000 pages, including all the research raw materials ("states of play" of 1996 and 1998, 31 cases studies). All the data are contained in a CD-ROM, joined to the final report.

The infobase EVALUE will progressively be in free access in the second part of 1998 : the website is already open (www.infobase.it/InfobaseEvalue.htm) and will be accessible in the same period. The confidentiality and the data protection, necessary for the redaction of the final report and for the preparation of publications, will have been secured until that period.

From the end of 1998, the CD-ROM will be disseminated under the responsibility of each partner. The researchers, responsible of the two books, have in charge to negotiate with the publishers the addition of a part of the infobase within the book. The objective is to give access in the infobase to the scientific community and to the researchers who would conduct researches in Higher Education and in Evaluation in the future : the information having been accumulated by EVALUE, it is useless that other people start again the same work.

4.2. Direct interventions close to the Higher Education and Evaluation actors

International Rectors' Conference

Each case study has been delivered to the concerned university Rector/President; it has been discussed in many cases. The procedure was included in the contract. The rectors, who have been met, are interested, still more, in the evaluations conducted in the other universities and to their results. From that fact, the idea to organise, at the end of research, a meeting with the rectors of the 31 universities has emerged.

In July 1998, CONICS (the EVALUE partner in Rome) has accepted to ask for a subvention in order to fund the conference (demand close to the European Commission, negotiation with the universities of Catania and Udine). If the needed funding is obtained, the Conference will be organised by CONICS, will take place in Italy, at the end of 1998 or at the beginning of 1999.

Other direct interventions

Six EVALUE researchers took, during the research, responsibilities in the university councils or in national institutions, or have been associated to workgroups charged to think of reforms in Higher Education and in Evaluation. 21 conferences or consultancy have been given close to ministry directions, to professional bodies in Higher Education.

Interventions in media

Several interviews have been given to journalists and have been published.

5. CONCLUSIONS and POLICY IMPLICATIONS for HIGHER EDUCATION

Pierre Dubois

5.1. Main results

The main scientific results of EVALUE are only briefly reminded : they are detailed in the synthesis (part 1). We assess on the other hand EVALUE as a European research, its strong and weak points, referred to 12 ideal dimensions, dimensions which seem important for European co-operation. This assessment is able to produce a learning effect for the social scientists who would engage themselves in European co-operation for the first time.

5.1.1. Scientific results

External evaluation, made by many public bodies in all the countries, is sometimes a recent phenomena, but it is today an irreversible phenomena. Universities accept to account for the public funding. After an experimental phase, the main societal stake of external evaluation is today the development of internal evaluation : external evaluation and internal evaluation interact in order that universities develop strategies, succeed in improving the quality and the performance of teaching, research and services to users, use in a better way their financial resources.

Reasons of the evaluation development

Universities are evaluated and they evaluate themselves because they are autonomous by law. their autonomy is more and more inscribed in « contractualisation » policies between public authorities and each of the universities. Activities, objectives and results are evaluated. evaluation keeps close to the traditional controls (conformity controls), made by the public authorities.

Universities are evaluated and they evaluate themselves because they know strong financial pressures : the growth in the students' number, the diversification of missions and degrees have obliged an increase of the public funding (in spite of a decrease in the expense by student, observed in some countries); so, universities are looking for other resources and, to catch them, they are evaluated by new institutions and authorities.

At last, universities are evaluated and they evaluate themselves because they have to manage more and more missions : are they able to be excellent in all the fields? Evaluation is sometimes used to manage tensions in the teaching field (tensions between traditional teaching, profession-oriented teaching, continuous training), in the research field (tensions between

fundamental research and applied research), in the education-employment relationship field (to increase the participation rate in Higher Education, to participate in the cultural liveliness and in the economic development of the territory...). That part of the research has allowed to refer the investigated universities to three ideal-types : universities of general character, profession-oriented universities of education and applied sciences, universities of territorial development.

In favour of a pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation model

EVALUE has questioned the degree of development of the evaluation model which seems to be the most pertinent to impulse changes in each university, to impulse a better performance and quality. The model implements a pluralist evaluation (participative and contradictory), a context-sensitive one (taking in count the university environment), a dynamic one (taking in count the university objectives and history), an integral one (making links between all the university activities and dimensions; the fragmented evaluations generate a lassitude), ant at last which is repeated at regular intervals. The model is developing, but it is still minority in the observed cases.

Which are the conditions of the model? External evaluation (particularly in the context of a contractualisation-negotiation between universities and public authorities) is able to strengthen dynamics of change if it finds a support in the university government : a strong university government looks for evaluation and is strengthened by it (so, we observe, in a significant number of universities, the development of a new government model - the presidential-managerial one - at the place of the traditional models - collegiate and/or bureaucratic -). Some universities have, in the context of a contractualisation with the public authorities, launched by themselves a horizontal co-operation with some other universities to organise, in particular, teaching and organisation evaluations; the co-operation generates, as benefits, an optimal division of costs and resources which are necessary to evaluate, comparisons as « experience-exchanges », a control of the competitiveness (competitiveness between universities will be more and more a major stake). The horizontal co-operation seems to favour dynamics of internal changes within universities.

Innovative practices

The most innovative evaluation practices, which look for changes, are as follows. 1. Internal contractualisation between the university government and each university component can generate new modes of funding : resources do not only finance activities (to fund teaching according to the students' number, to fund research according to the researchers' number); more and more, funding is linked to objectives and results. 2. In the administrative services (central or decentralised services), the most innovative practices are inspired by quality insurance procedures and methods : which is the degree of quality of services delivered to users (teachers, students, external partners)? how to measure it and how to improve it? 3. The innovative practices make compulsory the development of effective computerised information systems (dashboards and sets of statistical indicators); they allow a follow-up of the realised improvements.

5.1.2. European research in social sciences : an assessment

It is obvious that the EVALUE research would not have been realised without a strong European partnership. To be efficient and effective, a co-operation research seems to involve 12 conditions. From the experience of the last 30 months, it is possible, for each of these conditions, to assess the EVALUE strong and weak points.

European research : conditions of success	Strong and weak points of the EVALUE research
1. A good topic	*Strong point*: evaluation and self-evaluation of universities is a good topic, at the scientific and political levels *Weak point* : the topic is immense
2. Good problematic	*Strong point* : the interpretations of the evaluation practices development, of their field of application, of their actors and methods have been progressively elaborated thanks to the case studies *Weak point* : the differences in the disciplinary approaches (sociologists have been more interested in understanding the structural conditions of the evaluation development; researchers in sciences of education in understanding the actors'representations)
3. A good partnership	*Strong points* - a well-balanced representation of the different European countries - partners having, at the beginning of the research, the same knowledge of the studied field - a permanent interest in participating in the research (the partnership has been stable all along the research) - an effort to understand and to use the two languages (English and French) - a support by a partner specialised in the information systems (setting of the infobase EVALUE) *Weak points* - two partners in Germany and in Portugal. Only one partner by country seems to be better - an unequal understanding of the two languages from some researchers
4. A good funding	*Strong point*: an important funding *Weak points* - a not easily equitable allocation between the different partners : how to solve the question of differences in the living cost between the different countries? - an uncertainty : who is able to modulate, during the research, the funding allocation between the different partners according to the work quantity and quality? - a rather bad estimate of costs for the setting up of the infobase EVALUE and of translation costs in the two languages
5. A good duration	*Strong point*: 30 months seemed to be a satisfying duration *Weak point*: an accelerated agenda and a huge workload during the last months

6. A good ability to co-ordinate	*Strong points* - nine co-ordination meetings - 53 co-ordination newsletters - 7 groups co-ordinating the different research dimensions *Weak points* - a very huge workload for the co-ordinator - a co-ordinator who does not have an ability to sanction (positively or negatively) the different partners; he only is able to convince

7. Good investigation methods	*Strong points* - the case study is a pertinent research tool - a good balance between the use of documents and the interviews - in each country, one university has been investigated twice in order to study in a better way the evaluation effects *Weak point* : a regret to have been not able to implement "crossed" investigations (participation of a foreign researcher in each case study), because of agenda problems, of costs, of language understanding

8. Good technological supports	*Strong points* - electronical mail to send files - huge data base (more than 7.000 pages) : it makes easier the structuring of and the search for information - final report on a CD-ROM (with all the raw materials of the research) *Weak points :* - a high cost to set up the infobase - an unequal interest from the partners for the infobase and so an unequal use from some of them

9. A good work investment	*Strong points* - a very important work capacity (during the 30 months, more than 50 researchers have been associated to the research) - a respect of the different defined workloads and of the deadlines *Weak point* : an unequal investment of researchers, because of differences in the status, in the hierarchical positions, in the professional trajectories and projects, in the other associated workloads

10. A good support from the concerned board of the European Commission	*Strong points*: - a permanent logistic and scientific support - a recalling of targeted research objectives and requirements - a control of the work advancement (progress reports) *Weak points*: - finally, a rather distant scientific follow-up - guidelines for reports, still not a lot adapted to the social sciences - frequent progress reports (too high workload for the co-ordinator)

11. Good results : pertinent and proved results	Evidently, the co-ordinator and his partners may not judge the results...

12. A good involvement of researchers to disseminate the research results	*Strong points* : - more than a hundred of dissemination actions, realised or planned : rectors' conference, communications in conferences, learning of young researchers, interventions in universities and evaluation bodies... - a CD-ROM with more than 7.000 pages available for the scientific community : the collected information are able to be disseminated *Weak points* - a more or less partners'interest for the actions of dissemination - a difficulty to resolve the question of the dissemination of all the research raw materials (particularly the case studies) : are they a public good or the researchers' ownership?

5.2. The implications for Higher Education policies : recommendations

Developing the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation

In this final report, we have already pointed out (see part 1.3 in the synthesis and the previous point 5.1) that the main stake is today the development of an evaluation model which pushes universities to decide by themselves many changes, which encourage them to achieve in a better way the public missions, assigned by the State and by the society as a whole, missions dealing with teaching, research, economical, cultural and social development. Universities have to be more effective (to achieve results according to their missions) and more efficient (to have a better use of the resources allocated by the public authorities).

The traditional evaluation models have showed their limits, because they do not take into account the fact that each university is, at the same time, a public institution and administration, a set of professional bodies, a knowledge firm.

The pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation has to be developed. The pluralist evaluation associates and takes in count the analyses and the viewpoints of all the university actors and partners, even if they are contradictory. The dynamic evaluation compares the university to itself : which are the changes? are there improvements according to the previous situations? The context-sensitive evaluation takes in count the different dimensions of the context, particularly when several universities are compared.

The main conditions of the development of the pluralist, context-sensitive, dynamic evaluation and the necessary reforms are : 1. Strengthening the university autonomy, particularly in the statutory field (autonomy of government modalities) and in the financial one, 2. Enlarging the contractualisation policies (internal and multilateral contracts). The two recommendations are detailed in the synthesis (see part 1, point 3).

The following recommendations are much more and are more detailed. They deal with the different evaluation fields, its methods and actors.

Chapter 1.
Evaluations of activities and results obtained by the universities

Evaluation of teaching and learning
(Danielle Potocki-Malicet, Içara Holmesland, Maria Teresa Estrela, Ana Margarida Veiga Simão)

The evaluation of teaching and learning should be a ***lever for changes*** within education. Whenever reasonable, the teaching and administrative staffs ought to use the results of evaluations, and incorporate into the teaching activities the revisions of courses' content and new courses, implement new teaching methodologies and new forms for control of knowledge acquisition, establish a better balance between the different levels of teaching and between the various degrees.

Based on the evaluation results, ***immediate actions ought to be implemented***. In a first stage they should concern minor changes that do not require supplementary resources: eliminate identified failures, implement modifications within study plans, programs, courses, and in all aspects regarding teaching and learning. In relation to more important changes whose implementation will take longer time and require higher costs, they should be the object of discussions and negotiations between the different decision makers within the institutions prior to deciding on the necessary means to implement them. The institution and its departments can, thus, utilise the evaluations for asserting their autonomy and construct their identity.

In connection with the financing problems, the evaluations can also be considered as a ***support document for requesting additional funds*** – external or guide for internal display. Through the evaluations, the institution learns about its situation as a whole, and about its parts. In the discussions about the budget, it is possible then to utilise the various bits of information to present the strengths, and justify the weaknesses, in order to project a good image about itself, and, thus, have a strong position within the negotiations.

In addition, it is evident that the evaluations of teaching need, and are the source of numerous and varied information. Taking into account the possible utilisation previously presented, this information should not disappear after the evaluations; they should be kept ***to create data banks*** that can be available within short notice and without having to restore them continuously.

Efforts must still be made ***to reduce the resistance on the part of the teaching staff***. The institutions ought to utilise the process of evaluation, and instruments, such as questionnaires, meetings, in order to provoke fruitful discussions about the importance of evaluation, and increase the awareness of those who shall intervene for improving teaching, in general, and their teaching performance, in particular. It is also important to bring forward the need to collect information, exchange information regarding evaluation activities, and to establish a profile of the universities and their missions. In parallel to the development of communication, it is recommended to implement activities aimed at the preparation of those responsible for internal evaluations for improving such practices. Within a context of pedagogical and financial autonomy of the university, the evaluation of teaching and learning ought to be a responsibility of the institution, without being harmful to the discipline. It should then constitute a genuine

strategic instrument for the development of the quality and the control of costs of teaching for all the actors, departments and faculties.

Evaluation of research
(Daniel Chave, Stefano Boffo, Erkki Kaukonen, Liv Randi Opdal)

Developing good practices of research evaluation is possible under the following conditions :

Research evaluation should be closely integrated to the scientific activity and its development in the first place, to ensure that the specific characteristics and objectives of the research fields are appropriately taken into account. Instead of becoming an administrative mechanism of control evaluation should provide positive incentives and motivation for research work. It is important to understand that evaluation is a secondary, supportive activity – not an end in itself.

In order to assure the positive effects of evaluation, and to minimise the potential unintended effects and manipulative use of evaluation, ***its criteria should be transparent and based on a dialogue within the research community***. This implies on a pluralistic concept and understanding of science which takes into account the differences between scientific disciplines and research fields.

A comprehensive evaluation of research performance presupposes both active self-evaluation, or self-reflection, and external evaluation by scientific peers and other experts. In case the societal relevance and impact of research is assessed, the evaluation may involve a broader range of external views (users, customers, citizens).

Evaluations should, in the first place, ***provide qualitative information of the objectives, state and results of research***. The use of quantitative data and indicators, which is an important element especially in large-scale evaluations, should build on qualitative accounts in order to make the numbers valid, reliable and 'transparent'.

Evaluations should take into account all relevant aspects of research activity. In addition to research output, also the input factors (research conditions) and the development of research activities (research process) should be considered in the evaluations.

In evaluating university research it is increasingly important to pay attention to the linkages and ***mutual effects between research and other university activities*** – teaching, learning and management (organization of activities).

As time is becoming an increasingly critical resource for the academic staff and the sphere of evaluations is expanding, one should carefully ***consider the actual need and frequency of evaluations***. We estimate that there should be a time period of at least four to five years between more systematic and time consuming evaluations in order to motivate the research community and to avoid 'evaluation fatigue'.

Evaluation of the education-employment relationship (Annette Jobert, Mariana Alves, Agnes Simonyi, Teresa Ambrosio)

The crucial character of the development of the evaluation of the relationship between the University, the labour market and the territory should be underlined in the first place. It is justified by the progression of these relations the variety of the forms which they cover and the interest given to them by the actors. Such an evaluation demands the participation of many institutions at different levels. The ***commitment of territorial political authorities***, which comprises the financial plan, appears particularly necessary in order to obtain the best results.

One can recommend the ***installation of permanent observatories*** which are capable of doing surveys on professional integration and the students' career paths after their graduations on conditions that they appear to be useful instruments for the University. Considering the mobility of graduates and the high costs of the functioning of these observatories, it is necessary for many universities on the given territory , to be co-financed by both the university and the region and finally, to work hand in hand with the national observatory. This helps to compare Universities, to situate them on the national average and to follow their evolution.

To complete such observations and conventions which were contracted by ministries of higher Education and National Institutes of Statistics either side could anticipate systematic production of data in connection with professional integration of graduates. For the time being this data is not part of what ISTAT has committed itself to MURST on the terms of the agreements signed between these two institutions.

The ***comparability of national surveys*** which are done on graduates brings about such difficulties like those shown by the CEREQ in conclusion of its participation in the research programme called Leonardo which was financed by the DG XXII of the European Community. This thought should be followed particularly through categories used in each country (integration, graduates, young beginners...). The CEREQ also suggests the completion of the European Survey on the « Work Force »/Labour Market by a questionnaire on the relationship between initial training and professional integration <Couppie, 1998>[73].

Nevertheless, the existence of an observatory does not guarantee that the results should be used by the University. In order for it to be thus it is necessary for Universities to strongly take part in the management of observatories and that they should respect the deadlines and the form in which the results are produced.

If the relationships between University and Territory do not march concerning formal evaluation, considering what the case studies have shown, they could be subject to ***qualitative research*** which would aim at identifying and analysing the inter-relations between Universities, labour market and territories : the manner in which they are constructed, their developments and their effects.

As this evaluation field is weakly developed, knowledge has to be enriched. ***Accountable data about the financial relationships between universities, firms and local public authorities*** have to be gathered. Identifying the financial resources that universities receive from the firms (continuous training, charges, researches contracts, real estates, equipment, student grants,

[73]. Couppie Thomas, Mansuy Michèle, 1998, "Vers une plateforme commune pour observer l'insertion professionnelle des jeunes en Europe", *Bref*, 141, avril.

loaning of staff, functioning grants...), developing a systematic analysis of cost by student of each degree, and more particularly of each profession-oriented degree and identifying the financial part brought by the firms. A same analysis could be made for recourses coming from the public local authorities.

Chapter 2. Evaluations of resources

Evaluation of the Academic Staff
(Marie-Françoise Fave-Bonnet, Roberto Moscati, Maria Teresa Estrela, Ana Veiga Simao)

Faced with present situation of different University systems, it is difficult to prone a model of evaluation during recruitment. We can however, in view of the present situation, give a few suggestions.

No evaluation of academic staff can be done without ***"contextualisation"***. Case studies have shown a lot of disparities in work conditions between these countries, universities and disciplines. There is a question of equality.

Academic staff having teaching assignments and research, it is necessary to take into consideration these two competences during recruitment and to introduce the ***evaluation criteria of the teaching capacities*** when they are not practised.

The power of each University in the recruiting field should be reinforced so that it can bring about a real policy, in particular to "re-equilibrate" disciplines (cf. Helsinki). The question of linkage between the University policy and the needs of the departments and disciplines can be resolved by the precise definition of the profile of the post. That would allow the University to follow a scientific policy, and yet giving the disciplines the power to recruit.

Many case studies mention have heavy procedures. Many countries already practice precise procedures, simple and flexible (Norway and Finland) : they merit generalization.

Many case studies show the bad side of "opacity" of the procedures of local recruitment. The procedures which are not formal enough or profiles which are extremely precise can "encourage" mandarins. ***If the profile of the post was precisely determined by the faculty and/or the University***, then went under control after selection, the recruitment procedures criteria would be "clarified", and particular interest would flop.

Concerning the ***composition of the commissions***, one can recommend : the recruitment should be done by internal experts and external experts at the same time (geographically), with disciplinary proximity.

Commissions have been surveying the ***"equity" of men and women*** in Norway for ten years. In the United Kingdom the national commission publishes the prize-lists of universities on this question.

Finally, concerning the problem of investment of Academic staff in their different missions and in their the university, one can suggest that there should be ***a contract*** between the teacher and

the University comprising on one part the teaching assignments, the research and collective assignments, etc. and on the other hand the means given in order to accomplish them (subventions, continuing education, personnel, etc.). This contract could be renegotiated every five years, or throughout one's career for example.

Evaluation of the non-academic staff : developing indicators to measure the quality of services to users
(Pierre Dubois)

A pluralist, context-sensitive and dynamic evaluation of the quality of services delivered to users (teachers, students, external partners) by the administrative personnel can be inspired by the quality insurance procedures, implemented in UK universities. these procedures define stages and indicators.

The first stage is ***to define the different delivered services***, to identify what is their quality from the users' viewpoint (what are they asking for?); this stage supposes some inquiries close to the users. The second stage is ***to make surveys*** on the different dimensions of quality, described supra or on dimensions which seem to be the most important. Surveys can be made by the administrative staff or by external people; they have to be made with the easiest methodology, with a time-saving one. This stage, strongly participating, requires an analysis of tasks, procedures, provisions, technical tools, useful for the service delivery and implemented, used, disseminated by the administrative people. In fact, surveys can identify the obstacles to quality achievements.

The third stage is ***to identify the problematical points, to look for improvements, to decide*** on reasonable and measurable objectives, and/or on standards to achieve. So, indicators are necessary : they have to be context-sensitive, to exist in every administrative service; comparisons are not intended. Because the most essential thing is to measure the improvement in the quality of service, indicators have to be stable. This stage also supposes an analysis of the time and of the cost necessary to deliver the service; in fact, the aim is to improve the quality with a quasi-constant cost (a better efficiency). The last stage is to ***write procedures*** (good practices manuals), to learn the personnel (procedures have to be done in the easiest way), to control and to evaluate..

Evaluation of university government : strengthening and opening the government to external partners
(Josep Rotger)

Transforming universities asks for a high degree of consensus in order to maintain the internal balances. the dilemma is : how to make more efficient and more effective the university management and, at the same time, to maintain something which seems to be consubstantial to the institution, i.e. the university autonomy, the autonomy of academic staff?

The ***contractualisation between universities and public authorities*** seems to achieve good results. This process, as long as it is implemented in the respect of the university autonomy, as it assigns the objective to favour the general interest, as it is set up democratically, allows a greater transparency and a better closeness in the relationships between the university and the public authorities.

In another hand, if we consider the crisis of the collegiate government model and the necessity to set up a greater efficiency and effectiveness in management, the question is : does the rectors'power (and more generally the power of central government bodies) have to be strengthened by different ways such as the lengthening of their mandate, a greater coherence in the hierarchical lines, the suppression of the bureaucratic obstacles in his capacity of decision-taking? These changes would generate a restructuration of the deliberation and decision collective bodies in order to simplify modalities of consultation, but, at the same time, they would eliminate the internal *contre-pouvoirs*.

If we consider the social changes of the recent period, there are ***new actors involved in the development of university activities*** (representatives of the local public authorities, trade-unions, professional bodies, employers). They surely have things to tell; in some cases, they are already present in the consultation or government university bodies. It is probable that the intervention of these new actors has to be taken in count in an extended way, as it is the case in countries which have cultural traditions other than the European ones... Maybe, the point is controversial, but it is more and more present in the debates about the university government.

Evaluation of financial resources : relativizing the conformity controls to improve the financial effectiveness
(Stefano Boffo)

Evaluating university resources and expenses is not a lot developed; more, comparative information between universities is rather weak. We observe that ***the conformity control***, which is the most diffused modality to evaluate financial resources, ***is an elementary and inadequate form of evaluation***; it is only useful in a centralist vision of the university system, a vision which is outdated in all the European countries; more, it is time- and energy-consuming in so far that it represents an obstacle to the development of an evaluation more coherent with the requirements of university changes, particularly in the economic and financial field.

More, we observe that the financial information, produced by the universities, is not detailed and not enough structured. We may think that this situation is a part of the sclerosis generated by the tension to satisfy the formal implementation of regulations. It is a serious insufficiency if we refer, for instance, the ***university activities for producing own resources***, the lack of information about investing, financial products, sales of services and products, management of real estates... If information is not sufficient, the evaluation of financial resources will be not developed.

However, the universities seem to be ready to relativize the importance given to external financial audits; they agree to make efforts to produce, organise and disseminate an adequate quantity of information in order ***to be evaluated*** on their managerial ability (reference to economic criteria), ***on their ability to find additional resources***. In that context, the innovative practice of Dortmund could be taken in count : the university has set up a financial funds at the rector's disposal, supplied by resources saved by different ways (vacant jobs for instance); this funds is used as an internal redistribution funds according to the priorities set up by the rector's strategy. The practice seems to be an interesting solution to promote and to disseminate a form of internal financial evaluation.

Evaluation of structures : identifying and describing the criteria for promoting a pluralist, dynamic and context-sensitive evaluation of the academic and non-academic structures
(Anne-Lise Tarrou Hostmark)

A collegial model seems, mainly, to characterise the functioning of the academic structures of the universities, except for certain recently established structures of support. Regarding the evaluation of the functioning of the structures of the university, some reservations are observed, especially at the lowest level of the university, i.e., the one closer to the primary activities (research and teaching), where the existing structures have to treat issues most closely linked to the academic knowledge. Which criteria to choose to capture and analyse the mechanisms that facilitate and hamper an evaluation of academic structures?

Within most of the universities, the administrative tasks remain organised according to a bureaucratic model. This happens although these tasks, on the one hand, cover the treatment and management of issues concerning all questions that have to be handled in the same way in all public institutions (personnel, budget, accountability) and for which a system of more and more complex rules is operating. On the other hand, these functions consist of preparation of issues to be decided upon in committees, support units of “policy type”. The two types of administrative activities demand three types of competence: knowledge within the specific domain to administer, administrative or technical competence, and knowledge about the culture of the university, i.e., of what is particular within its functioning in terms of values, ideas, rules, norms, codes and symbols.

The establishment of academic and non-academic structures, being important for the functioning of a dynamic and coherent work division, open to demands from the society, and having, at the same time, to protect its own academic goals, seems to be facilitated by the development of a pluralist, dynamic and context-sensitive evaluation. In order to reach a better understanding of the mechanisms in play, and which of these create conditions for the good functioning of the structures and their interactions, it might be desirable to initiate a work of identification and description of criteria necessary to make the academic and non-academic structures function in a coherent way, permitting a better quality assurance (of the whole university as well as of its components), and respond better to the increasingly more explicit demands of the world of work.

Chapter 3. The actors and the decision to evaluate
(Albert Gueissaz, Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo, Karin Fischer-Bluhm & Karoliina Snell)

It seems that ***vertical contractualization and horizontal cooperation provide many opportunities*** to cumulate the advantages and limit the defects of the controlling and autonomous evaluation models. They are worth promoting and supporting. However, horizontal cooperation cannot be established if additional means are not taken into account. Therefore, it should be linked with vertical contractualization formula including regional, national and European authorities. On the other hand, since contractual procedures tend to strengthen simultaneously the position of the ministry (giving more precise information and control over the universities and competition between universities), and the position of the heads of the universities (centralization of internal power), the negative effects might be counterbalanced if these contractual procedures are associated with diversified cooperative

ventures, bilateral and multilateral, academic and non-academic, at the national and the international levels. This would diminish dysfunctional competition between universities and encourage a broad participation of all types of actors.

Apart from that general recommendation, one may also make more precise recommendations :

It is necessary to recognize that ***negotiation*** is a crucial tool in the practice of evaluation as well as in the implementation of its conclusions.

The ***goals, terms of reference and criteria*** of the evaluation process should be made as explicit as possible. An agreement between the various actors should be sought in the initial stages of the evaluation as well as in the further course of the process.

After the writing of a report an opportunity should be given ***to discuss about the results*** and implications by the external actors and internal actors.

Currently evaluators are mostly « birds of passage », and the evaluees are left alone with the results. ***Experts should be linked with the evaluated units in a longer time***, without losing their « exteriority ». It is also the way by which the long-term learning process can be promoted. All evaluation procedures create expectations, which should not be ignored.

Sectoral groupings of activities should be avoided from the start, as it favors opportunistic adjustments or sources of injustice.

Evaluation should be organized in such a way that it does ***not reproduce traditional divisions of labour*** (e.g. administrative staff as being assigned to provide information).

External partners, users and spokesmen, should be given the ***means to construct more relevant evaluations*** rather than ignoring or depreciating their attempts at evaluation; the universities should provide methodological advice and support (the press, the firms).

A clear distinction should be made between the roles and duties of evaluation bodies, statistical units, meta-evaluation bodies, observatories, service centers, technical units, etc.

More permanent bodies should be established at the universities having functional links with the rectors or presidents of the university. However, only flexible modes of action are worth of promoting.

The implementation of our recommendations refers to ***two basic conditions*** : a) the central role of negotiation, participation and pluralism, and b) the need to define a policy at the levels of the State and of the university and to take a political responsibility for this policy.

Chapter 4. Evaluations, Statistics and Indicators (Anne West, Rainer Trinczek)

At present, the university systems are quite differently organized in Europe. This is why the indicators used in each country often are only understandable in the context of each national system of higher education. This is one of the main reasons why it is difficult to produce a

single set of recommendations for statistics/indicators that we believe it would make sense to produce at a European level. Nevertheless we think that a ***mixture of input and output indicators*** might best fit the requirements of the universities as well as the public/political system. Indicators should also cover all of the four most important fields: teaching, research, administration and the education-employment relationship.

Thus it is recommended that ***a small set of indicators*** is produced at a supranational level to address inputs to the higher education system, funding and outcomes. These would supplement those already produced by the OECD (1996). The following indicators could perhaps be considered:

- participation rates over time
- proportion of budget devoted to administration as opposed to teaching or research
- research grants by source (EU, national research bodies, foundations, private companies or bodies)
- publications by type (articles in refereed journals, books, book chapters, monographs, editorship of books, other)
- student completion and drop-out rates
- student destinations (including destinations of drop-outs) by types of employment

Statistics/indicators serve an important accountability role **– *they are there to inform the various stakeholders in higher education***. Therefore it is of great importance that the statistics/indicators are not only easily accessible but also that user-orientation is the central principle in their production and presentation. At present, it is often not so much the number or kinds of statistics/indicators produced in the different countries of Europe that cause the major problems, but their lack of comparability and 'user-friendliness'. Therefore we propose that the European Commission considers the development of comparable EU/EEA-wide indicators (to minimise the problems of data comparability from different countries) and that these are then published electronically (e.g. on the Internet) and in a user-friendly manner.

Counting and describing the population of non-academic staff (Pierre Dubois)

OECD and Eurostat do not publish statistics allowing to compare at the international level the population of engineers, technicians, administrative people working in universities. This population is not always concerned by a quantitative description in all the countries. More, each university has its own way to count the non-academic staff : serious comparisons between universities are not possible. However, the case studies indicate a great improvement in the setting up of centralised data base : it could be an advantage to develop indicators about the population.

The preliminary condition to count is an ***agreement on the definition***. It is easy to set up if we refer to the teaching mission : a non-academic personnel does not teach. The definition is not so easy if we refer to the research mission : is a research-engineer who helps a researcher counted among the academic personnel or among the non-academic staff? An agreement could be found on the following definition : counting only, among the non-academic staff, the research personnel who do not have the vocation to make scientific publications or who are not authorised to make such publications.

The second preliminary condition to count is ***an agreement on the working time***. It is impossible to only count the full-time people, working all year long. So, time keeping has to be made in yearly full time equivalents for the people who have a part-time job or who only work a part of the year (seasonal contracts). Two other questions have to be debated : how to count the external subcontracting work and the administrative work made by the academic staff?

If the two preliminary conditions are met, a static and a dynamic accountancy would become possible. It could take into account the following ***breakdown criteria*** : status, employment duration, place of allocation, rank, wage level, degree, and evidently sex, age and seniority... Some indicators could be calculated : supervision rate (non-academic staff by student), rate of internal mobility within the university, rate of people who have followed a continuous training during a given period...

5.3. Proposals for future researches : universities in the third millenary

The proposals of future researches are issued from the EVALUE research results and from consultations between the 11 EVALUE partners. « Universities in the third millenary » deal with three topics of the future key-action (Improving the socio-economic knowledge base) of the programme "Improving Human Potential", which will be implemented in the 5th PCRD of the European Union.

The European Union has more than one thousand universities : they employ more than one million people who teach, learn and manage more than fifteen millions students. Higher Education is the economic sector which has the most progressed during the last decades in terms of employment, wages and investments.

To study this economic sector as a service organisation to the students, to the private and the public companies, and to the whole society, we have to consider that each public university is a complex organisation with four dimensions. It is an institution which has in charge to disseminate general values, to contribute to the social cohesion. It is an administration which has in charge to fill the missions decided by the State and to respect the rules fixed by the State. It is a whole of professional bodies, organised by the evolution of the knowledge, of the teaching and research disciplines. At last, it is a knowledge company which has to produce and to deliver efficient services. Tensions, conflicts, actual or potential, are issued from those four dimensions of the organisation. The university autonomy is recognised by the law : it is necessary; however it explains those tensions, those conflicts; it should be increased. At last, competitiveness between universities, which is already observed and which is increasing, will bring more tensions in the future.

The results of EVALUE allow to indicate the researches which should be undertaken in the future because the knowledge is not established or, at present, is not sufficiently precise.

5.3.1. Topic « Governance and Citizenship » Research : government, management and evaluation of universities

Question of research 1. May a stronger university government maintain a high participation of all the university members? An interaction exists : a strong university government allows the evaluation development; the evaluation makes stronger the university government. The new government is either a presidential one (strong power of the rector), either a managerial one (strong power of non-academic professionals), or a presidential-managerial one. So, the traditional university government models (the collegiate government by the teaching professional bodies and the bureaucratic government implementing and controlling the regulations set up by public authorities) are weakened. The evaluation strengthens the university government, but it generates changes only if it is a participate evaluation, only if it sets up the participation of all the university members, academic staff, non-academic staff, students. How is the organisational centralisation, presently observed in universities, able to be a stage before the decentralisation of decisions, decentralisation which is indispensable to make everybody responsible, and particularly to make the students responsible from their studying life.

Question of research 2. Towards more horizontal, more flexible, more transparent evaluations? The interplay between various actors goes through all levels and types of evaluation (cf. chapter 4). A plenty of problems that need to be studied arise from the results of our analyses. As a rule the vertical effort to evaluate points to more official ways of action. From this viewpoint the goals and contents of policies, strategies and the power structures between the actors are the key problems. The horizontal forms of co-operation are in our experience more diffuse, spontaneous and flexible both from their goal-setting, means and structures.

On the basis of our analysis, it is worth of considering the following problems for further research. 1. A more detailed analysis on how the vertical systems of evaluation can be transformed to make them more responsive to bottom-up activities. 2. What are the optimal structures of power and limits of responsibility if the vertical and horizontal forms of evaluation are integrated in a more systematic way? 3. How can the problem of promoting flexible and transparent models of evaluation be solved if more stabilised and permanent modes of evaluation will be established? 4. What kind of consensus about the criteria of evaluation can be achieved if the emphasis is not anymore on efficiency, cost-effectiveness and accountability?

Question of research 3. The process of decision and the management practices in the universities (cf. infra questions of research 9 and 10).

5.3.2. Topic « Societal trends and structural changes »
Research : the universities questioned by « equality » or/and « equity »

The participation rate in Higher Education of the young Europeans has strongly increased during the last decades. However Higher Education has only partly known a democratisation. In fact and in spite of the high increase of the students number, the social origin influences, more than ever, the access to the studies, their progress, the opportunities on the labour market. In comparison to a student who is the son of a manager, a child issued from the working class a four handicaps : he has less chances to access the university, to succeed in his studies, to enter in post-graduation, to find a good job after his degree.

In the same way, the increase of the students number has been accompanied by an increase in the number of teachers and maybe by a diversification of the recruitment in that profession. For the teaching professions, the question of the equality is also on the agenda : do the teachers, in function of their social origins and of the students origins, play a role in the selective access to Higher Education and in their provisions? Probably, differential provisions also depend on the teachers grades and on the disciplines.

Those two fields of research have not a lot explored by the EVALUE research.

Question of research 4. Positive discriminations in favour of students with a not high social origin : new temporalities and new spaces. Are universities able to set up and do they set up, and in which conditions, positive discriminations in favour of the students issued from the most underprivileged populations? In order to equalise the chances, which are the possible positive discriminations? Are the changes of temporalities in the student trajectories (individual trajectory, continuous training, learning all life long...) and are the changes of temporalities

within the university organisation itself (lengthening of the daily, weekly and yearly timetables in order to improve the university functioning and the delivered services to users) positive discriminations, opportunities for the students issued from the working class? Are the changes in the actual work places (learning at distance, mobility within Europe..) an opportunity or an obstacle to the equality of chances?

Question of research 5. Diversification of the university financial resources and social equity. In Europe, the main university financial funding is brought by public authorities - the central State and/or the Regional public authorities -. The financial resources brought by the companies is increasing. The direct users' contribution to finance theirs studies represents in Europe a small part of the learning cost, but it is significantly increasing in some countries : is the users contribution to the public service cost a legitimate one? is it acceptable and accepted? Which are the consequences for the Higher Education democratisation?

Question of research 6. Evaluation of academic staff and equity between the disciplines. Several case studies seem to point out differences in the development of the teachers evaluation according to the disciplines : medicine, sciences and professional degrees would be more advanced in the setting of teachers evaluation procedures. This hypothesis of a disciplinary culture of evaluation, which would cross the national contexts, should merit more extended researches.

5.3.3. Topic « Technology, Society and Employment »
Research : universities, technological innovation and employment

The results of the EVALUE research point out that technological innovation and employment are a field of tensions within universities, tensions which have to be referred to the fact that each university is made of disciplinary professional bodies and is today a quasi-firm. By their researches, universities contribute to the processes of technological innovation, of technological dissemination and, at the same time, they use some technological innovations in their management (computerised information systems). Universities create and manage teachers' jobs, non-academic jobs; at the same time, they are preparing the future jobs by the technological innovations in which they participate; they have more and more to prepare the students to the jobs.

This research field is specially interesting for the EVALUE researchers. Different aspects are concerned.

Question of research 7. Technological innovation policies and new *logiques d'action* of the universities and of the academic staff. Which are the national and international political conditions to adapt the university missions to the needs of the innovation policies? to integrate these missions in these needs? In which conditions can the *logiques d'action* (teachers and researchers' *logiques d'action*) be changed in order that they are able to participate more in the innovation processes? How are set up the frontiers between fundamental research and applied research and how do they change?

Question of research 8. Employment and working time in universities. The growth of the teachers' number and of the non-academic staff is everywhere observed in Europe, but it does not have suppressed the national differences. How to explain the differences in the supervision

rates (teachers' number by student) between the Northern Europe and the Southern Europe? Employment level and working time can be linked to the university history of each country, to the history of university funding and so to the history of public policies, to the history of research and teaching disciplines and of their progressive division. Today, employment level and working time can also be linked to the evaluation practices, to the implementation of computerised management systems, to forms of the organisational rationalisation.

Question of research 9. The social construction of information systems and the question of performance indicators in universities. A gap is observed between the increasing diffusion of the new information technologies in universities, particularly because of the impulsion of external evaluations, and their actual use in management and in the decision-taking process. This gap has to be explained. More particularly, the knowledge of the production, diffusion, interpretation and use (in negotiations and decisions) of statistics, indicators and others forms of structured information has to be improved. Which are the strategic dimensions (actors' strategy), the cognitive dimensions (learning processes), the normative dimensions (obligation to produce figures for evaluations)?

Question of research 10. The development of the quality insurance in universities. The development of "presidential governments", "managerial governments" or "presidential-managerial governments" (see question of research 1) is coherent with the fact that the university can be considered as a firm. It is also coherent with the development of quality insurance and certification (for the organisation of administrative services, for teaching and students' learning); these systems are borrowed to the entrepreneurial world. However, this development is unequally observed according to the countries, the universities and within each university. The research would have the objective to trace the history of the implementation of the quality insurance in universities, to understand the processes and the conditions, to identify the actual practices, to measure the effects.

5.4. Infobase EVALUE : a working tool which should be updated

The building of the infobase EVALUE, available for consultation on Internet, has needed a huge workload of documentation. It includes, apart from the synthesis texts (states of play, case studies, provisional final report), seven data bases :

Laws
Chronology (since 1993)
Statistics and Indicators
Bibliography and abstracts : several thousands of references and several hundreds of abstracts
Acronyms
Addresses (partners, evaluation bodies, reviews...)
Evaluation bodies : data base with several items for each evaluation body

The infobase EVALUE should be a working tool for the scientific researchers, interested in higher education topics and/or on evaluation topics, for the key-actors within universities and for their partners, for the ministries, for the media. It would be a great damage if the knowledge, which has been accumulated, had to be built, once again, by other people.

Those data bases, in order to keep their utility, should be updated. It is a technical and a scientific work, which requires specific skills and specific financial grants.

A consultation, close to the 11 EVALUE partners, gave the following results :

- nine partners are interested in participating in the Infobase updating,
- the infobase should be progressively open to other European countries, particularly to Netherlands and Sweden, because of their experience in higher education evaluation,
- a yearly updating appears the most desirable.

Those data bases could be used to publish every year a « state of play » on Higher Education and Evaluation in Europe (as we made for the eight countries in 1996 and 1998).

6. ANNEXES

6.1. List of deliverables (February 1996 to August 1998)

1. Progress Reports (paper and floppy disks)
- august 1996
- february 1997
- august 1997
- february 1998

2. States of Play (CD-Rom)
- state of play 1996 (july 1996)
- state of play 1998 (april 1998)

3. 31 Case Studies (CD-Rom)
- case studies 1 (february 1997)
- case studies 2 (july 1997)
- case studies 3 (september 1997)
- case studies 4 (february 1998)
- case studies "revisited" (april 1998)

4. Data Base (CD-Rom)

Bases created in july 1996, updated in february 1997, in may 1998
- Laws
- Chronology (since 1993)
- Statistics and Indicators
- Bibliography and abstracts : several thousands of references and several hundreds of abstracts
- Acronyms
- Addresses (partners, evaluation bodies, reviews...)
- Evaluation bodies : data base with several items for each evaluation body

5. Final report (august 1998 : paper and CD-Rom)
- final report (paper)
- CD-ROM : states of play, case studies, data base, provisional final report (part 3)

The final report is delivered in two versions (French and English), i.e. in the two languages of the partnership EVALUE. All the other deliverables are either in French or in English.

6.2. Dissemination and exploitation of results : publications, conferences, university degrees, responsibilities...

1. Scientific publications (chapters in books, articles in reviews...)

ALESTALO Marja (1996)
"Yliopisto valtion käskyläisenä" (The University under the Control of the State)
Sosiologia, 3, pp. 251-252

ALESTALO Marja (1996)
"Tiede-eliitin valta ja vastuu" (The Power and Responsibility of Scientific Elite)
in B. Helenius, E. Hämäläinen & J. Tuunainen (eds)
Kohti McDonalds yliopistoa (Towards the McDonalds University)
Tammi, Jyväskylä, pp. 246-280

ALESTALO Marja (1997)
"Variations in State Responsiveness: The Science System and Competing Theories of the State".
International Sociology, 12, 1, pp. 73-92

HÄYRINEN-ALESTALO Marja (1998)
"Is Knowledge-Based Society a Relevant Strategy for Civil Society?"
in K. Adhikari & A. Sales (eds.)
Knowledge, Economy and Society
SAGE (in print)

BOFFO Stefano (1997)
"Power distribution and evaluation in Italian universities"
European Journal of Education, n°2

BOFFO Stefano, **MOSCATI** Roberto (1998)
"Note su università e valutazione"
Economia e Lavoro, n.1

DUBOIS Pierre (1997)
"Universités. Croissance et diversité de l'offre de formation"
Formation Emploi, n°58, avril-juin 1997, pp. 7-12

DUBOIS Pierre (1997)
"Universités. Les stratégies de l'offre de formation"
Formation Emploi, n°58, avril-juin 1997, pp. 13-26

DUBOIS Pierre (1997)
"L'organisation des universités : complexification, diversification, rationalisation, évaluation"
Sociétés Contemporaines, n°28, 1997, pp. 13-32

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1996)
"Women in educational management in France"
European Journal of Education, Volume 31, n°4, pp. 389-401

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1997)
"France"
in **WILSON** Maggie (ed)
Women in Educational Management : a European Perspective
Londres, Paul Chapman Ed, pp. 37-51

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1997)
"Université, les conséquences de la croissance, in La France à la recherche de ses universités"
Harvard University (Center for European Studies), USA***, French Politics and Society***, *vol.15, n°1*, Winter

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1997)
"Les mutations de l'Université"
Sciences Humaines, n°70, mars 1997, pp. 12-17

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1997)
"Les premiers cycles : états des lieux"
Paris, ***Les Cahiers de l'ADMES***, 10, (Journée d'études du 6 décembre 1996)

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1998)
"L'Université : état des lieux"
in **RUANO-BORBALAN** Jean-Claude (ed)
Eduquer et former
Auxerre, Editions Sciences Humaines, pp. 465-472

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1998)
"La recherche pédagogique : une grande absente à l'Université"
in **RUANO-BORBALAN** Jean-Claude (ed)
Eduquer et former
Auxerre, éd. Sciences Humaines, pp. 109-110

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1998)
Enseignant-chercheur, approche d'un métier
Université Paris XIII, note pour l'habilitation à diriger des recherches, 30 juin 1998, 129 p.

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1998)
"Les enseignants-chercheurs et l'enseignement"
Colloque *De la reflexio a la innovacio pedagogica a l'ensenyament de ciences aplicades a farmacia*
Université de Barcelone, Faculté de Pharmacie, 13 février 1998
Les Cahiers de l'ADMES, 13, octobre 1998.

GUEISSAZ Albert (1997)
"La transformation des organisations universitaires"
Sociétés Contemporaines, n°28, 1997, pp. 5-13

GUEISSAZ Albert (1997)
"Informatisation et dynamique des relations entre administratifs, enseignants et étudiants dans les établissements universitaires"
Sociétés Contemporaines, n°28, 1997, pp. 33-56

GUEISSAZ Albert, **HÄYRINEN-ALESTALO** Marja (1998)
"La contractualisation entre le ministère et l'université : comparaison France-Finlande"
Article en préparation

JOBERT Annette, **MARRY** Catherine (1997)
"En Europe, Réussir à l'école, pour quel emploi",
in J.P. Terrail (ed)
La scolarisation de la France. Critique de l'état des lieux, La Dispute, 209-227

JOBERT Annette, **TALLARD** Michèle (1997)
"Politique de formation et de certification des branches professionnelles en France",
in Moebus M. et Verdier Eric
Les diplômes professionnels en Allemagne et en France, conception et jeux d'acteurs
L'Harmattan, pp 77-91.

JOBERT Annette (1998)
"Un nouvel espace de régulation collective : la formation en région"
in Bourque R. et Bernier C. (eds)
Regards croisés sur la formation professionnelle et les relations professionnelles en Europe et au Québec
Presses de l'université Laval, pp 27-45

MORA José-Ginés (1996)
University Graduates in the Spanish Labour Market
Universidad de Valencia, rapport de recherche pour EVALUE

MOSCATI Roberto (1998)
"Autonomia e trasformazioni dell'istruzione superiore nei paesi europei"
Il Mulino, 2/98

POTOCKI MALICET Danielle (1997)
"Evaluation and Self-Evaluation in French Universities"
European Journal of Education, Volume 32, n°2, pp. 165-174

POTOCKI MALICET Danielle (1997)
"Les règles de scolarité dans l'université : importance et rôle des règles et des pratiques locales"
Sociétés Contemporaines, n°28, 1997, pp. 57-78

TARROU Anne-Lise Høstmark, **OPDAL** Liv Randi, **HOLMESLAND** Içara da Silva (1998)
Evaluation of Higher Education. A Way towards Quality Assurance of the Universities (Research, Education, Organisation)
Book project with the Scandinavian University Press, Oslo

WEST Anne, **NODEN** Philip, **HOLDSTOCK** Claire (1998)
"The evaluation of teaching and research : policy and practice in three universities"
Quality in Higher Education (publication in preparation)

2. Communications in scientic conferences

Communications for the 14th World Congress of Sociology, 1998, 26 July - 1 August

ALVES Mariana, **AMBROSIO** Teresa (1998)
"Criteria, tools and practices of evaluation of the relationship university - labour market, the Portuguese case"

HÄYRINEN-ALESTALO Marja, **GUEISSAZ** Albert (1998)
"Changing Objectives of Expertise. Experiences of Evaluation of the Universities in Europe"
Joint session of RC23 and RC04 : Evaluating the Development of Universities, Approaches from the Sociology of Science, Education and Organization II

OPDAL Liv Randi, **BOFFO** Stefano, **CHAVE** Daniel, **KAUKONEN** Erkki (1998)
"Evaluation of research at European universities"

SIMONYI Agnes (1998)
"Evaluation of the university-territory relationship"

Other communications in scientific congresses

ALESTALO Marja (1997)
"Is Knowledge-Based Society a Relevant Strategy for Civil Society?"
Montreal, International Conference on "Knowledge, Economy and Society" by the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics (SASE) and the University of Montreal, July 3-5

ALESTALO Marja (1997)
"Has Neo-Liberalism provided Any Real Alternatives to the Welfare State?"
Montreal, International Conference by SASE, July 5-7, 1997

HÄYRINEN-ALESTALO Marja (1998)
"Is the University Able to Respond to the Demands of Technology Policy?"
Lissabon, EASST 98 General Conference "Cultures of Science and Technology. Europe and the Global Context"
Lissabon, Portugal, September 30 - October 3

AMBRÓSIO Teresa (1998)
"L'évaluation de la recherche"
Communication présentée au séminaire international sur l'évaluation organisé par l'Université d'Evora (Portugal), 15 et 16 juin

AMBRÓSIO Teresa (1998)
"Evaluation des universités et politique d'enseignement supérieur"
Communication présentée au séminaire international sur l'évaluation organisé par l'Université d'Evora (Portugal), 15 et 16 juin

ALVES Mariana (1998)
"Evaluation de la relation formation-emploi"
Communication présentée au séminaire international sur l'évaluation organisé par l'Université d'Evora (Portugal), 15 et 16 juin

ALVES Mariana, **AMBROSIO** Teresa (1998)
"Evaluation of universities : the evaluation of the education-employment relationship"
Aveiro, Portuguese Society of Sciences of Education, February

BOFFO Stefano, **MOSCATI** Roberto (1997)
"Evaluation in the Italian Higher Education System: Many Tribes, Many Territories, Many Godfathers"
Valencia, colloque "Present and Future University Challenges", 16-17 september

BOFFO Stefano, **MOSCATI** Roberto (1998)
"The Evaluation of Universities : a study on eight European countries"
Kassel, Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER), Annual Conference, 3-5 september

BOFFO Stefano, **MOSCATI** Roberto (1998)
"Evaluating Higher Education"
Rome, European Association (EES), International Conference on "Evaluation : profession, business or politics", 29-31 october

DUBOIS Pierre (1996)
"Universities and firms : more and more cooperation, less and less money?"
Rome, colloque "New competences : the linkage between universities and enterprises", novembre

DUBOIS Pierre (1997)
"*Evaluations of university governments in Europe"*
Londres, colloque international "What kind of university?", juin

ESTRELA Maria Teresa (1997)
"O processo de avaliação. Estudo comparativo"
II Jornadas de Avaliação, Reitoria da Universidade de Lisboa, 25 de Junho

ESTRELA Maria Teresa, **VEIGA SIMÃO** Ana Margarida (1998)
"Algumas reflexões sobre práticas de avaliação do ensino e dos docentes a partir da informação recolhida no projecto EVALUE"
Seminário Internacional "Avaliação das Universidades, problemáticas e Metodologias", Universidade de Évora, 15 e 16 de Junho de 1998

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1996)
"Evaluation et auto-évaluation des universités en Europe : présentation du projet EVALUE"
Grenoble, Colloque de l'Association pour le Développement des Méthodes d'Evaluation en Europe, 18-20 septembre

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1997)
"*L'évaluation des enseignements à l'Université en France"*
Liège, 15ème colloque de l'Association Internationale de Pédagogie Universitaire, 6-10 juillet

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise, **HOSTMARK-TARROU** Anne-Lise (1998)
"Les effets de l'évaluation sur les enseignants-chercheurs à l'université : comparaison France-Norvège"
Paris, 4ème biennale de l'Education et de la Formation, 15-17 avril

FAVE-BONNET Marie-Françoise (1997)
*"*Les attitudes des enseignants-chercheurs vis à vis des premiers cycles*"*
Strasbourg, Symposium ITEM SUP : Les NTIC et les premiers cycles, 17-19 septembre 1997

GUEISSAZ Albert (1997)
"The universities between profession, public service, and enterprise : the contradictions of the rationalization process in french, german and italian universities"
Montréal, The Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics, 9th International Conference, July 5-7

GUEISSAZ Albert (1998)
"Informatisation et performances des organisations universitaires : les arbitrages des acteurs"
Aix-en-Provence, revue Politiques et Management Publics, colloque "La performance publique", 28-29 mai

JOBERT Annette (1998)
"Développement des enseignements supérieurs et dynamique de croissance régionale en Europe"
Bologne, 11ème congrès mondial de l'Association Internationale des Relations Professionnelles, 22-26 septembre

KAUKONEN Erkki, **NIEMINEN** Mika (1998)
"S&T systems in transition: The Triple Helix from a small country perspective"
New York/Purchase, Conference on "A Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations: The Future Location of Research", January 7-10

POTOCKI-MALICET Danielle (1997)
"Evaluation des enseignements et des dispositifs d'accompagnement"
Université Libre de Bruxelles, Communication aux journées de l'Association Internationale de Pédagogie Universitaire (AIPU), 24 janvier

POTOCKI MALICET Danielle (1998)
"Les défis de l'évaluation des enseignements universitaires"
Toulouse, communication au colloque Réseau Francophone de Recherche en Education et Formation, 28-29 Octobre

TARROU Anne-Lise Høstmark (1998)
"Evaluation of the Organisation of Universities and Colleges in Norway. Challenges to Teacher Education in the 21st Century"
Limerick, 23rd Annual Conference, Association for Teacher Education in Europe, 24-30 August

3. Learning young researchers : university degrees

ALMEIDA Marta
O factor humano na avaliação do ensino superior: os actores e a sua formação. Contributos para a detecção de necessidades de formação dos responsáveis pela avaliação do ensino superior em Portugal
Dissertation de mestrado en préparation, Université de Lisbonne

CASTELLE Aurélie (1998)
Le palmarès des universités
Mémoire de maîtrise de Sociologie, Université de Paris X, juin

DIECKHOFER Sonja (1998)
Long on vision, short on cash. Higher Education in the 21st century : an anglo-german comparison
Dissertation for Msc degree in European Social Policy, London School of Economics and Political Sciences

FRIÃES Rita (1998)
A avaliação do ensino e dos professores no ensino superior: que referenciais?
Dissertation de mestrado en préparation, Université de Lisbonne

GHINI Aurora (1999)
Facteurs et obstacles au développement de l'évaluation : comparaison France Italie
Thèse de laurea en préparation, Université de Milan

LEU Frédérique (1996)
Qui candidate et qui est admis au concours d'entrée de professeur des écoles? Comparaison entre deux Instituts Universitaires de Formation des Maîtres
Mémoire de maîtrise de Sociologie, Université de Paris X, juin

LEU Frédérique (1997)
La formation professionnelle continue dans les universités : une double marginalisation?
Mémoire de DEA de Sociologie, Université de Paris X, juin

NIEMINEN Mika (1999)
University research in transition
Doctorat en préparation, Université de Tampere

SNELL Karoliina (1999)
Changing objectives of Education at the Universities
Master Degree in preparation, University of Helsinki

4. Responsibilities of EVALUE researchers in university bodies, in national bodies, in committees for the reform of Higher Education

Marja **HÄYRINEN-ALESTALO** is a member of the Social Sciences Faculty Council in her university (university of Helsinki)

Teresa **AMBROSIO** is the president of the Education Committee close to the Portuguese Parliament.

Stefano **BOFFO** and Roberto **MOSCATI** are members of the Martinotti Commission, charged by the ministry (MURST), of a report on the university pedagogical autonomy (report at the end of 1997)

Pierre **DUBOIS** is a member of the University National Council in sociology and is a member of the University Council in his university (Paris X Nanterre)

Roberto **MOSCATI** is a member of the Internal Evaluation Unit (Nucleo di Valutazione) at the University of Pavie

Josep **ROTGER** has, in his university (university of Girona), the responsibility of the Continuous Education

5. Discussion of the research results within the observed universities, interventions beside official bodies in Higher Education (ministries, rectors' conferences, professional bodies), or close to reflection groups on Higher Education and/or Evaluation

ALESTALO Marja (1997)
"Tiedon etsijästä rahan palvelijaksi - Tieteensosiologi Marja Alestalon näkemyksiä muuttuvasta yliopistosta" (From a Searcher of Knowledge to a Servant of Money - The Views of Marja Alestalo, the Sociologist of Science, about the Changing University
Tutkain, February.

APODAKA P. (1998)
"Presentación al Consejo Social de los resultados de la investigación EVALUE en el caso de la Universidad del País Vasco"

DUBOIS Pierre (1998)
"Evaluer le gouvernement des universités"
Participation à la table ronde : *"*Organisation et management des universités*"*, Colloque annuel de la Conférence des Présidents d'Université, colloque sur le thème *"*L'Evaluation : pour quoi faire?*"*, Limoges, 19-20 mars (résumé de l'intervention dans ***Espace Universitaire***, *"*L'évaluation au pouvoir*"*, 23, mai, 1998)

DUBOIS Pierre (1998)
"L'évaluation de la recherche"
Présentation des résultats d'EVALUE, Ministère de l'Education Nationale, de la Recherche et de la Technologie, Direction de la Recherche, Direction Scientifique des Sciences Economiques, Juridiques et Sociales, Paris, 9 avril

DUBOIS Pierre (1998)
"Renforcement du gouvernement des universités et autonomie financière des établissements"
Communication aux 12èmes journées de printemps de l'Association des Agents Comptables d'Université, journées sur le thème *"*Les universités et l'Europe*"*, Caen, 12 juin

DUBOIS Pierre (1998)
"Les nouvelles technologies et la coordination des recherches en sciences sociales"
Conférence au département de Sociologie, Université de Milan, 24 juin

DUBOIS Pierre (1998)
"Overview of national approaches : the EVALUE project"
Paris, CRE Institutional Evaluation Programme, Debriefing Seminar, 10-12 octobre

ESTRELA Maria Teresa, **VEIGA SIMÃO** Ana Margarida, **ALMEIDA** Marta, **FRIAES** Rita (1997)
Evaluation et auto-évaluation des universités en Europe: présentation du projet EVALUE
Agenda Semanal da Universidade de Lisboa/ Boletim do Conselho de Avaliação / Boletim da Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação da Universidade de Lisboa, 1997/98

ESTRELA Maria Teresa, **VEIGA SIMÃO** Ana Margarida, **ALMEIDA** Marta, **FRIAES** Rita (1997)
Participation dans *II Jornadas de Avaliação do Ensino Superior da Universidade de Lisboa*
Universidade de Lisboa, 25 de Junho

ESTRELA Maria Teresa, **VEIGA SIMÃO** Ana Margarida (1998)
Participation dans le Seminário Internacional *Avaliação das Universidades, problemáticas e Metodologias*
Universidade de Évora, 15 e 16 de Junho

GUEISSAZ Albert, **FAVE-BONNET** Marie-Françoise, **POTOCKI-MALICET** Danielle (1998)
Présentation des résultats de l'enquête
Créteil, Université Paris XII - Val de Marne, Equipe de direction, 24 février

GUEISSAZ Albert (1998)
"Contextes, enjeux, tendances de l'évaluation des universités en Europe "; "Construction de la méthodologie et des outils de l'évaluation"; "Les acteurs de l'évaluation : rôles et relations"
Evora (Portugal), communications présentées au séminaire international sur l'évaluation, 15 et 16 juin

JOBERT Annette (1997)
"Relations entre le système éducatif et le système d'emplois en France, les politiques des branches professionnelles en matière de diplôme et de certification dans l'enseignement supérieur"
Paris, Conférence devant la Commission nationale des IUT-IUP, Ministère de l'Education Nationale, 9 octobre

KAUKONEN Erkki (1997)
"Evaluation of (basic) research in Finland: contexts, trends and issues"
Evaluation of Scientific Research : Selected Experiences, Committee for Scientific and Technological Policy, OCDE/GD(97) 194: 12-26

PERERA Santi, **VILA** Ignasi, **PEREZ** M.L. (1998)
"Presentació a l'Equip de Govern de la UdG dels resultats de la recerca EVALUE en el cas de la Universitat de Girona"

PERERA Santi (1998)
"Assesorament en l'elaboració del Pla d'Avaluació de la Docència de la UdG a partir dels resultats de la recerca EVALUE"

POTOCKI-MALICET Danielle (1998)
"Du lycée à l'université : les années DEUG"
Reims, communication au colloque *"Quels savoirs enseigner dans les lycées"*, 18 mars

TARROU Anne-Lise Høstmark (1998)
"En bedre evalueringspolitikk" (A better evaluation policy)
Presentation of EVALUE in HAUGE Kristin (Ed)
Eus Fourth Frame Programme, an important source of innovation
The Research Council of Norway, January 1998

TARROU Anne-Lise Høstmark (1998)
"Presentation of EVALUE Results"
National Council of Norway Network, Bergen, 24 September

TARROU Anne-Lise Høstmark (1998)
"Résultats d'EVALUE"
Conférence nationale sur l'évaluation des universités, en collaboration entre HIAK et le Conseil National pour le Réseau Norvège, Novembre

TARROU Anne-Lise Høstmark, **OPDAL** Liv Randi, **HOLMESLAND** Içara da Silva (1998)
"Les quatre études de cas norvégiennes"
Publications dans les cahiers d'HIAK, introduction en norvégien et en anglais

6. Interviews in the media

DUBOIS Pierre (1997)
"L'université gaspille"
L'Express, mai

DUBOIS Pierre (1998)
"Il est légitime de se comparer et d'être comparé à d'autres universités"
Université de Paris X Nanterre, ***Paris X Info***, mars

DUBOIS Pierre, **FAVE-BONNET** Marie-Françoise (1998)
"Trente ans après le mouvement du 22 mars, Nanterre veut faire sa révolution"
Interview, ***Le Monde***, 24 mars

DUBOIS Pierre, **POTOCKI-MALICET** Danielle (1998)
"Reims : huit pays évaluent leurs systèmes universitaires"
Interview, ***L'Union de Reims***, 4 juin

DUBOIS Pierre (1998)
"L'Agence Supérieure de l'Evaluation (proposition du rapport Attali)"
Interview, ***Vie Universitaire***, 8, juillet

DUBOIS Pierre (1998)
Augmenter la contribution des étudiants au financement de leurs études
Libre opinion proposée au journal ***Le Monde***, juillet