AUSTRIAN PLATFORM
for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation

EVALUATION STANDARDS
FOR RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION POLICY

MARCH 2019

DOI: 10.22163/fteval.2019.344

FEDERAL MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND RESEARCH
Minoritenplatz 5, 1014 Vienna
Mag.ª Irene Danler
E: irene.danler@bmbwf.gv.at
Mag.ª Simone Mesner
E: simone.mesner@bmbwf.gv.at

FEDERAL MINISTRY FOR DIGITAL AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS
Stubenring 1, 1014 Vienna
Mag.ª Sabine Pohoryles-Drexel
E: sabine.pohoryles-drexel@bmwfw.gv.at

FEDERAL MINISTRY FOR TRANSPORT, INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY
Radetzkystraße 2, 1030 Vienna
Dr. Rupert Pichler
E: rupert.pichler@bmvit.gv.at
Dr. Mario Steyer
E: mario.steyer@bmvit.gv.at

ACR – AUSTRIAN COOPERATIVE RESEARCH
Sensengasse 1, 1010 Vienna
Dr.in Sonja Sheikh
E: sheikh@acr.ac.at

AUSTRIAN COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT
Pestalozzigasse 4/DG 1, 1010 Vienna
Dr. Johannes Gadner
E: j.gadner@rat-fte.at
Dr.in Constanze Stockhammer
E: c.stockhammer@rat-fte.at

AIT – AUSTRIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Giefinggasse 4, 1210 Vienna
Mag. Michael Dinges
E: michael.dinges@ait.ac.at
Mag.ª Barbara Heller-Schuh, MAS
E: barbara.heller-schuh@ait.ac.at

AQ AUSTRIA – AGENCY FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION AUSTRIA
Franz-Klein-Gasse 5, 1190 Vienna
Dr.in Elisabeth Froschauer-Neuhauser
E: elisabeth.froschauer-neuhauser@aq.ac.at
Dr.in Eva Maria Freiberger
E: eva.maria.freiberger@aq.ac.at

AWS – AUSTRIA WIRTSCHAFTSSERVICE GMBH
Walcherstraße 11A, 1020 Vienna
Mag.ª Marlis Baurecht
E: M.Baurecht@aws.at
Mag. Norbert Knoll
E: n.knoll@awsg.at

CDG – CHRISTIAN DOPPLER RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
Boltzmanngasse 20, 1090 Vienna
DIin Magª. Brigitte Müller
E: brigitte.mueller@cdg.ac.at

CONVELOP – COOPERATIVE KNOWLEDGE DESIGN GMBH
Bürgergasse 8-10/I, 8010 Graz
DIin Drin. Karin Grasenick
E: karin.grasenick@convelop.at

Erdbergstraße 82/4, 1030 Wien
Mag. Thomas Jud
E: thomas.jud@convelop.at

FFG – AUSTRIAN RESEARCH PROMOTION AGENCY
Haus der Forschung,
Sensengasse 1, 1090 Vienna
DIin Dr.in Sabine Mayer
E: sabine.mayer@ffg.at
Mag. Leonhard Jörg
E: leonhard.joerg@ffg.at

FWF – AUSTRIAN SCIENCE FUND
Haus der Forschung
Sensengasse 1, 1090 Vienna
Dr. Falk Reckling
E: falk.reckling@fwf.ac.at
Dr. Thomas Völker
E: thomas.voelker@fwf.ac.at

IHS – INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES
Josefstädter Straße 39, 1080 Vienna
Dr.in Angela Wroblewski
E: wroblews@ihs.ac.at
Dr. Richard Sellner
E: richard.sellner@ihs.ac.at

INDUSTRIEWISSENSCHAFTLICHES INSTITUT – IWI
Mittersteig 10, 1050 Wien
FH-Hon.Prof. Dr. Dr. Herwig W. Schneider
E: schneider@iwi.ac.at
Mag. Philipp Brunner
E: brunner@iwi.ac.at

JOANNEUM RESEARCH FORSCHUNGSGESELLSCHAFT MBH
Haus der Forschung
Sensengasse 1, 1090 Vienna
Mag. Wolfgang Polt
E: wolfgang.polt@joanneum.at
Dr. Jürgen Streicher
E: juergen.streicher@joanneum.at

KMU FORSCHUNG AUSTRIA – AUSTRIAN INSTITUTE FOR SME RESEARCH
Gusshausstraße 8, 1040 Vienna
Mag.ª Iris Fischl
E: i.fischl@kmuforschung.ac.at

LUDWIG BOLTZMANN GESELLSCHAFT
Nußdorfer Straße 64, 1090 Vienna
Mag. Patrick Lehner
E: patrick.lehner@lbg.ac.at

OEAW – AUSTRIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCE
Dr. Ignaz Seipel-Platz 2, 1010 Vienna
Nikolaus Göth, MSc
E: nikolaus.goeth@oeaw.ac.at

TECHNOLPOLIS GROUP AUSTRIA
Rudolfsplatz 12/11, 1010 Vienna
Mag.ª Katharina Warta
E: warta@technopolis-group.com

VIENNA BUSINESS AGENCY. A SERVICE OFFERED BY THE CITY OF VIENNA.
Mariahilfer Straße 20, 1070 Vienna
Robert Mayer-Unterholzer
E: mayer-unterholzner@wirtschaftsagentur.at

WIFO – AUSTRIAN INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
Arsenal, Objekt 20
Postfach 91, 1103 Vienna
Dr. Jürgen Janger
E: Juergen.Janger@wifo.ac.at
Dr. Andreas Reinstaller
E: andreas.reinstaller@wifo.ac.at

WPZ RESEARCH GMBH
Mariahilfer Straße 115/16, 1060 Vienna
Dr.in Brigitte Ecker
E: brigitte.ecker@wpz-research.com

WWTF – VIENNA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FUND
Schlickgasse 3/12, 1090 Vienna
Dr. Michael Stampfer
E: michael.stampfer@wwtf.at
Dr. Michael Strassnig
E: michael.strassnig@wwtf.at

ZSI – CENTRE FOR SOCIAL INNOVATION
Linke Wienzeile 246, 1150 Vienna
Dr. Klaus Schuch
E: schuch@zsi.at

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

The Austrian Platform for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation (fteval) is an association whose members are institutions from the fields of research, technology and innovation (RTI). It includes government ministries, agencies, research funding organisations, research institutes and consulting firms. Membership is open to all those involved in commissioning or carrying out evaluations in the field of RTI.

The aim of the association is to further develop the culture and practice of evaluation in Austria in the field of RTI. The fteval platform regards evaluation as central to ongoing improvement and strategic focus in RTI policy. A "good" culture of evaluation is both a prerequisite for and a result of "good" – i.e. efficient, transparent, and fair – policies. As declared in the mission statement[1]:

The mission of the Austrian Platform for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation is to promote the quality, transparency and adequate coverage of evaluations, to improve strategic planning of research, technology and innovation (RTI) policy in Austria. The existing evaluation culture is evolving continuously, in consultation with decision makers in Austrian RTI policy.

The current standards published by fteval present the key principles of evaluation in RTI policy and serve as a **binding code of conduct for members**. They provide commissioning (client) institutions, evaluators and those affected by an evaluation with a framework for conduct, and a guideline for planning, managing and performing "good" evaluations, as well as how to use them. The aim is to create a greater sense of commitment and assurance for all concerned. The fteval platform also aims to ensure that these Standards are widely distributed and applied.

The **Standards** are designed to be applicable to all evaluations in the area of RTI policy.

1 See also: https://www.fteval.at/content/home/plattform/about/

2. DEFINITION – WHAT IS AN EVALUATION?

Definitions of evaluation are discussed in numerous manuals and publications. Fteval is a member of DeGEval (Gesellschaft für Evaluation - the Society of Evaluators) and principally uses their definition (see below), but also acknowledges the relevance of other definitions such as that of the OECD DAC and the United Evaluation Group[2] (see Glossary).

The boundaries between evaluation and other forms of assessment are not always clear, however. Some of these formats may not necessarily be based on evaluation standards. For this reason, the definitions of and differences between audits, reviews, monitoring, studies and other associated approaches (see Glossary) are of great importance.

According to DeGEval, an evaluation is defined as "the systematic investigation of the merit or use of the evaluation object"[3]. This is the definition as set down in:

- *"a transparent and systematic procedure, based on empirically obtained data; distinct from everyday assessment procedures,*
- *firstly as it is a transparent assessment based on specific criteria, undertaken for a specific purpose (study of potential benefits) or on a more general basis (study of merit) – and thus in contrast to pure research studies – and*
- *secondly, as the same procedure can be applied to various different evaluation objects. The most important evaluation objects include projects, initiatives and other interventions (programmes), organisations, products (outputs) and evaluations themselves (meta-evaluation)."*[4]

In summary, DeGEval defines an evaluation as: *"The systematic investigation of the benefits and/or merit of the evaluation object on the basis of empirically obtained data. Implies an assessment based on clearly stated criteria for a specific purpose."*[5]

---

2 OECD DAC, see https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/43184177.pdf, UNEG, see http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914

3 DeGEval, Standards, 2016, Langfassung (unabridged version): p.13; https://www.degeval.org/degeval-standards-alt/download/; accessed June 20184

4 Ibid, own translation.

5 DeGEval, Standards, 2016, Langfassung (extended version), Glossary: p.33; own translation, https://www.degeval.org/degeval-standards-alt/download/; accessed June 2018.

As derived from the above-mentioned DeGEval definition, the planning and performance of evaluations are therefore based on a systematic, transparent and unbiased approach. The evaluation procedure

a. generates theoretically justified, empirically based findings about the evaluation object and its relevant context – for example its operational setting and institutional framework, sphere of influence, use of resources etc. – in order to

b. make assessments based on specific criteria, and

c. to build on these to derive strategic and operational recommendations for decision-making, planning and control processes in relation to the evaluation object.

The benefits and quality of an evaluation process are demonstrated by the extent to which it succeeds in providing helpful, reliable, new insights to guide the relevant stakeholders of the evaluation object.

Consideration of and adherence to the evaluation standards in planning, commissioning and carrying out evaluation procedures – and the subsequent interpretation and use of the findings obtained by the evaluation – contribute to the ethical validity of evaluation procedures.

In this regard it is particularly important to note the crucial intersection between monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring is generally understood to include the following[6]: *"Routine, regular and criteria-driven collection (in written form) of comparison data, with the aim of identifying quickly where corrective measures are needed. This differs from evaluation in that no value judgement is made and it is always longitudinal in approach."*

A good monitoring system should record all relevant data in a simple, systematic and gender-sensitive manner. Gathered data are used partly for monitoring the content and financial aspects of a project, and also to provide evaluators with a clear picture of funded interventions and schemes. A good monitoring system can significantly improve the data quality of an evaluation, avoid duplication of effort in data entry and reduce the work of data collection. Nonetheless, set-up and maintenance of monitoring systems is not a function of evaluation. In the area of RTI, monitoring systems are generally operated by or commissioned by agencies, funding institutions or government ministries.

---

6 DeGEval, Standards, 2016, Langfassung (extended version), Glossary: p.35; own translation, https://www.degeval.org/degeval-standards-alt/download/; accessed June 2018.

3. SIGNIFICANCE OF EVALUATION IN RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION POLICY

Research, technology and innovation policy (RTI policy) covers all public initiatives for shaping research and innovation systems – i.e. in addition to public programmes, funding instruments, policies, strategies and regulations, it also covers the “landscape” of all institutions involved in research and technological development. The distinctive feature of RTI policy in comparison with other policy areas is that programmes, instruments, policies and institutions are legitimised partly by the phenomena of market and system failure, which are inherent in research, technology development and the dynamics of innovation.

On the other hand, recent research studies suggest, particularly under the influence of major global and social challenges, that the needs of a goal-oriented, transformative change in innovation systems should also be considered, in order to legitimise RTI policy actions.[7]

Market and system failures arise principally because it is difficult to ensure exclusive use of knowledge and research findings by those making the discoveries (public-good character), which results in the risk that the amount of investment in research and development tends to be lower than needed. Additional factors include a higher risk of failure associated with new – and therefore often uncertain – scientific and technical discoveries; a lack of risk-spreading options for small and medium enterprises (SMEs); information asymmetry (imbalances) between the areas of academic research, private enterprise and policy-making; and divergence between socially worthwhile and (commercially) feasible investment schemes and timeframes. RTI policy is responsible not only for establishing appropriate frameworks for commercial research and development (R&D), but also for supporting R&D that is genuinely in the public interest, with non-commercial goals.

Ill-considered RTI policy can also result in “policy failures”, i.e. inefficient use of (public) funding, for example by “crowding out” private involvement and investment, or in poor institutional and/or topical adjustment to new circumstances and developments (so-called “lock-in effects”), which

7 See for example Boon, W., and Edler, J. (2018); Foray, D., Mowery, D. C., and Nelson, R. R. (2012; Kulhmann, S., and Rip, A. (2014; Mazzucato, M. (2011); Weber, K. M., and Rohracher, H. (2012); specific sources in Chapter 5.2, Further reading

may lead to increased rather than reduced market failure. New approaches and developments may then be insufficiently supported or even impeded.

Conversely, good RTI policy can benefit from reflection, feedback loops and lessons learned, since these make it clear why investments in science, research and development are worthwhile, and which initiatives or bundles of initiatives were or could be productive.

Decision makers in RTI policy therefore need instruments and tools that fulfil the growing demand for information and learning, for example about the methods of operation in the Austrian research and innovation system, the quality of Austrian research and development by international standards, and the effectiveness of research and technology funding. These instruments include regular evaluations of public interventions. Good evaluations can successfully reveal “blind spots”, topical and institutional “lock-ins” and places where similar programmes overlap. Through regular assessment, they enable questions to be raised about traditional assumptions of what constitutes “good” science, research, technology and innovation policy, and about entrenched practices – including in the area of subsidies and institutions themselves. Evaluations help policy-makers to take a broader view, by weighing up various possibilities or highlighting inspiring practices for comparison.

For this to be effective, it is of course essential that there is a culture that allows for open, reflective and critical evaluations.

The Austrian RTI strategy addresses this issue: *“The new budget law strengthens and promotes the impact and output orientation of the innovation system with medium-term financing solutions and performance targets. Binding ex ante evaluations, standards for both formulating goals and evaluating them, and systematic monitoring all contribute to efficiency gains.”*[8]

The 2015 review of RTI guidelines also refers extensively to evaluation. For example, it mentions the extent to which programmes conform with the provisions of the RTI guidelines, the monitoring of legal and defining conditions and the evaluation of funding programmes.

With regard to the latter, the following requirements are specified as minimum standards:

- “Definition of objectives (distinguishing between strategic and operational objectives),
- definition of measures taken towards reaching the objectives,
- definition of indicators for such measures and operational objectives,

8 Federal Chancellery (BKA) et al. (2011) p.48

- mandatory evaluation of the objectives, measures and indicators, including the evaluation schedule, indicators for monitoring the effectiveness of measures implemented."[9]

The guidelines stipulate that a written evaluation plan must be created for all subsidy programmes and measures based on the RTI guidelines. This plan must include the purpose, objectives, and procedures, as well as deadlines for evaluating the fulfilment of the funding objectives, and must define specific indicators. The evaluation plan must form part of the documentation for such programmes or measures, or of a customised plan for individual measures.

Evaluations are part of an overall process; they can provide policy support for responsible actions or conceptual work, but do not replace them. Evaluations are one of several types of support for policy makers.

9 Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology (BMVIT) and Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economy (BMWFW, 2015), p.10

4. SUBJECT, TYPES AND FUNCTIONS OF EVALUATIONS

Evaluation is generally a broad-based concept; in practice evaluations differ from one another by several dimensions, which may be combined in various ways.

First and foremost, evaluations are defined by their **object**; the types of evaluation objects relevant for RTI policy are as follows:

- **Policy,** meaning a set of activities (funding instruments, procedures, regulations, etc.), which may vary from one another in style and form, but have a common motivation or objective. Broadly speaking these relate to what is usually a loosely defined policy area (e.g. labour market or social policy, etc.).

- An **institution**, meaning a body which is responsible for a specific task. In the context of RTI policy, there are four major types of institution that are subject to evaluation: a) higher education institutions with their interrelated research and teaching, b) research institutes, c) intermediaries (agents) and d) funding institutions and agencies.

- A **programme** in the context of RTI policy is a combination of measures with similar intentions, designed to achieve one or more specific, previously defined objectives. A programme has a fixed duration and an allocated, often centrally administered budget.

- An **instrument** of RTI policy describes the specific form of an intervention. A distinction should be made between monetary instruments (funding, finance) and non-monetary instruments (advice, awareness-raising measures, norms and standards). Funding mechanisms are targeted towards specific outcomes and target groups. Programmes can make use of an instrument or a combination of instruments (instrument mix).

- In this context a **project** is a single activity with a fixed timeframe and its own budget. Projects produce specific results (outputs and outcomes). These standards are also relevant for RTI policy projects, but not for academic project proposals, which are assessed by funding agencies as part of their own procedures.

RTI policy evaluations focus on programmes generated by RTI policy or on institutions involved in that area. Policies, institutions, programmes, instruments and projects may be evaluated, as may laws, strategies, guidelines, systems, processes, technologies, services, events, training activities, materials, reports etc.

Evaluations may also be defined as such by the **date** they are carried out:

- **Ex ante evaluations** take place before the start of an intervention and are forward-looking in character. They improve the internal architecture of programmes and institutions in particular, and expand the options for control within these. In the area of RTI funding, ex ante evaluations of project proposals are a regular component of the rationale on which funding decisions are based. Ex ante evaluations are also frequently described as potential analyses, feasibility studies, exploratory studies, needs analyses or more generally as studies, although they do include value judgements.

- **Interim evaluations** are carried out during the course of an intervention. They generally have a formative emphasis and focus on processes, efficiency and effectiveness.

- **Accompanying evaluations** (e.g. participatory evaluations) commence at the start of an intervention and continue throughout its implementation, for example in the form of strategic process support. They are generally formative in character and focus on learning outcomes for those involved. Accompanying evaluations should be seen as distinct from coaching and organisational consultancy.

- **Ex post evaluations** (e.g. evaluations of effectiveness) begin after the end of an intervention (conclusion of a policy period, conclusion of a programme/an institution) and make a retrospective assessment of the development, effects, costs and benefits (as far as possible). A distinction can be made between ex post evaluations that take place directly after the end of an intervention, and backward-looking evaluations that take place some years later. There is also a difference between ex post evaluations and audits.

Depending on the extent, budget and information requirements, several different types of evaluation may be applied to a scheme. In terms of the time perspective, it is important to consider the following:

- The findings of a project evaluation can be used as an input for the evaluation of a programme, institution or instrument.

- In the case of major initiatives, where an interim evaluation is planned, this may also be important for planning the next phase.

- If the focus is on impact analysis, it makes sense to evaluate a programme/ instrument at various different points in time after it has ended, as some effects may only become apparent after a significant delay.

Evaluations may also be categorised according to their different **functions**:

- An information-oriented learning function for funding bodies, decision-makers in policy, intermediaries, universities, research institutes, firms, consultants, academics etc.

- A steering function for shaping future policy objectives, and for planning future intervention measures etc.

- An information function with regard to dealing with and using public funding.

- A legitimising function, for example in relation to the use of public funding.

On this basis, evaluation can also fulfil a moderating function between the competing interests of various different stakeholders in research and technology policy.

Indeed, many evaluations will serve several purposes rather than having one single function, even if there is a potential for tension, for example between the functions of learning and legitimisation. It is not uncommon for both these aspects to be important in an evaluation. In order to avoid potential misunderstandings between those commissioning the evaluation (client) and those performing it (evaluators), it is essential to clarify the function(s) of an evaluation before it begins, and to specify them in the "Terms of Reference" (ToR).

Evaluations also differ from one another with regard to the **methods** used. They may have a quantitative or qualitative emphasis, and very often a mixture of methods is used.[10] There are numerous quantitative and qualitative methods available for measuring achievements in the area of RTI, such as econometric studies, microeconomic procedures, cost-benefit analyses, input-output analyses, network analyses, surveys, interviews, case studies, peer reviews, bibliometric analyses[11] and others.

Lastly the **position of the evaluators** also influences the type of evaluation. External evaluations are carried out by evaluators who are independent of the evaluation object, and who were neither involved in the intervention measure nor have any role in the institution being evaluated. For internal evaluations, in contrast, the responsibility for planning and implementation of the evaluation (recording findings, deriving results and recommendations etc.) rests largely within the organisation itself. For this reason, internal evaluations are often carried out by internal evaluation departments, or evaluation officers who have special rights within the organisation.[12]

Furthermore, evaluations are also classified according to their **formative or summative characteristics;** see the relevant definitions in the Glossary.

---

10 See also the FTEVAL topic folder on "methods"; DOI 10.22163/fteval.2019.308

11 As far as the limits of applicability for bibliometric analyses are concerned, mention should also be made here of the "San Francisco Declaration" and the "Leiden Manifesto" (see also further reading).

12 See Stockmann (2004).

5. GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF RTI EVALUATIONS

These **principles** represent an integral part of the evaluation standards and define the requirements from and expectations of various participants, such as the client or client organisation, the evaluators, and those affected by the evaluation. These **principles** are valid for all types of evaluation in the RTI policy area. Evaluations are different from one another in nature, depending on scope, objectives, methodical approach etc. Nevertheless it is expected that the **principles and standards** will be applied and observed conscientiously (as a **code of conduct**). All **principles** described in these **standards** are of equal importance and interdependent.

5.1 JOINT UNDERSTANDING:

All those involved in an evaluation[13] are guided by a shared understanding of evaluation[14] and in the context of the specific evaluation concerned, have a common understanding of the objective and scope of the evaluation. They agree that the interim and final findings, and the evaluation process itself are important. An evaluation should therefore also be regarded as a communication process.

5.2 COMMITMENT:

Evaluations have the support and commitment of decision makers in the institutions concerned. One expression of this commitment is to allocate sufficient budgetary resources, appropriate to the scope of the evaluation, and to make the necessary time available. Individual tasks and responsibilities in the context of the evaluation are clearly defined and documented.

5.3 PARTICIPATION:

Relevant interest groups are identified early in the process of evaluation, for example through stakeholder analysis, and involved in the evaluation. This increases the benefits and learning outcomes of evaluations. It is also important to check the proportion of women and men involved in the evaluation object and affected by the process of evaluation, and to ensure that they are properly represented.

---

13 For more on the distinction between "participants, those affected, beneficiaries and addressees", see the Glossary.

14 See Section 2, Definition of evaluation.

5.4 UTILISATION AND BENEFITS:

An evaluation should focus on the information requirements of the eventual users and/or user groups. Both the process of evaluation and its findings should be useful to them. The benefits of an evaluation are generally enhanced if relevant interest groups are involved in the evaluation process, if specific evaluation questions are formulated and responded to professionally, and if coherent recommendations are communicated as a result of the evaluation. One prerequisite for the usefulness of an evaluation is a timely beginning and end, so that the findings can be integrated promptly into decision-making and improvement processes. The proposed subsequent use and application of data collected is to be made clear in the framework of the evaluation; this should generally be evident in the tender documents and/or the contract for the evaluation, or at the latest on acceptance of the evaluation report.

5.5 FEASIBILITY:

An evaluation must be feasible for all those involved within the given timeframe. It is important to allow sufficient time not only to enable the ToR to be carefully defined and for high quality proposals to be prepared, but also for data collection and analysis, validating results and for presenting findings, conclusions and recommendations. An evaluation is regarded as feasible when the evaluation questions and proposed methods are compatible, when sufficient resources are made available for it, and when it is carried out by competent evaluators.

5.6 IMPARTIALITY:

An evaluation is a process with an open outcome. The entire process of evaluation and its findings imply impartial action and positions, and are carried out in a transparent and open manner. Any relevant views held by participants which could possibly influence the evaluation process or its findings, are made explicit. Differing opinions, perspectives and positions are represented in interim and/or concluding findings.

5.7 INDEPENDENCE:

An evaluation is designed using scientific methods and takes account of differing opinions and positions. The evaluation is not materially influenced or manipulated by political interests, the client, programme managers or those affected, nor by any possible bias of the evaluators themselves. “Analyses as a favour” or similar forms of biased process – particularly with a view to generating possible subsequent contracts, or to avoid criticism that could have a negative impact in the wider political context – are not a serious form of evaluation and are inconsistent with the sense and purpose of an evaluation.

5.8 PROFESSIONALISM:

Both the client and the evaluators should have the necessary skills to direct and conduct an evaluation. These include expertise in the topic area and methodology, gender awareness, management skills, social skills and knowledge of different types of procedure for awarding contracts.

5.9 GENDER DIMENSION:

Gender aspects of the evaluation object are considered at every step of the evaluation, and by all those involved. In the event that there is no gender dimension apparent in the evaluation object, this should also be indicated and explained. Gender-specific evaluation questions are included in the Terms of Reference (ToR). Gender-specific data are collected, evaluated and interpreted. Contexts (concepts, strategies, policy documents, programme documents, interventions, etc.) and any information gathered are analysed for gender-specific differences and interpreted in this light. Recommendations resulting from an evaluation take account of gender-specific aspects.

All documentation prepared for the evaluation, such as contract tender documents, the evaluation report etc., are formulated in a gender-neutral manner. This means that gender-specific language should be avoided, for example by using gender-neutral terms or by including both masculine and feminine forms.

5.10 TRANSPARENCY:

The evaluation process, its findings, and the subsequent recommendations are conducted and completed in a manner that is transparent and accountable for all those involved and affected. This also requires open access to evaluation findings/reports and their publication in the fteval Repository, → https://repository.fteval.at/.

If differing perceptions, expectations, interests and needs should come to light, it is essential to address these at an early stage, in order to clarify inconsistencies, differing expectations or possible misunderstandings.

5.11 ETHICS:

Activities undertaken in connection with evaluations are carried out in a manner that is ethically responsible, gender aware, and with openness toward social and cultural diversity (e.g. age, background, language).

All those involved in or affected by an evaluation are treated with respect and fairness. Evaluations are planned and conducted in a manner that protects the individual rights, security and dignity of all those affected or involved. Sensitive data may not be used without consent, and should not be traceable to their source. Data collected are subject to data protection law and generally belong to the client. To ensure ethical practice, evaluation activities must not be obstructed and their findings must not be presented or interpreted in a distorted manner. An evaluation may not be misused with the purpose of deliberate advantage or harm to any institutions, programmes or persons.

5.12 CREDIBILITY:

An evaluation is regarded as credible if it is planned, managed and conducted in an independent, unbiased, transparent and competent manner, and if it has identified and involved relevant interest groups. In methodological terms, this refers to the use of different methods, for instance, as appropriate to the evaluation questions, and that these are "triangulated". Evidence obtained from analyses, interpretations and the resulting assessments and recommendations are presented in a comprehensible and transparent manner.

6. PLANNING AND CARRYING OUT RTI EVALUATIONS

A programme, instrument or intervention measure is devised and developed in response to an identified problem. In the policy cycle is it essential that evaluation reflects this. This makes it possible to ensure that relevant evaluation findings are available in a timely manner and can be integrated into the development, design or re-design of an intervention measure, or for a summative assessment.

For this reason, evaluation should be considered in the planning phase of any such measure. It is therefore important to work back from any future deadlines relevant to the interventions when planning the evaluation schedule.

In preparing/planning an evaluation, it is vital that the actual requirements, information needs and expectations of relevant participants are made clear at the outset. These include: objectives, purpose, scope, content, evaluation questions and the tasks required of individual participants in the evaluation process, as well as the budget and schedule.

An important precondition of any evaluation is a clear understanding of the evaluation object together with its underlying assumptions, and of the instruments that will be used to determine its effectiveness. Ideally, when developing the programme/instrument, concrete suggestions should already have been devised as to how its success or failure can be defined and measured. Its objectives should be formulated in such a way that there is clarity and consensus amongst decision makers, funding bodies, the targets of the intervention, and the evaluators, about what the planned measures are intended to achieve.

The client is responsible for checking the “evaluability” (see glossary) of a proposed scheme, whether or not the stated objectives are clearly defined and whether the outcomes achieved can be verified.

If the evaluators should become aware during the course of an evaluation that, for example, certain evaluation questions cannot be answered, because in reality the evaluation object is different from what was anticipated, this should be clarified with the client and documented in the evaluation report.

An evaluation usually consists of a preparation and planning phase, an implementation phase and a management response phase.

PREPARATION AND PLANNING PHASE

When preparing and planning an evaluation, the following **standards** should be observed:

6.1 EVALUATION MANAGER / SUPERVISORY GROUP:

Depending on the scale of an evaluation, it should be managed by at least one person (generally the client) and/or monitored by several people (supervisory group). The role of an evaluation manager includes establishing the evaluability of the proposed measure, drafting the ToR, calling for tenders and selecting the evaluators, monitoring the evaluation, quality control and official acceptance of the interim findings and conclusions on completion.

The governance structure of an evaluation should be clarified at the outset, so that roles and responsibilities, processes and functions are transparent to all those involved. The evaluation manager may and should naturally seek support, for example from public procurement experts.

6.2 TERMS OF REFERENCE:

For all evaluations, the Terms of Reference (ToR) should be drafted by the client / supervisory group. To ensure clear parameters and transparency in the substance of the evaluation, it is important that the evaluation questions are defined in the ToR. ToR should be unambiguously formulated, so that the function of the evaluation is comprehensible and transparent to all those involved. The gender dimension[15] must be adequately considered. The ToR are a *"written document presenting the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the methods to be used, the (norms and) standards against which performance is to be assessed or analyses are to be conducted, the resources and time allocated, and reporting requirements"*[16].

ToR form the interface between clients and evaluators, and serve as a guideline for both parties.

The ToR should be drafted by the client in a participatory process, so that the evaluation has institutional support and commitment; this also ensures that any operational and strategic perspectives can be integrated into the evaluation.

When drawing up the ToR, it is essential that the client analyses and references any existing documentation such as reports, evaluations, studies etc., for example to avoid duplicating questions. It is not advisable to "copy and paste" from other ToRs without careful consideration, as the evaluation questions for one context may not be relevant for another. Nevertheless, it does of course make sense to learn from other ToRs.

When formulating the evaluation questions, the client / supervisory group must take particular care that they are formulated in a context-specific manner and in agreement with the relevant

---

15 See "Gender dimension" section of the general principles.

16 OECD DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, 2009. https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf

stakeholders; this sharpens the focus of the task. It is evident from surveys of fteval members that ToR are frequently very cumbersome, because they include an accumulation of questions from previous evaluations, together with a few new ones specific to the current evaluations.[17]

Depending on the scope and financial resources available, it is advisable to consciously limit the focal points of the evaluation, and ensure that they are precise in content. Not all information needs can or should be met by a single evaluation. The more extensive the list of evaluation questions is, the more likely it is that either not all questions will be answered, or that there is a risk that answers will be too "superficial".

It is also important that the objectives of the evaluation and the evaluation questions are compatible. The more people are involved in preparing the ToR, the more necessary it is to double-check at the end of the drafting process that the objectives and the evaluation questions are still compatible. It is important that the expectations of the client are realistic and congruent with the available resources and the chosen methods.

In the planning and preparation phase, the client should also particularly consider any other aspects which could influence the quality of the evaluation and the approach of the evaluators:
The schedule for the evaluation should allow adequate time, depending on the scope of the evaluation, for the evaluators to analyse the documents even during the initial phase. Identification or reconstruction of the evaluation object, and the rationale behind it as an intervention (intervention logic), is often more time-consuming than expected. Nonetheless, a precise depiction of the intervention measures as originally planned, and of their intended outcomes, is a basic prerequisite for a good evaluation.

The budget for an evaluation is determined by the client, and should reflect the objectives and scope of the evaluation. Internationally the assumption is that 0.5 - 1% of the budget for any programme should be spent on evaluations. However, if it is for example a monitoring (i.e. on-going) evaluation, or an impact analysis, then it will be necessary to adjust the evaluation budget appropriately. The methods chosen will naturally also have an effect on the costs. The crucial parameter for the level of evaluation costs is the amount of effort needed to answer the evaluation questions.
Depending on the practices of the institution concerned, the budget for the evaluation may be mentioned in the ToR, or in the accompanying documentation.

Assessment of the value for money offered by tenderers is based on net pricing.

A list of content to be included in the ToR can be found in **Annex 1**.

---

17 Warta, K. and Philipp, S. (2016); p.11.

6.3 CALL FOR TENDERS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT:

Every evaluation is based on a transparent and professional contracting process appropriate to the value of the contract. All the necessary legal requirements should be identified by the client, communicated clearly and observed fully. Documentation for the call for tenders and award of contracts should be formulated in a gender-balanced manner. For the award procedure, a timeframe is chosen that allows a wide range of evaluators to submit proposals on equal terms. Issuing calls for tenders just before holiday periods should therefore be avoided as far as possible.

The rights and responsibilities of all participants (who should do what, how and when) are included in the documentation for the awarding procedure. Preparation and implementation of a call for tenders and the award of contracts should take a realistic amount of time in proportion to the scale of the evaluation.

The clients or supervisory group assess the proposals submitted according to weighted quality and price criteria; in practice the quality criteria have a higher value. The end of the planning and preparation phase is marked by the agreement of a contract between the clients and the evaluators.

Good practice requires that those submitting proposals are each given an assessment of their own proposal by the client or supervisory group, in an appropriate form, including its relative strengths and weaknesses compared to the winning bid.

IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

In the next phase of the process, the evaluation is carried out by the evaluators.

The expression “inception phase” is the internationally accepted term for the beginning of this phase. Whether or not the first phase of implementation is so named, it provides the evaluators with an opportunity to clarify the contract, including the ToR, in detail with the client / supervisory group, to give their views about the ToR, and raise any questions or suggestions for improvement, to the extent that this has not already been done as part of the bid proposal, and for example to discuss the (reconstructed) rationale behind the intervention or programme model, and its underlying assumptions. The contract for the evaluation may subsequently be “refined”, but it may not be substantially altered. Any changes should be recorded in writing.

In this first phase an initial meeting may be helpful, including a presentation by the client about the evaluation object, but this depends on the scope and resources of the evaluation concerned.
In this phase the evaluators should receive all the documentation and data from the client, so far as this has not already been done, and should review the method options and existing data.

6.4 MIX OF METHODS:

Depending on the objectives, purpose and scope of the evaluation, various quantitative and qualitative methods are used. The evaluators should make use of any existing and valid monitoring data, in order to avoid duplicated data collection in the evaluation process. The selection of data and methods of data collection and analysis are derived from the information requested in the evaluation questions. Scientific principles of empirical research should be taken into account when collecting, analysing and interpreting data.

The various strengths and weaknesses of the methods used should be clarified as needed, and combined according to the principle of complementarity (the strengths of one approach largely balance the weaknesses of other approaches).

6.5 QUALITY ASSURANCE:

Quality control takes place throughout the evaluation process. If clients and evaluators both give careful consideration to the evaluation principles and standards, and apply these, it can be assumed that the quality requirements for an evaluation have been met. It is particularly important that data and information are systematically checked for errors.

In the context of an evaluation the client is responsible for quality assurance in drafting the ToR, awarding the contract, selecting appropriately qualified evaluators, and in acceptance of the evaluation reports and any other outputs of the evaluation; while the evaluators are responsible for quality assurance in the professional implementation of the evaluation itself.

6.6 INTERIM FINDINGS AND END RESULTS:

Interim findings and end results should be presented by the evaluators as specified in the ToR and the award documentation. In the event that other agreements are made during the evaluation process, these should be documented, for example in a written note.

Interim findings and end results are generally presented in the form of notes, reports and/or presentations. Whether an interim report and a preliminary report are to be submitted and reviewed by the client, or whether there is only to be a final report presented, is all specified in the ToR.

Evaluation reports and findings generally include the following information:

- an executive summary in English and German
- a brief description of the evaluation object
- one or more chapters describing the objectives, purpose and scope of the evaluation, the specific evaluation questions, the evaluation criteria and the schedule

- a chapter on the design of the evaluation, the methods used, any possible limitations, and also whether or not all evaluation questions have been answered

- a description of the evaluation findings and the resulting conclusions

- transparent, realistic and clearly formulated recommendations, directed specifically towards the relevant institutions, partners etc.

- the Terms of Reference, in an annex

- additional annexes, such as for example a list of interviewees[18], relevant outlines, bibliography, etc.

For official acceptance of a final report, it is advisable to refer to the set of questions in **Annex 2**.

Any conclusions resulting from evaluations are based primarily on analysed and accountable data and information. Any possible missing data must not be compensated for by contextualisation or speculation. Background knowledge held by the evaluators about the way the RTI system functions should be identified as such. It is possible that such information might influence the conclusions and recommendations.

An evaluation report should be clearly comprehensible, in order to ensure that the maximum benefit is obtained from the evaluation. The benefit and usefulness are improved by the use of high quality language. Comprehensibility includes a number of aspects, such as the terminology used, or the avoidance of ambiguity.

It is important to provide adequate opportunity for the client and evaluators to communicate about the findings, conclusions and recommendations, as part of the evaluation process. This can be facilitated in the context of suitable formats such as interim discussions and final presentations.

18 with due regard for data protection regulations.

7. USING EVALUATION FINDINGS AND IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF RTI EVALUATIONS

When a report and the findings are officially accepted by the client, a new process begins. This does not involve evaluators, unless otherwise agreed in the ToR.

Evaluations are not carried out for their own sake; rather, they provide knowledge which should lead to concrete action. A prerequisite for this, however, is that evaluations are not seen as a "necessary evil" or as a "tiresome compulsory exercise" that has to be done, but are instead conducted with the necessary professionalism.

Evaluation findings should provide direct or indirect support for decision-making processes in RTI policy. To this end, the following **standards** should be observed:

7.1 DISCLOSURE:

Evaluation results and reports, including any recommendations, are publicly accessible to all those involved and affected, and any other interested parties. To ensure that evaluations can also be made use of at a later date, they are saved and archived in the fteval repository, see → https://repository.fteval.at.

If evaluation reports contain confidential economic data from clearly identifiable firms, or other confidential information gained in the course of evaluations of institutions that are not directly accountable to public funding (e.g. departments within universities or research institutes), then an abridged analysis may be published, with analyses based on aggregated data, in accordance with the relevant data protection regulations. As a matter of principle, publishing should be discussed and agreed with the client.

7.2 COMMUNICATING THE FINDINGS:

Evaluation results must be communicated. A variety of options are available for this process (e.g. presentations, workshops, brown-bag lunches, webinars, blogs, videos, distribution of the entire report or a summary, publishing etc.). Evaluation results should be prepared and communicated in a form appropriate to the information needs of those involved and affected.

7.3 MANAGEMENT RESPONSE:

The Platform for Research and Technology Policy suggests that to ensure transparent implementation of any recommendations resulting from an evaluation, a Management Response should be formulated. This allows relevant interest groups to express a view on which recommendations are accepted, and to what extent, and what measures will be taken to implement these. This makes it doubly important that evaluators address their recommendations to specific groups. Responses are documented in writing, so that the proposed measures can be followed up.
Depending on the nature of the organisation, the management response process is led either by the evaluation manager or the programme leader. The process should involve a range of passive and active stakeholders in the evaluation process and in the intervention programme evaluated.

A management response is often presented in the form of a matrix and should include the following aspects:

- Evaluation recommendations
- An indication as to whether a recommendation has been “accepted”, “accepted to some extent”, or “not accepted”, with the reason why
- Specific measure(s) in response to each recommendation
- Responsibility for proposed implementation
- Date of proposed implementation

How often and what way these measures will be monitored is dependent on the extent of evaluation recommendations and the culture of evaluation in the relevant institutions, but this is decided and communicated in advance.

The management response should also be presented to the relevant responsible managers, so that the content and proposed measures can be confirmed and to establish their commitment to these.

If responses to evaluation recommendations are included in the final report, then distribution and/or publication of the evaluation report should wait until after this management process is complete. This may result in delayed publication of the report. It is more usual for responses to evaluation recommendations to be documented separately, encouraging an ongoing discussion process.

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

The following grid provides an overview of the information that should be conveyed in the ToR.

The **evaluation object** describes the measure/programme or institution to be evaluated (including the objectives, on different levels, of the rationale behind the intervention and the programme model, the historical and institutional context, the various target groups, gender dimension etc.). Reference is made to already existing programme documentation, data, reports, studies, evaluations etc. The evaluation object should be described in such a way that it is comprehensible and transparent for external observers. It can be helpful to specify what the evaluation is not intended to cover or achieve.
The **purpose of evaluation** explains why the evaluation is being commissioned.
The **scope of evaluation** states the extent of topics and content that are to be considered by the evaluation, and makes any deliberate limitations clear.
The **evaluation criteria** describe in detail what the evaluation is based on, whether specific criteria are to be considered, such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact etc.
The **evaluation questions** are the issues being examined, including gender equality and diversity issues. All questions should be formulated in as specific a manner as possible. In most cases the rationale for the intervention (intervention logic) and programme model (programme theory) should also be examined.
The **methods** to be used in the evaluation may also be included in the ToR, although this is not mandatory.
The **evaluation schedule** specifies what information is to be provided by whom and when, together with fixed dates and deadlines to be met.
The list of **expected achievements and outputs** details presentations, reports etc. to be provided, and in what format, scope and language. Ideally the criteria that will be used to assess the evaluation report should also be included in the ToR.
The **governance and management structure** of the evaluation describes who has management responsibility for the evaluation, mentions contact names for any questions that may arise, and details the administrative and logistical support that will be made available for the evaluators.
Qualifications of evaluators defines the minimum required qualifications, as appropriate to the methods used and the subject knowledge required.
The **process for award of contract** provides details of the relevant call for tenders and the assessment criteria.
Reference of the **RTI evaluation standards**.
ToR may also include the **evaluation budget**.
Appendices to the ToR may include further information about the evaluation object, e.g. in the bibliography.

ANNEX 2: QUESTIONS FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE REPORT

QUESTIONS FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THE REPORT:

- Does the report include a comprehensive and clear summary (executive summary in German and English)?
- Does the report include a brief description of the evaluation object (including the rationale behind the intervention/programme)?
- Does the report include a chapter about the objectives, purpose and scope of the evaluation?
- Are the specific evaluation questions and criteria mentioned in the report?
- Have all the evaluation questions (including gender equality and diversity issues) and criteria been addressed in the report? If not, is this explained in the report?
- Does the report include a chapter explaining the methods used and the design of the evaluation, together with any possible limitations?
- Does the report describe the process and schedule of the evaluation?
- Does the report make a clear distinction between the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations?
- Are conclusions and recommendations based on empirical evidence and consistent with this?
- Is it transparent how the evaluators have arrived at their findings?
- Are the recommendations realistic and clearly formulated, and is it clear to whom these recommendations are directed?
- Were the key stakeholders consulted?
- Were the key documents considered (e.g. those listed in the bibliography)?
- Are all the findings and the entire report formulated in gender-neutral language?
- Is the content of the report presented in a reasonable and clearly arranged form?
- Have graphics, charts and/or other visual aids been used?
- Is the report written in language that is also comprehensible to people who are not involved in the intervention itself, nor in the subject area?
- Is the report legible and free of spelling, grammatical and typing errors?
- Can the report be distributed in the form in which it was submitted?
- Are the ToR included in an annex to the report?
- Are any additional annexes, such as for example a list of the interviewees (taking account of data protection regulations), relevant outlines, bibliographies etc. attached to the report?
- Has the evaluation report been submitted on time?

ANNEX 3: GLOSSARY

The glossary lists terms used in these standards, and includes other terms that seem important to understanding issues in the area of Evaluation. This is a selected set of terms and does not constitute a complete Evaluation lexicon. Readers are also directed to the EvalWiki webpage, which includes 420 terms, in German, English and French: → https://eval-wiki.org/glossar/Kategorie:A_bis_Z The terms explained in this glossary were drawn from various other glossaries and reference works.

CONCEPT	DEFINITION
accompanying evaluation	This starts at the beginning of an intervention and continues in parallel with its implementation, for example in the form of strategic process monitoring. This type of evaluation, which is generally participative in form, also looks at aspects of practical implementation and/or the circumstances in which the evaluation object is implemented, by recording and analysing the entire implementation process systematically.[19] Accompanying evaluation is primarily formative in style, where the emphasis is on the learning of all those involved.
audience	People and institutions to whom the evaluation results are addressed. These include the intended users, user groups, those involved and affected (i.e. active and passive stakeholders), and also others such as interested members of the public.
attribution	The establishment of a causal connection between trends or changes observed or anticipated, and a specific intervention measure.
audit	An independent, objective assessment procedure, designed to improve the work and output processes of an organisation, and increase its value. It helps an organisation to achieve its objectives by using a rigorous, systematic approach to assessing and improving the effectiveness of risk management, controlling and governance processes. In the context of funding, however, the term "audit" refers to a monitoring procedure specifically for finance-related processes, such as accounting, bookkeeping and payment in connection with a funding instrument.
clients	Institution or person who commissions an evaluation, manages the evaluation contract and is the official recipient of the evaluation report and results.

19 See http://www.evaluation.co.at/evaluation_prozess.htm; accessed October 2018.

controlling	Monitoring and control function in organisations that support and/or fund programmes. This refers principally to monitoring of financial management, to ensure that funds provided for a programme (inputs) are used as intended, economically and efficiently, and also includes advising and considering how this can be optimised.
effect	Generally describes a change that can be attributed to certain causes. In evaluations it is primarily the changes resulting directly or indirectly from the evaluation object that are of interest (net effects); for the purpose of analysis, these should be considered separately from effects resulting from other causes. Here a distinction is often made between short-term, medium-term and long-term effects on target groups (outcomes), and effects on other individuals, groups, institutions, systems etc. (impacts). "Effects" include not only intended and desired effects, but also negative and unexpected changes.
effectiveness	Extent to which the objectives of an intervention have been achieved, or are expected to be achieved, with reference to their relative importance. OR: The effectiveness of an intervention in terms of comparing between planned and achieved objectives.
efficiency	Ratio of (net) effects of a programme to the resources invested. The greater the (net) effects, and the smaller the resources invested, the higher the efficiency of the programme; i.e. it is a way of measuring how effectively resources/inputs (funding, expertise, time etc.) are being converted into results.
evaluability	Extent to which an intervention can be evaluated in a reliable and credible way. Assessment of evaluability depends on a prior check that the stated objectives of the planned intervention are appropriately defined, and that the outcomes can be verified.
evaluation – as defined by DeGEval – the Evaluation Society	The systematic investigation of the benefits and/or worth of the evaluation object (evaluand) on the basis of empirically obtained data. Implies an assessment based on clearly stated criteria for a specific purpose.[20]
evaluation – as defined by OECD DAC	The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy intervention, its design, implementation and results. Its aim is to examine the relevance and attainment of objectives, and to establish their effectiveness for development, their outcomes, longer-term effects and sustainability.[21]

20 DeGEval, see https://www.degeval.org/en/about-us/

evaluation – as defined by the United Evaluation Group	*"An evaluation is an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide credible, useful evidence-based information that enables the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of organizations and stakeholders."*[22]
evaluation object (also "evaluand" or "subject of evaluation")	This refers to whatever is being evaluated (projects, programmes, instruments, institutions etc.).
evaluators, evaluation team	Individuals or teams responsible for the concept, method and implementation of an evaluation.
evaluation manager	Person leading the entire evaluation process on behalf of the client. It may also refer to the leader of an external evaluation team (although it is not used this way in the text of these standards).
ex ante evaluation	Evaluation that takes place before implementation of an intervention, on the basis of concepts, plans or proposals, and assesses aspects such as need, feasibility or prospects for success.
ex post evaluation	Evaluation of an intervention after it has been concluded. The evaluation may take place immediately after the end of the intervention, or later. The focus is often on sustainability and long-term impacts.
expert opinion	An expert opinion is an informed judgment by a qualified expert in a matter where there is some doubt. It includes evidence from past experience (empirical principles) and conclusions derived from the actual assessment of an event or situation by one or more qualified experts. A qualified expert is often consulted in connection with technical/medical results, written appraisals or statements of opinion.
external evaluation	An evaluation carried out by evaluators who are not part of the organisation responsible for the evaluation object.
findings/results	Output, direct outcomes or longer-term effects of an intervention (intended or unintended, positive and/or negative)

21 OECD, see http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/44798177.pdf
22 UNEG, see http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914

formative evaluation	Evaluation for the purpose of performance improvement, usually carried out during the implementation phase of a project or programme. Generally directed at those responsible for the intervention/programme. In contrast to a summative evaluation, the focus is on learning.
impact	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects resulting directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally from an intervention. OR effects beyond the intended reach of the evaluation object, i.e. on things (systems, institutions, organisations, individuals, outputs etc.) where the evaluated object has been a contributing factor.
impact evaluation	Impact evaluations measure changes that can be attributed to a defined intervention. They are based on models of cause and effect, and require a credible and strictly defined counter-factual approach, in order to check if there are any other factors besides the intervention itself which could possibly explain the changes observed. Impact evaluations which make comparisons between (potential) "beneficiaries" who are allocated randomly either for inclusion in a procedure or to a control group provide the strongest evidence of a connection between the intervention under investigation and the outcome being assessed.
impact model	Graphic representation of presumed effects, in the sense of imaginary/probable causal relationships between elements of a programme, particularly the relationships between interventions and outcomes (usually visualised as arrows). An impact model is the product of effect modelling and is based on the assumption that the desired results represent effects of the programme interventions. One component of an impact model can be a single strand of effects. (see also logic model, programme theory)
implementation	Generally refers to the practical operation of the intervention being evaluated, or to the process of carrying out an evaluation.
inception phase	The first phase of an evaluation after the contract is signed. In this phase the details of the evaluation task are discussed with the evaluators. Normally this means developing the evaluation concept in more detail and planning for practical implementation by the evaluators. For more extensive evaluations this phase may end with the delivery and official acceptance of the inception report (an interim report).

indicator	A marker (parameter) that allows a justifiable assumption to be made about facts that cannot be directly perceived. According to the OECD/DAC, an indicator is a quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable method for measuring success or reflecting changes associated with an intervention, or that can help to evaluate the achievements of a person or group.
inputs (resources)	Financial, personal, material, administrative, organisational, knowledge-based and other resources invested in an intervention in order to meet its objectives.
internal evaluation	An evaluation carried out by evaluators who belong to the same organisation responsible for the evaluation object.
intervention logic	Intervention logic can be defined as a series of hypothetical causal connections that describe how the intervention is intended to achieve its overall objectives.
logic model	Process logic of an evaluation object, including elements such as resources, activities, outputs, outcomes etc.[23]
merit	Inherent or intrinsic value of an evaluation object, regardless of any context.
meta-analysis	Analysis of different scientific (quantitative and qualitative) studies on the same topic. The data are re-analysed, compared and interpreted. A meta-analysis can also make use of existing evaluation reports.[24]
meta evaluation	The evaluation of one of more evaluations for the purpose of description and valuation of their merit, worth and significance. Meta-evaluations should also be based on the evaluation standards and can be either formative or summative evaluations.
monitoring	Routine, regular and criteria-driven collection (in written form) of comparison data, with the aim of identifying quickly where interventions are needed. This differs from evaluation in that no value judgement is made and it is always longitudinal in approach.
net impact	Sum total of all effects arising directly or indirectly from the evaluation object. Reflects the difference from the counter-factual situation that would exist if this intervention had not taken place.

23 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logic_model

24 eval-wiki also gives two further EN versions:
research synthesis
evaluation synthesis

outcome	Effects of the evaluated object on the target group(s).
output	The measurable services and products of the programme/intervention being evaluated, by means of which the outcomes and impacts are supposed to be achieved.
participative evaluation	Form of evaluation in which the representatives of the organisations and other involved parties (including the beneficiaries) work together to design, carry out and interpret an evaluation.
performance specification	See Terms of Reference
personal evaluation	Evaluation of the performance and skills of a person, for example evaluation of a researcher on the basis of his/her publications output and peer reception, or his/her acquisition of third-party funding. Personal evaluations are not covered by the standards presented here.
process evaluation	Evaluation focused on the implementation of an evaluation object, rather than on its impact, and thus generally carried out on a on-going basis during the course of the intervention.
programme	Typical evaluation object, usually with several interdependent, specified and implemented activities, instruments, measures, projects or programme components. A programme usually consists of several interventions designed to achieve specific objectives. Implementation of a programme is influenced by the availability of resources (inputs) and by other contributing conditions and is intended, by means of services provided (activities and outputs) to produce certain changes/ stabilising effects for specifically identified target groups (outcomes) or in organisations or social systems (impacts).
programme theory	Impact modelling based on different presumed effects, showing how the activities and outputs of a programme contribute to the intended (and where relevant, also any unintended) outcomes and impacts. In contrast to the simple, linear process logic of a logic model, it shows more detailed relationships (chains of effects, impact pathways) between specific factors centred both within and outside the programme.
progress check	See monitoring
purpose of evaluation	Defines what the evaluation is intended to achieve (e.g. assessment of processes or impacts in preparation for possible reorientation of an intervention).

quality assurance	Broadly speaking, actions intended to guarantee that established quality requirements are met. This means all planned and systematic activities designed to fulfil quality requirements.
relevance	Priority allocated by stakeholders to an objective of a programme or to a set of programme objectives. Evaluations are often expected to determine the relevance of the programme objectives. This can only be done if, for example, the needs of the target groups (needs analysis) are stated and clearly understood, as well as the available potential for achieving the objectives (potential analysis), the requirements of other stakeholders and any policy guidelines or conditions.
resources	See inputs
review	Assessment of the success of an intervention, either at regular intervals or on an ad hoc basis. In terms of method, reviews can also be understood as comprehensive, information and data-led assessments by distinguished experts in the relevant field who are brought together as a review team.
self evaluation	Evaluation in which individuals responsible for developing and/or implementing an object/intervention also evaluate it in a conscientious and autonomous manner. The roles of the evaluators, programme managers and to some extent also the client organisation, coincide in such cases.
stakeholders (active, i.e. those involved)	Clients, evaluators, representatives of the evaluation object, and others whose role in the evaluation is largely active and/or formative.
stakeholders (passive, i.e. those affected)	Individuals, groups and institutions affected by an evaluation whose role is largely passive, for example providing information and/or being interviewed etc.
study	A scientific investigation of a single issue or topic.
summative evaluation	Evaluative report intended to help decision-making about the evaluation object (e.g. whether to continue it, expand it, or discontinue it). Implies a complete retrospective assessment and is addressed primarily to decision-makers.
supervisory group	A group with members drawn from the client organisation and others, which manages and supervises the evaluation from beginning to end. They are responsible for drafting and negotiating acceptance of the ToR, selecting evaluators, quality control for the entire evaluation and for accepting the various reports and results.

sustainability	Extent to which positive effects of an intervention continue after the end of its operation. Likelihood of positive long-term effects.
target group	Individuals, groups, institutions or other entities towards whom the planned effects of the evaluation object are directed.
Terms of Reference	Written document, in which the purpose and scope of the evaluation are established, as well as the methods to be used, the norms and standards against which achievements will be assessed or analyses made, the resources which have been made available and the reporting schedule and documentation requirements.
triangulation	Use of at least three methods, theories, information sources or types, and/or forms of analysis, in order to double-check an assessment and support it. Using a combination of multiple data sources, procedures, analyses or theories, the evaluators aim to overcome any distortions that can arise if an investigation is based on a single information source, a single method, a single observer or a single theory.
use	Usefulness, worth or suitability of an evaluation object in a particular context.[25]
users, user groups	Individuals, groups and institutions expected to implement the evaluation results and recommendations.

25 https://www.degeval.org/degeval-standards/glossar-der-standards-fuer-evaluation/; accessed September 2018.

ANNEX 4: CHECKLISTS, STANDARDS, GUIDELINES AND OTHER GLOSSARIES

4.1 CHECKLISTS

Austrian Development Agency, see evaluation, Samples/Formats for Terms of Reference, Inception Report, Evaluation Report, Management Response
→ http://www.entwicklung.at/ada/evaluierung/

Gesellschaft für Evaluation (DeGEval), Checkliste. Zur Anwendung der Standards, 2016
→ https://www.degeval.org/fileadmin/DeGEval-Standards/2018_Checkliste_zur_Anwendung_der_Standards.pdf

The Evaluation Center, Evaluation Checklists
→ http://www.wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists

The World Bank Group, Independent Evaluation Group, Writing Terms of Reference for an Evaluation: A How-To Guide
→ https://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/ecd_writing_TORs.pdf

UNICEF, Evaluation Management Response Tracking System, Guidance for Management Response to Evaluations, 2016
→ https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/2016_Management_Response_Guidelines.pdf

UNICEF, Evaluation Management Response Tracking System
→ https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/index_86334.html

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports, 2010
→ http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/608

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports
→ http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/607

Univation. Checklists in German
→ http://www.univation.org/checklisten

Widmer, Thomas, Leitfaden für Wirksamkeitsüberprüfung beim Bund, Instrument for Quality Assurance based on the Evaluation Standards of the Swiss Evaluation Society (SEVAL Standards), 2005
→ https://www.bj.admin.ch/dam/data/bj/staat/evaluation/umsetzung/leitfaden-wirksamkeitsueberpruefung-d.pdf

WikiEducator, Evaluation Report Template
→ https://wikieducator.org/images/5/53/Evaluation_report_template.pdf

4.2 STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

American Evaluation Association (AEA), The Program Evaluation Standards,
→ http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=103

American Evaluation Association (AEA), Guiding Principles for Evaluators, 2004
→ http://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51

Beywl, Wolfgang; Widmer, Thomas, Die Standards für Programmevaluation: des Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2012
→ http://www.zora.uzh.ch/id/eprint/63498/1/JCSEE-Standards_2012.pdf

Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (bm:bwk), Wie kommt Gender in die Forschung? Leitfaden. Leitweg. Checkliste, 2004
→ https://www.uibk.ac.at/gleichbehandlung/gender_mainstreaming/gmforschung.pdf

Gesellschaft für Evaluation (DeGEval), Standards für Evaluation, 2016
→ https://www.degeval.org/degeval-standards/standards-fuer-evaluation/

Gesellschaft für Evaluation (DeGEval), Empfehlungen für Auftraggebende von Evaluationen. Eine Einstiegsbroschüre für den Bereich der Öffentlichen Verwaltung, no date
→ https://www.degeval.org/fileadmin/Publikationen/Publikationen_Homepage/DeGEval_-_Empfehlungen_Auftraggebende.pdf

Gesellschaft für Evaluation (DeGEval), Empfehlungen zur Anwendung der Standards für Evaluation im Handlungsfeld der Selbstevaluation, 2004
→ https://www.degeval.org/fileadmin/Publikationen/DeGEval_-_Empfehlungen_Selbstevaluation.pdf

Gesellschaft für Evaluation (DeGEval), Empfehlungen für Auftraggebende von Evaluationen. Anforderungsprofile an Evaluatorinnen und Evaluatoren, 2004
→ https://www.degeval.org/fileadmin/Publikationen/Publikationen_Homepage/DeGEval_-_Empfehlungen_Aus-_und_Weiterbildung.pdf

OECD DAC, Qualitätsstandards für die Entwicklungsevaluierung, 2010
→ www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/qualitatsstandardsfurdieentwicklungsevaluierungdesentwicklungs-ausschusses.htm

Schweizerische Evaluationsgesellschaft (SEVAL), Evaluationsstandards der Schweizerischen Evaluationsgesellschaft, 2016
→ http://www.seval.ch/de/standards/

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016
→ http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, 2014,
→ http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616

Univation, Guiding Principles for Evaluators, original July 2004 of the American Evaluation Association
→ www.univation.org/download/leitprinzipienaea-uebersetzt-2006.pdf

UN Women, How to Manage Gender-Responsive Evaluation. Evaluation Handbook. 2015
→ https://gest.unu.edu/static/files/unwomen-evaluationhandbook-web-final.pdf

Other guides, see also: → https://www.degeval.org/links/leitfaeden/

4.3 OTHER GLOSSARIES

"Eval-Wiki: Glossar der Evaluation"
→ https://eval-wiki.org/glossar/Kategorie:A_bis_Z

Evaluation and quality assurance in education
→ http://www.evoluation.de/glossary

Gesellschaft für Evaluation (DeGEval), Standards für Evaluation, 2016
→ https://www.degeval.org/degeval-standards/standards-fuer-evaluation/

OECD DAC, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, 2009
→ https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/43184177.pdf

USAID, Glossary of ADS Terms, 2018
→ https://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/agency-policy/glossary-ads-terms

ANNEX 5: BIBLIOGRAPHY

5.1 PUBLICATIONS BY THE PLATFORM

Standards der Evaluierung in der Forschungs- und Technologiepolitik, 2012
→ https://www.fteval.at/content/home/plattform/standards/fteval_Standards_deutsch.pdf

Evaluation of Austrian Research and Technology Policies. A Summary of Austrian Evaluation Studies from 2003 to 2007, 2007
→ https://www.fteval.at/content/home/lesenswertes/literatur_und_journals/publikationen_der_plattform/eval_of_austrian_research/Evaluation_Austrian_technology_policies.pdf

Eckpunkte der Evaluierung von Forschungs- und Technologiepolitik, 2004
→ https://www.fteval.at/content/home/lesenswertes/literatur_und_journals/publikationen_der_plattform/eckpunkte_der_eval/Eckpunkte_der_Evaluierung_von_Forschungs-_und_Technologiepolitik.pdf

Evaluierung der Sondermittelprogramme Bausteine einer Evaluierungsstrategie für den Rat für Forschung- und Technologieentwicklung, 2004
→ https://www.fteval.at/content/home/lesenswertes/literatur_und_journals/publikationen_der_plattform/eval_der_sondermittelprogramme/Modul-II.pdf

5.2 FURTHER LITERATURE

American Society for Cell Biology (ASCB) (2012): The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment, Putting science into the assessment of research
→ www.ascb.org/dora/

Boon, W., and Edler, J. (2018): Demand, challenges and innovation. Making sense of new trends in innovation policy. Science and Public Policy, 45(4), pp. 435-447.

Austrian Research Centers (2006): Neue Entwicklungen im Bereich der Wirkungsanalyse und -abschätzung FTI-politischer Maßnahmen, Vienna 2006.

Federal Chancellery (BKA), Verordnung des Bundeskanzlers über Grundsätze der wirkungsorientierten Folgenabschätzung bei Regelungsvorhaben und sonstigen Vorhaben (WFA-Grundsatz-Verordnung –WFA-GV) StF: Federal Law Gazette II No. 489/2012, Ammendment fo the Federal Law Gazette II No. 67/2015
→ https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung/Bundesnormen/20008150/WFA-GV%2c%20Fassung%20vom%2009.04.2018.pdf

Federal Chancellery (BKA) (2013): Handbuch Wirkungsorientierte Folgeabschätzung. Working Document, January 2013
→ https://oeffentlicherdienst.gv.at/wirkungsorientierte_verwaltung/dokumente/handbuecher.html

BKA, BMF, BMUKK, bmvit, BMWFJ, BMWF (2011): Realising potentials, increasing dynamics, creating the future: Becoming an Innovation Leader. Strategy of the Federal Government for Research, Technology and Innovation, Vienna 2011
→ https://www.bmvit.gv.at/innovation/publikationen/fti_strategie.html

Böttcher, Wolfgang et al., (2014): Arbeitsfelder und Herausforderungen der Evaluation. Special print from „Evaluation in Deutschland und Österreich,
→ http://www.degeval.de/fileadmin/Publikationen/Sammelband/1_Introduction_Boettcher.pdf

Federal Ministries of Science, Research and the Economy (BMWFW) and Transport, Innovation and Technology (BMVIT) (2017): Austrian Research and Technology Report
→ https://repository.fteval.at/318/

Federal Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology (BMVIT) and the Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economy (BMWFW), GUIDELINE on the Promotion of Economic and Technological Research, Technology Development and Innovation (RTI Guidelines 2015) Thematic FTI Guidelines, 2015
→ https://www.bmvit.gv.at/innovation/foerderungen/downloads/richtlinie_fti_2015_themen.pdf

Dinges, M. and Schmidmayer, J. (2010): Country report: Austria., in: Edler, J., Cunningham, P., Gök, A., Rigby, J., Amanatidou, E., Garefi, I., Bührer, S., Dinges, M., Berger, M., Schmidmayer, J. and Guy, K. (2010): Understanding evaluation of innovation policy in Europe, in: INNO-Appraisal final report, Manchester, 243–264.
→ https://repository.fteval.at/168/

Edler, J., Berger, M., Dinges, M., Gök, A. (2012): The Practice of Evaluation in Innovation Policy in Europe, In: Research Evaluation Volume 21, Issue 3.

European Science Foundation (ESF) (2012): Evaluation in Research and Research Funding Organisations: European Practices
→ http://archives.esf.org/coordinating-research/mo-fora/evaluation-of-publicly-funded-research.html

European Science Foundation (ESF) (2012): A Guide to Evaluation Activities in Funding Agencies
→ http://archives.esf.org/coordinating-research/mo-fora/evaluation-of-publicly-funded-research.html

European Science Foundation (ESF) (2012): The Challenges of Impact Assessment
→ http://archives.esf.org/coordinating-research/mo-fora/evaluation-of-publicly-funded-research.html

Foray, D., Mowery, D. C., and Nelson, R. R. (2012): Public R&D and Social Challenges: What Lessons from Mission R&D Programs. Research Policy, 41/10, pp. 163-183.

Franzen, M., Hartstein, J. , Priester, S. (2016): Der vermessene Nutzen der Forschung. Impact als neuer Faktor im britischen Evaluationssystem. In: WZB Mitteilungen, Issue 152
→ https://bibliothek.wzb.eu/artikel/2016/f-19950.pdf

Gutknecht-Gmeiner, M., Eckstein, K., Wroblewski, A. (2017): Genderkompetenz und Genderexpertise - Anforderungen an Kompetenzprofile von Evaluator(inn)en, In: Zeitschrift für Evaluation, Vol. 16, Issue 1.

Heidler, R., Reinhardt, A. and Saß, U. (2016): Evaluation der Förderung von Wissenschaft und Forschung – Rückblick, Einblick, Ausblick, 16 June 2016 in Bonn, In: Zeitschrift für Evaluation, Vol. 15, Issue 2.

Hicks, D., Wouters, P., et al. (2015): The Leiden Manifesto for Research Metrics
→ http://www.nature.com/news/bibliometrics-the-leiden-manifesto-for-research-metrics-1.17351

Kulhmann, S., and Rip, A. (2014): The Challenge of Addressing Grand Challenges. Brussels: EU Commission.

Landsteiner, G. (2015): Nützlichkeit und Nutzen der Programmevaluationen im Bereich der österreichischen FTI-Politik. Metaevaluation der Programmevaluationen 2003-2014
→ http://www.rat-fte.at/tl_files/uploads/Studien/Metaevaluation-FTI-Kurzbericht-web.pdf
→ http://www.rat-fte.at/tl_files/uploads/Studien/Metaevaluation-FTI-Endbericht-final-web.pdf

Mayring, P. (2017): Schlaglichter auf die Entwicklung der Evaluation in Österreich, In: Zeitschrift für Evaluation, Vol. 16, Issue 2.

Mazzucato, M. (2011): The Entrepreneurial State, Soundings, 49/49, pp. 131–42.

Melin, G. and Danell, R. (2006) The top eight percent: development of approved and rejected applicants for a prestigious grant in Sweden, Science and Public Policy, Volume 33, Number 10, 1 December 2006.

Moss, T. (2016): Evaluierung transdisziplinärer Forschung. Herausforderungen und Ansatzpunkte, In: Nachrichten der ARL 2/2016
→ https://shop.arl-net.de/media/direct/pdf/nachrichten/2016-2/NR2_2016_Moss_S23_online.pdf

Österreichischen Agentur für wissenschaftliche Integrität (2015): Richtlinien der Österreichischen Agentur für wissenschaftliche Integrität zur Guten Wissenschaftlichen Praxis, Vienna
→ http://www.oeawi.at/downloads/Brosch.%20GWP-Richtlinien%20WEB%202017_neu.pdf

Österreichischer Wissenschaftsrat (2014): Die Vermessung der Wissenschaft. Messung und Beurteilung von Qualität in der Forschung
→ http://www.wissenschaftsrat.ac.at/news/Messung_Endversion_inkl%20Cover.pdf

Reiner, D. and Smoliner S. (2012): Outputorientierte Evaluierung öffentlich geförderter FTI-Programme. Studie der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Forschung im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Innovation und Technologie, Vienna.

Rogers, P. J. (2012): Introduction to Impact Evaluation. Interaction
→ https://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/1%20-%20Introduction%20to%20Impact%20Evaluation.pdf

Staatssekretariat für Bildung, Forschung und Innovation (2013): Wirkungen innovationspolitischer Fördermassnahmen in der Schweiz
→ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259737955_Wirkungen_innovationspolitischer_Fordermassnahmen_in_der_Schweiz

Pasanen, T. and Shaxson, L. (2016): How to design a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for a Policy Research Project, 2016
→ https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/10259.pdf

Stockmann, R., Meyer, W. and Schenke, H. (2011): Unabhängigkeit von Evaluationen, In: Zeitschrift für Evaluation, Vol. 10, Issue 1.

Stockmann, R. (2010): 10 Thesen zur Evaluation der Wirksamkeit der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Centrum for Evaluation. Working paper 18. Saarbrücken.
→ http://www.ceval.de/modx/fileadmin/user_upload/PDFs/workpaper18.pdf

Stockmann, R. (2004): Was ist eine gute Evaluation? Centrum for Evaluation. Working paper 19. Saarbrücken.
→ http://www.ceval.de/modx/fileadmin/user_upload/PDFs/workpaper9.pdf

Streicher, J. (2017): Evaluations, Actors and Institutions. The Case of Research, Technology and Innovation Policy in Austria.
→ http://epub.wu.ac.at/id/eprint/5445

Warta, K, and Philipp, S. (2016): Was bringt die Platform fteval und zu was hat sie es gebracht? Rückblick und Ergebnisse einer Mitgliederberfragung. fteval Journal, Issue 41, 2016
→ https://www.fteval.at/static/journals/upload/fteval_Journal_for_Research_and_Technology_Policy_Evaluation_-_41_.pdf

Weber, K. M., and Rohracher, H. (2012): Legitimizing Research, Technology and Innovation Policies for Transformative Change. Research Policy, 41/6, pp. 1037–1047.

Wessels, J., Kind, S., Kerlen, C. (2016): Verwendung von standardisierten Indikatoren bei der Evaluation von FTI-Programmen. Zeitschrift für Evaluation, Vol. 15, Issue 1.

Austrian Science Fund (FWF), Die Regeln des Wissenschaftsfonds zur Qualität und Transparenz von Evaluierungen, Studien und forschungspolitischen Dienstleistungen, no date
→ https://www.fwf.ac.at/de/forschungsfoerderung/entscheidung-evaluation/evaluationsstandards/qualitaets-und-transparenzregeln-von-evaluierungen/

The current version of the standards of the Austrian Platform for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation (FTEVAL) replaces the version which was last revised in 2012.

Citation proposal for the English version of the standards:
Austrian Platform for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation (2019): Evaluation Standards in Research, Technology and Innovation Policy. Vienna.
DOI: 10.22163/fteval.2019.344

IMPRINT:

AUSTRIAN PLATFORM FOR RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY EVALUATION (FTEVAL)
c/o ZSI – Centre for Social Innovation GmbH
Linke Wienzeile 246, 1150 Vienna
Austria
E office@fteval.at
W www.fteval.at

Graphic design:
W carotte.at

Translation:
Young Translations LLC, 1030 Vienna

The Austrian Platform for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation expresses its sincere thanks to **Ms Karin Kohlweg, MSc (Econ)**.

The standards are based on a draft created by Ms. Kohlweg and the core aspects of the text were developed together with the FTEVAL Supervisory Group, which was established specifically for the purpose of revising the standards. This draft was then revised in an intensive multi-stage consultation process that included the member organisations of FTEVAL, and consolidated by Ms Kohlweg using the Discuto software. The standards were adopted at the FTEVAL General Assembly in autumn 2018.

AUSTRIAN PLATFORM FOR RESEARCH
AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY EVALUATION

www.fteval.at