

RISIS



RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE FOR SCIENCE
AND INNOVATION POLICY STUDIES

SIPER Basic Tutorial

Elisa Wallwaey (Fraunhofer ISI), Susanne Böhner (Fraunhofer ISI)
August 2019



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement N° 824091

Outline

1	Introduction	2
2	Fields of Application and Coverage.....	2
2.1	Policy Makers	2
2.2	Evaluation Professionals	2
2.3	Academics	2
3	Basic User Guide	2
3.1	Search Criteria Structure	2
3.1.1	Related policy measure characteristics.....	3
3.1.2	Evaluation characteristics: Basic	4
3.1.3	Evaluation characteristics: Topics covered	5
3.1.4	Evaluation characteristics: Design	6
3.1.5	Evaluation characteristics: Data collection methods	6
3.1.6	Evaluation characteristics: Data analysis methods.....	7
3.1.7	Document properties	8
4	Basic Examples	9
4.1	The Search Process.....	9
4.2	Exemplary Search Runs	9
4.2.1	Ex-post evaluations in the UK including case study analysis.....	9
4.2.2	Evaluation reports on STI programmes / measures by supranational / international bodies since 2000	13
5	Published use cases.....	14

1 Introduction

SIPER stands for Science and Innovation Policy Evaluations Repository, which is a central source of knowledge on science, technology and innovation (STI) studies evaluation reports. Furthermore, it is embedded in a larger scale multi-partner effort, entitled the Research Infrastructure for Science and Innovation Policy Studies (RISIS) project, now having started its second round aiming at interconnecting datasets from various disciplines. SIPER's objective is mainly to identify, collect and characterise evaluation reports of STI studies for presenting them to wider stakeholders and to conduct academic research by analysing these evaluations. A central benefit of SIPER is that it pools the evaluation reports in a single location while providing further information, e.g. on their quality, as detailed below (3 Basic User Guide).

2 Fields of Application and Coverage

Across the world, numerous avenues of support for science and innovation exist. These are provided by governments, ministries, agencies, together with international and / or supranational organisation and a host of non-governmental organisations. However, all these actors continually seek to determine the effects of their policy interventions: How well are they being managed? What results have been achieved? How effective or efficient is their implementation? What impact have they had?

Having initially started with evaluations mainly from OECD member countries, the ultimate goal is to reach global coverage for STI evaluation reports issued since 2000. The basic rationale of SIPER is that effective policymaking depends on evidence and learning. For facilitating this learning process, a central benefit of SIPER is that it pools evaluation reports of STI policies and measures at a single location that is accessible online. Particular attention is paid to three distinct stakeholder groups:

2.1 Policy Makers

Policy makers in charge of the design, implementation, management and evaluation of science and innovation policy interventions and instruments can use the database for purposes of information on various combinations of characteristics of policy interventions / measures and the related effectiveness and efficiency in achieving the aim(s) stated before implementation.

2.2 Evaluation Professionals

Evaluation practitioners and those generally engaged into science and innovation policy evaluation or the broader area of STI can retrieve information on e.g. the methods applied in the evaluation of projects / measures (in specific fields), the analytical steps performed or the conclusions and recommendations derived. These may influence or inspire their own evaluations.

2.3 Academics

In addition to the above mentioned stakeholder groups, SIPER provides a unique source of knowledge for academic research by using the evaluation reports e.g. either as a source of inspiration for own research and / or methods or to compare results to other similar programmes / measures included in SIPER.

3 Basic User Guide

Please note that this user guide and the graphics therein are based on the interface of http://si-per.eu/Search/MainSearch##RS_panel (date of access: 2nd August 2019). Once the technical transfer from the former unit (University of Manchester) is completed, the database will be running on Fraunhofer ISI servers and will have a new user interface.

3.1 Search Criteria Structure

The search criteria are organised in a hierarchy and grouped in seven sections. Each section contains a fixed number of subsections, which can either be searchable items themselves or an

unsearchable title only. Within each subsection a fixed number of searchable subitems is defined. You can select various search criteria in order to better tailor the search results to your interests or requirements. Any combination of searchable items can be chosen, but not each of them yields results. In the online platform scrolling over each of the blue information buttons in the graphs below gives you additional information on the regarding (sub-)item.

Table 1: Overview of the main sections

	Section Name	Subsection Type	Subsection Count
1	Related policy measure characteristics	unsearchable	4
2	Evaluation characteristics: Basic	unsearchable	6
3	Evaluation characteristics: Topics covered	searchable	15
4	Evaluation characteristics: Design	searchable	5
5	Evaluation characteristics: Data collection methods	searchable	12
6	Evaluation characteristics: Data analysis methods	searchable	9
7	Document properties	unsearchable	2

Detailed information on each section is provided below. Further information on each item is included if it increases comprehending the SIPER database.

3.1.1 Related policy measure characteristics

The section contains four subsections:










Geographical area

Categorisation of the reports depending on where the programme or measure is managed and/or administered. You can select from a list of 222 entries including, next to single nations, categories such as "multiple countries" or "international / supranational body". Multiple categories can be ticked if you want to see if the reports cover any of those countries.

Target group

This item refers to the principal beneficiary / beneficiaries of the support. You can choose from ten categories to specify, e.g. if you only want to look at evaluation reports where the main beneficiary is a firm in general or a special population of SMEs.







Figure 1: Searchable target group items

- 1 Individuals 
- 2 Higher Education Institutions, HEI (including sub-departments and institutions)
- 3 Research Organisations 
- 4 Public organisations - non-R&D performing 
- 5 Intermediaries 
- 6 Firms (SME focused) 
- 7 Firms (no size-specific focus) 
- 8 Other funding organisations (e.g. charities, etc.) 
- 9 Specific industrial sector 
- 10 Specific S&T field 

Modality

How is the support provided? The main types are financial and non-financial support, but on the whole you can choose from seven options, three of which refer to direct financial support:

Figure 2: Searchable modality items

- 1 Direct financial support: grants, loans, guarantees, contracts, etc. 
- 2 Direct financial support: scholarships, fellowships, etc.
- 3 Direct financial support: (non-project specific) institutional block grants 
- 4 Indirect financial support: tax & fiscal incentives (e.g. R&D credits) 
- 5 Infrastructure support (e.g. access to & construction/upgrading of research infrastructure) 
- 6 Non-financial support (e.g. training, coordination & advisory/information support/provision) 
- 7 Prizes and awards (ex-ante inducement, ex-post performance recognition, etc.) 

Objectives

The section deals with the question why exactly the particular policy intervention was designed and implemented. You may select from a list of 16 objectives:

Figure 3: Searchable objective items

- 1 Enhancement of education and initial/further training 
- 2 Facilitating personnel mobility (including career enhancement) 
- 3 Internationalisation of RDTI activities 
- 4 Awareness raising and promotion of public acceptance 
- 5 Strengthening/improving research excellence, relevance and management practices 
- 6 Improving absorptive capabilities and capacity 
- 7 Collaborative interactions for the production of new knowledge (inc. project focused approaches, innovation vouchers, etc.) 
- 8 Supporting broader (multiple) interactions (e.g. through clusters or networks) 
- 9 Supporting the commercialization of research (including support for the protection of IP) 
- 10 Mobilising additional (non-public) financing for innovation (e.g. support of business angels, VCTs, equity schemes, etc.) 
- 11 Stimulation of additional RDTI activity (e.g. increasing R&D expenditures) 
- 12 Strengthening the quality of RDTI activities (promotion of excellence) 
- 13 Creating new RDTI capacity (e.g. new organisations, start-ups, technology-based companies, etc.) 
- 14 Diffusion of innovation (including creation or exploitation of new markets, public procurement of innovation) 
- 15 To support priority setting (e.g. foresight exercise) 
- 16 Supporting the participation and advancement of women or minority groups in research and innovation

3.1.2 Evaluation characteristics: Basic

Geographical area

Again, you can choose from the 222 entries, but this time, the question refers to where the evaluation was commissioned.

Year of publication

Even though SIPER focuses on evaluation reports published since 2000, some earlier seminal works are included as well. Thus, currently you can choose one year or a sequence of multiple years between 1997 and 2017.

Evaluation performer

The evaluator's position in relation to the project includes three groups from which you can select:

- internal to programme: the evaluation was performed by the agency responsible for the management or administration of the programme or measure;
- external to programme: the evaluation was conducted by an evaluator external to the programme but positioned within government (including court of auditors);
- independent evaluators external to the programme and government, e.g. performed by external consultancies or specialised evaluation bodies in the private or academic sectors.

Timing of the evaluation

You may choose from four categories covering different points in a project's lifetime:

- Ex ante: The evaluation is performed before the implementation of the measure / programm (e.g. in order to estimate the outcomes and impacts it might have or difficulties it might be confronted with);
- Accompanying: The evaluation is permanently or repetitively performed during the life time of the project;
- Interim: Unlike an accompanying evaluation, interim evaluations take place at one or more specific points throughout the project's lifetime. Interim evaluations might as well be (periodic) ex post taking place after a specified phase during implementation of the measure or programme;
- Ex post: The evaluation is performed sometime after the project / measure has finished.

Purpose of the evaluation

An evaluation usually is either summative, meaning it seeks to establish the effects of programmes and the difference made on the target group (or beyond), or formative meant to support a programme / measure in its development examining e.g. how, why and under what conditions policy instruments work or fail to do so.

For the sake of completeness, a third category "other" is included, so far seven publicly searchable reports are assigned to this category.

Reference to programme logic

Logically, SIPER distinguishes three categories here from which you can choose.

Reference to the programme logic is "fully included" in the evaluation when it clearly refers to the measure's / programme's rationale of development and identifies, how the intervention is supposed to achieve the stated objectives by e.g. using a logic chart model.

When the evaluation refers in a broad sense to the implementation rationale of the programme / measure, it is categorised as "partially included".

In the absence of any kind of reference to the programme logic, the category is, of course, "not included".

3.1.3 Evaluation characteristics: Topics covered

Appropriateness

Appropriateness includes three distinct items covering three dimensions in which a measure/programme could be appropriate that can be included in an evaluation: 1) the underlying programme rationale; 2) the goals and 3) the design / modality

Coherence / complementarity to other measures or programmes

The evaluation might examine in how far a programme / measure is complementary and coherent to others (on a regional, national, international or supranational level).

Goal attainment / effectiveness

Does the measure examine whether the programme's / measure's goals were achieved?






Outputs

The evaluation analyses the direct and immediate results of the programme / measure. If you especially want the evaluation to look at the quality of outputs, you can select a special category for that.

Outcomes and impacts

Regarding the outcomes and impacts of a programme / measure you may choose from nine items if you want the evaluation to cover a certain aspect:

Figure 4: Categories of outcomes / impacts included in SIPER

- 5 Outcomes and impacts 
- 1 Regional 
- 2 National 
- 3 Multinational 
- 4 Scientific and technological 
- 5 Economic 
- 6 Social 
- 7 Education, skills & capacity 
- 8 Environmental 
- 9 Unintended 

Value for money / return on investment

Programme implementation efficiency

Additionality

Even if the evaluation report does not refer to the term additionality, the evaluation might examine at least either input, output or behavioural additionality. Then it is still included here.

Policy / strategy development

Choose this item if the evaluations should examine implications for future strategy development and policy formulation.

Gender issues

Minority / inclusivity issues

Uptake of the programme


The evaluation examines to which extent the programme / measure attracted applicants.




Degree of stakeholder satisfaction

Collaboration / partnerships

There are eight categories you may choose from covering different types of actors involved in the collaboration / partnership and / or the number of actors included:

Figure 5: Possible modes of collaborations / partnerships

14 Collaborations/partnerships 

- 1 Firm-Firm
- 2 Non-Firm - Firm 
- 3 Non-Firm - Non-Firm
- 4 Regional
- 5 National
- 6 International
- 7 Between two parties 
- 8 Between more than two parties 

Scope of mobility

The two modes of mobility that an evaluation might look at in the context of SIPER are either 1) inter-sectoral or 2) geographical mobility.

3.1.4 Evaluation characteristics: Design

Possible evaluation designs are categorised in five groups, one of which has three sub-elements.

Experimental

The evaluation includes an experimental evaluation design (i.e. including a randomised control trial) to provide evidence on e.g. the relative effectiveness of a policy intervention in comparison to other interventions or none at all.

Quasi-experimental

The quasi-experimental design comprises three categories. You can choose 1) before / after comparison (the evaluation uses data from the same sample at two or multiple distinct periods in time); 2) comparison and control groups (the evaluation compares the data of the "experimental" group to those derived from (nearly) identical samples); or 3) beneficiary self-reporting (involves asking the target of the support what would have happened in the absence of the programme / measure; i.e. if funding would not have been received).

Non-experimental

Included explicit comparison / benchmarking with similar measures

Ticking this item gives you as a result a list of evaluations comparing its object to similar or comparable programmes / measures in operation; be it in the same country or abroad.

Benchmarked against previous phases / evaluations of the programme / measure

3.1.5 Evaluation characteristics: Data collection methods

Existing databases & monitoring data

Here you can choose between existing internal (e.g. collected during programme implementation) or external (e.g. other administrative data or databases covering publications) databases / monitoring data.

Surveys



Within this category, the execution mode of the survey is not of interest, rather you can select from seven distinct target / respondent groups:

Figure 6: List of survey respondent groups

- 2 Surveys
- 1 Participants
- 2 Non-participants
- 3 Unsuccessful applicants
- 4 Nonapplicants
- 5 Stakeholders directly linked with the programme
- 6 Other parties/stakeholders

Interviews

Depending on the evaluation's focus, different groups might be interviewed. Accordingly, SIPER provides six distinct items to select:

Figure 7: Possible interview partners

- 3 Interviews
- 1 Participants
- 2 Non-participants
- 3 Unsuccessful applicants
- 4 Nonapplicants
- 5 Stakeholders directly linked with the programme
- 6 Other parties/stakeholders

The mode of conducting the interviews might, of course, vary including a range of formats such as face to face, telephone or skype interviews.

Focus groups / workshops / meetings

Peer reviews (incl. stakeholder reviews)

Formalised data on IP (patents etc.)

Publications data

The item includes common publication types (e.g. scientific / academic publications, grey literature or reports), but not patent data (included above).

Altmetrics data

If you choose this item, your list will only include evaluation reports making use of this more novel approach to using bibliometric data and information on social interactions (typically referring to a range of data sources derived from online social media).

CV data

Longitudinal tracking data

Site visits

This data collection method is usually applied when evaluating institutions or scientific facilities.

Other

For any data collection method not included in the item set above, tick this item to see which further methods might be included in evaluations as well.

3.1.6 Evaluation characteristics: Data analysis methods

Case study analysis

Network analysis

This item includes amongst others the analysis of social networks.

Econometric analysis

The evaluation includes advanced statistical methods or economic modelling approaches.

Descriptive statistics

Input / output, cost / benefit, return-on-investment analysis

Amongst others, forms of input-output analysis, return on investment, rate of return or leveraging approaches are applied here.

Intellectual property (IP) data analysis

The evaluation report includes patent statistic analyses, patent citations, technometrics or the like. You can choose whether citation analysis should be used or not.

Publications data analysis

This item refers to several types of bibliometrics. Again, you can choose if citation analysis should be included or not.

Altmetrics data analysis

The evaluation report includes the analysis of alternative or new metrics for publications and/or social interactions.

Qualitative / quantitative text analysis

Select this item if text-mining or similar approaches should be used in the evaluation reports.

3.1.7 Document properties

Language

You can select from five options here:

Figure 8: Language Options

1 Language	
1	<input type="checkbox"/> English
2	<input type="checkbox"/> French
3	<input type="checkbox"/> German
4	<input type="checkbox"/> Spanish
5	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

Availability of evaluation reports

Tick which parts of the evaluation reports should be available through SIPER:

Figure 9: Availability of Documents

2 Availability of evaluation reports	
1	<input type="checkbox"/> Appendices
2	<input type="checkbox"/> Executive summary
3	<input type="checkbox"/> Main report
4	<input type="checkbox"/> Multipurpose
5	<input type="checkbox"/> Terms of reference
6	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

4 Basic Examples

4.1 The Search Process

Searching in the database is a four-step process:

- 1) Build search criteria by selecting the searchable items provided in the search criteria builder on the main search page. The selection panel display full available search criteria.
- 2) Check the selected criteria in the summary panel at the bottom of the main search page and click [search] to start your research.

Figure 10: SIPER search template

Select your search criteria Hide

Please click on the search options panels to show/hide details of search criteria.

- 1: Related policy measure characteristics
- 2: Evaluation characteristics: Basic
- 3: Evaluation characteristics: Topics covered
- 4: Evaluation characteristics: Design
- 5: Evaluation characteristics: Data collection methods
- 6: Evaluation characteristics: Data analysis methods
- 7: Document properties

Summary of your selected search criteria Hide

- 1: Related policy measure characteristics
- 2: Evaluation characteristics: Basic
- 3: Evaluation characteristics: Topics covered
- 4: Evaluation characteristics: Design
- 5: Evaluation characteristics: Data collection methods
- 6: Evaluation characteristics: Data analysis methods
- 7: Document properties

Search
Clear criteria

- 3) You will see a list of matching evaluations for your selected criteria as the search result.
- 4) You can either use the resulting list as a starting point for your research or click on an evaluation title to see more details in the evaluation detail page (including a download function for the report(s)).

4.2 Exemplary Search Runs

4.2.1 Ex-post evaluations in the UK including case study analysis

If you decide to list all **ex-post** evaluation reports using **case study analysis** of programmes / measures **administered in the UK** the database lists the following results for your search run:

Figure 11: Result list of the exemplary search procedure

#	Evaluation title	Country	Year
1	A Feasibility Study for an Evaluation of the Impact and Added Value of the EU Structural Funds in the UK	United Kingdom	2002
2	Evaluation of the Ceredigion Social Enterprise Growth Fund Grant Scheme	United Kingdom	2014
3	Evaluation of the ESRC Research Seminars Scheme	United Kingdom	2011
4	Final Evaluation of GO Wales	United Kingdom	2015
5	Research Excellence Framework 2014: the Results	United Kingdom	2014
6	The Nature, Scale and Beneficiaries of Research Impact an Initial Analysis of Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 Impact Case Studies	United Kingdom	2015

Assuming you selected the fourth entry "Final Evaluation of GO Wales", you are forwarded to a page giving you an overview of the items in each section it has been assigned to by the SIPER team. You can download any document by clicking "Full content" in the basic information panel.

Table 2: Exemplary overview of a selected evaluation (use case: GO Wales)

<h2 style="margin: 0;">Siper Public Site</h2> <p>Basic information</p> <p>Title Final Evaluation of GO Wales</p> <p>Title (Native) Final Evaluation of GO Wales</p> <p>Code E_GB_0129</p> <p>Author Hardisty Jones Associates Ltd (HJA)</p> <p>Published year 2015</p> <p>Geographical area Single country United Kingdom, Regional level</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">#</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Document name</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Category</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Language</th> <th style="width: 25%;">View</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>E_GB_2019_AP_EN_01</td> <td>Appendices</td> <td>English</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Full content</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>E_GB_2019_MR_EN_01</td> <td>Main report</td> <td>English</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Full content</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Policy measure information</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 5%;">#</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Policy measure title</th> <th style="width: 65%;">Country</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>GO Wales Programme</td> <td>United Kingdom</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Policy measure detail</p> <p>1. GO Wales Programme</p> <p>Geographical area: Single country - United Kingdom, Regional level</p> <p>Title in native language: GO Wales Programme</p> <p>Targets (Recipient of the support)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals (researcher, student, manager, entrepreneur, investor, etc.) • Higher Education Institutions, HEI (including sub-departments and institutions) • Firms (SMEs focused) <p>Modalities (How support is provided)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct financial support: grants, loans, guarantees, contracts, etc. • Non-financial support (e.g. training, coordination and advisory/information support/provision) <p>Policy objectives (Why the support is provided)</p>					#	Document name	Category	Language	View	1	E_GB_2019_AP_EN_01	Appendices	English	Full content	2	E_GB_2019_MR_EN_01	Main report	English	Full content	#	Policy measure title	Country	1	GO Wales Programme	United Kingdom
#	Document name	Category	Language	View																					
1	E_GB_2019_AP_EN_01	Appendices	English	Full content																					
2	E_GB_2019_MR_EN_01	Main report	English	Full content																					
#	Policy measure title	Country																							
1	GO Wales Programme	United Kingdom																							

- Enhancement of education and initial/further training
- Awareness raising and promotion of public acceptance
- Improving absorptive capabilities and capacity
- Supporting collaborative interactions for the production of new knowledge and/or innovation (including project focused approaches, innovation vouchers, etc.)
- Supporting broader (multiple) interactions (e.g. through clusters or networks)

Factual characterisation

Section 1: Basic Information

1.1 Author:

- External to programme and government (independent)

1.2 Timing:

- Ex post final (after the lifetime of the measure)

1.3 Purpose of the evaluation:

- Summative (descriptive, judgemental)
- Formative (developmental, supporting)

1.4 Reference to programme logic/rationale:

- Fully - it clearly refers to the rationale for its development and identifies the way in which the intervention achieves the stated objectives (e.g. by using a logic chart model)

Section 2: Topics Covered

2.1 Aspects of the programme examined by the evaluation:

- Appropriateness of programme rationale
- Appropriateness of programme goals
- Appropriateness of design/modality
- Coherence/complementarity
- Goal attainment/effectiveness
- Outputs
 - Quality of outputs:
 - No
- Outcomes and impacts
 - Geographical scope of outcomes and impacts:
 - Yes
 - Level of geographical scope of outcomes and impacts:
 - Regional
 - National
 - Types of impacts/effects examined:
 - Economic
 - Social
 - Education, skills and capabilities



- Environmental
 - Examination of unintended impacts/effects:
 - No
 - Value for money
 - Implementation efficiency
 - Additionality
 - Types of additionality examined:
 - Output additionality
 - Behavioural additionality
- Policy/strategy development
- Gender issues
- Minority/inclusivity issues
- Degree of satisfaction of stakeholders
- Collaboration/partnerships
 - Sectoral nature of collaboration/partnership examined:
 - Non-Firm (universities, research organisations and third-sector organizations etc.) -Firm
 - Non-Firm Non-Firm (universities, research organisations and third-sector organizations etc.)
 - Geographical level of the collaboration/partnership examined:
 - Regional
 - National
 - Forms of collaboration/partnership examined:
 - Between two parties
 - Between more than two parties
- Career development/progression
- Networking

Section 3: Evaluation Design

3.1 Design approach used:

- Quasi-experimental
 - Types of quasi-experimental approach:
 - Comparison/control groups
 - Beneficiary self-reporting
- Non-experimental

3.2 Comparison with similar measures:

- Yes

3.3 Benchmarking against previous phases:

- Yes

Section 4: Data Collection Methods



4.1 Data collection methods/sources:

- Existing databases/monitoring data
 - Types of existing databases and monitoring data employed:
 - Existing internal databases/monitoring data
 - Existing external databases and monitoring data
- Surveys
 - Types of stakeholders surveyed:
 - Participants
 - Unsuccessful applicants
- Interviews
 - Types of interviewees:
 - Direct stakeholders
 - Other parties/stakeholders: Context experts

Section 5: Data Analysis Methods

5.1 Data analysis methods:

- Case study analysis
- Descriptive statistics
- Cost/benefit analysis
- Text analysis

Summary of your selected search criteria

Related policy measure characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographical area United Kingdom
Evaluation characteristics: Basic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing of the evaluation Ex post - final (after the lifetime of the measure)
Evaluation characteristics: Data analysis methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case study analysis

Note: Reproduction of http://si-per.eu/Ev/EvDetail?evCode=E_GB_0129

4.2.2 Interim evaluation reports on STI programmes / measures by supranational / international bodies since 2000

Assuming you are interested in getting a list of all **interim** evaluation reports of STI programmes or measures managed / administered by **supranational or international bodies** that were published **since the year 2000** and were evaluated **independently** (i.e. external to programme and government), you tick the relevant criteria and check your selection after the search process:

Figure 12: Overview of selected search criteria

Summary of your selected search criteria

- 1: Related policy measure characteristics
- 2: Evaluation characteristics: Basic
 - 2.1: Geographical area Supra-/international body
 - 2.2: Year of publication From 2000 To 2019
 - 2.3: Evaluation performer External to programme and government ('independent')
 - 2.4: Timing of the evaluation Interim (periodic ex post, after a specified phase during implementation of measure/programme)
- 3: Evaluation characteristics: Topics covered
- 4: Evaluation characteristics: Design
- 5: Evaluation characteristics: Data collection methods
- 6: Evaluation characteristics: Data analysis methods
- 7: Document properties

The resulting list currently encompasses 52 entries which you can either sort by country (in this case meaning supranational or international bodies) or year of publication. Of course, you can as well narrow down the list by selecting further criteria.

5 Published use cases

- Borrás, S. & Laatsit, M. (2019): Towards System Oriented Policy Evaluation? Evidence from EU28 Member States, *Research Policy* 48, pp. 312-321.
- Cunningham, P.N.; Edler, J.; Flanagan, K. & Larño, P. (2016): The Innovation Policy Mix, in: Edler, J.; Cunningham, P.; Gцk, A. & Shapira, P. (Eds.): *Handbook of Innovation Policy Impact*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Cunningham, P.N. & Gцk, A. (2015) The Impact of Innovation Policy Schemes for Collaboration, in: Edler, J.; Cunningham, P.; Gцk, A. & Shapira, P. (Eds.): *Handbook of Innovation Policy Impact*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Cunningham, P.N.; Gцk, A. & Larño, P. (2015): The Impact of Direct Support to R&D and Innovation in Firms, in: Edler, J.; Cunningham, P.; Gцk, A. & Shapira, P. (Eds.): *Handbook of Innovation Policy Impact*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Cunningham P.N. & Ramlogan, R. (2015): Innovation Networks, in: Edler, J. Cunningham, P.; Gцk, A. & Shapira, P. (Eds.): *Handbook of Innovation Policy*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Edler, J. (2016): The Impact of Policy Measures to Stimulate Private Demand for Innovation, in: Edler, J.; Cunningham, P.; Gцk, A. & Shapira, P. (Eds.): *Handbook of Innovation Policy Impact*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Edler, J.; Cunningham, P.; Gцk, A. & Shapira, P. (2016): *Handbook of Innovation Policy Impact*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Edler, J.; Gцk, A.; Cunningham, P. & Shapira, P. (2016a): Introduction: Making Sense of Innovation Policy, in: Edler, J. Cunningham, P.; Gцk, A. & Shapira, P. (Eds.): *Handbook of Innovation Policy*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Edler, J.; Gцk, A.; Cunningham, P. & Shapira, P. (2016b): Conclusions: Evidence on the Effectiveness of Innovation Policy Intervention, in: Edler, J.; Cunningham, P.; Gцk, A. & Shapira, P. (Eds.): *Handbook of Innovation Policy Impact*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Edler, J.; Berger, M.; Dinges, M. & Gцk, A. (2012): The Practice of Evaluation in Innovation Policy in Europe, *Research Evaluation*. scholar ID 176301.

- Edler, J.; Amanatidou, E.; Berger, M.; Böhner, S.; Cunningham, P.; Daimer, S.; Dinges, M.; Garefi, I.; Gцк, A. & Schmidmyer, J. (2010): INNO-Appraisal - Understanding Evaluation of Innovation Policy in Europe. Brussels / Manchester.
- Gцк, A.; Li, Y.; Cunningham, P.; Edler, J. & Larřdo, P (2016): Towards a Taxonomy of Science and Innovation Policy Instruments, Paper presented at 2016 Annual Conference of the EU-SPRI Forum, Lund (Sweden).
- Hristov, H.; Slavcheva, M.; Jonkers, K. & Szkuta, K. (2016): Intersectoral Mobility of Knowledge Transfer - Preliminary Evidence of the Impact of Intersectoral Mobility Policy Instruments, JRC Science for Policy Report.
- Kubera, Paulina (2017): Conceptual Framework for Evaluations of Economic Impacts of RDI Instruments, Research Paper, Journal Association 1901 SEPIKE, pp. 90-96.
- Miles, I. & Cunningham, P. (2006): Smart Innovation - A Practical Guide to Evaluating Innovation Programmes, Commission of the European Union.
- Reid, A.; Cunningham, P.; Edler, J.; Kamburow, T. & Simmonds, P. (2012): Evaluation of Innovation Activities - Methods and Practice, Study Funded by the European Commission, Directorate for Regional Policy, Brussels.