

# Update MOForum on (ex-post) Evaluation of Publicly Funded Research

Anko Wiegel, NWO

8 February 2011, Brussels



NWO



# MOForum on Evaluation of Publicly Funded Research

- MOForum established in 2010, first meeting in May 2010, second in November 2010
- Focus on ex-post evaluation of funding schemes and research programmes
- Aims:
  - Help to improve evaluation studies on funding schemes
  - Learn about best practices of impact assessment
  - Identify the challenges in conducting transnational comparative evaluation.



## Three working groups

- WG1: ensuring and improving quality in ex-post evaluation of funding schemes and research programmes
- WG2: assessing the impact of funding schemes on science and society
- WG3: classification systems and categorization of output data



## **WG1: three objectives**

- Recommendations on (ex-post) evaluations
- Mapping exercise on evaluation function within the MOs
- Website repository of evaluation studies



## Recommendations on ex-post evaluations

- Document containing guidelines and common standards:
  - 1. Principles/common ground
    - starting point: Danish evaluation principles
  - 2. Guidelines on performing evaluation procedures
    - guidelines from various organisations
    - Structure of Peer Review Guide
  - 3. Specific procedures?



## Danish Evaluation Commandments

1. Allocate sufficient time to planning and design of the evaluation project
2. Conduct pre-analyses if necessary to focus the goals of the evaluation
3. All actors should «play with open cards»
4. Clarify terms and conditions when establishing the contract and project description
5. Actively involve stakeholders at relevant times



## Danish Evaluation Commandments (contd)

6. Test the sustainability and scope/range of analyses along the way (meetings or preliminary presentations)
7. Always agree in advance on publication rights and specify plans to publicize results
8. The commissioning agent should not over-play its ownership, and the evaluator must guarantee standards of execution
9. Communication must be built into the project, and directed to relevant target groups along the way
10. Evaluator and commissioner should meet afterwards to discuss and critically assess the evaluation process



## Recommendations on ex-post evaluations

- Peer Review Guide experience
- ESF-expertise, secondment

### Questions:

- Ideas on an Evaluation Guide (scope, items, structure)
- Next step in development of guidelines?
- Which level should we aim for?



Thank you for your attention



NWO