Developing indicators for the evaluation of Public Engaged Research
WP9: Main objectives

WP9: Monitoring and evaluation of PER through science shops and variants and knowledge debates

- To develop a set of indicators to evaluate influences of CSO and public participation in the development of scientific knowledge with reference to specific projects and actions.
- To make available guidelines and replicable instruments and practices for such evaluation.
- To ‘test’ these indicators and instruments on initiatives undertaken by science shops as part of the present project.
- To be a resource for the project partners and individual work packages in their self-evaluation exercises.
Why evaluate?

1. **Building knowledge.** Knowledge is produced as an end in itself (thus, not necessarily for intervention).

2. **Learning.** In order to learn from what has been done. It applies to all relevant actors of the evaluated organization.

3. **Managing and planning.** In order to get a better organization. Evaluation is intended to get elements useful for decision making. Differently from the simple “learning” evaluation, it is mainly used by decision makers within an organization. It mainly focuses on internal efficiency (typically organization monitoring and evaluation, quality management etc.) and external efficacy (costs/benefits analysis; customer satisfaction etc.).

4. **Informing (accountability).** In order to give information to relevant stakeholders (funders, institutions, general public etc.). It mainly focuses on results and impacts.
Evaluating PERARES: Why? What? When?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared objective</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Needs and resources</td>
<td>CSOs Community Science shop</td>
<td>Ex-ante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Teaching and learning Research Science Shop</td>
<td>In itinere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Effects: •Outputs •Outcomes •Impacts</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning Research CSOs Community</td>
<td>Ex-post •Outputs •Outcomes •Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning
Evaluating PERARES: Phases and instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-ante</td>
<td>Checklist for early-stage evaluation</td>
<td>To be used in the preparatory phase before substantive interventions happen and researchers go into the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In itinere</td>
<td>Questionnaire for mid-point evaluation</td>
<td>To be used at a stage in a project when the project can still be modified without damage to it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-post</td>
<td>1. Questionnaire for end-point evaluation</td>
<td>1. To be used when the project report is submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Questionnaire for post-project evaluation</td>
<td>2. To be used as a means of assessing the longer-term impacts and carried out approximately 12 months after the project has completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERARES: Main indicators

Start point
• Framing and aims
• Means and organisation
• Resources
• Involvement (access, participation)
• Expectations
• Monitoring

Mid-point
• Framing
• Objectives
• Transparency
• Resources
• Involvement
• Reorientation

End of project
• Outputs
• Experience
• Resources
• Participation
• Unexpected ideas
• Project statistics

Post project
• Processes and relations
• Utility
• Comments
• Project outputs (figures)
• Longer-term impacts
## PERARES: In itinere indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Framing    | Project alignment with the original aims  
Definition of main questions at the start  
Significant unexpected issues causing the main questions to be redefined  
Modifications agreed between the partners  
Need to redefine questions and aims as the project proceeds |
| Objectives | Level of achievement of objectives set for this point  
Possibility of overcoming delays experienced so far  
Need to re-set the objectives for the later stages of the project |
| Transparency | Roles and responsibilities clearly established  
Efficiency of project management  
Allocation of personnel resources  
Allocation of financial resources  
Adequacy of methods  
Fairness of project management |
| Resources | Quality of personnel  
Quantity of personnel  
Efficient use of personnel  
Adequateness of funding  
Adequateness of administrative facilities |
| Involvement | Participants’ opportunities to contribute to the project’s content  
Participants’ opportunity to contribute to the project’s methods  
Efficiency of partnership |
| Reorientation | Present need for significant changes  
Future need for significant changes |
### PERARES: Output indicators (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outputs    | • Meeting of the end-user’s needs  
            • Usefulness to a wider public than the immediate client  
            • Relevance to academic research  
            • Readability of publications produced for a non-specialist public  
            • Improvement of students’ ability to perform research  
            • Improvement of students’ Problem-solving abilities  
            • Improvement of students’ capacity for self-directed work  
            • Outputs’ consistency with overall objectives |
| Experience | • Participants’ overall satisfaction  
            • Quality of staff involved (e.g. friendly, pro-active, client-oriented, accessible)  
            • Partners’ understanding of procedures  
            • Students’ supervision quality  
            • Satisfaction of partners’ expectations |
| Resources  | • Appropriateness of personnel resources  
            • Appropriateness of financial resources  
            • Appropriateness of facilities (e.g. equipment, meeting spaces) |
| Participation | • Development of common ideas  
                • Development of a common understanding of the problem area  
                • Partnership’s utility in achieving the project results  
                • Efficiency of partnership  
                • Students’ commitment  
                • Supervisors’ commitment |
## PERARES: Output indicators (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Unexpected ideas    | • Unexpected ideas or innovative process/product that emerged from the project  
                       • Indication of eventual relevant change                                                                                     |
| Project statistics  | • Students involved in the project  
                       • Total credits, e.g. ECTS, obtained for participation in this project by each individual student involved  
                       • Average grade for student assignments  
                       • Academics involved in the project  
                       • Staff personnel involved (paid and volunteer)  
                       • External contributors  
                       • Value of contract research in cash  
                       • Days from first contact to delivery of final product  
                       • Civil society organisations contributing to the project  
                       • Private enterprises contributing to the project  
                       • Local government agencies contributing to the project  
                       • State agencies contributing to the project  
                       • Individual citizens affected by the issue(s) examined                                                                     |
**PERARES: Impacts indicators (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes and relations</td>
<td>• Increase of clients’ knowledge of how research is done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awareness of community-based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diffusion of research-based policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in students’ interest in engaging with societal issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effects on academic policy towards community-based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relations between academics and civil society organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Influence on the direction of further research in the subject area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>• Increase of organisation’s capacity to participate in research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase of organisation’s capacity to apply research results in a societal context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase of organisation’s capacity to get project funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>• Most important impact of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most stimulating aspect of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most disappointing aspect of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PERARES: Impacts indicators (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project outputs</strong> (figures)</td>
<td>• Academic publications produced arising from this project&lt;br&gt;• Non-academic publications/documents produced (e.g. policy reports, guidelines)&lt;br&gt;• Citations in academic publications&lt;br&gt;• Mentions, appearances or contributions in public media (e.g. radio, TV, newspapers)&lt;br&gt;• Mentions in non-academic publications/documents (e.g. policy reports, guidelines)&lt;br&gt;• Participations in academic conferences where the project was presented&lt;br&gt;• Participations in non-academic conferences where the project was presented&lt;br&gt;• New in-house research projects on same or related theme&lt;br&gt;• Requests for advice on policy or legal issues relating to the project topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longer-term impacts</strong></td>
<td>• Development of new research collaborations&lt;br&gt;• Reinforcement of existing research collaborations&lt;br&gt;• Raise of societal awareness of the issue(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>