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Evaluation is more than applying methods. It is also “political and managerial activity, an input into the complex mosaic from which emerge policy decisions and resources for the planning, design, implementation, and continuance of programs” (Rossi & Freeman, 1993: 15).

Source: The Texas political project  https://texaspolitics.utexas.edu
The role of evaluation

Why evaluate?

1. Accountability purposes: Measuring policy effectiveness
2. Improving planning: Looking at the efficiency of policy resources
3. Improving implementation: Looking at the implementation mechanisms
4. Learning and knowledge purposes: Analysing the causes of the impacts and measures and looking at the whole policy process

Function of evaluation

- Legitimisation for the allocation of public money to R&D,
- Enhance an adequate and effective use of funding by measuring quality or impact
- Improve programme management and programmes,
- May release new ideas
- Improve transparency of the rules of the game of science and technology funding decisions
- Enhance the information basis for science and technology policies

Source: Kulhman; 2003.
Which types of decisions?

General outcomes and decisions of evaluation

01 Policy is judged to be successful -> continuation in its present form

02 Policy is judged a failure -> termination

03 Policy is judged as necessary / but changes suggested

Source: Howlett et al; 2009
Which types of changes?

Rationale of innovation policy and public R&D funding (theory, practice)

Strategy: Foresight and identification of strategic goals of public R&D funding

Implementation of innovation policy instruments and measures

Impact assessment and evaluation of public R&D funding

Source: Loikkanen et al. ; 2006
Which types of changes?

01 Content vs. process of policy instruments

02 Strategic vs. operative decisions:

• Strategic decisions (e.g., rationale of intervention, priorities and objectives, budget, supported project types)

• Operative decisions (e.g., training for beneficiaries, monitoring indicators, dissemination activities)

Source: Kupiec; 2015
## Which types of changes?

**Discussion examples from Manumix regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basque Country</th>
<th>Strategic decisions/changes</th>
<th>Operative decision/changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase of projects’ budget (Hazitek, BI, Gauzatu)</td>
<td>Changes in management’s procedures: digitalization, phasing (Hazitek, Gauzatu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in characteristics of supported programmes, e.g. Technologies, S3 priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hazitek, BI, Gauzatu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in types of beneficiaries: types of companies (Hazitek, Gauzatu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>Reshaping of technological domains according to S3 priorities (Poli d’innovazione)</td>
<td>Activities to achieve a wider involvement of beneficiaries (Manunet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding allocation (ROP, Innovazione MPMI, IR2)</td>
<td>Output indicator of OP Performance framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New actions in the policy mix (ROP)</td>
<td>Simplification of procedures (IR2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Incorporation of wider society goals and cross cutting goals</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting out evaluation direction and methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Blue – changes related to the process**

**Black – changes related to the content**
The need for coordination

Complexity of actors in STI regional policymaking

Source: Magro et al.; 2014
The need for coordination

A typical innovation governance structure
Coordination modes and instruments

**Coordination modes**

- Vertical coordination / horizontal coordination
- Hard coordination / Soft coordination
- Positive coordination / Negative coordination

**Coordination instruments / mechanisms**

- Strategies, plans and programmes
- Organisational structures (e.g. inter-departmental committees)
- Laws, regulations or standards
- Agreements and contracts
- Finance and budget
- Actions linked to staff (e.g. mobility and training)
- Evaluation and indicators
- Reports, exploratory studies, consultancy, etc.
- Calls, informal contacts, personal relationships, etc.
- Inter- and intra-party relationships

Sources: Braun, 2008; Magro et al, 2014; OCDE 2010; Orkestra, 2017.
Coordination: from evaluation to decision

Let us discuss the Manumix examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASQUE COUNTRY</th>
<th>PIEMONTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation to influence future decision making</strong>&lt;br&gt;Continued testing and probing&lt;br&gt;Possible role for Innovation Advisory Council for Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example – targeted Innovation Vouchers for Structural Steel CE marking to take advantage of the ‘Fit for Nuclear’ supply chain opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence gathered to help Innovation senior managers build a business case to input into future business planning (post European Funding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compete for UK industrial strategy funding/Wales contribution to UK GVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post BREXIT strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors that influence on evaluation use

Usability and Use

Usability

Elements related to the evaluation process: how evaluation is organized, quality, relevance, credibility…

Use

Elements related to the capacity of organizations to uptake the results: structures, practices, political climate…

Factors that influence on evaluation use

- BUY-IN
- QUALITY
- INVOLVEMENT
- FIT
- COMPLEMENTARITY
- TIMELINESS & PLANNING

Evaluation makes significant impacts only at certain periods of time (e.g. during the design)

- Understand the policymaking cycle and determine the best moment for delivering of evaluation results
- Plan evaluations to respond to decision making needs
- Flexibility in the timing of evaluation
- Framework contracts to avoid length of procurement procedures

Appropriate evaluation design and process for the need of evaluation. E.g.:

- Decisions on resource allocation – analysis of efficiency
- Accountability purposes – steering group, communication strategy…
- Learning purposes – interactive modes of evaluation

What about in your regions?
Involvement

a) Those responsible for uptake of results

Direct involvement:
- On defining terms of reference
- Taking part in the steering group
- Discussing draft and final results

b) Wider stakeholders

Involvement through consultation, expert hearings, etc.

What about in your regions?

Source: Ginaelle et al.; 2016.
Buy-in

• Relevance of support of senior management (although usually implicit -> instrumental use) for evaluation results to be “filtered up”

• Need to ensure “buy-in” and ownership
  • Through institutionalizing evaluation: assigning specific roles for senior managers in defining production and dissemination of evaluation
  • Promoting evaluation culture (ongoing process)

• Involvement for strategic use of evaluation particularly important in:
  • Planning stage (discussing evaluation terms)
  • Discussion of draft evaluation results

What about in your regions?
Evaluation quality, fit and complementarity

- Relevance of the quality of evaluation exercise.
  - Quality of the content and the process of evaluation
  - Credibility of recommendations (connection between recommendations and results)
  - Relevance of combining subject-matter and evaluation expertise
  - Scope – narrow focus evaluations usually more useful

- Fit to purposes and organization:
  - Fit of evaluation approaches and methods to evaluation purposes
  - Relevance of knowing the organization well and tailoring recommendations
    - E.g., Evaluation for improving implementation – practical and realistic recommendations

- Complementarity:
  - Complementarity with other “intelligence tools”, such as science and technology foresight, technology assessment (Kulhman, 2003)

What about in your regions?
Final reflections

1.- Regarding the use of evaluation results to improve the policy-mix in your regions…
   - What works?
   - What doesn’t work or could be improved? Do you know of changes that should and have not been made? Why has this happened?

2.- Is there anything from other regions’ way of doing that you think could be interesting for your region?

3.- What have we learned from this learning pillar?
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Thank you!

Twitter: @InterregManumix
Web: https://www.interregeurope.eu/manumix/
Linkedin: https://www.linkedin.com/in/manumix-interreg-312014141/

Questions/Comments welcome