Developing policy evaluation in an academic setting: assets and challenges

Anne Revillard, Lucia Corno, José Luis Fernandez, Danielle Mason, Gaby Umbach, Thilo Bodenstein, Andrew Cartwright, Ioana-Roxana Melenciuc, Kai Wegrich, Diane Stone

Débats du LIEPP

SciencesPo
#7
April 2023

Developing policy evaluation in an academic setting: assets and challenges

How to cite this publication:
Anne Revillard et al., **Developing policy evaluation in an academic setting: assets and challenges.** *Débats du LIEPP n°7,* 2023-04-19.

CIVICA RESEARCH

Introduction

by Anne Revillard

(Director, LIEPP, Sciences Po)

Based on a seminar organized by LIEPP and CIVICA [1]which took place at Sciences Po in June 2022, this publication brings together ten academic researchers from seven different CIVICA universities (Bocconi, CEU, EUI, Hertie School, LSE, Sciences Po, SNSPA), who are involved in various forms of policy evaluation. These contributions from Austria, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Romania, and the United Kingdom, reflect on the assets and challenges of developing policy evaluation in an academic setting. The seminar was organized as part of CIVICA's research focus on "Democracy in the 21st century", but through the crosscutting nature of program evaluation, it is also of interest to CIVICA's three others research streams (on societies in transition, data, and Europe revisited).

Since the notion of program evaluation encompasses a diversity of practices, it is useful to start with a working definition: Carol Weiss defines evaluation as: *" the systematic assessment of the operation and/or the outcomes of a program or policy, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to the improvement of the program or policy"* (Weiss and Weiss 1998:4). Three elements are key:

- Evaluation is an **applied social science practice**: it implies the use of systematic research methods - hence the connection to academia - to study the conception, operation and outcomes of policies or programs.
- This practice aims at **formulating a judgement on policies or programs**, which implies that the reflection on evaluative criteria, involving values, is fundamental.
- And this practice aims at **improving policies or programs**; hence evaluation is fundamentally concerned with its use. The preoccupation with **knowledge utilisation** is much more central in evaluation than in other branches of academic production of knowledge (Patton 2018). As summed up by one of the founding fathers of evaluation, Robert Schuman, in 1967, in evaluative research "Only rarely can [one] take consolation in the fact that 'the operation was a success but the patient died' (Suchman 1967:21)

Evaluation has developed in a diversity of settings, and academia is not necessarily the most prominent: evaluation also involves public administrations, parliaments, private consultants, NGOs…

Within academia, evaluation has a peculiar status (Cox 1990). There are endless epistemological debates so as to whether evaluation should be considered a discipline, a transdiscipline or metadiscipline – as favoured by Michael Scriven for example (Scriven 1993). Yet in any case evaluation has very limited existence as a distinct discipline *within academia*. More generally speaking, there seems to be a paradox between the fact that many academic researchers practice evaluation, and the very limited collective institutionalization of this practice within academia. Evaluation practices on the part of academics are often developed within topic-specific research centres, such as centres specializing in public health, education, social welfare, and so on, but there is limited crosscutting reflection on evaluation within the academic world.

[1] CIVICA – The European University of Social Sciences unites ten leading European higher education institutions. It was selected in 2019 by the European Commission as one of the pilot European Universities, funded under the Erasmus+ program.

The aim of this debate is thus to better understand the specificities, assets and challenges of developing evaluation from within an academic setting, in view of eventually reflecting on possible ways to collectively reinforce this practice within CIVICA, and use CIVICA as a leverage to reinforce this practice (see box below).

There are arguably particular assets to developing evaluation from an academic standpoint, for example in terms of autonomy in the choice of objects of evaluation, in the possibility of developing long-term research frameworks and more systematic methods, or in the capacity to bring "non-evaluation" academic research into the evaluative discussion.

Reciprocally, it may be argued that evaluative practice has contributions to make to more "fundamental" academic research. Examples of methodological inputs from evaluation include the development of systematic literature reviews, methods such as theory-based evaluation, realist evaluation, contribution analysis, outcome harvesting, or the promotion of more participatory approaches (Hong and Pluye 2018, 2018; Mayne 2012; Pawson 2006; Rogers and Weiss 2007; Wilson-Grau 2018).

On the other hand, there are challenges to developing evaluation in an academic setting: for example, the rhythm of academic research may be too slow for evaluative needs, doing evaluation is valued to very varying degrees in the different academic disciplines, and the interdisciplinary approach often required by evaluation is a challenge when researchers themselves are evaluated based on disciplinary criteria (Jacob 2008).

Another major responsibility that we have towards evaluation as academic actors is in terms of knowledge brokering and training, in connection to the centrality of this question of evaluation use. Beyond producing evaluative research, how can we make sure that the process and results of this research are conveyed to relevant stakeholders in adapted and efficient formats that actually favour their impact on policymaking and civil society? Making research actionable and relevant to policymakers and civil society is a key component of policy evaluation. What publics do academic institutions target, what are the relevant formats? What role should academic institutions play in the training of policymakers, NGOs, etc., in evaluation? Can investing in training favour a broader awareness of the need for a more systematic evaluation of public policies?

This debate is organized around two topics, developing academic evaluative research, and the role of academic institutions in outreach and training in evaluation. Contributions are based on presentations of the experiences of each CIVICA partner.

I. Developing academic evaluative research

This section offers to reflect on the specificities of developing evaluative research from an academic setting. Who conducts evaluative research within academia? How is this research funded? What are the topics covered? How can we draw on the inputs of topic-based fundamental research to better inform evaluative practice? To what extent does producing research in an evaluative perspective favour certain types of methods, formats, or research designs? Contributions also address the challenges to developing evaluation in an academic setting: for example, the rhythm of academic research may be too slow for evaluative needs, doing evaluation is valued to very varying degrees in the different academic disciplines, and the interdisciplinary approach often required by evaluation is a challenge when researchers themselves are evaluated based on disciplinary criteria.

Laboratory for Effective Anti-poverty Policies (LEAP) at Bocconi University

by Lucia Corno

(Executive Director, LEAP, Bocconi)

The Laboratory for Effective Antipoverty Policy (LEAP) is a research lab based at Bocconi, launched in 2016 by Eliana La Ferrara and Lucia Corno. Its mission is to evaluate programs aimed at reducing poverty around the world, with a focus on developing countries and Italy. It aims at combining original data collections in the field and rigorous research methods. This involves the uses of randomized control trials (RCT), but not only, as we know they are not always relevant: other observational methods are sometimes preferred. Research includes various topics related to development such as agriculture, health, financial inclusion, labour market and institutions, social norms. LEAP collaborates with international and local partners (World Bank, Governments, NGOs) all across the world, including in Italy. It combines more than 50 researchers, from full professors to master students, and now totalizes 40 research projects. It is funded by the Invernezzi Foundation, but also very actively generates outside grants (such as ERCs).

Evaluation at LEAP is initiated two ways. In some cases, partners approach LEAP for evaluating a specific project. In this case, LEAP gathers to determine whether the project is sufficiently research-oriented for it to be allocated to a PI within LEAP. If the partners have a good research question, but their design is not appropriate for academic research publication standards, then LEAP allocates the evaluation to a student for a dissertation. In other cases, LEAP approaches partners directly when hearing about interesting projects.

In general, LEAP finances the pilot program of evaluation. External grants are then called for to support the full project. Most often this is done without the involvement of the partners participating in the evaluation (in part to maintain independence). LEAP money also helps researchers in the field of evaluation through Student Grants (0-5000 Euro to fund students' research); Faculty Grants; PhD Scholarship for 1 year; and LEAP development coffees (meeting with students every 15 days to discuss their research).

LEAP output is disseminated through several means. Its website and Twitter account summarize research findings. These are also conveyed more directly to policy makers every two months by the LEAP Policy Insight newsletter; and more recently by LEAPTalk videos, which are 2 minutes presentations in very accessible formats and vocabulary. LEAP also organizes events, from workshops to summer schools, and had its first big conference in 2022 to reflect on its 5 years of activity.

The Care Policy and Evaluation Centre (CPEC) at London School of Economics

by José Luis Fernández

(Director, CPEC, LSE)

Established at LSE 25 years ago, the CPEC is a research centre on policy and practice of social care (targeting older people as well as younger client groups, children …) and health care (mental health, dementia, …). Centred around the U.K. and solely funded through academic grants, the centre has strong international connections (e.g., though the International Long-term care Policy Network), which make up approximately 40% of its funding. As of 2022, it combines more than 80 members, working on 81 different projects. Because its main focus is the impact of policy and practice, research at the centre puts a strong emphasis on mixed methods (with an important quantitative component) and on creating research partnerships with stakeholders.

Evaluation takes place through two main channels. The government's *National Institute for Health and Care Research* finances 15 "Policy Research Units", whose aim is to support decision making by central government. These units benefit from large (£5 million) and long (5 years) endowments, allowing for long-term constructive relationships. CPEC leads one of these units (ASCRU, on social care policy) and contributes to another 3 (on economics of the care system, on older people and frailty and on policy innovation). These PRUs represent approximately 40% of CPEC's research income. Researchers involved develop strong networks with policy makers and a very good understanding of (and access to) the evidence available for policy evaluation. The research programmes combine "strategic" projects jointly agreed between researchers and government (approx. 75%) and « responsive work », where CPEC researchers provide bits of advice and evaluations on demand to address emerging policy questions (lasting typically between 3 and 9 months). Examples of projects are the social care funding reform in England, projections of demand for social care services, the reform of the eligibility criteria, the assessment of new technologies in health care. The other channel is more standard: CPEC researchers bid on specific calls for evaluation of policy initiatives, for example the evaluation of the impact of the Care Act 2014 on unpaid carers.

What are the benefits and challenges of this framework? Each project aims at producing quality peer-reviewed academic papers. But because the temporality of policy making and academia are different, tensions arise in the timing of research output: as policy cycles are always faster than research timetables, the time for writing up academic papers can get squeezed out; or, on the opposite, because of the need to notify the government agencies of the results before publication, be delayed. The need to find good balance between research and policy is always present.

Similarly, these projects offer significant opportunities for impact. They provide direct access to policy thinking, and unique evidence on policy consequences. The length of the relationships allows access to a stable pool of expert knowledge on both sides of the table: quick advice can be obtained through direct entry person, and commitments credible. However, these interactions necessarily cover underlying trade-offs. There are often negotiations over what is feasible, or what is important in the long run. The margin of intervention in policy design of CPEC is variable: sometimes it is limited, with the evaluation concentrating on analysing the impact of a centrally designed policy. Besides, while projects are unbounded in the writing of their findings, conclusions that go directly against the general philosophy of the reform might be difficult to hear.

What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth at London School of Economics

by Danielle Mason

(Head of Policy, Centre for Local Economic Growth, LSE)

The UK What Works Network is a network made up of 10 What Works Centres, plus other 'affiliate members', that work on many policy areas including education, health, crime, homelessness, and youth unemployment. Each What Works Centre aims to improve the use of high quality, quantitative evidence in policy and practice, including by generating new evidence and linking academic researchers and policy makers. The structure, funding, and activities of each Centre are different; but almost all of them receive funding from the national government.

What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth (What Works Growth), established in 2013, is the only What Works Centre to be based within a university (the LSE). It partners with the think tank Centre for Cities and, until March 2020, was also working with Arup, the multinational professional services firm. Its focus is on local economic growth policies, i.e., any policy that is intended to improve local economic performance, whether through employment support, business support, transport investment, etc. Half of its funds come from the UK Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), and the rest from three government departments – the Department for Business & Trade, the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, and the Department for Transport.

What Works Growth aims to increase the cost-effectiveness of local growth policies by: improving the use of evidence in policy design and delivery; supporting and delivering high quality impact evaluation; and filling gaps in our understanding of "what works". Concretely, this means doing some impact evaluation of 'what works' in local economic growth policy areas (mostly through quasi-experimental methods on policies that already happened), but also synthesizing existing evidence and presenting it to government in a useful way. Their work with local and central government, which is where most of the efforts of the centre go, includes showing directly to policy makers how to use evidence-based impact evaluation through one-to-one advice and support, training, and events.

Compared to other What Works centres, being university based offers several advantages. The academic credibility is useful both in the dissemination of findings and recruitment of staff. University environment allows access to infrastructure (secure data labs, journals, etc.), and technical and professional expertise. Besides, the LSE reputation and strong establishment within the U.K. policy sphere allows flexibility and independence.

But this comes with disadvantages. While it guarantees independence, being external to government necessarily makes access to data or policymaking harder. The university bureaucracy can limit flexibility and speed (having external partners such as the Centre for Cities helps with that). The public image of the university can yield accusations of being 'too academic' and not enough practical or policy-focused. It is in fact true that academic standards are higher, and thus more often lead to conclusions of ineffectiveness. Conversely, the wider focus on policy (not just publication) of the centre makes retention and development of the academic staff more difficult.

Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies at the European University Institute

by Gaby Umbach
(Part-time Professor, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, EUI)

One of the six academic units of the European University Institute (EUI), the Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies (RSCAS) was founded in 1992 as an inter-disciplinary research centre of both basic and policy studies, in order to complement the educational branches of the EUI. The research agenda of the RSCAS is currently guided by three major themes: Integration, Governance and Democracy; Regulating Markets and Governing Money; 21st Century World Politics and Europe. Under these themes, it covers nine big programs, thematically ranging from media analysis, migration, climate and energy policy, finances to global governance. At the end of 2021, it included 80 professors and over 100 fellows working on 95 projects. Among these nine programs is the "Global Governance Programme", which, since 2022, comprises a research area dealing with "Knowledge, Governance, Transformations" (KGT).

The KGT research area explores the dynamic interaction between knowledge, evidence, data and governance. It analyses how governance by knowledge and governance of knowledge transform politics and policies. In doing so, it connects four elements of contemporary societal, political, and scientific concern: (1) knowledge production and science advice in politics; (2) ethical and normative aspects of knowledge production and quantification; (3) evidence-informed policymaking and governance innovations; (4) the contribution of knowledge and governance transformations to sustainability. The research area's activities hence focus on the role of knowledge, its sources and use in evidence-informed policymaking; responsible and trustworthy evidence and data; data-driven innovation and future-oriented governance; and transformative dynamics between these elements supporting the delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals.

Methodologically, the research area is based on both qualitative and quantitative research and nurtures engagement with the world of practice in all its activities. Its main objective is to shape and facilitate a dynamic, adaptive, and engaged research and learning environment for the future-oriented analysis of data, evidence, knowledge, governance and transformations. It ultimately aims to establish a community of research and practice of academics and practitioners dealing with the generation, use and transformation of knowledge and governance for politics and policymaking.

Major research areas and themes include:

Knowledge for and in policymaking. We focus on knowledge as a central resource in policymaking, particularly on the use of scientific knowledge and expertise in politics. We have a special interest in data as evidence in policymaking and analyse types and quality of data and evidence used to inform policy design, implementation, evaluation and strategic planning. Guiding questions of our research on knowledge are: *What constitutes responsible and trustworthy data and evidence? What type of data, evidence and expertise are relevant for policymaking? What are supply and demand side factors of knowledge production and use in politics? What are their functions and limitations? What knowledge effects does the use of data and evidence have in policymaking? How relevant are transparency, accountability, legitimacy, contestation and politicisation of knowledge production and use in politics? How does innovation in form of computational advancements in data collection and modelling contribute to new forms of knowledge? What types of literacies and capacities does evidence-informed policymaking demand?*

How can knowledge literacies and capacities for policymaking be strengthened?

Governance by and of knowledge, data and evidence. We are interested in evidence-informed policymaking; knowledge mobilisation and brokerage; as well as knowledge- and data-driven governance innovations. We analyse abstract and concrete functions of evidence as policymaking instruments and their impact on future-oriented governance; the institutionalisation of governmental science advice and advisory systems; innovation and digitalisation in governance; and the politicisation of policy processes through evidence use. Guiding questions of our research on governance are: *How do data, evidence, expertise and knowledge deriving from them inform policymaking? How does the use of evidence impact governance? What is the role of experts in policymaking? How do scientific experts and policy-makers, i.e. scientific and policy communities, interact? What governance effects does the use of data and evidence have? How do evidence-informed policymaking and politicisation of knowledge interrelate? How do governance innovations change governance practices? How are governance innovations, such as digitalisation, used? Can participatory approaches profit from governance innovation?*

Transformations in and through knowledge, governance and politics. We focus on the contribution of knowledge and governance innovations to more sustainable policies and policymaking. We analyse channels through which transformative dynamics between knowledge and governance support better policymaking processes, especially in view of the delivery of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Guiding questions of our research on transformations are:

How does the use of evidence in policymaking impact on accountability, legitimacy, transparency, contestation, and politicisation in politics? What are democratic functions and challenges of evidence use in policymaking? Is evidence-informed policymaking supporting the development of epistocracies? How do evidence-informed policies and governance balance the economic, environmental and (somewhat overlooked) social dimensions of sustainability? What is the conceptual core of social sustainability? What are the prospects for social innovation and social investment?

The research area integrates and connects the various activities and cooperation with the world of practice:

- GlobalStat, launched in 2015, is a public information tool on statistics that forms the data backbone of the research area. It facilitates access to data on 12 thematic and three horizontal areas that contribute to the understanding of interrelations between human living conditions and globalisation trends.
- Partnership and publications with the European Parliamentary Research Service since 2015.
- Co-leadership of the EUI's interdisciplinary research cluster on the crisis of expert knowledge and authority
- Advice for Area 3 Policy and Literacy for Data of the Data for Policy community
- Lead on 'Statistical and data literacy in policymaking' within the International Statistical Literacy Project (ISLP)
- Advice and contribution to the EU Commission Joint Research Centre's research programme 'Enlightenment 2.0'
- Engagement with the EU Commission Joint Research Centre's Strengthening and connecting eco-systems of science for policy in Europe workshop series
- Participation in expert group of the ESPAS horizon scanning process Futurium
- Lead of foresight exercise "Berlin Futures" – IEP Strategy group on the future of German EU policies of the Institut für Europäische Politik, Berlin.

Within our KGT research area, we analyse measurement as a governance technique, covering also the policy evaluation perspective. We scrutinise the use of statistics and indicators in policymaking; different evaluation tools; as well as ethics of

quantification, and the sociology of quantification. In other words, we contribute to the understanding of how evaluation tools impact on politics.

Our KGT research team also conducts analysis on the evaluation of governance for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG16). Our findings show that it is still predominantly the economically developed world that funds and designs governance evaluation tools to measure progress towards SDG16 across the world's nations. Such measures, mainly developed by research institutes located in the Global North, have a strong impact on development aid lows and, consequently, also on the livelihood in developing countries. Such structural patterns of the political economy of measuring governance around the world raise essential questions related to the ethics of quantification for policy evaluation that need to be discussed for a broader framing of policy evaluation as a research field.

From our research, we can deduct conclusions that may inform policy evaluation research. First, the autonomy of choice of the objects of evaluation research depends on research funding opportunities by which funders frame the corridor of potential research, and hence also long-term research focuses. Independent research should be aware of this thematic shaping power of funders and question topics and motives of funding schemes to inform the broader discussion on policy evaluation. Second, the capacity to embed academic "non-evaluation" research in the analysis about policy evaluation represents both an opportunity for calibrating research design and an inter-disciplinary challenge. It requires methodological rigour, especially when it comes to the operationalisation of research and to the normativity and political economy of framing and producing policy evaluation. The latter requires an ex-ante deliberation and consensus on the aim of the evaluation exercise within research teams. Third, the choice of evaluation tools is connected to essential questions of evidence and statistical literacy and interpretative policy analysis that researchers need to tackle to ensure the coherence of their evaluations. In this context, essential questions are to be asked at project design and operationalisation stages: Do we understand each other scientifically and in view of our research approaches/interests? Is there enough shared literacy within the research team to evaluate the policy in question coherently across disciplines? How do we manage expectations and capabilities within the research team? Can we, as members of an inter-disciplinary research team, agree on the methodology and expected outcome of the evaluation exercise? Are the underlying assumptions of the research and their impact on the research design transparent for all? Fourth, it is not only essential to conduct excellent policy evaluation research, but the results also need to be communicated directly to relevant actors. Therefore, science-policy interactions become an essential feature of the dissemination phase of evaluation projects. Policy evaluation researchers need to understand how to ensure that the process and results of their research are conveyed to relevant stakeholders in a format that supports impact on policymaking and across civil society. Active engagement of academics through targeted products for policymaking is required, as are incentives in academia to engage with the world of practice. The latter are yet still not always aligned with the requirement for science-policy interaction, making academics at times hesitant to engage directly. Adaptation of evaluation schemes for academics, such as through inclusion of direct science-policy engagement in an evaluation criterion, are therefore essential to incentivise interaction. On top of that, academic roles need to be redefined to provide the basis for active and responsive science-advice engagement also in co-creation efforts, especially in current times of contestation of evidence in policymaking.

The Laboratory for Interdisciplinary Evaluation of Public Policies (LIEPP) at Sciences Po

by Anne Revillard

(Director, LIEPP, Sciences Po)

Academic actors still play a limited role in the field of evaluation in France. Evaluation remains more centrally a practice of public administrations or consultants in the private sector. To be sure, some academics practice evaluation, but they most often do it on the side within research centres that do fundamental research and do not specialise in evaluation as such.

The laboratory for interdisciplinary evaluation of public policies (LIEPP) is part of a small number of initiatives to structure collectively the practice of evaluation within French academia. It was created in 2011 at Sciences Po and has also been working since 2020 in partnership with Université Paris Cité. LIEPP has about 100 affiliates and a permanent staff of four.

LIEPP has been built around three key principles. First, it is interdisciplinary, with an initial focus on economics, sociology and political science, that recently extended to include disciplines such as psychology, behavioural sciences, public health, environmental science, management… Secondly, the centre covers a broad range of policy domains. We currently have six research groups: evaluation of democracy, socio-fiscal policies, educational policies, discrimination and category-based policies, environmental policies, and health policies. Thirdly, it is strongly research-oriented, in the sense that our research projects lead first and foremost to publications in scientific journals, but also in the sense that we give researchers a voice in the definition of the evaluative agenda thanks to the public funding that we received from the French National research agency, which enables us to conduct internal calls for projects.

We also carry projects with external funding. In order to guarantee the independence of evaluative research

conducted with external funding, LIEPP has co-signed a charter of ethics with other French research centres specializing in evaluation, that aims at preventing conflicts of interest, and notably guarantees the publication of the results of the evaluation.

Projects conducted at LIEPP encompass a broad diversity of methods, including experimental and quasi-experimental designs, qualitative approaches, and mixed methods. In line with our interdisciplinarity, we are very attached to the promotion of a dialogue and mutual understanding and respect between the different types of methods, which we envision as providing complementary inputs into policy evaluation, by addressing different research questions. We also promote comparative approaches. Indeed, our evaluative research is not only conducted on small-scale interventions but also at broader policy levels, for example comparing broad social policy orientations and the use of tax expenditures as a social and employment policy tool in different countries.

We have also developed a series of cross-cutting activities in order to strengthen this dialogue and mutual understanding between researchers coming from different disciplinary and methodological traditions, as well as their connection to the international field of evaluation. These include:

- A monthly seminar on methods and approaches in evaluation, METHEVAL, addressing different methodological techniques and

reflections on the epistemology, ethics and uses of evaluation.
- The publication of an anthology of fundamental and contemporary texts in evaluation, translated into French (Delahais et al. 2021).
- The creation of a blog compiling methodological resources for qualitative evaluation (QUALEVAL).
- The publication of "methods briefs" which present a variety of approaches and methods in a concise and accessible way to facilitate their appropriation by a diverse audience.

All these activities are public and open access, with the aim for the LIEPP to function as a resource centre on evaluation theory and methods for a diversity of actors, including academics but also professional evaluators working in public or private settings. Our visiting scholars program aims at fostering the incoming mobility of scholars from universities and research institutions outside of France, and our young researchers program targets doctoral students and postdocs.

Based on this experience at LIEPP, three productive tensions can be stressed regarding the practice of evaluation in academia – that is, elements that represent both assets and challenges:

- The *independence of academic research* is first and foremost an asset for the practice of evaluation. Threats to independence have been identified as one of the major challenges in the professional practice of evaluation, either from within public bodies or on the part of external consultants working for public authorities (Mathison 2018). One cannot stress enough how precious academic independence is to the practice of evaluation. This independence first refers to the fact that research can be conducted independently, in a way that is more easily removed from the influence and possible pressure on the part of public authorities, compared to what is the case when one is working within the public administration or as a consultant for a public administration. Our charter of ethics plays an important role in guaranteeing this independence. But independence also refers to the idea that researchers have an independent voice in the definition of the evaluative agenda because they are more generally autonomous in the definition of their research agenda: this is something we encourage through our very open calls for projects. This challenges a major implicit assumption of the field of evaluation, which is that evaluations are necessarily commissioned (evaluation is demand-driven). The engagement of academic actors in evaluation, like other civil society actors or independent authorities, contributes to de-indexing the evaluation agenda from that of public authorities - in other words, it contributes to addressing to public policies questions they are not necessarily willing to ask themselves. This favours a diversification of points of view and a form of knowledge-based counter-power, which is essential in democratic terms. There is therefore a major democratic stake in giving more space to knowledge from the University in the field of evaluation. Yet it is also important to be attuned to the evaluation needs stakeholders themselves perceive. In some cases, research questions can be driven by methodological constraints (such as what data is available, notably in quasi-experimental approaches) that limit their relevance to evaluation. While it is crucial to guarantee this independence, it is also important to encourage a dialogue with policymakers and stakeholders around what they see as areas in need of evaluation. Stakeholder participation has also been shown to be useful in the practice of evaluation, notably in order to favour its impact (Patton 2018). So, it is important that the preservation of researchers' independence not become a synonym with an excessive distance or defiance towards policymakers and stakeholders: this would go against one of the main goals of evaluation which is to have an impact on policymaking and civil society.

- Secondly, having academics practice evaluation means bringing to the field of evaluation people who (in their vast majority to

this day) do not have initial training in evaluation, but are trained in their respective academic disciplines, methods and thematic areas of specialisation. The challenge here is to sensitize these researchers to the specific stakes and tools of evaluation that may differ from fundamental research: issues of criteria, values, and judgements, the centrality of the question of knowledge utilisation, sometimes specific methods coming from the field of evaluation that may be useful (for example, theory-based evaluation, contribution analysis...). This is part of the work we do in our crosscutting methodological activities. But reciprocally, these researchers who generally have not been trained in evaluation have a lot to bring to the practice of evaluation. First, they bring to evaluation more rigorous methodological practices, thanks to their academic training. But secondly, they also bring to evaluation their thematic expertise, a broader understanding of the topic area of the evaluation at hand, which is an expertise that professional evaluators sometimes lack. This thematic expertise is key in stages of the evaluation process such as needs assessments, implementation evaluation, or the understanding of the mechanisms through which the intervention produces its impacts.

- Thirdly, practising evaluation within academia raises questions of timing. On the one hand, it opens the possibility for more in-depth evaluative research, which favours methodological quality. But on the other hand, longer-term projects may induce a mismatch with the timing within which research results may be useful for policymakers and civil society. At LIEPP, we identify two main avenues in order to overcome this mismatch. First, we have invested in the development of systematic literature reviews, which can be conducted in a shorter timeframe than research projects and provide useful inputs from research to policymakers and civil society. Secondly, we develop communication formats such as policy briefs and interviews on ongoing research.

Beyond those general features of academic evaluation, doing *interdisciplinary* evaluation represents a more specific challenge. Interdisciplinarity is undisputedly an asset, since the field of evaluation has historically drawn on the inputs of a diversity of disciplines, and is fundamentally a problem-oriented practice, rather than the practice guided by theories or disciplinary boundaries. Yet interdisciplinarity raises difficulties at the institutional level, in a scientific world which is still very organized into disciplinary silos (especially in terms of journals, career logic, etc.). It also raises epistemological challenges (tensions between positivist and constructivist approaches, tensions around the definition of causality), which we have been working on over the years to encourage the development of a more reflective science (Wasmer and Musselin 2013).

To conclude, LIEPP's mission is fundamentally one of translation, mediation and organization of a healthy confrontation between different worlds and different traditions: between disciplines and methods, but also between different actors of the field of evaluation, including academic, public and private actors.

II. The role of academic institutions in outreach and training in evaluation

Making research actionable and relevant to policymakers and civil society is a key component of policy evaluation. The second section addresses the role of academic institutions in outreach and training in evaluation. Beyond producing evaluative research, how can we make sure that the process and results of this research are conveyed to relevant stakeholders in adapted and efficient format that favour their impact on policymaking and civil society? What publics do we target, what are the relevant formats? What role should academic institutions play in the training of policymakers, NGOs, etc., in evaluation? Can investing in training favour a broader awareness of the need for a more systematic evaluation of public policies?

Policy Labs at Central European University, Budapest

by Thilo Bodenstein and Andrew Cartwright

(Associate Professors, Department of Public Policy, CEU)

Policy Labs is an exercise of practical research for public, private or civic bodies done by students who are supervised by university professors and teaching assistants over a two-term course, with the aim to get hands-on experience in all facets of project design, negotiation, and implementation through group work. It can take many forms from reviews of existing policy in a broad sense to project assessments (more often though "slices" than full-blown assessments) or comparative scenarios. The clients arise opportunistically: based in Budapest, we have had access to a whole range of grant giving organizations supported by the Open Society Foundations; international development organisations; think thanks and advocacy groups.

From the work done at Policy Labs, we have singled out 3 different scenarios on the interest in evaluation, involving 3 different types of bodies.

- "The unexperienced NGO". An example comes from a Romanian foundation who was being encouraged by its donor to do a review of a program on after school care, evaluating its impact on the quality of education and teachers' expertise. The donors were ready to fund it but needed to get external evaluation. The NGO was not keen to the idea. It was not familiar with formal evaluations and, as common in such cases, project goals were ambitious but with indicators vaguely elaborated, and access to first-hand information difficult.

  We thus had to act as a kind of "friendly broker", mediating some fairly difficult situations arising from our investigations. The key point here was to communicate that the evaluation was independent, that we were not being critical about any particular sort of activities, but rather trying to build something that includes inputs from all actors. In that case, it meant talking with parents, teachers, head teachers, members of the NGOs… and then convince the latter of the benefice to do this exercise again in the future.

- "The cautious international organization". These organisations rarely commission policy evaluations, as it could jeopardize sensitive relations with local or national partners, if their results are seen as too critical. Hence here what has worked are "comparative studies" of good practices. In other words, doing a small inventory of what works and what does not in a specific policy realm, with sound evidential base, which the organisation can then circulate internally or with their interlocutors saying: do you know about this? From that point of view, the evaluator becomes a kind of resource support.

  We have seen this happen for instance in the development of the FAO supported network, LANDNET, which mostly included practitioners, and yet has seen a progression from case presentations and country updates to good practice publications based, in part, on surveys, interviews and deliberative workshops.

- "The advocacy group in the making." Some organizations that were initially trying to meet a specific social or public need have moved towards a primary activity that is more based upon policy entrance. In this context, interest in evaluation might come less from donors' expectations concerning proven results, but more from an interest in developing their authority on the basis of sound or evidence-based policy critique. An example is Habitat for humanity, a structure initially focused on the cooperative production of

housing. As concerns about housing gained in dimensionality – with social, inclusive, environmental-friendly concerns – the organization has moved from being a service provider into an advocacy body. This move created certain needs, such as field guides, stakeholder mapping, power analyses and funding trends. They asked us for instance for scenarios about future funding coming out of MDG-supported activities in housing; or a stakeholder mapping of actors in the African Union interested in housing.

Academics in these contexts might be invited to join advocacy campaigns, providing various types of input, for example, policy assessment. Such opportunities can be enhanced by cultivating relations with policy brokers such as think tanks or applied research institutes.

The bottom line of these examples is that there are many ways through which evaluation can penetrate public debates. More long-term relations, such as those we are trying to build at Policy Labs, can allow to develop them meaningfully and eventually lead to greater co-operation on research design and implementation. For all those organizations providing advise based on practice, evaluation methods can effectively be presented as helping overcome problems of policy transfer and scaling up, identifying the "critical elements" that make them possible.

We have also inferred from our work a few reflections on how to teach evaluation.

After working on what is good practice in qualitative evaluation methods and how the reporting of evaluation findings can establish standards of scientific reporting, striking takeaways are that almost no one discusses the choice of methods. Reflective practices are never really reflexive, and the required standards by the UN Evaluation group, like human rights or agenda, are never reported. This reflects the fact that evaluation is a practice-driven exercise, much more than an object of academic reflection and teaching. An illustrative anecdote comes from the European Evaluation Society annual conference in Thessaloniki, where all participants could post their training programs in evaluation: there was barely anything on the board. The evaluation training landscape in Europe was haphazard and random.

On the question of what academia could bring to policy evaluation, one should first ask: is its lack of involvement a problem? The world of evaluation is quite rich, and with many different approaches already. Some better than others, but this is part of the richness. Besides, when evaluation is taught at university, it is often focused on quantitative methods, even though these approaches are only the minority in practice.

Another show of the weaknesses of university training is that evaluators very often started to be so by chance, in their first jobs, for instance working for development agency. They are then trained by providers outside of the academic world, that offer certificates. In other words, they rarely go back to academia. In that sense, it could be that the discipline is very much regarded from within academia as not really academic simply because we do not have the infrastructure to host it and train its members.

Of course, this raises the question of what it takes to be a trained evaluator. The Canadian Evaluation Society lists: reflective practice, technical practice, situational practice, management, practice and interpersonal practice. At university, we only focus on the "technical" aspect. In other words, we need to develop all other fours, and for that we need to really have discussions with departments other than political science and economics. This is key as the high demand by students and others for learning about evaluation, which is not met by the supply, is the proof that there is a gap to meet.
By putting better guidelines and trainings on how to become an evaluator, we could increase the visibility of the profession, and thus of evaluation in public policy spheres.

The Master in Policy Evaluation at Scoala Nationala de Studii Politice si Administrative

by Ioana-Roxana Melenciuc

(Head of Department of International Relations and European Integration, SNSPA)

The National University of Political Studies and Public Administration is a small university, with 4 faculties and one department, which aims at shaping the future leaders of Romania. The Department of International Relations and European Intervention has 10 masters, one on which is in policy evaluation. Contrary to those that teach evaluation within specific fields or discipline, we have decided to provide tools and expertise that encompass many of them. It is true that, as an evaluator, one eventually realizes that it is more efficient, if not relevant, to focus on specific fields; but we want to give our students a general understanding and give them time before making the specialization decisions. The program was initially designed to train evaluators from academic (mostly political science) backgrounds, but it ended up attracting mostly professional evaluators, looking for technical trainings, but also to increase their professional credibility.

As it is important to understand evaluation programs within specific institutional contexts, it is worth noting that Romania has yet to reach maturity in terms of evaluation. Most projects come solely from the central government, and the requirements of EU programs. Besides, the profession itself is still not matured. Questions arise for instance as to what standards we should train evaluators – for now, we focus on those of the European Evaluation Society, but most importantly, we design our programs to best train them for the professional markets they will enter.

Several of the dimensions mentioned in previous interventions are also at the core of our approach. We are very attached to the respect of methodological diversity, while we also face the challenge of mixing disciplines, partly since, in Romania as well, evaluation is not always seen as a discipline as such – though we have reached the point where everybody understands that we use scientific methods. We also work with the government, and in particular its International Development agency, for monitoring policy. Finally, we have built an Institute for Evaluation, where we match students with NGOs looking to review their impact.

The Hertie School in Berlin

by Kai Wegrich

(Professor of Public Administration and Public Policy, Dean of Research and Faculty, Hertie School)

The Hertie School is a professional school of public policy. It currently consists of 37 faculty members - the Hertie School is organised as one faculty and is not separated in different departments. The Hertie School is organised around five "centres of competence": international security, sustainability, fundamental rights, European governance, digital governance, and one data science lab. Although none of the research centres are expressively dedicated to evaluation research, all of them are involved in the evaluation of policies. In its teaching programmes – the School offers four degree programmes at the Masters' level and one PhD programme – policy evaluation plays an important role. The Master of Public Policy (MPP) in particular offers a range of courses that train students in various aspects of policy evaluation.

I would like to make two comments on the role of evaluation in public policy. First, evaluation will never resolve political conflicts about policy. Conflicts centre around evaluation criteria, and these evaluation criteria vary between different stakeholders. The more significant and complex a policy is, the more variation there will be about these criteria. Second, evaluation is complicated by the significant role of implementation. The effects and effectiveness of a policy is as much driven by post-adoption dynamics as by the policy design itself. In other words: the policy to be evaluated is a moving target.

This has several implications. First, better methods are not enough. They are important, but they also fuel the illusion that ambiguity – the fact that people disagree because they have different values and interests – can be resolved by throwing more data and more sophisticated methods at the problem. In fact, problems of ambiguity and judgment will likely increase with the use of more data.

This is the reason why professionals within the policymaking engine room need to be skilled in understanding and shaping the politics of evaluation and of policymaking in general: framing beats evaluation designs. In Finland, for instance, the framing of the universal basic income debate around labour demand issues completely crowded out other dimensions to be evaluated, such as well-being. Evaluators also need to know how the involvement or exclusion of various stakeholders matters in how a policy and its evaluation is perceived and presented.

The training of evaluators therefore needs to include an understanding of the politics of policymaking. They should be trained to acquire key skills such as: (actor-centred) institutional analysis; critical thinking; argumentation and framing; normative justifications; stakeholders' engagements. In other words, the politics of policy making. This is to be found in old and new textbooks, such as Hassel and Wegrich's "How to do Public Policy", Majone's "Evidence, Argumentation and Persuasion in the Policy Process" and Lindblom and Cohen's "Usable Knowledge" (Hassel and Wegrich 2022; Lindblom 1979; Majone 1989).

Higher Education Engagement and Evaluation in Transnational Governance

by Diane Stone

(Chair of Global Policy, School of Transnational Governance, EUI)

Global policy making enrols Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) into sites and practices of transnational governance. There is a growing array of informal international organizations (like the G20 or BRICs) and transgovernmental policy networks (such as the Basle Committee on Banking or the International Organization of Securities Commissions) that draw upon evaluative research. This type of informal international organization (IO) is growing at a faster rate than traditional intergovernmental treaty-based organizations. The traditional IOs including the International Financial Institutions (IFIs) like the World Bank, IMF and various regional banks as well as bodies like the OECD or EU. This first group of consumers of evaluation research – both formal and informal – are international public sector bodies. They exist alongside a more diverse and hybrid set of 'transnational public-private partnerships' (like GAVI or the Stop TB Initiative), multi stakeholder initiatives and private standard setting regimes that also deal with highly specialised and technical matters of cross border and cross jurisdictional policy problems.

In this policy ecology, HEIs are one set of actors aspiring to inform transnational governance. In general, existing analysis has primarily addressed how expert actors from within HEIs have sought to inform the institutions of transnational governance with evidence at earlier stages of the policy process. That is, problem definition and agenda setting. Monitoring and evaluation is also an important phase of the policy cycle at which HEIs can potentially inform and provide feedback on policy developments. A focus on the transnational identities and roles of HEIs allows us to view these institutions as carving out expanding domains of work on evaluation at regional and global levels. This stance takes us away from the traditional analytical treatment of HEIs as state-based entities (methodological nationalism).

One of the clearest examples of how HEIs have sought to provide evidence and evaluation is via partnering in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Evaluative research is clearly of relevance in establishing whether and how the SDGs are being realized. UNAI – also known as United Nations Academic Impact – convenes HEIs supporting the United Nations goals and mandate, including its need for evaluative research.

International Organisations in general are important sources of funding for (social) science in HEIs. But donors want to see utility from their investment in research. Development agencies want to evaluate and document the effectiveness of that research. Consequently, there is a dual dynamic in play when considering HEI evaluative research in transnational governance:

- Evaluative research of individuals and institutes within HEIs seeking to inform (transnational) governance, and
- Evaluation of HEIs by donors and commissioners of evaluative research.

The role of HEIs in outreach and training in evaluation

The 'impacts agenda' imposed on HEIs is pronounced in Anglo systems of higher education and manifest in pressures for engagement with industry, the third sector, and government agencies. Elsewhere in the world, the desirability of the results of (publicly funded) research being conveyed to relevant stakeholders has become increasingly

pressing. HEIs have incentivised their researchers to seek both funding from, and interaction with, more diverse constituencies. This includes joint activities with multinational corporations, international consultancy firms and bodies in global civil society such as NGOs, philanthropy and professional associations. In terms of evaluative research, the methods and practices deployed by HEIs are multiple:

- *Establishment of HEI Think Tanks, Institutes and 'Policy Labs'*: Separate funding streams have been developed by a number of universities and colleges to establish stand-alone institutes or centres that are more policy engaged and outward looking to external stakeholders than is the case with traditional university departments focused on teaching and research. These university 'think tanks', are similar to the traditional understanding of think tank as an independent civil society-based organization investigating issues of public concern and providing policy research and analysis as evidence for governance reform. However, university institutes and think tanks are usually cross-disciplinary drawing together academics from a number of disciplines to collectively evaluate a particular policy concern or policy sector. For instance, environmental institutes or policy centres focus on human rights issues.

- *Executive Education and Training*: Throughout OECD countries HEIs have increasingly turned to revenue raising activities both to generate an extra stream of funding but also to demonstrate openness to societal and industrial needs and interests. Mid-career training via executive courses is now unexceptional in most HEIs and already represents for some universities an avenue for delivering courses on methods of evaluation, or how to 'bridge research and policy' or to engage in 'science diplomacy'. Governments and international organizations frequently contract out such training for both their employees and for program beneficiaries.

- *Secondment, Consultancy and Co-option*: Another route to promote evidence and evaluation into institutions of transnational governance is through mobility of university faculty and researchers. Periods of secondment in international organizations as well as co-option onto advisory boards and expert panels (of for instance, the EC) or as reviewers of multi-stakeholder programs brings in the individual expertise of university scholars. Likewise, analytic services proffered on a fee-basis, as consultants, by university economists, demographers or others has markedly increased with many IOs, most of which are not large bodies like the EU, IFIs or NATO, but are much smaller issue specific entities (*inter alia*, the Arctic Council, the WTO) without substantive in-house capacity, and more so in the case of informal IOs that generally lack a standing secretariat. In short, IOs often need to contract evaluative research due to their own lack of expertise or time and resources.

- *HEI Research Impact*. The above points underline a utilitarian logic that increasingly pervades university education and training, research and scholarship. In this milieu, the utility of HEIs rests in some degree in their organizational capacity not only to create and co-design the guidelines, benchmarks, best practices, causal models, policy metrics, standards, data sets, new problem definitions and framing, amongst other calculative devices used by IOs and transnational policy actors, but also in their utility to monitor some of these devices and provide on-going evaluations and analysis of them. At the same time, HEI involvement bestows some epistemic legitimacy on such processes by virtue of being socially and politically recognized knowledge institutions. Research agendas are constructed around the prevailing social or economic challenges identified as national or global priorities by governments and IOs (which also tend to be the main

funders of evaluation research). Instrumental scholarship means an emphasis on gathering data – usually but not always quantitative – to accurately pinpoint social pathologies, to discern the contributing cause-and-effect mechanisms of those pathologies and prescribe suitable corrective action or governance reforms. In this sense, utilitarian scholarship is usually geared around foundationist ontology and a positivist epistemology.

It is important to note that transnational policy advisory processes are different from those at the domestic level, where decision-making authorities are more institutionalized. Sovereign power is lacking at transnational levels of governance. Accordingly, power and authority are distributed among multiple policy actors, sometimes conflicting and in tension, other times cooperating and collaborating. Global policy processes are more iterative, tentative, reactive, and incremental. Evidence and evaluative research is channelled, refined and challenged, revised, and re-channelled through IOs and transnational policy networks where HEI actors are but one set of actors among other expert interests that carry out, or commission and fund, evaluative research.

The evaluation of HEIs in transnational governance

A critical question is whether the evaluative research and training of HEIs is *relevant* to global policy making and whether HEIs can have substantive, sustained and tangible *impact* on aspects of transnational governance. *Demonstrating* impact, however, is methodologically difficult and proof, or causal pathways, often elusive in the multi-actor environments of global policy making.

Nevertheless, 'impact' – and the evaluation of it – has become a form of 'evidence'. For academics, 'impact' requires two moments: a moment in which impact is achieved and a moment in which impact is demonstrated. For academics, a prior incentive to pursue research that has impact on government in a manner easily demonstrated is generated. The UK Research Evaluation Framework, for instance, requires state-supported researchers or teams to provide evidence and cases of 'impact'. Increasingly, research groups supported by IOs, international philanthropic bodies (think Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, OSUN, Welcome Trust, Ford Foundation, etc) and other consumers of evaluative analysis such as major international NGOs (eg MSF, Oxfam) demand feedback on anticipated outcomes from their financial instruments (scholarships, grants, gifts and bequests or commissioned research) designed to secure policy change.

This logic has increasingly found its place in the priorities behind Horizon Europe and also in the mandate and activities of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre. The concern for impact of research has also seen the mushrooming in the past three decades of official bodies promoting capacity building for research communication such as the International Development Research Centre in Canada, the Swiss Commission for Research Partnerships with Developing Countries and the Global Development Network. In sum, the donors and commissioners of evaluative research from HEIs are also inclined to evaluate, rank and review not only the content or quality of evaluation research but also its impact among stakeholders.

Yet, it must not be forgotten that additional measures also need to be developed to ensure that international administrations and other stakeholders commissioning or using research are also 'intelligent consumers' of that research. This implies long term social engagement between researchers with global policymakers and international funding agencies in order to create common understandings of the purposes of research, its limitations and applications. HEIs do not simply 'supply' policy research in a mechanical and one-way linear relationship towards IOs or transnational actors. Instead, HEI policy institutes and individual academics, or policy labs and research teams, often (seek to) become enmeshed in

transnational policy networks and international deliberations to promote social learning in global policy making.

All of the above themes are considered at the new School of Transnational Governance (STG) at the European University Institute. Like Hertie, evaluation is a theme that has been mainstreamed through the degree programs and the research of members of faculty rather than highlighted as a specific interest at STG. Nevertheless, through the encouragement of the CIVICA network of European universities, there are plans to launch a joint Masters course on Policy Evaluation as a partnership between CEU, Sciences Po and STG.

Conclusion

by Anne Revillard
(Director, LIEPP, Sciences Po)

This "LIEPP Debate" illustrates the vitality and reflexivity of evaluative research and training across CIVICA. Partner institutions confirm and illustrate the assets and challenges to developing evaluation in an academic setting, as described in the introduction. Their evaluative research activities encompass a diversity of methods. Most of them draw on a combination of permanent and project-based funding and use selectivity in the choice of their external partnerships to ensure scientific relevance. Building long-term relationships with more stable policy stakeholders improves trust and research impact.
The nine institutions represented here (including both research labs and training programs) have developed creative ways to reach out to students and stakeholders, for example through policy labs, student involvement in research projects, or matching students with NGOs and other policy stakeholders. These innovative practices thus contribute to training while increasing connections to policy stakeholders. Yet contributions also point to the need to better formalize requirements and guidelines for training future (academic or non-academic) evaluators, going beyond strictly methodological training to include reflections on values, knowledge utilisation and the politics of evaluation.

Indeed, several contributions also illustrate how research conducted on evaluation practices (for example, on the imposition of evaluation frameworks from the Global North to the Global South, or on how academic research itself is subjected to increased evaluation requirements and expectations of impact) can increase reflexivity in evaluation training and in the practice of evaluation by academic researchers – yet another asset of developing evaluation from an academic setting.

Cited references

Cox, Gary. 1990. 'On the Demise of Academic Evaluation'. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 13(4):415–19.

Delahais, Thomas, Devaux-Spatarakis, Agathe, Revillard, Anne, and Ridde, Valéry, eds. 2021. *Evaluation: Fondements, Controverses, Futurs*. Québec: Editions science et bien commun.

Hassel, Anke, and Kai Wegrich. 2022. *How to Do Public Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hong, Quan Nha, and Pierre Pluye. 2018. 'Systematic Reviews: A Brief Historical Overview'. *Education for Information* (34):261–76.

Jacob, Steve. 2008. 'Cross-Disciplinarization a New Talisman for Evaluation?' *American Journal of Evaluation* 19(2):175–94. doi: 10.1177/1098214008316655.

Lindblom, Charles Edward. 1979. *Usable Knowledge : Social Science and Social Problem Solving / Charles E. Lindblom and David K. Cohen*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Majone, Giandomenico. 1989. *Evidence, Argument and Persuasion in the Policy Process / Giandomenico Majone*. New Haven London: Yale University press.

Mathison, Sandra. 2018. 'Does Evaluation Contribute to the Public Good?' *Evaluation* 24(1):113-119.

Mayne, John. 2012. 'Contribution Analysis: Coming of Age?' *Evaluation* 18(3):270–80. doi: 10.1177/1356389012451663.

Patton, Michael Quinn. 2018. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. London: Sage.

Pawson, Ray. 2006. *Evidence-Based Policy: A Realist Perspective*. London: Sage.

Rogers, Patricia J., and Carol H. Weiss. 2007. 'Theory-Based Evaluation: Reflections Ten Years on: Theory-Based Evaluation: Past, Present, and Future'. *New Directions for Evaluation* 2007(114):63–81. doi: 10.1002/ev.225.

Scriven, Michael. 1993. 'Hard-Won Lessons in Program Evaluation.' *New Directions for Program Evaluation* (58):5–48.

Suchman, Edward A. 1967. *Evaluative Research. Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wasmer, Etienne, and Christine Musselin. 2013. *Évaluation Des Politiques Publiques : Faut-Il de l'interdisciplinarité?* Paris: LIEPP Methodological discussion paper n°2.

Weiss, Carol H., and Carol H. Weiss. 1998. *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Wilson-Grau, Ricardo. 2018. *Outcome Harvesting: Principles, Steps, and Evaluation Applications*. IAP.

Le LIEPP (Laboratoire interdisciplinaire d'évaluation des politiques publiques) bénéficie du soutien apporté par l'État au titre du programme d'Investissements d'avenir dans le cadre de l'IdEx Université Paris Cité (ANR18IDEX0001).

www.sciencespo.fr/liepp

@LIEPP_ScPo

Si vous voulez recevoir les prochains échos du LIEPP et rester informés de nos activités, merci d'envoyer un courriel à : liepp@sciencespo.fr

Directrice de publication :
Anne Revillard

Edition et maquette :
Andreana Khristova
Ariane Lacaze

Sciences Po - LIEPP
27 rue Saint Guillaume
75007 Paris - France
+33(0)1.45.49.83.61