

Vienna, 6 – 7 October 2008

**Third workshop of the ESF Member Forum on Evaluation of Funding Schemes and Research Programmes**

**TOPICS / SCOPE**

The Workshop will be organized around two Strands:

- Strand A:** Quality of ex-post evaluation studies of funding schemes
- Strand B:** Common European indicators in the evaluation of public research performing organizations

The workshop will be organized in plenary sessions and interactive parallel sessions which will deal with dedicated topics.

The objective is to produce a set of documents which describe the state of art of and reflects the consensus on discussed issues. Those documents could be used in various organizations in planning or organizing their own evaluation activities

**STRUCTURE**

DAY I	AM	Opening		9.00 to 9.30	
		Plenary I			
		Break			9.30 to 12.15
		Lunch			
	PM	A1: Evaluation activities in Research funding agencies	B1: Overview of evaluation approaches in research performing organisations		13.00 to 15.30
		A2: Mapping the funding portfolio of research funding agencies	B2: Criteria and indicators of evaluation in research performing organisations:		
		Break			
A3: Experiences in ensuring quality in ex-post evaluation		B2 (continued) : Criteria and indicators of evaluation in research performing organisations:		16.00 to 17.30	
	Short plenary session to report on the key outcomes of the first day			17.30 to 18.00	
<b>End of day one : 17.30</b>					
DAY II	AM	A3 (continued) Experiences in ensuring quality in ex-post evaluation	B2 (continued) : Criteria and indicators of evaluation in research performing organisations:	9.00 to 10.30	
			Break		
		Plenary II : Updates on major international initiatives		11.30 to 12.30	
		Lunch			
	PM	Plenary III: Report from the activities of the three strands ( 3 presentations of the chairs/rapporteurs)		13.30 to 14.20	
Feedback roundtable and Wrap up			14.20 to 14.50		
<b>End of workshop : 16.30</b>					

**ORGANIZING TEAM**

Anke Reinhardt, DFG  
Rudi Novak, FWF  
Gerit Oberraufner, FWF

Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman, ESF  
Isabelle Vonesch, ESF  
Alexis-Michel Mugabushaka, ESF

**OPENING SESSION**

8.30 – 9.00	Arrival and Registration
9.00	Opening and Welcoming - <b>Christoph Kratky, FWF President (tbc)</b>
9.20	Setting the scene and structure of the workshop – <b>Neil Williams, ESF</b>

**PLENARY SESSION I 9.30 to 12**

45'	9.30	Quality assurance in evaluation – standards and practices – <b>Klaus Zinöcker, Plattform and Vienna Science and Technology Fund (WWTF, Austria)</b>
	10.15	Break
45'	10.45	The study process of the evaluation / review reports at the US National Academies – <b>Michael Moloney, US National Academy of Sciences</b>
45'	11.30	Peer Review: Principles of Good Practice - ESF MO Forum on Peer Review- <b>Patricia Vogel, NWO;</b>

**PLENARY SESSION II : Update on major international initiatives**

30'	11.30	Use of indicators in the evaluation of the EC Framework programme – <b>Peter Fisch</b>
30'	12.00	The ERC Monitoring, Assessment and Evaluation Strategy: the Framework and experiences with the first call for evaluation studies (working title) – <b>Anne Mallaband, ERC</b>
30'	12.30	Key outcome of the 10 <sup>th</sup> International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators – <b>Rudi Novak, FWF</b>

**PLENARY SESSION III : Reports from the sessions of the two Strands by the Chairs**

20'	13.30	Strand A : Rapporteur Jürgen Güdler
20'	13.50	Strand B : Rapporteur : Michel Dodet
30'	14.10	Feedback roundtable and Wrap up

---

**PARALLELL SESSIONS : STRAND A**

	<p><b>A1 The wide spectrum of Evaluation activities in Research funding agencies.</b>  <b>Chair : Brendan Curran, HRB Ireland</b>  Based on the presentations of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop of the forum, this session will present an overview of the various approaches to evaluation in different organizations.  The outcome will be a document recording the wide spectrum of the evaluation activities in research funding agencies and showing similarities on which further cooperation can be based on. The document can be used by evaluation officers looking for organizations which are engaged in the type of evaluation of her/his interest. This session will also help clarifying the concepts and levels of evaluations.</p>
	<p><b>A2 Mapping the funding portfolio of research funding agencies</b>  <b>Chair: Frank Bingen, FNR Luxembourg</b>  In the previous workshops of the forum, the ideas “benchmarking results of ex-post evaluations and “jointly conducting or synchronizing ex-evaluations” were often discussed as means to enhance the quality of own evaluation process.  A prerequisite for such an exercise is an understanding of how comparable the funding schemes that one wishes to evaluate are (in terms of objectives and “intervention logic and targets groups).  In this session a mapping exercise of funding schemes of selected research funding agencies will be presented and discussed.  The objective is to get an overview of similar research funding schemes which can be (ex-post) evaluated in similar ways.</p>
	<p><b>A3 Experiences in ensuring quality in ex-post evaluation</b>  <b>Chair: Gro Helgesen, Research Council Norway</b>  In most organizations (ex-post) evaluation play a crucial role guiding future developments of their funding schemes. Therefore it is crucial that the evaluation process itself meet highest standards. The session will deal with among others with following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Which are the experiences of the organizations in commissioning external studies and how do they ensure that those studies meet the highest standards?</li> <li>- Ex-post evaluations of “thematic programs” are conducted generally in two steps: (1) Research groups are asked to prepare a “self-evaluation reports” which are then (2) reviewed by the external panels. Which are the potential sources of bias/inaccuracies? How do the organizations ensure the accuracy of the stated facts and the overall integrity of the process?</li> </ul> <p>Following cases studies will be presented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Ex-post evaluation of EAU, a FNR thematic programme – <b>Frank Bingen (on behalf of Christiane Kaell)</b></i></li> <li>2. <i>Ensuring the quality of an evaluative study - the case study of the DFG commissioned study to evaluate Transregional Collaborative Research Centres- <b>Anke Reinhardt</b></i></li> <li>3. <i>Process of evaluation of research fields/disciplines at the Research Council Norway - <b>Gro Helgesen</b></i></li> <li>4. <i>How the Academy of Finland ensures the quality of ex-post evaluation- <b>Anna Maija Lehvo</b></i></li> <li>5. <i>Experiences of the Foundation for Polish Science in ex-post evaluation <b>Marta Lazarowicz, FPS</b></i></li> <li>6. <i>ESF MO Forum on Peer Review: the Action Plan and its implementation - ESF MO Forum on Peer Review - <b>Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman, ESF</b></i></li> </ol>

---

**PARALLELL SESSIONS : STRAND B**  
**Chair : Michel Dodet, INRA, France**

*A meeting of the Working Group on Common European Indicators in European research Performing Organizations agreed that the Strand B will be structured in three sessions*

	<b>Introducing the Strand B:</b>  Challenges for the production of indicators: an introduction – <b>by Michel Dodet, INRA</b>
<b>Session B1</b>	<b>Criteria and Indicators to evaluate “Internationalization /Embedment in the international collaborations” of research performing organizations</b>  Chair: <b>Sarah Chen, CNR Italy</b> Introductory note: <b>Emanuela Reale, CNR-CERIS , Italy</b>
<b>Session B2</b>	<b>Criteria and Indicators to evaluate the innovation capacity of research performing organizations</b>  Chair: <b>Valerio Vercesi, INFN, Italy</b>  Introductory note: <b>Emanuela Reale, CNR-CERIS , Italy</b>  On the experience of the UK RCs in assessing innovation & societal impact of research funding - <b>Rebecca Steliarios, EPSRC, UK</b>
<b>Session B3</b>	<b>Criteria and Indicators to evaluate the innovation capacity of research performing organizations</b>  <b>Chair: Michel Dodet, INRA, France</b>  This session will discuss the results of the two previous sessions with the view of choosing one of the topics for the benchmarking exercise. The session will also discuss how this should be done (terms of references, how to collect the data needed ...).