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1 Mapping of evaluation questions against research methods

Table 1.1 below maps the individual evaluation questions against the research methods used. It provides an overview of how the method of approach and the methodological tools chosen have been applied to meet the requirements of the Terms of References and the Steering Group.
### Table 1.1 Mapping of evaluation questions against research methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation issue/ question</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7</th>
<th>Cooperation projects</th>
<th>FP7 SiS participants</th>
<th>SESAM</th>
<th>Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Bibliometrics</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme rationale and design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale for intervention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What was the rationale for the SiS programme?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were the goals set for the programme realistic?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the Programme clearly structured and were the objectives set out clearly enough?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was there an adequate consistency between the activities funded and the initial goals set out by the Programme that is to say did the tools and approaches used help to reach the objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Did changes in project contents over time reflect / take into account changes in research programming (as reflected in changes in Work Programmes and calls)? If so, to what extent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How policy-relevant were the topics taken up in the Work Programmes 2011-2013 for the ERA?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation issue/question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme implementation</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7 projects</th>
<th>FP7/FP7 participants</th>
<th>SESAM Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Bibliometrics</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were there sufficient tools to monitor and evaluate the progress, results and impacts of the activities in different areas?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of projects and partnerships funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did the Programme over time succeed over time in its ambition to develop less but bigger, more strategic projects with more pronounced policy links and impacts?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did a diversification of contexts and partnerships beyond academic circles (especially industry, CSOs, cities) take place during the programming period?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Did the introduction of new mechanisms (especially MML) within the Programme succeed in significantly increasing stakeholder participation?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Did the new mechanisms change the type of involvement of non-researchers in the SiS Programme?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are the new developments for increased integrated SiS efforts through e.g. MMLs, in pace with national and sectoral capacities across Europe?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Were the elements of novelty introduced by FP7 (broader focus, increased research activities, transversal focus) efficient with respect to reaching their intended objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation issue/ question</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7 Cooperation projects</th>
<th>FP7 SiS participants</th>
<th>SESAM Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. How was the new funding scheme research for the Benefit of specific groups - CSOs been used by the different Programmes analysed and with what results (types of stakeholders involved, changes in the relationship / collaboration between research organisations and CSOs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How has this funding scheme involved civil society organisations in the agenda setting of research in comparison with other funding schemes that pursue similar objectives (especially the MML - CSA type)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dissemination and awareness raising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation issue/ question</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7 Cooperation projects</th>
<th>FP7 SiS participants</th>
<th>SESAM Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. What was the progress with dissemination and awareness activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thematic and geographic coverage of the programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation issue/ question</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7 Cooperation projects</th>
<th>FP7 SiS participants</th>
<th>SESAM Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Did the funded projects cover the whole spectrum of SiS objectives?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. What was the progress made to increase participation from &quot;new&quot; Member States?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Is there evidence for progress in quantitative and qualitative terms of increased international focus of the Programme?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adequacy of funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation issue/ question</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7 Cooperation projects</th>
<th>FP7 SiS participants</th>
<th>SESAM Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Was the budget adequate in relation to the overall objectives and the individually funded actions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Method overview and research tools

**Evaluation issue/ question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme achievements</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7 Cooperation projects</th>
<th>FP7/SIS participants</th>
<th>SESAM Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Bibliometrics</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement of objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How far has the SIS Programme achieved its general objectives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Would a different choice of approaches (instruments, funding and content priorities) have delivered better results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on policy making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. What has been the impact of the FP7 SIS Programme on scientific advice and decision-making processes at different levels (EU, national, regional, local)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. What has been the impact on policy development, including on multi-level policy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Is there a visible impact of the SIS Work Programmes on policy development in SIS at national level?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on ERA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Has the SIS Programme played a role in shaping the ERA? If yes, in which ways and how can the impact of SIS Programme in policy developments and shaping ERA be improved under H2020?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. What has been the impact of the Programme on the SIS communities and landscape in the Member States and Associated Countries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Are there specific parts of Europe that the Programme &quot;helped&quot; more than others / where the impacts of the Programme have been stronger?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation issue/ question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation issue/ question</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7 Cooperation projects</th>
<th>FP7 SiS participants</th>
<th>SESAM Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Bibliometrics</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Is there evidence of the hypothesis made by the MASIS Expert Group of a European Model of SiS?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainstreaming of SiS aspects within other parts of FP7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. To what degree (including quantitative elements where possible) were SiS related activities implemented within the Thematic Programmes of the FP7 Cooperation Programme (on Programme - as well as project level) and which were the issues most frequently tackled?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. What was the quality and nature of the integration of SiS issues within other parts of the Cooperation Programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. What has been the impact of Science in Society activities in comparison with other Programmes (SSH Programme as a reference) when it comes to instruments as well as the Programme as a whole?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Did the projects within the Programme have an impact with view to the integration and involvement of stakeholders? Did this have an impact for example on the relation with policy making, public accountability or attitudes towards SiS issues? (e.g. outcomes Eurobarometer).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EU added value</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National SiS activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. What is the nature / what are the patterns of SiS activities (programmes, single projects) in different countries and are there any issues that are more frequently / strategically tackled than others?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation issue/ question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation issue/ question</th>
<th>Desk research</th>
<th>CORDA data analysis</th>
<th>Online survey: FP7 Cooperation projects</th>
<th>FP7 SiS participants</th>
<th>SESAM Final reporting questionnaires</th>
<th>SESAM Dissemination data</th>
<th>Network analysis</th>
<th>Bibliometrics</th>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Is there any significant overlap of activities between EU and MS level that challenge the impact and relevance of the EU-level activities?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. How efficient, relevant, appropriate and sustainable was the funding level of SiS actions in comparison with comparable national and international activities?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall added value of FP7 SiS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. What was the European added value of the programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Revised evaluation framework

This section provides the revised evaluation framework used for the present ex-post evaluation study. Changes vis-à-vis the evaluation questions set out in the study’s terms of References are set out in red and strikethrough. The framework provides for each Evaluation Question the Judgement Criteria, necessary evidence and analysis as well as specific sources of primary and secondary information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance            | 1. What is the relevance of the goals set out for the SiS activities in comparison with other activities taking place on Member state level and within academia, industry, education etc.? | ■ Whether the programme addressed a well-defined set of issues that were both real and important  
■ The extent to which different stakeholder groups acknowledge that:  
  ─ There were/are issues w.r.t gender participation, public engagement etc.  
  ─ These issues were/are important and need to be addressed  
  ─ A programme such as SiS was an appropriate response to these issues  
■ Whether the programme was underpinned by a clear intervention logic  
■ The extent to which FP7-SiS programme objectives address the issues  
■ The extent to which programme areas and topics were relevant to and consistent with high level EU policy objectives | Issues addressed by the programme  
Underlying rationale for each SiS theme, namely gender, ethics, public engagement, science education, governance, open access and communication | Annual Work Programmes, Calls and project documentation  
Policy documentation such as legal base, ERA progress reports  
Interim evaluation | Interviews with DG RTD  
Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, PMC members, NCPs, national SiS policymakers/funders, expert evaluators) |
|                      |                     |                    |                       |                        | Interviews with DG RTD |
|                      |                     |                    |                       |                        | Online surveys - SiS project participants and coordinators  
Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, PMC members, NCPs, national SiS policymakers/funders, expert evaluators) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | **This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole** | - The extent to which Annual Work Programmes and Calls evolved in line with progress and new developments in the selected fields  
- The extent to which important priority topics/ issues in selected fields were not covered (missed opportunities) | Composition analysis - demand for and take-up of FP7 SiS funding | Communication, ERA Vision 2020 (2008) |
|                      |                     |                     |                       |                       |
|                      |                      |                     |                       |                       |
|                      |                      |                     |                       |                       |
|                      |                      |                     |                       |                       |
|                      |                      |                     |                       |                       |
|                      |                     |                     |                       |                       |
|                      | 2. **Have the goals set for the programme been realistic?** | **This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole** | The goals are vaguely formulated which makes it difficult to assess progress and to judge whether they were realistic or not. At the same time it is doubtful whether a programme of this nature can have very precisely formulated/SMART objectives. It would therefore, be more sensible to judge the level of ambition demonstrated by the programme  
Assessment of programme targets in relation to available budget and timeframe | Identification of explicit and implicitly stated goals, targets, timeframes and inputs (intervention logic analysis) | Annual Work Programmes, Calls PMC minutes |
|                      |                     |                     |                       |                       |
|                      |                      |                     |                       |                       |
|                      |                      |                     |                       |                       |
|                      |                      |                     |                       |                       |
|                      | 3. **Is the design of the** | The extent to which there was a | Comparison between actual achievements and established objectives | Interim evaluation CORDA project data |
|                      |                      |                     |                       |                       |
## Evaluation criteria, Evaluation Question, Judgement criteria, Evidence and analysis, Sources of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coherence</td>
<td>Programme clearly structured, and were the objectives set out clearly enough?</td>
<td>clear and logical link between programme objectives and structure (“action lines”, “activities”, “areas”)</td>
<td>and programme goals</td>
<td>Programmes, Calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant ratings of clarity of structure and objectives of programme goals</td>
<td>Online surveys - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder perspectives on clarity of programme structure and objectives</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, PMC members, NCPs, national SiS policymakers/funders, expert evaluators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme management</td>
<td>Are were there sufficient tools to monitor and evaluate the progress, results and impacts of the activities in different areas?</td>
<td>The extent to which M&amp;E outputs were relevant and useful for managing the programme and for making policy decisions</td>
<td>Review of M&amp;E tools that were put in place to monitor and report on progress, results and impacts</td>
<td>M&amp;E material e.g. PO reports, RESPIR reports, reports presented to the PMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which users were satisfied with the M&amp;E tools and outputs</td>
<td>Review of M&amp;E outputs e.g. monitoring reports produced etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who used this information and how</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback from key users of M&amp;E outputs on the quality, timeliness of information, usefulness of tools</td>
<td>Interviews with DG RTD officials, PMC members, advisory/expert groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Have Did the Programme over time succeeded in its ambition to develop less but bigger, more strategic projects with more</td>
<td>Whether the evidence demonstrates:</td>
<td>Evolution in programme priorities and content</td>
<td>Annual Work Programmes, Calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ An increase in average size of SiS project budgets over time</td>
<td>Composition analysis of project and participant data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ An increase in the average</td>
<td>Interim evaluation CORDA project and participant data</td>
<td>Interviews with DG RTD officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criterion</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Evidence and analysis</td>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronounced policy links and impacts?</td>
<td>numbers of partners per project over time</td>
<td>Network analysis – an analysis of the nature and extent of links between different types of participants over time</td>
<td>Interim evaluation based on CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole</td>
<td>An increased diversity of partnerships over time</td>
<td>Stakeholder feedback on whether projects became more strategic over time with increased policy links and impacts</td>
<td>Secondary sources: Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, PMC members, NCPs, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole</td>
<td>Greater strategic orientation of projects in terms of their policy linkages and impacts</td>
<td>Case studies of strategic projects (one for each theme) with pronounced policy links and impacts</td>
<td>Primary sources: Interviews with project participants, coordinators, users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme coverage – target groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has Did a diversification of contexts and partnerships beyond academic circles (especially industry, CSOs, cities) taken place during the programming period?</td>
<td>Whether the evidence demonstrates:</td>
<td>Analysis of nature and extent of links between different types of participants over time</td>
<td>Based on CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole</td>
<td>Increased diversification of project partnerships and changes to balance of lead partner organisation types over time</td>
<td>Network analysis of project contexts</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased diversification of project contexts away from purely academic settings and to industry, civil society, public authorities, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme coverage – target groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has Did the introduction of new mechanisms (especially MML) within the Programme succeeded in significantly increasing stakeholder participation?</td>
<td>Whether there is evidence of:</td>
<td>Number of MMLs funded</td>
<td>CORDA project data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased stakeholder participation (average number of participants per project) within MML instrument compared to other instruments</td>
<td>Analysis of participant data for MMLs and other instruments (comparative analysis)</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Network analysis - analysis of nature and extent of links</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criterion</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Evidence and analysis</td>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of &quot;new-to-FP&quot; organisations</td>
<td>between different types of participants in MMLs versus other instruments</td>
<td>coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme coverage – target groups</td>
<td>8. Did the new mechanisms change the type of involvement of non-researchers in the SiS Programme?</td>
<td>Whether there is evidence of changes to the nature of involvement of non-researchers in MMLs versus other instruments (as indicated by participation rate, share of coordinator roles held, share of budget, linkages with other actors etc.)</td>
<td>Desk research - analysis of CORDA participant data for MMLs and other instruments (comparative analysis)</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Network analysis - nature and extent of links between different types of participants in MMLs versus other instruments</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>9. <strong>Are the elements of novelty introduced by FP7 (broader focus, increased research activities, transversal focus) efficient with respect to reaching their intended objectives?</strong></td>
<td>Judgements based on: 1. what the novel elements were? 2. what were the intended objectives of these novel elements? 3. were these achieved? 4. were the desired effects achieved at a reasonable cost?</td>
<td>Identification of novel items and their intended objectives</td>
<td>Programme documentation; interim evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant ratings of effectiveness of novel elements</td>
<td>Online surveys - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder ratings of effectiveness of novel elements in reaching objectives</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>10. Did changes in project contents over time reflect / take into account changes in research programming (as reflected in changes in early Work Programmes and calls)? If so, to what extent?</td>
<td>The extent to which project content evolved in line with the changes in programme orientations</td>
<td>Identification of major changes to work programmes and calls over time</td>
<td>Work Programmes and Calls Interim evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes to project content heralded by adjustments to work programmes and calls</td>
<td>Project interim and final reports – extracted from CORDA in excel format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with EC officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criterion</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Evidence and analysis</td>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>11. What <em>was</em> the progress with view to dissemination and awareness?</td>
<td>The extent to which stakeholders and user communities are aware of the outputs and results of FP7-SIS</td>
<td>Awareness and dissemination of outputs and results of the programme among potential user communities</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SIS policymakers/funders) Interviews with user communities and wider stakeholder groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project interim and final reports – extracted from CORDA in excel format</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregate programme level analysis of:</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SIS participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ No. of publications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ No. of workshops etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ Average dissemination activity per project - trends overtime and in comparison to FP7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project interim and final reports – extracted from CORDA in excel format</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SIS participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Web scraping / data mining – online impact of scientific and grey literature</td>
<td>Supplied by CORDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on CORDA project data and information contained in the final reports submitted by projects</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SIS participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference networking analysis</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SIS participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on CORDA project data and information contained in the final reports submitted by projects</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SIS participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>12. <em>Would</em> a different choice of approaches with view to (instruments, funding and content priorities) that could have delivered better results?</td>
<td>The extent to which stakeholders and participants express their satisfaction with:</td>
<td>Participant ratings of effectiveness of instruments, funding and content priorities</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SIS participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■ The suitability and attractiveness of the instruments used for SIS</td>
<td>Stakeholder ratings of effectiveness of instruments, funding and content priorities</td>
<td>Interviews with DG RTD officials Stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criterion</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Evidence and analysis</td>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(advisory/expert groups,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NCPs, PMC members,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>national SiS policymakers/funders, expert evaluators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal coherence</td>
<td>13. Did the funded projects cover the whole spectrum of SiS objectives?</td>
<td>Whether there were any significant gaps in coverage of SiS objectives and the reasons for these gaps</td>
<td>Bibliometric analyses - analysis of publication profiles of SiS researchers and projects in comparison to global profiles</td>
<td>List of SiS publications and researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Work Programmes and Call documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data on applications received and accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Work Programmes and Call documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CORDA project data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder perspectives on any significant gaps identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with DG RTD officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with SiS participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Method overview and research tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme coverage - geographic</strong></td>
<td>14. What <strong>is was</strong> the progress made to increase participation from &quot;new&quot; Member States? <strong>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole</strong></td>
<td>Whether participation rates of 12 &quot;new&quot; Member States increased over time  Whether &quot;new&quot; Member State participation rates in FP7-SiS are higher or lower than FP7 averages  Nature of participation of new Member States</td>
<td>Time series analysis on demand levels &amp; participation per country - changes in levels of participation (proposals + projects + funding) of new Member States  <strong>Analysis to be performed for FP7-SiS as well as relative to FP7 overall</strong></td>
<td>Interim evaluation CORDA application and participation data  Network analysis – centrality scores of new Member States versus &quot;old&quot; and EU-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme coverage - geographic</strong></td>
<td>15. Is there evidence for progress in quantitative and qualitative terms to increase international focus of the Programme? <strong>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole</strong></td>
<td>Whether participation rates of third countries increased over time  Whether third country participation rates in FP7-SiS are higher or lower than FP averages  Nature of participation</td>
<td>Analysis of nature and extent of partnerships over time, focusing on increased internationalisation  Network analysis of links between countries over time and centrality scores  Qualitative aspects of third country participation in FP7</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data  Stakeholder ratings of improvements to international focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>16. How far has the SiS</td>
<td>Whether objectives have been</td>
<td>Overarching analysis of project</td>
<td>CORDA project data  Online surveys &amp; interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme achieved its general objectives?</td>
<td>achieved If objectives have fallen short – the extent to which progress has fallen short and why</td>
<td>impacts (aggregated) for each SiS programme objective</td>
<td>- SiS project participants and coordinators Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness 17. What is has been the impact of the FP7 SiS Programme on scientific advice and decision-making processes at different levels (EU, national, regional, local)?</td>
<td>Whether programme had a major/ minor/no impact on scientific advice and decision-making processes at different levels Concrete examples can be found of the programme’s impact on scientific advice and decision-making processes at different levels</td>
<td>Overarching analysis of project impacts on scientific advice and decision making at EU, national, regional and local levels</td>
<td>Project documentation (e.g. interim/ final reports, project website, publications etc.)</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders) Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance 18. How policy-relevant are</td>
<td>The extent to which there was a</td>
<td>Analysis of relevance of Work</td>
<td>Annual Work Programmes</td>
<td>Interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators Interviews with target groups of project dissemination activities e.g. scientific advisory groups, users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criterion</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Evidence and analysis</td>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | *were* the topics taken up in the Work Programmes 2011-2013 for the ERA? | logical causal link between work programme topics and ERA objectives  
The extent of coordination between ERA unit and SiS unit in design of work programmes | Programmes topics and ERA objectives / actions | ERA communication |
|                      |                      |                    | Internal coordination within the Commission | Interviews with DG RTD officials |
|                      |                      |                    | Stakeholder ratings on policy relevance of Work Programmes topics | Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders) |
| Effectiveness        | 19. *What* has been the impact on policy development, including on multi-level policy? | Whether programme had a major/ minor/no impact on policy making  
Whether concrete examples can be found of the programme's impact on policy and practice | Overarching analysis of programme impact on policy development  
Participant ratings of impacts on policy developments at each level | Project documentation (e.g. interim/ final reports, project website, publications etc.)  
Online surveys & interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators |
|                      |                      |                    | Stakeholder feedback on impacts on policy developments at each level | Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders) |
|                      |                      |                    | Case studies of project impacts / influence | Interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators  
Interviews with target groups of project dissemination activities e.g. policy makers, users |
### Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>20. <strong>Has the SiS Programme played a role in shaping the ERA?</strong> If yes, in which ways and how can the impact of SiS Programme in policy developments and shaping ERA be improved under H2020?</td>
<td>Extent to which FP7-SiS has had a demonstrable (and if significant) impact on the way in which Europe’s research landscape is shaped, structured and organised, for example through:  - Facilitating networking beyond borders (both national and of research disciplines)  - Creating links between individuals and institutions  - Fostering cooperation between research actors  - Coordination of research and innovation at national, regional and European level  - Shaping and influencing the research agenda  - Channelling of national resources to particular research areas  - Establishing a ‘critical mass’ of resources in the fields of SiS  - Strengthening of research excellence through competition at European level and via transnational collaboration  - Exercising a catalytic effect on national initiatives  - Promoting excellence through competition</td>
<td>Project composition analysis</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Network analysis</td>
<td>Based on CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliometrics – co publication rates</td>
<td>Based on CORDA data on researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback on the influence of SiS programme on ERA + mechanisms for increasing impacts</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies of project impacts / influence</td>
<td>Project documentation (e.g. interim/ final reports, project website, publications etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators, users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>21. <strong>What has been the impact</strong></td>
<td>Whether SiS has had a greater/</td>
<td>Extent to which SiS and other</td>
<td>CORDA project data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criterion</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Evidence and analysis</td>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Science in Society activities in comparison with other Programmes (SSH Programme as a reference) when it comes to instruments as well as the Programme as a whole?</td>
<td>lesser impact than SSH taking into account budget allocation and instruments deployed</td>
<td>FP7 programmes have used different instruments - analysis of data on instrument profiles (usage) by SiS and other FP7 programmes</td>
<td>Impacts of SSH – it is assumed that DG RTD will provide the evaluation team with this information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness 22.</td>
<td>Did the projects within the Programme have an impact with view to the integration and involvement of stakeholders? Did this have an impact for example on the relation with policy making, public accountability or attitudes towards SiS issues? (e.g. outcomes Eurobarometer).</td>
<td>Extent of formal integration of stakeholders within SiS project teams</td>
<td>Analysis of project partnerships by organisation type</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of engagement of other (non-project) stakeholders by SiS projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement of non-project stakeholders and user communities</td>
<td>Desk research on related EU outcomes (Eurobarometer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts of stakeholder involvement on project outcomes (including impacts on policy making, public accountability or attitudes towards SiS issues)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts of stakeholder involvement on project outcomes (including impacts on policy making, public accountability or attitudes towards SiS issues)</td>
<td>Project documentation (e.g. interim/ final reports, project website, publications etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies of project impacts (pathways to impact)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Case studies of project impacts (pathways to impact)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness 23.</td>
<td>What has been the impact of the Programme on the SiS communities and</td>
<td>Whether there is evidence of increased funding and capabilities, improved</td>
<td>Analysis by country: Role and involvement of new actors in SiS</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criterion</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Evidence and analysis</td>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | landscape in the Member States and Associated Countries?                             | coordination of actors, etc                               | ■ Trends in national funding for SiS  
■ Examples of coordination platforms  
■ Emergence /growth in size or shape of SiS communities in participating countries | vis-à-vis national funding, capabilities and networks  
Stakeholder interviews (EC officials, advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders) |
|                      | Nature and extent of participation in the programme and impacts by country           |                                                                                                           | Comparative analysis of application and participation data (demand levels, success rates & participation per country) | Application data and CORDA project data |
| Effectiveness        | Are there specific parts of Europe that the Programme "helped" more than others / where the impacts of the Programme have been stronger? |                                                                                                           | Comparative analysis of impacts, organised by country                                | Stakeholder interviews (EC officials, advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders) |
| Internal coherence   | Was there an adequate consistency between the activities funded and the initial goals set out by the Programme that is to say did the tools and approaches used help to reach the objectives? | The extent to which different tools and approaches have contributed effectively to SiS objectives | Desk research (analysis) to map project types & approaches to impacts on different programme goals | CORDA project data |
|                      |                                                                                     |                                                                                                           | Participant and stakeholder perspectives of the relative effectiveness of different tools and approaches | Stakeholder interviews (EC officials, advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders) |

*This question will be addressed thematically (e.g.)*
## Method overview and research tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td><strong>ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>26. Is there evidence of the hypothesis made by the MASIS Expert Group of a European Model of SiS?</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Evidence of EU-level / EU-wide SiS structures, approaches, and actions that exemplify the hypothesised European model</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (EC officials, advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders) Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Work Programmes and Calls CORDA project data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>27. Is the budget adequate in relation to the overall objectives and the individually funded actions?</td>
<td>Whether programme objectives were achieved or not If objectives have fallen short – whether this could be explained partly or fully by budget available The extent to which participants indicated that budget was sufficient</td>
<td>Identification of goals, targets and budgets at programme and project level - assessment of programme/ projects objectives and topics and related budgets / expenditure</td>
<td>Stakeholder views on adequacy of FP7 SiS budget vis-à-vis programme objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant views on adequacy of FP7 SiS budget vis-à-vis programme objectives Participant feedback on adequacy of project budget to meet project goals Participants’ reasoning in case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation criterion: External coherence

**28.** How efficient, relevant, appropriate and sustainable was the funding level of SIS actions in comparison with comparable national and international activities?

- **Evaluation Question:** Whether comparable national/international activities existed during 2007-2014?
- **Judgement criteria:** Whether SIS complemented or duplicated these activities?
- **Evidence and analysis:** Information on comparable national/international activities: scale and continuity of funding available, themes covered, participation SIS programme in the context of comparable national/international activities
  - **Sources of Information:** MASIS country reports

**NB:** It is doubtful that information will be available to compare the efficiency of SIS with national/international activities.

## Evaluation criterion: Effectiveness

**29.** To which degree (including quantitative elements where possible) are SIS related activities implemented within the Thematic Programmes of the FP7 Cooperation Programme (on Programme - as well as project level) and which are the issues most frequently tackled?

- **Evaluation Question:** Extent to which SIS issues were explicitly tackled in the Annual Work Programmes and Calls of other FP7 cooperation programmes, by issue and by programme
- **Judgement criteria:** Evidence of SIS principles being embedded in the thematic programmes of FP7 Cooperation (qualitative elements)
- **Evidence and analysis:** Nature and extent of FP7 Cooperation projects' engagement with SIS issues
  - % closed projects that have completed societal implications questionnaire
  - % FP7 Cooperation projects effectively addressing SIS themes
  - Quantitative and qualitative assessment of issues most frequently tackled (e.g. gender, ethics)

- **Sources of Information:** FP7 Cooperation Annual Work Programme analysis
  - CORDA project data and monitoring data - completed questionnaires on societal implications for FP7 projects
  - FP7 monitoring reports which provide selective findings from the societal implications questionnaires
  - Interim evaluation

**This question will be addressed thematically (if possible) as well as for SIS programme as a whole**

**This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SIS programme as**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>30. Has progress been made in quantitative and qualitative terms with view to the integration of SIS aspects within FP7 (compared to the findings of earlier analysis)? <strong>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SIS programme as a whole</strong></td>
<td>Extent of integration (quantitative) of SIS issues at FP7 Cooperation programme level and in Annual Work Programmes compared to interim evaluation findings</td>
<td>Assessment of improvements to nature (quality) of integration since the interim evaluation</td>
<td>FP7 Cooperation Annual Work Programme analysis CORDA + Monitoring data (reporting on societal implications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent of integration (quantitative) of SIS issues at FP7 Cooperation project level compared to interim evaluation findings</td>
<td>Internal coordination within the Commission – between SIS units and FP7 Cooperation thematic units on SIS issues</td>
<td>Interviews with RTD officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SIS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with RTD officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31. What is was the quality and nature of the integration of SIS issues within other parts of the Cooperation Programme? <strong>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SIS programme as a whole</strong></td>
<td>Evidence of wider impacts and benefits of increased integration of SIS aspects in FP7 Cooperation programme</td>
<td>Overall qualitative assessment of nature and extent of integration of SIS issues within FP7 Cooperation programmes</td>
<td>FP7 Cooperation annual work programme analysis Monitoring data (reporting questionnaires) Case studies of Cooperation projects addressing SIS issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with RTD officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SIS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criterion</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Judgement criteria</td>
<td>Evidence and analysis</td>
<td>Sources of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>32. How was the new funding scheme research for the Benefit of specific groups – CSOs been used by the different Programmes analysed and with what results (types of stakeholders involved, changes in the relationship / collaboration between research organisations and CSOs)?</td>
<td>Extent to which the BSG-CSO instrument has had high / low take-up in FP7-SiS, and reasons behind this Extent to which the BSG-CSO instrument has materially different types of stakeholders involved, different relationship / collaboration between research organisations and CSOs, and any other quantitative and qualitative differences</td>
<td>Extent to which the BSG-CSO instrument has been used, by FP7-SiS programme relative to FP7 overall Comparative analysis of this instrument versus others (size, partnerships, etc.) Analysis of stakeholders involved and nature and extent of collaborations</td>
<td>Analysis of CORDA BSG-CSO projects and participants in comparison to other instruments Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>33. How has this funding scheme involved civil society organisations in the agenda setting of research in comparison with other funding schemes that pursue similar objectives (especially the MML - CSA type)?</td>
<td>Extent to which CSOs are lead partners in BSG-CSO projects compared to other instruments, including MML-CSA</td>
<td>Analysis of the roles of CSOs in the BSG-CSO instrument, including in agenda setting, in comparison to other types of instrument including MML-CSA projects CSO perspectives on the relative benefits and drawbacks of this scheme</td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data Interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators (BSG-CSO projects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External coherence</strong></td>
<td>34. What is the nature / what are the patterns of SiS activities (programmes, single projects) in different countries and are there any issues that are more frequently / strategically tackled than others? <strong>NB: linked to Q28</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Identification of SiS funding programmes, initiatives and major projects, in each country Identification of SiS issues tackled by national programmes and projects, overall and in comparison with FP7 SiS issues</td>
<td>Interim evaluation MASIS country reports Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This question will be addressed thematically (e.g. ethics, open access etc.) as well as for SiS programme as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliometric analyses - assessment of the publication profiles of FP7 SiS participants in comparison to profiles for all EU researchers</td>
<td>List of SiS publications and researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>35. Is there a visible impact of the SiS Work Programmes on policy development in SiS at national level?</td>
<td>Extent to which the FP7-SiS projects and their results have had on impact on policy developments in SiS at national level The nature of this impact and the channels through which this impact has occurred</td>
<td>Overarching analysis of programme impact on national SiS policy development Project documentation (e.g. interim/ final reports, project website, publications etc.)</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS participants and coordinators Web scraping / data mining – impact of scientific and grey literature on national SiS policy Based on CORDA project data and information contained in the final reports submitted by projects Case studies of project impacts (pathways to impact) Project documentation (e.g. interim/ final reports, project website, publications etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder perspectives on the impact of SiS programme on policy development in SiS at national level</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators Stakeholder interviews (advisory/expert groups,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Method overview and research tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External coherence</strong></td>
<td>36. Are the new developments for increased integrated SiS efforts through e.g. MMLs, in pace with national and sectoral capacities across Europe?</td>
<td>Extent to which MMLs have implications for national and sectoral capacities across Europe</td>
<td>Nature of MML activity and participation</td>
<td>Secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent to which national and sectoral capacities across Europe are in place and are able to make increased integrated SiS efforts through e.g. MMLs</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORDA project and participant data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extent to which the necessary structures are in place at national level for increased integrated SiS effort</td>
<td>Analysis of EU and national SiS funding and activities, and assessment of areas and degree of overlap</td>
<td>MASIS country reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of nature and extent of coordination and coherence between EU and national levels</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CORDA data on activities implemented by project</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (EC officials, advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External coherence</strong></td>
<td>37. Is there any significant overlap of activities between EU and MS level that challenge the impact and relevance of the EU-level activities?</td>
<td>Evidence of perceived gaps/overlaps in provision that reduce added value of EU-level actions</td>
<td>Analysis of EU and national SiS funding and activities, and assessment of areas and degree of overlap</td>
<td>Secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB: linked to Q28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of nature and extent of coordination and coherence between EU and national levels</td>
<td>MASIS country reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim evaluation</td>
<td>CORDA data on activities implemented by project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (EC officials, advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** linked to Q28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criterion</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Judgement criteria</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European added value</td>
<td>What was the European added value of the programme?</td>
<td>Extent to which individual projects rely on a European dimension (e.g. to project teams, data, approaches, critical mass) Whether similar outcomes could have been realised through action at national level alone</td>
<td>An analysis of the ‘EU dimension’ of funded activities</td>
<td>MASIS country reports Annual Work Programmes and calls Interim evaluation CORDA data on activities implemented by project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW QUESTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder perspectives on EU added value</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews (EC officials, advisory/expert groups, NCPs, PMC members, national SiS policymakers/funders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant feedback on whether similar outcomes could have been realised through action at national level alone</td>
<td>Online surveys &amp; interviews - SiS project participants and coordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.1 Project level analysis

These questions are not explicitly addressed as part of the ex-post evaluation. However, project level analysis has informed the overall evaluation of the programme as indicated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>How the evidence and analysis will be used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **Has the project achieved its specific objectives?** | ■ Identification of individual projects and their specific objectives and documented outcomes  
■ Case studies of project impacts / influence | To inform:  
EQ2  
EQ16 |
| 2. **What is the added value compared to the issues requested in the Work Programme Topic?** | ■ Evidence that individual projects have added value beyond the requirements specified in the related Work Programme topics (added value, by project)  
■ Participant feedback on the added value of their project compared to the issues requested in the work plan  
■ Case studies of projects demonstrating notable added value | To inform:  
EQ16  
EQ38 |
| 3. **What is the relevance and significance of these project outcomes for the objectives of the Science and Society Programme in FP7?** | ■ Analysis of how funded projects have contributed to programme goals  
■ Case studies of project impacts / influence | To inform:  
EQ10  
EQ13  
EQ25 |
| 4. **Is there evidence of impact on stakeholders outside the partnership? (Degree of impact; relevance of the impact; on what stakeholders)** | ■ Analysis of numbers and types of stakeholders affected + nature and significance of impacts, by project and for FP7 SiS as a whole  
■ Main intended users and beneficiaries of project outputs and results  
■ Dissemination of project outputs and results  
■ Case studies of project impacts / influence | To inform:  
EQ6  
EQ7  
EQ8  
EQ17  
EQ20  
EQ22  
EQ23 |
| 5. **Have funded projects have had any potential future impact on public policy, regulation or practice etc.? Are they likely** | ■ Evidence that individual projects will realise further impact on policy, regulation or practice | To inform:  
EQ18 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Evidence and analysis</th>
<th>How the evidence and analysis will be used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to have any such impact in future?</td>
<td>■ Analysis of the nature and significance of impacts + in what areas and through which routes, by project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Did projects show outstanding or path breaking advancements with view to new ways of undertaking or governing research activities (stakeholder involvement, participatory processes, impact on policy, indicator development etc.)?</td>
<td>■ Case studies of noteworthy projects</td>
<td>EQ19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Where are any best-practice examples of initiatives, actions or cross-thematic partnerships with other parts of the Framework Programme?</td>
<td>■ Evidence that individual projects have formed partnerships, initiatives or other joint actions with other parts of FP7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the project go beyond the state of the art, can innovative approaches (e.g. related to research, the involvement of stakeholders, the dissemination of results etc.) be observed?</td>
<td>■ Analysis of identified cross-FP7 partnerships, initiatives and actions, by project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Case studies of exemplary projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>To inform:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Evidence that individual projects have employed novel or innovative approaches that go beyond the state of the art</td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ5 EQ6 EQ11 EQ17 EQ20 EQ22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Analysis of identified innovative approaches of different types (e.g. to research methods, involvement of stakeholders, dissemination of results, etc.), by project</td>
<td></td>
<td>To inform:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Case studies of exemplary projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do the project outcomes demonstrate European added value?</td>
<td>■ Extent to which individual projects rely on a European dimension (e.g. to project teams, data, approaches, critical mass)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Participant feedback on EU added value and whether similar outcomes could have been realised through action at national level alone</td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Case studies of exemplary projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are the project outcomes disseminated to all relevant stakeholders?</td>
<td>■ Extent to which individual projects have identified and engaged relevant stakeholders (users) and have effectively disseminated project outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Nature and extent of dissemination of project outcomes, by project</td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is the project disseminated sufficiently within the Commission?</td>
<td>■ Extent to which individual projects have identified and engaged relevant stakeholders within the Commission and have effectively disseminated project outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Means of dissemination of project outcomes to the Commission, by project</td>
<td></td>
<td>EQ11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question

12. Is there evidence of sustainability (further use of the acquired knowledge, further co-operation, publications etc.) beyond the funding period?

### Evidence and analysis

- Role of SiS officials and SiS committee in dissemination
- Extent to which individual projects have achieved sustainability beyond the funding period in terms of further use of the acquired knowledge, further co-operation between partners, further publications, etc., by project

### How the evidence and analysis will be used?

EQ11
3 Questionnaires for online surveys

This section sets out the survey questionnaires for FP7 SiS project participants and coordinators of the FP7 Cooperation programme. The questionnaires mirror to a large degree the questionnaires used at the interim evaluation stage, in order to ensure comparability of results between the two studies. However, a considerable number of adjustments and extensions have been made to reflect analytical framework for the present evaluation.

3.1 Questionnaire: SiS project participants

Introduction

This questionnaire is aimed at all participants in the Science in Society (SiS) actions of the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programmes (FP7). The data collected will form an integral part of the ex-post evaluation of FP7 Science in Society actions, which is being undertaken on behalf of the European Commission's Directorate General for Research and Innovation (DG RTD).

This is a voluntary exercise. However, we hope that all participants will find the time to look at the questionnaire and to answer as many of the questions as possible. The survey provides an important opportunity to shape the key messages that will form part of the evidence base for the evaluation. The results of this evaluation will be used to inform stakeholders about main achievements of FP7, improve implementation of the Horizon 2020 programme and provide inputs for the design of the next generation research programme after 2020. Your contribution is, therefore, both valuable and important.

When answering the questions, please represent the views of your research group or organisation as appropriate. The survey consists of 27 questions and we estimate that it will take around 25 minutes to complete. We would be grateful if you could complete the survey by May 14.

All individual answers and comments will be treated as strictly confidential and non-attributable.

You can start, save and return to the survey at a later time using the same URL and reference number.

Thank you in advance for your participation and input to this study. Please click the ‘next’ button below to start the survey.

3.1.1 Basic information about you and your project

A number of questions in this survey ask about the Science in Society project you participated in. If you have participated in more than one Science in Society project, please answer the questions in relation to the project that you feel is most significant in terms of its (potential) wider benefits and impacts.

1. Please enter the title or acronym of your project (just one):

2. Has this project finished?
   ■ Yes – project completed
   ■ No – project ongoing

3. Which of the following options best describes your organisation? (tick one)
   ■ A research organisation
   ■ Higher or secondary education institution
   ■ Private commercial entity
   ■ Public body
   ■ Research organisations
   ■ Civil Society Organisation
   ■ Other, please specify:
3.1.2 Thematic focus of your project

4. Which of the following Science in Society themes best describes the focus of your project?
   - Ethics: E.g. research on ethical issues and ethics in science, networking between existing ethics bodies, development of ethics frameworks and review procedures
   - Open Access: e.g. supporting direct open access to research results, supporting networks, capacity of researchers, publishers and funders, studies on Open Access standard setting, metrics and infrastructure
   - Gender balance: actions fostering gender balance in the research and innovation process
   - Gender dimension: integration of gender dimension in research content
   - Science education: developing innovative curricula, teaching and learning approaches to impart scientific knowledge in formal and informal education and training
   - Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   - Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policymakers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
   - Governance: research on governance framework for good practice and quality in/of research, research and governance frameworks to ensure research programmes are aligned to societal challenges

3.1.3 Partnership arrangements and roles

5. To what extent was (or will) your organisation (be) involved in the following aspects of the project: (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)
   - Defining the objectives of the project
   - Defining the content and scope of the project description of work
   - Defining the size and membership of the consortium
   - Implementing the project activities
   - Disseminating the results of the project
   - Exploiting the results of the project

3.1.4 Users and beneficiaries

6. Which of the following groups do you consider to be the main intended ‘users’ or beneficiaries of the project and its results? (tick maximum 3)
   - The scientific community
   - Private industry
   - Public administration and/or public service organisations
   - EU institutions
   - National or regional governments
   - Civil Society Organisations (CSOs)
   - National research councils
   - The media
   - Citizens
   - Pupils, teachers or schools
   - Museums

* Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are defined as organisations that are non-governmental, not for-profit, not representing commercial interests, and that pursue a common purpose for the public interest. They are responsible for articulating the opinions of various social spheres, and include environmental groups, minority groups, consumer representatives and patient organisations, etc.
3.1.5 Project approaches

7. To what extent has (or will) the project make advances in relation to new ways of undertaking or governing research activities in the following areas? (*not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent*)
   - Stakeholder involvement
   - Participatory processes
   - Impact on policy
   - Indicator development and/or standard setting

8. To what extent would you say that this project has (or will) involve innovative approaches to the following: (*not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent*)
   - To research
   - To the involvement of different types of partners
   - To the involvement of stakeholders
   - To the dissemination of results
   - Other innovative elements (please specify)

9. To what extent would you say that the scope of your project: (*not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent*)
   - Goes beyond a purely academic focus or context?
   - Has an international focus?

3.1.6 Project outputs

10. How many journal publications were produced as a direct output of the project (co-authored with consortium partners & based on consortium’s results individually)?

11. What were, in your view, the most important scientific publications that resulted from the project? Please provide the complete title of the publications and the first author’s family name.

3.1.7 Dissemination and outreach

12. To what extent have (or will) the project results be(en) disseminated to the following: (*not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent*)
   - To EU institutions
   - To national/regional governments
   - To national research councils
   - To the general public?
   - To the scientific community?
   - To media?
   - To industry?
   - To civil society?
   - Internationally?
   - Others (please specify)

3.1.8 Impact on SIS Objectives

13. To what extent has the project (or is it expected to) contribute (d) towards the following overall objectives of the programme? (*not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent*)
   - Science education
     - Further development of inquiry based learning techniques and materials
     - Better informed and more proficient teachers
– Improved exchange of knowledge and knowhow between science teachers and the research community
– Adapting science teaching to young audiences
– Improved perception of science as a career
– Increased number of young people from all backgrounds entering careers in science, research and technology
– Increased levels of scientific literacy
– Other impacts not listed above (please specify)

■ Ethics
– Better conditions for informed debate on ethics and science
– Increased awareness and understanding of ethical issues
– Increased level of ethical compliance in research
– Greater consideration of ethical issues in research
– Application of new insights and practices in the areas of privacy and social impact assessments
– Monitoring and early detection of ethical issues arising from new technological developments
– Increased levels of ethical compliance
– Other impacts not listed above (please specify)

■ Governance/RRI
– Improved quality, effectiveness and efficiency of science advice
– Enhanced understanding of the relationship between scientific advice and policy making
– Improved take up of scientific advice in policymaking
– A shift from expert-dominated to more open, deliberative science-informed institutions on ethics, risk and innovation
– More inclusive and pluralistic discussion, learning and challenge
– Improved alignment of research and innovation with societal challenges
– Greater societal acceptability of research and innovation
– Improved governance of the European Research Area (ERA)
– Other impacts not listed above (please specify)

■ Public Engagement
– Greater dialogue between the scientific community and the public
– Greater trust between the scientific community and the public
– Greater involvement of stakeholders in the research and innovation process
– Increased use of public knowledge in science policy decision-making processes and R&I agenda setting
– Other impacts not listed above (please specify)

■ Open Access
– Improved knowledge and understanding of open access issues in research institutions and governments
– Development of policy and practical guidelines on Open Access across FP7/Horizon 2020
– Development of tools for open access
– Policy shift at EU level to move beyond open access towards the more inclusive idea of ‘open science’
– Policy shift at national level to move beyond open access towards the more inclusive idea of ‘open science’
– Other impacts not listed above (please specify)

■ Gender equality in research
– Increased awareness and visibility of gender issues in research
– Tools for fostering gender balance
– The mainstreaming of gender in national research policy or programmes
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- Institutional change
- A strengthened role for women in research or research bodies
- An enhanced gender dimension in research
- Any other impacts not listed above (please specify)

3.1.9 Other impacts

14. To what extent has the project (or is it expected to) achieve its specific ‘project’ objectives? *(not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)*

15. (Will) Has the project had (have) any impact in the following specific areas:

Scientific advice and decision-making processes at the following levels *(tick all that apply)* *(no impact, small impact, moderate impact, large impact, very large impact, don’t know, not applicable)*
- Local
- Regional
- National
- European
- Global

Policy (development) on Science in Society (SiS) / Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) issues at the following levels *(tick all that apply)* *(no impact, small impact, moderate impact, large impact, very large impact, don’t know, not applicable)*
- Local
- Regional
- National
- European
- Global

SiS communities and landscapes at national level? *(no impact, small impact, moderate impact, large impact, very large impact, don’t know, not applicable)*

Shaping the European Research Area (ERA)? *(no impact, small impact, moderate impact, large impact, very large impact, don’t know, not applicable)*
- Fostering cooperation/collaboration with organisations not directly involved in the FP7 SiS programme
- Channeling of national resources to particular SiS issues
- Establishing a ‘critical mass’ of resources in the fields of SiS
- Promoting a common understanding of RRI/SiS aspects among scientific community
- Promoting a common understanding of RRI/SiS aspects among policy makers

16. Please indicate the scale of positive impact the project has had (or is expected to have) on your own organisation in terms of each of the following types of benefit *(no impact, small impact, moderate impact, large impact, very large impact, don’t know, not applicable)*
- Improved understanding of Science in Society (SiS)/Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) issues/problems
- Improved relationships and networks
- Improved ability or capacity to conduct R&D
- Enhanced reputation and image
- Improved competitive position

17. From your perspective, how have the costs and benefits of participation in the project been balanced:
*(-3 costs outweigh benefits to +3 benefits outweigh costs)*
3.1.10 FP7 funding

18. Would you have gone ahead with the project in the absence of any funding from the FP7 programme
   ■ Yes – as originally planned
   ■ Yes – with some changes in scale and/or scope
   ■ No – not at all

19. If the project would have gone ahead in some form anyway, would this have been: (tick maximum 3)
   ■ With reduced funds
   ■ With less satisfactory outputs
   ■ With lower impacts
   ■ With fewer partners
   ■ With fewer ‘non-academic’ partners
   ■ With less ambitious objectives
   ■ The project would have taken longer

20. Are you aware of another body or programme that might have funded this project (or something very similar)?
   ■ Yes
   ■ No

   If yes, please provide brief details:

21. How adequate was the level of FP7 funding for the project for the achievement of the stated objectives?
   ■ (0 inadequate to 5 extremely adequate)
   ■ If inadequate, please explain why you think FP7 funding was inadequate

3.1.11 Sustainability and the Future

22. Beyond the FP7 funding period: (yes, no)
   ■ Is there a strategy for continuation of the work of the project?
   ■ Will further use be made of the acquired knowledge?
   ■ Will the project continue to have an impact?
   ■ Will follow-on activities take place?

3.1.12 Instruments and mechanisms

23. Did the instrument (e.g. Collaborative project, Co-ordination action, etc.) used for your project: (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)
   ■ Provide a suitable platform for the work being undertaken?
   ■ Provide a suitable platform for the preferred size and shape of the consortium?
   ■ Encourage you to participate in the programme?
   ■ Encourage a wider group of stakeholders to be involved?
   ■ Encourage a different type of involvement of non-academic stakeholders?
   ■ Is appropriate to the focus and objectives of the project?

24. Please explain why another instrument would have been more appropriate for the project
3.1.13 The SiS programme

25. To what extent would you agree with the following statements about the SiS programme: (strongly disagree, disagree, neither disagree nor agree, agree, strongly agree)

- The goals set for the programme were realistic?
- The SiS programme was clearly structured?
- The objectives of the programme were set out clearly?
- The programme budget was suitable for the tasks envisaged?

26. To what extent did the following factors positively influence your organisation’s willingness to participate in the SiS programme? (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)

- The topics covered
- The funding available
- The European dimension
- The international dimension
- FP7 rules for participation
- Other (please specify)

3.1.14 European model of Science in Society

27. To what extent are the following elements present in the European Research Area (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)

- Mutual trust and continuous dialogue between society and the scientific and technological community
- Effective self-governance by the scientific community rather than reliance on top down legislation
- Transparency in research
- Public participation in science policy and other science-related decisions
- Other elements not listed above (please specify)

Suggestions for improvements

What could be done differently in the future? Specifically, what lessons can be taken forward from FP7 Science in Society to Horizon 2020?

If you have any other comments, please add these here:

Thank you

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your answers have been saved automatically and you can click ‘done’ below to leave.
3.2 Questionnaire: FP7 Cooperation project coordinators

Introduction

This questionnaire is aimed at coordinators of Cooperation Programme actions in the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme (FP7). It focuses on the extent to which Science in Society (SiS) activities and principles have been embedded and tackled within research projects as a consequence of the FP7 SiS programme.

SiS activities and principles include:

- Ethics: E.g. research on ethical issues and ethics in science, networking between existing ethics bodies, development of ethics frameworks and review procedures
- Open Access: e.g. supporting direct open access to research results, supporting networks, capacity of researchers, publishers and funders, studies on Open Access standard setting, metrics and infrastructure
- Gender balance: actions fostering gender balance in the research and innovation process
- Gender dimension: integration of gender dimension in research content
- Science education: developing innovative curricula, teaching and learning approaches to impart scientific knowledge in formal and informal education and training
- Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
- Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
- Governance: research on governance framework for good practice and quality in/of research, research and governance frameworks to ensure research programmes are aligned to societal challenges

This Survey is being organised in the context of the ex-post evaluation for Science in Society actions (30-CE-0667965/00-68), which is being undertaken on behalf of the European Commission’s Directorate General for Research and Innovation (DG Research)

The survey provides an important opportunity to shape the key messages of the evaluation. The results of this evaluation will be used to inform stakeholders about the achievements of FP7; to improve implementation of the Horizon 2020 programme and to advise the design of the research programmes after 2020. Your contribution is therefore both valuable and important.

When answering the questions, please represent the views of your research group or organisation as appropriate. The survey consists of 18 questions and we estimate that it will take around 20 minutes to complete. We would be grateful if you could complete the survey by May 14.

All individual answers and comments will be treated as strictly confidential and non-attributable.

Your answers will be saved automatically, and you can leave the questionnaire at any time and return to it later via the URL contained in the email that we sent you.

Thank you in advance for your participation and input to this study. Please click the 'next' button below to start the survey.
A1.1.1 Background information

A number of questions in this survey ask about the FP7 Cooperation programme project in which you were the coordinator. If you were the coordinator in more than one FP7 Cooperation programme project, please answer the questions in relation to just one of these projects (entering the name of this project below).

1. Please enter the title or acronym of your project (just one):

2. Has this project finished?
   ■ Yes – project completed
   ■ No – project ongoing

3. Which theme was the project funded under?
   ■ Health
   ■ Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, Biotechnology
   ■ Information and Communication Technologies
   ■ Nanosciences, Nanotechnologies, Materials and new Production Technologies
   ■ Energy
   ■ Environment (including Climate Change)
   ■ Transport (including Aeronautics)
   ■ Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities
   ■ Space
   ■ Security

3.2.1 Obligations with respect to Science in Society (SiS)/Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) issues

4. Were there any obligations placed on your project under the FP7 Cooperation Programme to consider any of the following Science in Society (SiS)/Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) issues as part of project design and implementation? (tick all that apply)
   ■ Ethical issues
   ■ Gender balance in (research) teams
   ■ Gender dimension in research content
   ■ Science, education, training and career issues
   ■ Open access issues
   ■ Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   ■ Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
   ■ Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   ■ Governance: Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions
   ■ None of the above

5. Please describe the obligations placed on your project with respect to SiS issues under the FP7 Cooperation Programme
   ■ Ethical issues
   ■ Gender balance in (research) teams
   ■ Gender dimension in research content
   ■ Science, education, training and career issues
   ■ Open access issues
Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public

Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)

Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)

Governance: Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

6. To what extent would you agree with the following statements about the science and society obligations placed on projects in the Cooperation Programme: (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)
   - They are clear
   - They are meaningful
   - They are legitimate
   - They are flexible

7. To what extent did these obligations lead to you taking greater consideration of each of the following issues (above and beyond what would have happened anyway): (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)
   - Ethical issues
   - Gender balance in (research) teams
   - Gender dimension in research content
   - Science, education, training and career issues
   - Open access issues
   - Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   - Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
   - Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   - Governance: Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

3.2.2 Integration of Science in Society (SiS) / Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) aspects

8. What was the main aspect of your project that changed as a result of the obligations?

   Ethical issues
   - Research content and the main lines of investigation
   - Research design
   - Nature and type of project partnership(s)
   - Communication and dissemination activities
   - Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
   - Other

   Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations

   Gender balance in (research) teams
   - Research content and the main lines of investigation
   - Research design
   - Nature and type of project partnership(s)
   - Communication and dissemination activities
   - Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
Other

Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations

Gender dimension in research content

- Research content and the main lines of investigation
- Research design
- Nature and type of project partnership(s)
- Communication and dissemination activities
- Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
- Other

Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations

Science, education, training and career issues

- Research content and the main lines of investigation
- Research design
- Nature and type of project partnership(s)
- Communication and dissemination activities
- Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
- Other

Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations

Open access issues

- Research content and the main lines of investigation
- Research design
- Nature and type of project partnership(s)
- Communication and dissemination activities
- Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
- Other

Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations

Public engagement and science communication

- Research content and the main lines of investigation
- Research design
- Nature and type of project partnership(s)
- Communication and dissemination activities
- Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
- Other

Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations

Multi-actor engagement: Involvement of a wide diversity of social actors

- Research content and the main lines of investigation
- Research design
- Nature and type of project partnership(s)
- Communication and dissemination activities
- Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
- Other

Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations

Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity

- Research content and the main lines of investigation
- Research design
- Nature and type of project partnership(s)
- Communication and dissemination activities
- Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
- Other

Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations
Governance: aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

- Research content and the main lines of investigation
- Research design
- Nature and type of project partnership(s)
- Communication and dissemination activities
- Administrative and budget arrangements of the project
- Other

Please explain the nature of the change made in response to the obligations

9. Overall, how effective do you believe your project has been in integrating the following aspects within the project? (not at all effective, somewhat effective, moderately effective, effective, very effective, not applicable)
   - Ethical issues
   - Gender balance in (research) teams
   - Gender dimension in research content
   - Science, education, training and career issues
   - Open access issues
   - Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   - Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
   - Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   - Governance: Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

10. How much (including the value of time spent, as well as paid-out costs) do you estimate your project (once it is completed) will have spent / has spent (if completed) on considering and dealing with each of the following:

   [0: No extra time and effort involved; 1: little extra time and effort involved (in relation to overall project costs); 2: moderately extra time and effort involved (in relation to overall project costs); 3: significantly extra time and effort involved (in relation to overall project costs); 4: a lot of extra time and effort involved (in relation to overall project costs)]

   - Ethical issues
   - Gender balance in (research) teams
   - Gender dimension in research content
   - Science, education, training and career issues
   - Open access issues
   - Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   - Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
   - Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   - Governance: Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions
3.2.3 Benefits

11. To what extent did consideration of the following issues lead to benefits for your project? (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)
   - Ethical issues
   - Gender balance in (research) teams
   - Gender dimension in research content
   - Science, education, training and career issues
   - Open access issues
   - Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   - Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
   - Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   - Governance: Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

12. What has been the main benefit to the project from consideration of the SiS issues mentioned above? Please specify:
   - Ethical issues
   - Gender balance in (research) teams
   - Gender dimension in research content
   - Science, education, training and career issues
   - Open access issues
   - Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   - Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
   - Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   - Governance: Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

13. Has consideration of SiS issues changed your perspectives in any way? Please explain how?

14. Have there been any drawbacks from considering these issues? Please specify:

3.2.4 Role of the FP7 Science in Society Programme

15. To what extent were you aware of the FP7 SiS Programme during the development/implementation of your project?: (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)

16. Where the direct influence had a large effect, please indicate the issues addressed and the nature of the project change (directly as a result of the FP7 SiS Programme / projects)?
   - Ethical issues
   - Gender balance in (research) teams
   - Gender dimension in research content
Science, education, training and career issues
- Open access issues
- Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
- Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/businesses/SME, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO)
- Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
- Governance: Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

17. If at least some direct influence please explain how the programme achieved this influence? (not at all, to a small extent, to a moderate extent, to a large extent, to a very large extent)
- Through information on the activities/results of individual projects
- Through information obtained from calls for projects and the related publicity
- Through discussion and interaction with SiS programme administrators
- Other (please specify)

18. If specific projects were influential at least to some extent, please advise the name of the project(s) that provided the influence?

Thank you
Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your answers have been saved automatically and you can click ‘done’ below to leave.
4 Topic Guides for Interview Programme

4.1 Discussion guide for scoping interviews with DG RTD officials

The Study methodology envisages scoping interviews with Commission officials responsible for the SiS programme to clarify and deepen the evaluation team’s understanding.

The following questions were used to guide the interviews:

4.1.1 About the interviewee

- Name, position and unit
- Role in relation to FP7 SiS
  - Areas of responsibility
  - Functions performed
  - Themes or topics covered

4.1.2 Programme rationale

- What was the need for the FP7-SiS programme?
  Discuss the challenges, issues and problems that the programme was designed to address in the following areas:
  - Gender e.g. gender inequality in research
  - Ethics
  - Science education
  - Open access
  - Public engagement/ science communication
  - Governance

- How has the programme set out to address these needs?
  - What impacts did FP7 SiS set out to achieve?
  - Which mechanisms and instruments were used, and how were these chosen?

4.1.3 Programme evolution

- How has the science and/in society theme evolved over time (FP6, FP7 and now H2020)
- Have there been any major changes to the specified objectives or deviations from the original intervention logic, particularly during the last few years? If so, what were these changes and what were the reasons for them?
- How have the recommendations of the interim evaluation been considered and acted on by the Commission?
  - Through what processes or mechanisms?
  - To what effect?

4.1.4 Management arrangements

- Please describe the process by which the annual work programmes, calls, themes, topics and objectives were developed, and who was involved
4.2 **Topic guide: Commission officials (SiS) and advisory/expert group members**

4.2.1 **Evolution of the programme**

4.2.1.1 **Objectives**

1. To what extent do you believe that the goals and objectives set for the SiS programmes were realistic?

2. Was the budget allocated to the SiS programme adequate for the achievement of these objectives?

4.2.1.2 **Programme design**

3. The programme has sought to change and develop over time in a number of ways. For each of the following ‘ambitions’, can you explain:
   - Why the programme has sought this change (i.e. rationale / objectives)?
   - How the programme has sought to achieve this (i.e. by what means)?
   - The extent to which you believe progress has been made (and evidence for this where available)?
   - What more / different could or should be done to make further progress towards these ambitions?

   - Include fewer, bigger more strategic projects within the programme
   - Develop projects with more pronounced policy links and impacts
   - Encourage diversification of contexts and partnerships beyond academic circles (especially industry, CSOs, cities)
   - Increase stakeholder participation? (e.g. through new mechanisms, such as MMLs)
   - Change the type of involvement of non-researchers in the programme? (e.g. through new mechanisms)
   - A broader focus to projects
   - Increased research activities
   - Have a transversal focus
   - Increase participation from ‘new’ member states in the programme
   - Increase the international focus of the programme over time (scope, focus, impact)?

4.2.1.3 **Monitoring and evaluation**

19. What tools were used to monitor and evaluate the progress, results and impacts of the programme, overall and at the project level (e.g. programme evaluation, monitoring reports, obligations on projects to monitor/evaluate, questionnaires to project leaders, etc.)?

4.2.2 **Programme coverage**

4.2.2.1 **In relation to objectives**

20. To what extent did the programme (through the projects funded) cover the whole spectrum of SiS objectives?

   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that did not received sufficient attention in the work programmes, in your opinion?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that did not received sufficient interest from the research community (e.g. in terms of number of proposals)?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that should have been a particular focus of further activity?

4.2.2.2 **In relation to national-level activity**

1. Are you aware of SiS programmes and activities taking place at the national level?

   - Are there issues that are more / less frequently tackled at this level?
2. What role did the FP7 programme have in funding SiS projects, within the wider set of activities taking place at member state level and within academia, industry, education, etc.? (e.g. is it gap filling, building on national-level research, focusing on activities that are better undertaken at European level, etc.)

3. Are you aware of any overlaps between activities at the EU and MS level?
   ■ Might any of these overlaps challenge the impact and relevance of EU-level activities?

4.2.3 Dissemination and awareness raising

4.2.3.1 Programme-level

4. What has been undertaken / planned at the programme-level in terms of dissemination and awareness raising:
   ■ About the existence of the programme and what it offers?
   ■ About the outputs of the projects?
   ■ About the outcomes and impacts of the projects?
5. What programme-level mechanisms exist / activities take place within the Commission to:
   ■ Raise awareness of funded projects?
   ■ Disseminate the outputs / results of these projects?
6. To what extent have these activities taken place (i.e. number of events/communications, number of projects disseminated)?
7. Is this level of awareness raising and dissemination sufficient? Could / should more be done?

4.2.3.2 Project-level

8. What are the obligations on projects relating to dissemination and awareness?
9. What has been done to encourage dissemination from projects to all relevant stakeholders?
10. What evidence have you seen that projects are having an impact on stakeholders outside of the project partnership?

4.2.4 Evidence of impact

4.2.4.1 Impact of the programme

11. To what extent do you believe that the programme has achieved / is on course to achieve its general objectives?
12. To what extent do you believe that the programme has had / is on course to have an impact on the following:
   ■ Scientific advice at different geographical levels
   ■ The decision-making process at different geographical levels
   ■ Policy development
   ■ Shaping the ERA
13. How could the extent of impact in these areas be improved?
14. Is there any evidence of the hypothesis made by the MASIS Expert Group of a European Model of S&S/SiS characterised by:
   ■ Mutual trust and continuous dialogue between society and the scientific and technological community
   ■ Effective self-governance by the scientific community rather than reliance on top down legislation
   ■ Transparency in research
   ■ Public participation in science policy and other science-related decisions

4.2.4.2 Links to the ERA

15. What role do you believe the SiS programme has played in shaping the ERA, if any?
16. How policy-relevant were the topics taken up in the work programmes (2007-13) to the ERA?

4.2.4.3 Impacts on Member State level
17. Are you aware is the SiS work programmes have had an impact on policy development at the national level? If so, please provide some examples

4.2.5 Important project examples
18. Are you aware of any projects that have shown outstanding or path breaking advancements in relation to new ways of undertaking or governing research activities (stakeholder involvement, participatory processes, impact on policy, indicator development, etc.)?
19. Are you aware of any projects that involve initiatives, actions or cross-thematic partnerships with other parts of the Framework Programme? Can these be regarded as best practice examples?
20. Are you aware of any projects that go beyond state of the art and involve innovative approaches (e.g. related to research, the involvement of stakeholders, the dissemination of results, etc.)?

4.2.6 Embedding SiS activities within other parts of FP7
4.2.6.1 Coverage
21. Why have efforts been made to encourage the integration of SiS related activities in projects funded through the Cooperation Programme?
22. What changes have been made to encourage / ensure SiS related activities are implemented across the Cooperation Programme?
   ■ New instruments
   ■ Changes to information in programme / call documents
   ■ New obligations on projects
   ■ SiS-specific projects
23. What progress has been made in implementing these changes? Does this vary by thematic area?

4.2.6.2 Assessment of the level of the integration
24. What tools were used to monitor and evaluate the progress, results and impacts of the embedding of SiS activities within other parts of FP7?
25. Is there an earlier analysis of the extent of integration of SiS aspects with other parts of the FP?
26. To what extent and how well have SiS aspects been integrated within other parts of FP7, compared with previously?
27. Are there areas of SiS that are commonly tackled / not tackled or addressed by projects in other parts of the FP?
4.3 Topic guide: Other Commission officials

4.3.1 The SiS Programme

4.3.1.1 Awareness and dissemination
1. How aware are you of the SiS programme, in terms of:
   ■ Its objectives
   ■ Its evolution
   ■ The projects being funded
   ■ The outputs and results emerging from projects
2. How well did the FP 7 SiS programme fit within the wider context of activities taking place at a member state level?
3. What has been done to disseminate these various aspects of the programme across the Commission?
4. Are the project outcomes disseminated sufficiently within the Commission? What more could be done?

4.3.1.2 Impacts of the SiS programme on policy
5. To what extent do you think that the programme has over time succeeded in developing projects with more pronounced policy links and impacts?
6. What has been the impact of the SiS programme on:
   ■ Scientific advice and decision-making processes at the EU level?
   ■ Policy development, including on multi-level policy?
7. How could the impact of the programme on policy developments be improved?
8. Did the integration and involvement of a wider group of stakeholders in projects have an impact on the relationship between the projects and policy making?

4.3.1.3 Impacts of the SiS programme on the ERA
9. How policy relevant were the topics taken up in the work programmes for the ERA?
10. Did the programme play a role in shaping the ERA?
    ■ In which ways did the programme play a role?
    ■ How can the impact of the SiS programme in shaping the ERA be improved?

4.3.1.4 Impact of SiS in comparison to other programmes
   What has been the impact of FP7 SiS in comparison with other programmes such as SSH?

4.3.1.5 Impacts of SiS projects
11. Are you aware of any specific SiS projects that:
    ■ Have shown outstanding or path breaking advancements in terms of new ways of undertaking or governing research activities (e.g. stakeholder involvement, participatory processes, impact on policy, indicator development, etc.)?
    ■ Are best practice examples of initiatives, actions or cross-thematic partnerships with other parts of the FP?
    ■ Have had a significant impact already / a potential future impact on public policy, regulation or practice?

4.3.1.6 Future
12. How could results be better achieved (different instruments, different funding, different priorities, etc.).
4.3.2 Embedding SiS within the cooperation programme

[for SiS programme leads within the Cooperation programme only]

13. What has been done to increase the integration of SiS aspects within your programme area in FP7?

14. What are the obligations relating to SiS that are placed on the projects?

15. To what extent are the following dimensions considered as a part of the research projects in your area?
   ■ Ethics issues
   ■ Open Access
   ■ Gender issues
   ■ Science education, training and career development
   ■ Engagement between science/research and other actors

16. To what extent do the following dimensions form a part of the research content/focus of the projects in your area?
   ■ Ethics issues
   ■ Open Access
   ■ Gender issues
   ■ Science education, training and career development
   ■ Engagement between science/research and other actors

17. Overall, to what extent would you say that SiS issues now integrated and embedded within (i) your programme area, and (ii) individual projects within your programme area?

18. Are there tools in place to monitor and evaluate the progress, results and impacts of SiS activities embedded in other parts of the Framework Programme?

19. Can you say anything about the benefit / impact of this increased integration?

4.3.3 Research for the Benefit of Specific Groups – CSOs

[for SiS programme leads within the Cooperation programme only]

20. Has your programme area used the new funding scheme ‘research for the benefit of specific groups – CSOs’?
   ■ Why have you / why have you not chosen to use the programme?
   ■ Where? Only in certain areas / for certain types of project?

21. What has been the uptake of this particular instrument?

22. Do you feel that the rules relating to this instrument (e.g. where CSOs can only claim 50% of their costs) acted as a barrier to (i) the involvement of CSOs in this project, or (ii) the uptake of this instrument more generally? (please explain)

23. What has this meant for:
   ■ The types of stakeholders involved?
   ■ The relationship between research organisations and CSOs?

24. To what extent do you believe the interaction between CSOs and research organisations has:
   ■ Been a productive combination
Method overview and research tools

- Been an easy combination
- Been a useful combination
- Helped to achieve results
- Helped to achieve wider impacts
- Provided a link to users / beneficiaries of the research
4.4 Topic guide: national policy makers and research councils

4.4.1 Connection between national and EU level activities

4.4.1.1 Comparison between national and EU activities

1. What SiS activities (programmes and projects) are taking place at the national level?

2. What is the nature of these activities (i.e. main funders, main programmes, main instruments)?

3. What issues are most frequently / strategically tackled?

4. What is the relevance of EU level SiS activities in relation to national level activities?
   - How well did the FP7 SiS fit with / align / have coherence with national level activities?
   - Are there national funding programmes that might be seen as duplicative or similar?
   - Can any serious overlaps of activities between EU and MS level be observed that challenge the impact and relevance of the EU-level activities?

5. Are there areas that should be receiving greater / lesser attention through the FP?

6. How did the funding level of SiS activities (programme and projects) compare with similar national and international activities?

7. How appropriate was the funding level for SiS actions in comparison with comparable national and international activities?

4.4.2 The FP7 SiS programme

4.4.2.1 Awareness of the programme

8. What has your organisation done to increase awareness of and participation in the SiS programme amongst actors in your country?

9. What has been done more generally to raise awareness of and participation in the programme within your country?

10. For potential participants in your country:
    - What is attractive about participation?
    - What are the drawbacks?
    - (e.g. research instruments, scale, duration, focus, participation rules, funding, etc)

4.4.2.2 Design and evolution

11. To what extent would you agree that:
    - The programme addressed relevant and important issues?
    - The programme was clearly structured?
    - The objectives of the programme were clear?
    - The goals set were realistic?
    - The funding available was appropriate in relation to the objectives set for the programme?
    - The programme evolved overtime in line with progress and new developments in selected field?

12. Are you aware of any important priority issues that were not covered by the programme (missed opportunities)?

13. Do you think that over time (i.e. throughout FP7) the changes introduced to the SiS programme have:
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- Enabled more strategic projects
- Enabled projects with more pronounced policy links and impacts
- Encouraged a greater integration of a wider range of stakeholders?
- Had a positive influence on the ability or willingness of organisations within your country to participate?
- Better aligned with national and sectoral capacities across Europe?

4.4.2.3 Impacts of the programme

14. What do you think the impact of the programme has been on the following (to what extent and in what ways):
- Scientific advice and decision making processes (national/international)?
- Policy development, including on multi-level policy?
- Agenda setting for national research policy?
- Public accountability?
- Attitudes towards SiS issues?
- Shaping the ERA?
- SiS communities and the landscape at national level?
- Stakeholders outside of the project partnerships?

15. To what extent do you think that the programme has achieved its objectives?

16. Is there a visible impact of the SiS work programmes on policy development at national level?

17. Is there any evidence of the hypothesis made by the MASIS Expert Group of a European Model of S&S/SiS characterised by:
- Mutual trust and continuous dialogue between society and the scientific and technological community
- Effective self-governance by the scientific community rather than reliance on top down legislation
- Transparency in research
- Public participation in science policy and other science-related decisions

4.4.2.4 Individual SiS projects

18. How aware are you of the SiS programme, in terms of:
- The projects being funded
- The results and outputs emerging from projects

19. Are you aware of any projects that have shown outstanding or path breaking advancements in relation to new ways of undertaking or governing research activities?

20. Are you aware of any projects that have had a significant impact on public policy, regulation or practice (or that have the potential for significant impact in the future)?

4.4.2.5 The future of EU SiS

21. Are there different approaches in relation to instruments, funding and content priorities that could better deliver results?

22. How could the impact of the programme on policy development and shaping the ERA be improved?
4.5 **Topic guide: National Contact Points (NCPs)**

Note to researcher: please prepare yourself with statistics on the country’s participation in FP7-SiS (refer to composition analysis in interim report) and national SiS activities (read national country report available at [http://www.morri.res-agora.eu/masis](http://www.morri.res-agora.eu/masis)) before undertaking the interview.

4.5.1 **General information**

Name of the interviewee:

Country:

Organisation/ Role:

4.5.2 **Participation in the FP7-SiS programme**

1. Are you satisfied with the take-up of FP7-SiS funding within your country?

2. To what extent do you believe the following factors have positively or negatively affected willingness or interest in participation in the SiS programme?
   - Focus and content of the annual work programmes
   - The instruments available
   - The funding available
   - Participation rules/ eligibility criteria
   - Other factors not listed above

3. What was done to increase awareness of and participation in the SiS programme amongst actors in your country?
   - By you
   - By the Commission
   - By national government
   - By other actors

4.5.3 **Design and evolution of FP7 SiS**

4. To what extent would you agree that
   - The SiS programme was clearly structured?
   - The objectives of the programme were clearly spelled out?
   - The goals set for the programme were realistic?
   - The programme addressed relevant and important issues? Are you aware of any important priority issues that were not covered by the programme (“missed opportunities”)?
   - The programme evolved overtime to reflect the evolving thinking and understanding of the notion of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI)?
   - The budget allocated to the programme was sufficient in relation to the objectives that it set out to achieve?
   - The budget allocated to individual projects was adequate in relation to the objectives they set out to achieve?

5. To what extent do you believe that the instruments available were appropriate to the focus and objectives of the programme?

6. From your experience, to what extent has the SiS programme:
   - Successfully diversified beyond academic circles (e.g. to industry, CSOsetc.)?
4.5.4 Programme coverage

4.5.4.1 In relation to objectives

10. To what extent did the programme (through the projects funded) cover the whole spectrum of SiS objectives?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that did not receive sufficient attention in the work programmes, in your opinion?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that did not receive sufficient interest from the research community (e.g. in terms of number of proposals)?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that should have been a particular focus of further activity?

4.5.4.2 In relation to national activity

11. Are you aware of SiS/ RRI programmes and activities taking place at the national level?
12. What is the nature of these activities? And what issues are most frequently / strategically tackled by national programmes/ initiatives?
13. How well did the FP7 SiS programme fit within the wider context of activities taking place at a national level (e.g. is it gap filling, building on national-level research, focusing on activities that are better undertaken at European level, etc.)?
14. Has FP6-SaS or FP7-SiS had any influence on national SiS/ RRI programmes and activities or vice versa?
15. Are you aware of any overlaps between activities at the EU and national level? Might any of these overlaps challenge the impact and relevance of EU-level activities?
16. How does the funding level of SiS actions compare with similar national and international activities?

4.5.5 Programme monitoring and management

17. Were you satisfied with the monitoring and reporting of programme progress, results and impacts by the Commission?
18. Were the programme results and impacts disseminated sufficiently by the Commission? What more could be done?

4.5.6 EU added value and impact

19. What do you think has been the impact of the programme on the following (to what extent and in what ways):
   - Scientific advice and decision making processes at EU/ national level?
Policy development at EU/ national level?
Public accountability?
Awareness of SiS/ RRI issues?
Shaping the ERA?
SiS/ RRI communities and the landscape at national level?

20. In which of the following areas has the SiS programme had more or less impact in your view?

(i) Promote the development of an ethically sound and responsible European science system
(ii) Fostering gender balance and integrating the gender dimension in research and innovation
(iii) Making science more attractive to young people
(iv) Promoting open access to publicly funded research
(v) Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
(vi) Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/business/(SME, entrepreneurs, farmers, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)
(vii) Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
(viii) Governance: aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

1. In which of the above areas, does Europe need to do more?
2. Overall, has the programme achieved its objectives?
3. What were the main achievements of the programme?
4. What is the EU added value of a programme such as FP7-SiS?

Possible examples:
Promoting a common understanding of SiS/ RRI across Europe
Shaping and influencing the research agenda
Establishing a ‘critical mass’ of resources in the fields of SiS
Fill gaps in national activity in the area of SiS/RRI

4.5.7 Embedding SiS within other parts of the FP

21. What has been done to encourage / ensure SiS/ RRI aspects (ethics, gender, open access etc.) are embedded across other parts of FP7 and national research programmes?

22. Are there areas of SiS/ RRI that are commonly tackled / not tackled or addressed by projects in other parts of the FP7?

23. Were the later developments for increased integrated SiS efforts (e.g. through MMLs) in pace with national and sectoral capacities across Europe?
4.5.8 Future

24. What could be done differently in future? Specifically, what lessons can be taken forward from FP7 SiS to H2020?

25. Is there anything else that you would like to add that we have not touched upon, but would be relevant for us to consider as part of the ex-post evaluation of FP7 SiS?

26. Suggestions for contacts at national level (particularly user communities), project case studies

Thank and close
4.6 **Topic guide: PMC members**

4.6.1 **General information**

Name of the interviewee:
Country:
Organisation/ Role:

4.6.2 **Design and evolution of FP7 SiS**

1. To what extent would you agree that
   - The SiS programme was clearly structured?
   - The objectives of the programme were clearly spelled out?
   - The goals set for the programme were realistic?
   - The programme addressed relevant and important issues? Are you aware of any important priority issues that were not covered by the programme (“missed opportunities”)?
   - The programme evolved overtime to reflect the evolving thinking and understanding of the notion of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI)?
   - The budget allocated to the programme was sufficient in relation to the objectives that it set out to achieve?

2. Do you think that over time the changes introduced to the SiS programme have:
   - Enabled more strategic projects?
   - Enabled projects with more pronounced policy links and impacts?
   - Enabled projects involving a broader range of stakeholders, particularly CSOs?

4.6.3 **Programme coverage**

4.6.3.1 **In relation to objectives**

3. To what extent did the programme (through the projects funded) cover the whole spectrum of SiS objectives?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that did not receive sufficient attention in the work programmes, in your opinion?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that did not receive sufficient interest from the research community (e.g. in terms of number of proposals)?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that should have been a particular focus of further activity?

4.6.3.2 **In relation to national activity**

4. Are you aware of SiS/ RRI programmes and activities taking place at the national level?
5. What is the nature of these activities? And what issues are most frequently / strategically tackled by national programmes/ initiatives?
6. Has FP6-SaS or FP7-SiS had any influence on national SiS/ RRI programmes and activities or vice versa?
7. How well did the FP7 SiS programme fit within the wider context of activities taking place at a Member State level (e.g. is it gap filling, building on national-level research, focusing on activities that are better undertaken at European level, etc.?)?
8. Are you aware of any overlaps between activities at the EU and national level? Might any of these overlaps challenge the impact and relevance of EU-level activities?

4.6.4 Programme monitoring and management

9. What has been the role of the PMC in shaping and influencing the design and orientations of the SiS programme?

10. Were you satisfied with the monitoring and reporting of programme progress, results and impacts by the Commission?

11. Were the programme results and impacts disseminated sufficiently by the Commission? What more could be done?

4.6.5 EU added value and impact

12. What do you think has been the impact of the programme on the following (to what extent and in what ways):
   - Scientific advice and decision making processes at EU/ national level?
   - Policy development at EU/ national level?
   - Public accountability?
   - Awareness of SiS/ RRI issues?
   - Shaping the ERA?
   - SiS/ RRI communities and the landscape at national level?

13. In which of the following areas has the SiS programme had more or less impact in your view?
   - Promote the development of an ethically sound and responsible European science system
   - Fostering gender balance and integrating the gender dimension in research and innovation
   - Making science more attractive to young people
   - Promoting open access to publicly funded research
   - Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   - Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/business/(SME, entrepreneurs, farmers, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)
   - Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   - Governance: aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

14. In which of the above areas, does Europe need to do more?

15. Overall, has the programme achieved its objectives?

16. What were the main achievements of the programme?

17. What is the EU added value of a programme such as FP7-SiS?
4.6.6 Future

18. What could be done differently in future? Specifically, what lessons can be taken forward from FP7 SiS to H2020?

19. Is there anything else that you would like to add that we have not touched upon, but would be relevant for us to consider as part of the ex-post evaluation of FP7 SiS?

20. Suggestions for contacts at national level, project case studies

4.7 Topic guide: External evaluators

4.7.1 General information

Name of the interviewee:
Country:

4.7.2 Design and evolution of FP7 SiS

1. To what extent would you agree that
   - The SiS programme was clearly structured?
   - The objectives of the programme were clearly spelled out?
   - The goals set for the programme were realistic?
   - The programme addressed relevant and important issues? Are you aware of any important priority issues that were not covered by the programme (“missed opportunities”)?
   - The programme evolved overtime to reflect the evolving thinking and understanding of the notion of Responsible Research and Innovation?
   - The budget allocated to individual projects was adequate in relation to the objectives they set out to achieve?

2. Do you think that over time the changes introduced to the SiS programme have:
   - Enabled more strategic projects?
   - Enabled projects with more pronounced policy links and impacts?
   - Enabled projects involving a broader range of stakeholders, particularly CSOs?

3. To what extent did the programme (through the projects funded) cover the whole spectrum of SiS objectives?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that did not receive sufficient attention in the work programmes, in your opinion?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that did not receive sufficient interest from the research community (e.g. in terms of number of proposals)?
   - Were there areas / objectives of the programme that should have been a particular focus of further activity?

4.7.3 FP7 SiS projects

4. What was the quality of applications received in response to calls for proposals?

5. The following criteria were set for evaluating project applications
   a. scientific and/or technological excellence;
   b. relevance to the objectives specified in annual work programmes
c. the potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results;
d. the quality and efficiency of the implementation and management.

How did you evaluate project proposals against criterion b and criterion c?

6. In your view what were the main barriers to participation of CSOs in FP7-SiS?

4.7.4 EU added value and impact

Please check with interviewee if they are able to comment on this topic. If not, skip this section and go straight to 1.5.

7. What do you think has been the impact of the programme on the following (to what extent and in what ways):
   - Scientific advice and decision making processes at EU/national level?
   - Policy development at EU/national level?
   - Public accountability?
   - Awareness of SiS/RRI issues?
   - Shaping the ERA?
   - SiS/RRI communities and the landscape at national level?

8. In which of the following areas has the SiS programme had more or less impact in your view?
   (i) Promote the development of an ethically sound and responsible European science system
   (ii) Fostering gender balance and integrating the gender dimension in research and innovation
   (iii) Making science more attractive to young people
   (iv) Promoting open access to publicly funded research
   (v) Public engagement and science communication: communicating and engaging with the public
   (vi) Multi-actor engagement: involvement of a wide diversity of social actors representing, for example, researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/business/(SME, entrepreneurs, farmers, policy makers and public authorities, as well as organised Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)
   (vii) Governance: responding to the need for good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   (viii) Governance: aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions

9. In which of the above areas, does Europe need to do more?

10. Overall, do you think that the programme has achieved its objectives?

11. What were the main achievements of the programme?

12. What is the EU added value of a programme such as FP7-SiS?
   Possible examples:
   - Promoting a common understanding of SiS/RRI across Europe
   - Shaping and influencing the research agenda
   - Establishing a 'critical mass' of resources in the fields of SiS
   - Fill gaps in national activity in the area of SiS/RRI
4.7.5 Future

13. With the benefit of hindsight, would a different choice of approaches (instruments, funding, content priorities) have delivered better results?

14. What could be done differently in future? Specifically, what lessons can be taken forward from FP7 SiS to H2020?

15. Is there anything else that you would like to add that we have not touched upon, but would be relevant for us to consider as part of the ex-post evaluation of FP7 SiS?

16. Suggestions for project case studies

4.8 Topic guide for wider stakeholders and users of the FP7-SiS programme

1. In your view, how important is it for the European research and innovation/ scientific community to address the following issues?
   i. Compliance with ethical principles and relevant national, EU and international legislation
   ii. Promoting open access / open science
   iii. Communicating and engaging with the public
   iv. Involving of a wide diversity of stakeholders e.g. (researchers, universities, R&I funders, industry/business/(businesses/ entrepreneurs, policy makers and public authorities, Civil Society Organisations, Non-Governmental Organisations etc.) in the research and innovation process
   v. Good practice in the design and conduct of research activity (ensuring transparency, objectivity and use of peer review)
   vi. Aligning research and innovation with societal challenges and ensuring that science is bringing forward socially acceptable solutions
   vii. Fostering gender balance and integrating the gender dimension in research content
   viii. Making science more attractive to young people

2. Do the above issues correspond with your understanding of the concept of “Responsible Research and Innovation”?

   If not, explore areas of differences

3. If organisation involved in R&I e.g. business or industry association: How is your organisation/ industry addressing the above issues in its R&I activities?

   If policy maker/ CSO: how is your organisation promoting the above dimensions of RRRIs?

4. Follow up question (if applicable): What are the main factors that have influenced / shaped your organisation’s activities in the above areas? e.g.

   – European legislation
   – National legislation
   – European policy
   – FP7 Science in Society/ H2020 programme
   – Industry practice
   – Peers etc.
5. Are you aware of the FP7 SiS programme?

6. Have you participated in any of the FP7 SiS funded projects / activities or used any of the outputs produced by an FP7 SiS funded project e.g.
   - Participation in knowledge platforms, networking activities, training etc
   - Participation in events/ workshops/ meetings/ conferences
   - Use of tools or publications produced by an FP7-SiS project

   If so, could you please indicate the events/ tools/ projects

7. How did you get interested/ involved in these projects/ activities?

8. Were these projects relevant and useful from your perspective?

9. Did you or your organisation benefit in any way from your involvement in FP7-SiS / from the use of tools or publications produced by the project? e.g. change in thinking, policies, practices, institutional structures, establishing new connections/ linkages etc.

   If no benefit, explore the reasons for this

10. Finally, should the EU continue to promote the development and implementation of the concept of Responsible Research and Innovation? If so, is there anything specific that the EU could be doing in this regard?

Thank and close

5  Case interview guide and case study template

The case studies will follow a standard reporting template to permit some degree of synthesis and aggregation. The template is likely to include the following sections:

- Overview of the project – objectives, funding, country
- Description of the delivery arrangements – the participants involved and how they were organised
- Intervention logic of the project including, activities, results and outcomes
- Links to wider research or policy groups
- How the FP7 SiS project outputs and results were disseminated (or in case of other FP7 projects, how they integrated SiS principles) – who were the target audiences and what dissemination channels were used
- How the results are being used by the target user groups
- Any good practice and / or lessons learned

To ‘bring the case studies to life’, we will use pictures and illustrations where possible.

5.1  Case study topic guide

5.1.1  Basic information on the project and consortium

1. What was the rationale behind the project and what did it hope to achieve?

2. Who was involved in the project consortium?
   - How was this formed?
   - What were the reasons for its size and structure?
   - Was the range of stakeholders involved important?
How did the size and shape of the consortium benefit the project?

3. Did the project involve non-research or non-academic partners (e.g. local and regional governments, CSOs, industry)?
   ■ What were the reasons for this?
   ■ In what ways did the project seek to integrate and involve these partners?
   ■ What were the benefits of the inclusions of these partners (e.g. did this have an impact on the relationship between the project and intended beneficiaries)?

5.1.2 Tools and approaches

4. What did the project entail?
   ■ What tools and approaches were used?
   ■ To what extent could elements of the project’s approach be considered new, innovative or path-breaking?

5.1.3 Results and outputs

5. What have been the main outputs from the project?

5.1.4 Engagement and dissemination

6. Did the project involve any linkages with wider research (e.g. other parts of the Framework Programme)?
   ■ What were the reasons for this?
   ■ What benefits did this bring?

7. Who were the intended users / beneficiaries of the research?
   ■ How did the project engage with these stakeholders and intended beneficiaries?
   ■ To what extent where they involved in the project?

8. What dissemination and outreach activities took place?
   ■ Who were the targets of these activities?
   ■ To what extent were the project outcomes disseminated to all relevant stakeholders?

5.1.5 Impacts

9. What plans are in place to monitor and evaluate the impact of the project results?

10. To what extent and in which ways has the project achieved its objectives?

11. What have been the main outcomes and impacts of the project:
   ■ On the partners involved?
   ■ On the wider research / scientific community?
   ■ On the wider SiS community and landscape?
   ■ On wider stakeholders and intended beneficiaries?
   ■ On scientific advice, decision-making processes, policy development, etc.?
   ■ On public accountability, attitudes to SiS issues, etc?

5.1.6 The future

12. What plans are in place for the future in relation to the project and its results?
   ■ Is follow-on work planned or needed?
   ■ Have new partnerships been forged that will be enduring?
   ■ Will the knowledge and results be used for further research?
   ■ Does the project have a potential for future impact on public policy, regulation or practice?
5.1.7 Reflections on the programme

13. Could this project have been funded by other means (e.g. at the Member State level)?
   ■ How would the project have been different (e.g. funding, partners, size, scope, etc.)?
   ■ Was their added value to the project being undertaken through the FP?

14. Were the goals set for the project realistic?

15. Was the funding sufficient for achieving the objectives and undertaking the project?

16. Was the instrument used appropriate?

17. Do you have any suggestions for how the programme could have been improved?
5.2 Case study reporting template

The case studies will be kept simple, with a common structure to permit some degree of synthesis and aggregation, a target length of perhaps 200-300 words and some images to help to convey the message and capture the attention of readers. The content should focus in the following main areas:

- Description of the FP-supported action (title, dates, funding, etc)
- Description of the project consortium (its formation, its size and structure, its diversity, the benefits to the projects of the range of stakeholders involved, etc.)
- Description of the SiS methodology or tools
- Description of the project results (outputs)
- Description of links to wider research or policy groups (plus engagement activity)
- Description of the project outcomes or social impacts

The future (follow-on work, use of knowledge/results in further research / policy in the future, changes and benefits for individual consortium members, etc.)
6 Technical note on network analysis

Network analyses were performed on a directed graph composed of all cooperations (edges of the graph) between all SiS participants (nodes). Each cooperation between two participants represents a participation of these two participants in the same project. Both nodes and edges were assigned timestamps to enable dynamic network analysis. The start and end date of individual cooperations were determined by the start and end date of the individual project during which the cooperation took place. The start and end date of individual nodes, i.e. the time during which individual participants are visible as nodes in the graph, is determined by the start date of the first project participation and the end date of the last project participation of the respective participant.

The graphs have been produced using the open source software Gephi (release 0.8.2, Windows edition), and the Force Atlas layout.¹ Gephi is an open source software available at http://gephi.github.io/.

The Force Atlas layout is “a force directed layout - it simulates a physical system in order to spatialize a network”² and present statistical attributes of a network visually.

“Nodes repulse each other like magnets, while edges attract their nodes, like springs. [This] is expected to help the interpretation of the data. […] The process is not deterministic, and the coordinates of each point do not reflect any specific variable. The [visualised network] cannot be read as a Cartesian projection. […] Its very essence is to turn structural proximities [or features of a network] into visual proximities [or visual features of a graph].”³ This is to say that the coordinates of points on individual graphs presented in this report do not represent specific features of the network but allows visual representation of network attributes as part of the graph layout.

The convention for visualising individual graphs in this report are as follows, if not noted otherwise: The size of individual points is determined by the overall number of direct and indirect cooperations (using dynamic degree and betweenness centrality as ranking parameters). The length of individual cooperations/edges represents the strength of relationship between two participants, determined by the number of cooperations between the two nodes. The attributes used to determine the shape of graphs presented in this report are explained in Table 6.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directed graph</td>
<td>A graph where the ‘direction’ of individual edges/cooperations is indicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undirected graph</td>
<td>A graph where individual edges/cooperations do not indicate a ‘direction’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


³ Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td>The degree of a node is the number of relation (edge) it has, independently if it’s an incoming or outgoing relation. It’s the sum of edges for a node.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted degree</strong></td>
<td>The weighted degree of a node is similar to the degree of a node, a measure of the number of edge for a node, however weighted by the ‘importance’ of its edges. This measure only applies if individual cooperations or groups of cooperations within a network are given varying importance, or ‘weight’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight</strong></td>
<td>The importance of an edge/connection. In the analysis of the SiS network, all edges or participations in projects carry the same weight, but it is conceivable that edges could be weighted e.g. by the assumed importance of a participation. E.g. outgoing cooperations departing from coordinating organisations could be given a higher weight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In degree</strong></td>
<td>In a directed graph, the number of incoming cooperations/edges into a node.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out degree</strong></td>
<td>In a directed graph, the number of outgoing cooperations/edges departing from a node.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average degree</strong></td>
<td>The average degree of all nodes of a network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average weighted degree</strong></td>
<td>The average weighted degree of all nodes of a network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic degree</strong></td>
<td>Degree of each node and the average of the network over time and for specific time windows. It is the number of links that have a node, and is an indicator of centrality of individual nodes or an indicator of average centrality across all nodes considered within a specific time window.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Betweenness centrality</strong></td>
<td>Betweenness centrality is a measure of centrality of any given node, based on the number of shortest paths between any two nodes that pass through a particular node. Nodes around the edge of the network would typically have a low betweenness centrality. A high betweenness centrality might suggest that the individual node/SiS participant is connecting various different parts of the network together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closeness centrality</strong></td>
<td>Closeness centrality is a measure that indicates how close a node is to all the other nodes in a network, whether or not the node lays on a shortest path between other nodes. A high closeness centrality means that there is a large average distance to other nodes in the network. I.e. a small closeness centrality means there is a short average distance to all other nodes in the network, a high closeness centrality means that there is a long average distance to all other nodes in the network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvctor Centrality/PageRank</strong></td>
<td>Eigenvector centrality is a measure of the influence of a node in a network. It assigns relative scores to all nodes in the network based on the concept that cooperations to high-scoring nodes contribute more to the score of the node in question than equal cooperations to low-scoring nodes. Google’s PageRank is a variant of the eigenvector centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentricity</td>
<td>The eccentricity measure captures the distance between a node and the node that is furthest from it. I.e. a high eccentricity means that the furthest away node in the network relatively far away, and a low eccentricity means that the furthest away node is relatively close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network diameter</td>
<td>The diameter of a graph is the maximum eccentricity of any node in the graph. That is, it is the greatest distance between any pair of nodes. It is a metric of the overall 'width' of the network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graph density</td>
<td>The amount of cooperations/edges per participant when compared to the total amount of participant in the network. I.e. a measure of the degree to which the network is completely interconnected. A density of 1 would mean the graph/network is complete and each participant is connected to each other participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modularity</td>
<td>The degree to which the network is modular, i.e. divided into distinct subgroups. A higher modularity suggests that SiS participants are very highly connected with specific other participants of e.g. the same project or the same group of projects, but have very few 'odd' cooperations with other participants in the network. A very low modularity would suggest that a group of participants shared a lot of modules/groups of projects between themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>