Name of organisation/ initiative Title, year, link	Dominant topic	Literature type	Study design	What was evaluated? Org; initiative; practice	Key findings
AAAS A Retrospective Evaluation of the STPF Program (2020)	Public Policy	Independent evaluation, grey literature	Quant. Retrospective survey. The researchers received survey responses from 1,261 alumni and 235 host-office mentors. They also interviewed 24 alumni and 14 mentors. The participating alumni represented each fellowship year between 1973 and 2018, while the mentors were drawn from five recent years, 2013 through 2018.	Policy Fellowship Scheme • Practice 4 • Practice 5	**Positive** Fellows ▪ Understanding of how public policy is formulated and implemented: Policy know-how and skills grow dramatically; Fellows continue to be involved in policy- related activities ▪ Knowledge and skills in the areas of science and technology policy: ▪ Impact on career path: Being a fellow impacts subsequent professional activities; Being a fellow impacts policy and careers; Significant impact on career trajectory Mentors/Host Offices ▪ Impact of fellow contributions to the work of the office: Mentors are highly satisfied with the STPF program; Mentors say fellows are prepared to fit in and contribute; Fellows provide scientific and technical expertise. **Areas for Improvement** ▪ Fellows want to strengthen ties with the program and engage with each other in meaningful ways: creating new collaborations, sharing information, and advocating for science. ▪ Many fellows and mentors would like to see the program grow to include more host agencies and more fellows. ▪ Some mentors suggested ways to improve the fellow selection and placement process. ▪ Some mentors asked for more guidance on how to determine the best tasks for fellows.
Academic Health Science	Health	Independent evaluation,	Qual. Stakeholder online survey and interviews. With input from AHSNs and commissioners, Savanta ComRes	ASHN • Practice 6	**Positive** 1. There are high levels of satisfaction across all stakeholder groups related to strengthening

Networks (AHSNs) [AHSN Network stakeholder research: national findings](#) (2019)		grey literature	developed and ran a 10-minute online survey and subsequently conducted 30-minute telephone interviews with up to 10 stakeholders for each of the 15 AHSNs and for the National AHSN Network.		partnerships across sector boundaries and facilitating the spread and adoption of innovation. 2. AHSNs are effectively employing tailored models of communications and engagement with stakeholders 3. Staff within all AHSNs are seen by stakeholders as a significant asset, and are routinely described as approachable, helpful and responsive. 4. AHSNs are collaborating with a growing network of individuals and organisations across the health and care sector. **Areas for improvement** 5. There is currently a high degree of variability in how stakeholders describe their initial involvement with AHSNs. 6. Stakeholders would like to learn about the National AHSN Network and the innovations within other AHSN areas that could support their objectives. 7. Whilst appearing strong in engaging industry and research stakeholders, AHSNs are less visible with local government, patients and VCS organisations. 8. Increasing visibility of innovation and best practice across AHSNs will help to demonstrate impact.
Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research (AHPSR) [External review](#) (2014) Also reviewed 2004, 2009.	Health	Independent evaluation, grey literature	Qual. Extensive document review and conducted telephone, VOIP and personal interviews with a range of key stakeholders (see Annex B). In addition, a small informal email questionnaire process was used to test advocacy and dissemination of research findings among selected health professionals in the field.	AHPSR • Practice 1 (synthesis and dissemination) • Practice 4 and 5 (capacity building, to lesser extent)	Whilst it should be congratulated on its engagement with researchers, research institutions and certain global bodies (World Bank, UNICEF, GAVI and hosted initiatives at WHO), there is less evidence of systematic communication and collaboration with the users of research, mainly policy-makers at country level. The Alliance should further rationalise and focus where it has a clear advantage. This is a fast evolving landscape and there are a number of areas where there is a degree of overlap with other local, regional and global entities; these need to be explored with a view to agreeing complementarity rather than duplication.The Alliance should review the balance of work between generating knowledge, building capacity, and advocacy and dissemination. The latter activity has not delivered and

					alternative ways of working need to be explored, including sharing resources with other initiatives and harmonising language and key messages. The Alliance urgently needs to review its dissemination and communication functions and to produce a strategy, which will strengthen this function. The Alliance should review its processes, including consultation on potential research topics, to ensure that country-level focal areas and globally recognised priorities are reflected in the proposed research focal areas and detailed agenda. The research agenda should be developed in consultation with a range of stakeholders and particularly users of research. Funding should be sought for an extended period. The Alliance should consider whether to continue any capacity-building support to individuals and whether to increase the focus on tools to support building capacity in HPSR. A strategic decision is required by the Board, advised by the STAC, about the relative importance and potential conflict between generating good-quality evidence (hopefully much of which has global significance and which therefore may be translated into policy), building capacity (particularly in LMICs) and responding to the stated needs of national policy-makers. This should form part of the strategic review. A review should be undertaken to identify the preferred communication medium of policy-makers. Implementation Research Platform is an area of work with a high profile and the potential to make change happen.
Aspen Institute Congressional Program [Impact Report (2020)]	Public Policy	Internal impact report, grey literature	Impact stories	Aspen Institute • Practice 6	New partnerships and collaborations boost impact within the Institute and across the globe.
Bristol Knowledge	Health	Peer reviewed	Qual. Data sources from brokers included personal logs, reflective	Bristol KM Team	Bristol Knowledge Mobilisation (KM) Team was an unusual collective brokering model, consisting of a multi-professional

Mobilisation (KM) Team [Collective knowledge brokering: the model and impact of an embedded team](#) (2020)			essays, exit interviews and a team workshop. These were analysed inductively using constant comparison. To obtain critical distance, three external evaluations were conducted, using interviews, observations and documentation.	• Practice 4 • Practice 5 • Practice 9	team of four managers and three academics embedded in both local healthcare policymaking (aka commissioning) and academic primary care. Aims and objectives: They aimed to encourage 'research-informed commissioning' and 'commissioning-informed research'. This paper covers context, structure, processes, advantages, challenges and impact. Stable, solvent organisations; senior involvement with good inter-professional relationships; secure funding; and networks of engaged allies in host organisations supported the brokers. Essential elements were two-way embedding, 'buddying up', team leadership, brokers' interpersonal skills, and two-year, part-time contracts. By working collectively, the brokers fostered cross-community interactions and modelled collaborative behaviour, drawing on each other's 'insider' knowledge, networks and experience. Challenges included too many taskmasters, unrealistic expectations and work overload. However, team-brokering provided a safe space to be vulnerable, share learning, and build confidence. As host organisations benefitted most from embedded brokers, both communities noted changes in attitude, knowledge, skills and confidence. The team were more successful in fostering 'commissioning-informed research' with co-produced research grants than 'research-informed commissioning'. Discussion and conclusions: Although still difficult, the collective support and comradery of an embedded, two-way, multi-professional team made encouraging interactions, and therefore brokering, easier. A team approach modelled collaborative behaviour and created a critical mass to affect cultural change.
Business Basics Programme	Innovation	Internal progress	MM. Ongoing RCTs of business support schemes. Case studies on projects in projects	Business Basics Funding	The Business Basics Programme is designed to test innovative ways of encouraging small and medium sized enterprises to adopt existing technologies and management

[Progress Report October 2019](#) (2019)		report, grey literature		mechanism and partnership projects • Practice 9	practices to improve their productivity. Partnership Projects enables BEIS to work with partners to deliver targeted projects eg in a specific place, sector or using specific techniques such as nudge or peer to peer advice. This compliments the "bottom up" approach of the Fund, provides flexibility to act on early findings and influence key stakeholders in an agile way. Developed logic model and evaluation framework. All currently funded trials from BBF1 and BBF2 are delivering RCTs over 12 months. This is too soon for the ultimate productivity improvements to emerge and/or be measured11, therefore projects are designing an evaluation to measure earlier stage outcomes that indicate the anticipated gain (eg behaviour change, intention of adopting or adopting). Proof of concept projects are much smaller, earlier stage projects, and are not expected to demonstrate causal impacts. Longer term impact evaluation can only take place in three to five years' time to allow impact to emerge and be measurable. It is currently too early to develop detailed evaluation plans, but the appropriate data collection and data sharing agreements have been put in place to enable the longer-term learning from the programme. Results are just beginning to emerge from BBF1 Proof of Concept projects and although longer term impacts on productivity can take years to materialise, early evaluation findings from the BBF1 trials will start to emerge in 2020. With most of the projects still to complete, including all trials, it is too early to start answering the big policy questions set for the fund. However, valuable insights into programme delivery, experimental design and qualitative evidence on what works to encourage adoption are already being gained. These lessons have and will continue to be fed back to improve the delivery of the Programme. Key insights:

					Increasing Awareness; Decision to Adopt; Delivering Evaluations.
ClimateXChange [End of Programme Narrative Report 2011-16](#) (2016) Also evaluated projects previously	Environment	Internal progress report, grey literature	Impact stories	ClimateXChange The current model – focused on a co-produced multi-disciplinary research programme and knowledge brokering, and based on our learning from engaging with the policy and research community. • Practice 1 • Practice 3 • Practice 6	Reflections on: Stakeholder engagement Policy relevant outputs Impact on policy Benefits to other stakeholders Collaboration and Multidisciplinary Working
Coalition for Evidence Based Policy [Review of the coalition for](#)	Social Policy	Grey literature	Qual. Interview-based assessment. Interviews with 15 individuals selected by the Coalition and with whom the Coalition has either worked or whose program evaluations have	• Practice 1 • Practice 4	There was a strong consensus that three activities of the Coalition are most effective and highly valued: educating policymakers in the executive branch and Congress on the credibility, utility and value of randomized controlled experiments; sponsoring careful reviews of existing

			been reviewed by the Coalition. The interviews lasted between 15 and 30 minutes, guaranteed the confidentiality of responses. The interviewees were typically high-level officials.		evaluations to assess their strength and validity, and well communicating the results of these reviews; and providing one-on-one feedback and advice to policymakers in response to specific evaluation-related requests. IT was felt that The independence of the Coalition gives its voice significantly greater weight than others as it presents the case for rigorous evaluation. In terms of potential future activities, interviewees cited the current and likely long-term federal and state budget environment, leading many to say that the Coalition should consider "taking its message" to new, larger social program arenas where its impact could be much greater. Two potential new areas were identified as ones that the Coalition might consider, but with caution: first, education-related entitlement programs, particularly postsecondary education student aid; and second, health care service delivery in the Medicaid and Medicare programs. In both areas, few rigorous studies have been or are being conducted. Most interviewees also expressed a caveat that the Coalition's limited resources and staff may preclude a serious effort in a new policy area, and that the educational role that the Coalition plays with Congress should not diminish.
evidence-based policy (2011) See also 2004 impact report and 2009 assessment of is role in advancing evidence based policy-making					
Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care Learning from the emergence of	Health	Peer reviewed.	Synthesis of evaluation findings. Twenty-six evaluations (reported in 37 papers) were deemed eligible for inclusion.	• Practice 6 (partnerships) • Practice 4 (cap-building) • Practice 9 (roles)	Five prominent themes were identified from the literature: organisational form and emergent properties, the nature and role of boundaries, the deployment of knowledge brokers and other hybrid roles to support knowledge mobilisation, engagement of health care users and the general public in the form of patient and public involvement (PPI), and capacity building. **Relationships:** It was shown that the CLAHRC initiative led to the development of relationships that span the 'research to practice' divide and have been able to work across professional and organisational boundaries.

NIHR Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRCs): a systematic review of evaluations (2018) See also a number of evaluations reviewed in the above.					**Brokering and hybrid roles:** a promising approach but evaluations highlight that there is often lack of support and recognition for these roles at an organisational level, and that formidable professional boundaries, existing organisational norms and lack of institutionalised career pathways for knowledge brokers may make such roles difficult to sustain in the longer term. **Capacity building:** Increasing the capacity to undertake and use applied health research in the NHS and to foster a culture of collaboration between the academic and service delivery sectors was one of the key objectives that CLAHRCs were required by NIHR to address. Soper et al. surveyed NHS and academic staff across six CLAHRCs and found that both NHS and academic respondents strongly supported both of these aims. Although these aims were well understood, there was considerable uncertainty about how best to achieve them in practice, The relative lack of data about the early impact of CLAHRCs on health care provision or outcomes is notable. **KMb:** unclear evidence: Further evaluation of CLAHRCs and other similar research and practice partnerships is warranted and should focus on which knowledge mobilisation approaches work where, how and why.
College of Policing (What Works Centre for Crime Reduction) An Evaluation of the 'What Works Centre for Crime Reduction'	Professions	Independent evaluation by Birkbeck. Grey literature.	Three and a half year evaluation - 2014 to 2017. In-depth interviews in 2014 (49) and 2016/17 (40); 'before-and-after web-based survey in 2014 and 2016; case study of evidence dissemination and adoption in a single force; Mapping the range of products and activities of the WWCCR and the College; collecting data on internet traffic to the	• Practice 1 • Practice 4 • Practice 7 (evidence champions; professional	**Shifts in attitudes towards research** • There has been some shift since 2014 in how interviewees discuss the status of research in their organisations. The surveys also indicate a shift towards greater use of research and imply that greater importance is now attached to using research **Increasing police and academic collaboration** • Interviewees were much more likely than in 2014 to be involved in research, in partnership with a university, and identified benefits resulting from these collaborations. **Dissemination and reach**

Final Report (2017)			WWCCR microsite and associated evidence structures; Reviewing progress made in building the evidence base by interviewing those responsible for producing and developing key research products; Interviewing end users including Evidence Champions and Officers	leadership)	• The support of the chief officer team continues to be viewed as crucial for encouraging an interest and commitment to evidence-based practice. • However chief officers noted a range of ways – more concrete plans than were reported in 2014 – in which forces were disseminating evidence-based practice to operational staff. However, it was clear from the survey that there were large differences between senior and other ranks, in terms of engaging with research; the former tending to have more positive attitudes to, and usage of, research on a variety of measures **Organisational facilitators and barriers** • There has been no change since 2014 in the perception of the main practical barriers to greater engagement with research. Lack of time is still the most commonly mentioned problem
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) Performance Report (2019) Transforming The Global Food System Also see previous impact and performance reports and	Agriculture	Internal MEL. Grey literature.	Programme monitoring against results framework.	Practice 1 Practice 4 (cap-building) Practice 6 (partnerships) Practice 7 (advocacy)	Across the CGIAR System, we aim to reduce poverty, improve food and nutrition security, and improve natural resources and ecosystem services. These three goals – what we call our System-level Outcomes – have been designed to align with and contribute to reaching the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals by 2030. In 2019, CGIAR Research Programs and Platforms reported 97 confirmed cases of progress toward our internal targets, bringing us closer to reaching the global goal of a more sustainable world. **Advocacy** Policies: In 2019, the number of policies, legal instruments or investments that had been influenced by CGIAR research increased by 44% compared to the previous year. From a total of 164 policies, 60% (99) showed evidence of research findings being taken up by next users and 36% (59) involved

MEL dashboard					a policy being passed or a law enacted. Seven (4%) demonstrated evidence of impact for the first time in 2019. **Partnerships:** In 2019, CGIAR Research Programs reported external partnerships involving a wide range of partners, from policymakers in governments and international agencies, to research collaborators in research and academic institutions around the world, as well as public- and private-sector companies and non-profit institutions involved in the development and scaling of innovations. From a total of 283 partnerships, 36% were focused on research, 26% on capacity development, 22% on delivery and 13% on policy **Cap building** Important capacity development contributions were made in 2019. A total of 796,273 trainees (including long- and short-term; 54% men and 46% women) were involved across the CGIAR Portfolio. A total of 538 PhD students were incorporated in CGIAR research initiatives in 2019, 49% (265) of them women.
CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis Focusing on quality – Report from the CPB Review Committee (2010)	Public Policy	Organisational review. Grey literature	Review Committee visited from January 19th through 22nd 2010. CPB prepared an extensive program of meetings (interviews) with CPB staff. members of the academic community, other institutes in the Netherlands, members of the press and representatives of Dutch civil service. In addition to the originally scheduled discussions with directors, sector heads and program leaders, as well as outside experts, the Committee also met with CPB researchers outside management, to get a broader perspective from the work floor.	Practice 1 Practice 2 (formal evidence role) Practice 3 (facilitating access)	CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (CPB) has a unique position in Dutch society. CPB forecasts for the short- and medium term set the framework for political negotiations on the budget, and their policy analyses are deemed to be authoritative in many policy areas. CPB is independent, but at the same time well embedded in the policy making process. **Quality of Work** In bridging the gap between academic research and policy making, CPB provides high quality research. **Policy Impact** CPB has a clear value-added for policy making in the Netherlands, setting a standard for intellectual discipline in what could otherwise be disparate political debates. CPB should add to its role in Dutch policy debate by educating policy makers, the media, and the wider public on

'[Uit de lengte of uit de breedte]' (2013) in Dutch					the uncertainties involved in forecasting and cost-benefit analysis. The impact of CPB publications appears to be good. The intended audiences of the different CPB publications series are not always clear; the Committee urges CPB management to review the publications strategies and intended audiences of each of the different outlets and make appropriate changes. **Structure and Organisation** – The Committee understands a division into sectors or units is needed for reasons of span of control. However, the Committee has been unable to understand the logic behind the existing sector structure, which seems to reflect several guiding principles at the same time. The current structure raises issues of heterogeneity of programmes within sectors and issues of links between sectors covering related issues. – In devising a new organisational structure, particular attention should be paid to the location of public finance. Arguably, public economics should be at the core of what the CPB does. However, it currently straddles several sectors without being the clear focus of any of them. – Whatever organising principle is chosen, an effective structure for coordination and communication between the different sectors is key. The Committee has the impression that there is room for improvement in the communication between the sectors on issues such as data sharing and project selection.
East Midlands Policing Academic Collaboration (EMPAC)	Policing	As part of PKF internal review. Grey literature	range of methods including semi-structured interviews, an online survey and synthesis of the 14 projects' final reports	Practice 3 (co-production) Practice 4 (cap-building, skills)	HEI networks finding commonalities and shared objectives, leading to increased respect and trust and the creation of cross-regional partnerships driven by collaboration rather than by competition (EMPAC) Sharing potential teaching and funded research opportunities, distributing rewards across HEIs (EMPAC).

Reviewed in [Police Knowledge Fund Review](#) (2018)				Practice 6 (partnerships, networks)	Partners committed to continuing the collaboration and are currently exploring a revised vision that directly aligns with priorities of regional Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC). Funding in place to support the continuing role of a knowledge exchange manager to support coordinating EBP activity and maximise the benefits of the PKF investment.
Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN) [Evaluation of the Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN)](#) (2015)	Health	Independent evaluation. Grey literature.	Performance evaluation. The evaluation was limited in resources and duration, and drew as much as possible on secondary materials. These included user surveys for FEX, NEX and en- net, as well as a citation survey, which were all undertaken by ENN in 2015, as well as ENN corporate documents. The team supplemented the secondary material with interviews. The evaluation team adopted a participatory approach and, as a part of this evaluation, facilitated a self-assessment by ENN of its organisational effectiveness.	Practice 1 Practice 6 (network)	External interviewees' assessments of ENN's work were predominantly very positive. Most interviewees saw ENN as living up to its aspirations of facilitating experience-sharing and promoting evidence-based improvements in the practice of emergency nutrition. Interviewees highlighted the contribution of ENN to making available high quality evidence-based reviews and research on key and emerging questions on nutrition in emergencies, and also their ability to bring field practice to a wider audience of practitioners. Field Exchange (FEX) continues to be central to ENN's work. User surveys in 2012 and 2015 found high levels of satisfaction, and interviews and documentary evidence also show that FEX continues to be held in high regard. FEX is particularly appreciated as a bridge between fieldwork and peer-reviewed academic publications. Nutrition Exchange (NEX) was launched as an annual publication in 2011, with French and Arabic a well as English editions; it aims to be more accessible than FEX to national staff. Again, user responses are very positive. Readers believe it has an effect not only on their personal performance but also on the organisations they work for. ENN helps contributors to both FEX and NEX to develop initial ideas into publishable articles. This capacity-development aspect is especially important for NEX which aims to increase contributions from country-level staff. En-net was initiated in 2009, but most of its development has been during the evaluation period. It is focused on the same community as NEX and FEX, but has the distinctive aim of providing real time advice to practitioners in the field,

					drawing on both experts and fellow field workers. The evaluation's assessment is strongly positive. The service has been easy to access and well moderated, striking a good balance between peer exchange of experiences and expert advice consistent with appropriate normative guidance. High usage rates are an indication of the value attached to the service. Recommended to create a ToC and strengthen governance: ENN should aim in the medium term to adapt and strengthen its governance so as to make it more durable and less dependent on the present set of individuals.
Engaging with Scottish Local Authorities (ESLA) Process and Impact Review: Engaging with Scottish Local Authorities Scheme ESRC End of Award Report (2012)	Local Government	ESRC award review. Grey literature	MM. methodological approach prioritised working with participants in the research process. Took a theory of change approach. Phase One: Baseline and Metrics. Desk research: Analysis of the five successful bids leading to the production of a matrix. Interviews with project leaders. Learning workshop. Phase Two: Process and Implementation We monitored the processes of engagement and observed and recorded KE. Including Telephone Interviews; Observations; Learning Workshop Phase Three: Outcomes and Preliminary impacts Follow up telephone interviews with the five project leaders. Analysis of project documentation and evidence of impact generation. Learning workshop	Practice 1 Practice 6 (networks)	The projects informed strategic policy and front-line practice within participating authorities. For the most part, impact to-date is local but one project developed a definition of 'community safety' that has been adopted nationally. Placements of staff within partner's workplaces were the most intense and sustained form of KE, and the most challenging to implement. Project teams found imaginative ways of configuring placements to fit the workloads of staff in time-poor organisations. Placements led to inter-organisational learning and increased the capacity of local authority staff to use research. For many participants in ESLA the true value of their projects lay in change in how different groups feel about each other. Not all the benefits achieved by the projects were defined within the original bids; examples of unpredicted spin-offs include involving informal community groups in bringing about a policy shift. Learning points There is much that universities can do to increase KE. Our report draws attention in particular to the importance of 'knowledge brokers' (groups or individuals) who mediate between research and users; and to the potential to utilise professional development of partners' staff as a conduit for KE. Timeliness is also a significant factor. In the context of public services, local impact should not be seen as modest impact.

Erasmus Programme (ERASMUS+) [Mid-term evaluation of the Erasmus+ programme](#) (2014-2020)	Education	Independent evaluation. Grey literature	MM. Combination of the ex post evaluation of predecessor programmes and the mid-term evaluation. Considering the high quality of data collected through several complementary techniques from various sources this evaluation can be considered very reliable and valid.	Limited focus on policy engagement but Practice 1 Practice 5	The evaluation finds that the Erasmus+ programme is highly valued by the general public as well as by its stakeholders. Though less visible, the evaluation confirms the systemic effect of the evaluated programmes on education, training, youth and sport policies and systems, directly through the critical mass reached at least in the higher education sector or indirectly in funding policy cooperation (Open Method of Coordination). This systemic effect goes together with partial progress made in the area of dissemination of results of the programme. However, the evidence of the exploitation of project results by policy makers and the effective engagement of the latter when they are not included in the project itself is not always clear. In this sense, the evaluation found that the dissemination of results is one of the aspects of Erasmus+ where there is room for further improvement. The evaluation also noted that the impact of funded projects on national systems could be more systematic if there were more cooperation projects fit for mainstreaming, focussed on fewer priorities at EU level and further efforts made for mainstreaming these at national level.
ESRC (formerly SSRC) **1.** [ESRC Impact Acceleration Accounts High level strategic review](#) (2017) **2**[. UK What Works Centres:](#)	Economic and social research	1. Internal review. Grey literature 2. Independent review. Grey literature.	1. Not found 2. Qual. Data on each What Works Centre's organisation, aims, methods and outputs were collected through interviews with the Director and/or relevant staff, internal documentation and public data sources including their websites. The purpose is to provide an overall analysis and description of the Network that can support the development of existing Centres and	1. Practice 1 Practice 9 (infrastructure - funding mechanisms) 2. Practice 1 Practice 3	1. The ESRC IAA model has benefitted knowledge exchange and impact for social science. The IAAs have encouraged cultural and behavioural change around impact, including a step change in impact activities and outcomes, and greater awareness and interest from social scientists and their users. IAAs are flexible, recognising non-linear pathways to impact, promoting early thought about impact and allowing researchers to do the work at the appropriate point, including the embedding of impact generation within research. While there are clear benefits to cross-research council IAA working in institutions, including the promotion of interdisciplinarity and efficiency gains through sharing systems/processes, our review finds that there would be

| Aims, methods and contexts (2018)

Other relevant literature includes: What works strategic review (2016) And Review of ESRC-DfiD joint fund (2016) | | | assist in the planning of future Centres and their equivalents. | | negative consequences were IAAs combined into one fund.

2.   The What Works Centres conduct a wide array of work: building a more robust and comprehensive evidence base; raising awareness and understanding regarding the need for using evidence, and; influencing local and national policy to consider evidence more effectively. This work has resulted in numerous achievements, some of which were captured in a recent publication by the Cabinet Office (2018) of the first five years of the What Works Network. If we consider the work of What Works Centres in the context of the overall evidence ecosystem, then a key question is, what are they doing in relation to that system?

In general, the greatest emphasis of work for the Centres is across three areas: communication; the synthesis of research findings; and providing access to what is known about the evidence base. Relatively less work is undertaken to actively support the uptake and application of evidence in policy and practice decisions. As already discussed, the Centres have undertaken less work on research uptake and implementation than on research production and engagement. Most Centres have some formal processes and/or criteria for standards of evidence, although there is considerable variation in how these standards are defined and applied. Most Centres are at an early stage in their development and undertake relatively little evaluation of the impact of their work on ultimate beneficiaries. A finding from this review is that all Centres face challenges, to some degree, in impacting on wider systems. |

EU Agencies Network on Scientific Advice (EU-ANSA) Overview of the scientific process of the EU Agencies network for scientific advice (EU-ANSA) (2015)	EU Public Policy	Grey literature.	presents, in a standardised format, a high-level description of the nature of the scientific advice and the processes in place to carry it out in the different agencies	Practice 3 (network)	presents, in a standardised format, a high-level description of the nature of the scientific advice and the processes in place to carry it out in the different agencies
European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) Third independent external evaluation of the ECDC in accordance with its Founding Regulation (2019) See also previous evaluations	Health	Independent evaluation. Grey literature	MM. Using logic model. an extensive in-depth interview programme covering 115 key informants from MS, EU Institutions, International Organisations, ECDC staff and ECDC Governance Bodies members; • a large questionnaire-based survey addressing ECDC direct stakeholders (507 complete responses received); • a questionnaire-based online public consultation (30 complete responses received); • focus groups (three conducted in person in Bulgaria, Lithuania and Spain, one conducted online with EU-level stakeholders); • country visits to France, Greece, Italy and Romania; • desk research on relevant documentary sources.	Practice 1 Practice 3 Practice 4 Practice 9 (infrastructure)	Overall, ECDC's activities and outputs under the current mandate of the Centre are found to be relevant for its stakeholders, both at national and EU level, although there is scope to further tailor its activities to individual Member States' needs. ECDC has successfully supported the EU and national policy priority areas and demonstrated the capacity to successfully adapt to policy developments, confirming the relevance of its activities. Nevertheless, a weakness was identified in the Centre's capacity to adapt to changes in the Member States, particularly reduced national public health spending. This consideration should be integrated and applied consistently in existing mechanisms for planning, prioritisation and provision of country support. ECDC should adapt its methodology for cost impact analyses to better capture the impact of its activities on resources used at national level and tailor its activities to existing constraints. In terms of the geographical scope of ECDC's mandate, the evaluation found that the Centre's international activities related to the Zika and Ebola crises, the preparedness of the EU to respond to such crises through the European Medical Corps and its support for capacity-building activities in

					neighbouring countries were relevant for the needs of EU and international stakeholders. However, ECDC's ability to respond to demand for its involvement in international activities is constrained by its limited mandate and resources to engage internationally. The existing EU mechanisms for financing such activities are not effective for addressing these constraints, as the Centre has not been able to use them to cover its staff costs and hire additional staff. Given the identified need for continued ECDC support in third countries, the resourcing mechanisms for such activities should be strengthened. The Centre has also effectively disseminated and communicated the results of its work, surpassing its performance indicators for their timely delivery over the evaluation period. The evaluation identified these as negative factors in the relevance and effectiveness of the Centre's activities for the Member States. Specifically, the Centre demonstrated a weak capacity to assess and consequently adapt and tailor its activities to the diverse contexts and needs of Member States over the evaluation period. Consequently, ECDC should streamline all areas of its work and focus on addressing structural gaps and deficiencies in Member States' public health systems, which hamper their ability to effectively contribute to and optimally benefit from ECDC's activities.
European Environment Agency (EEA) Evaluation of the European Environment Agency (EEA) and its	Environment	Independent evaluation. Grey literature	MM. Based on logic model. The evaluation started in 2016 with the publication of the Evaluation Roadmap22by the Commission, after consultation of EEA management Board. Document analysis, organisational consultation and public consultation, 83 interviews, workshops, case studies.	Practice 1 Practice 3 Practice 6	More effective in some policy areas than others: The EEA worked effectively to deliver on its core objectives, providing objective, reliable and comparable information, which was used extensively in EU and national environment and climate policy work. In most areas, the work of the agency was crucial or of significant importance to policy work at the EU level –this includes in particular

European Environment Information and Observation Network (EIONET) (2019) See also previous evaluations					the activities and outputs related to reporting required under EU legislation such as Air quality Directives, Bathing Waters Directive or the Climate Monitoring Mechanism Regulation. EEA and EIONET information and outputs also contributed significantly to national policy work in the environment and climate areas. Concerning other sectoral policies, while the EEA additionally supported concrete initiatives on indicators and reporting on integration of environment concerns, cooperation and interaction with the relevant sectoral policymakers has been limited, having an effect in the content, the use and the interpretation of EEA information and outputs. The fact that the role of the EEA is better specified in some areas than in others had a certain impact on the setting of priorities for the Agency and its Management Board. Many policy users and stakeholders perceived that evolving needs were met, in the above-mentioned fields but also e.g. for climate adaptation or the Fitness Check of the Birds and Habitats Directives, whilesome criticisms was raised by Commission serviceson the lack of support to Invasive Alien Species and Drinking Water Directives reporting during the evaluation period. The policy developments are somewhat reflected in changes in resource distribution between the strategic areas of the Multiannual Work Programme 2014-2018.
European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)	Food safety	Independent evaluation. Grey literature	results of a review of data collected, in-depth case studies, stakeholder interviews and an online survey.	Practice 1 Practice 3	Among the areas of progress noted in the report, the evaluators welcomed EFSA's new mechanisms for engagement with stakeholders, initiatives in the field of access to data and a strengthened independence policy. EFSA's cooperation with Member State authorities and other risk assessors at the international level was also welcomed.

[Third external evaluation of EFSA](#) (2018) See also previous evaluations					Recommendations for improvement relate to EFSA's mechanisms for prioritising resources, the economic viability of the system for recruiting experts and tailoring its communication outputs more closely to the needs of different audiences.
European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT) [Evaluation of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology](#) (EIT) (2017)	Innovation	Independent evaluation. Grey literature	The evaluation team analysed EIT performance data and conducted primary research consisting of stakeholder interviews at EIT and Knowledge and Innovation Community (KIC) level, surveys of KIC partners, graduates and business beneficiaries, an open public consultation, and case studies of specific features of the EIT model.	Practice 1 Practice 6 Practice 9	The evaluation concluded that the EIT's model of innovation via knowledge triangle integration (KTI) remains valid, and found that the activities of the KICs are starting to bear fruit, in the form of innovations introduced to the market, innovative businesses created and accelerated, and graduates provided with entrepreneurial skills. The KICs have been effective in establishing and building networks of partners. The EIT adds value beyond national innovation support initiatives, and is coherent with and complements EU, national and regional innovation policy. The KICs have the potential to act as repositories of knowledge and good practice, and have built relationships with regional and national policy-makers. Recommendations: streamline goals of KTI model and develop clear and consistent understanding. Improve transparency of process and visibility among stakeholders. Influence on policy development limited . have built relationships but not yet leveraged them
European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA)	Health	Independent evaluation. Grey literature	MM	Practice 1 Practice 6 (network)	The outcomes of the Agency's activities met the needs of its multiple stakeholders, by providing relevant and timely information. As shown through all means of the consultation activities, the Agency largely addressed the needs of policy-makers, especially at the EU level and to a more limited extent at the national level. There is scope for more engagement with the scientific community as well as

[Evaluation of the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA),](#) (2018)					increasing its visibility with practitioners and the general public. Overall, the interviews showed a need for more forward-looking products identifying future trends and risks to better support EU preparedness and response in the ever- changing drugs landscape as well as communicating more directly with national stakeholders. Network The Reitox network effectively delivered the data and information needed to meet the objectives set out in the Agency's 3-year strategies and work programmes during the evaluation period. The external study also concluded, based on the feedback from different stakeholders, including the EMCDDA staff, that the quality and timeliness of data provision varied between national focal points, although progress has been made since the last evaluation. The reason for these differences is mainly due to the human and financial resources available to the national focal points.
Evidence Information Service at Bath [Supporting evidence-informed policy and scrutiny: A consultation of UK research professionals](#) (2019)	Public Policy	Peer reviewed	Survey on experiences, motivations and challenges of UK-based research professionals engaging with research-users relevant to policy-making and scrutiny in the UK using a nationwide online questionnaire	Practice 5	Our findings reveal, at least for this sub-sample who responded, that there are gender-related differences in policy-related experience, motivations, incentives and challenges for research professionals to contribute to evidence-informed decision-making through initiatives such as the EIS. Male and female participants were equally likely to have policy experience; however, males reported both significantly broader engagement with the research-users included in the survey and significantly higher levels of engagement with each research-user. Reported incentives for engagement included understanding what the evidence will be used for, guidance on style and content of contribution, and acknowledgement of contributions by the policymaker or elected official. Female participants were significantly more likely to select the guidance-related options. The main reported barrier was workload. We discuss how academia-policy engagement initiatives can best

					address these issues in ways that enhance the integration of research evidence with policy and practice across the UK.
EVIPNet / EVIPNet Europe [Evaluation of the performance and achievements of the WHO Evidence-informed Policy Network (EVIPNet) Europe](#) (2020)	Health	Peer reviewed	A mixed methods design was used to assess changes in three domains, including triangulation of quantitative and qualitative methods, based on the EVIPNet Europe Monitoring & Evaluation framework and theory of change. Data were collected between August and October 2018. Data collection comprised documentary review, social media analysis, online country evaluation, key informant interviews and validated tools. Two case studies were also developed.	Practice 4 Practice 9	**Positive** The evaluation showed promising results as well as lessons to guide the future development of EVIPNet in the WHO European Region and other regions of the world. EVIPNet Europe appears to be filling a niche in promoting the capacity of Network member countries for evidence-informed policy-making. There is evidence that EVIPNet Europe's capacity-building programme of work is improving knowledge and skills at the individual level. There has been an increase in activity and outputs since its establishment and evidence has been used to inform new policies in some member countries. **Room for improvement** However, the speed at which member countries are developing or publishing products varies greatly and no formalised knowledge translation platforms have yet been created. Financial and human resources are limited and staff turnover is a cause for concern, both at the WHO Secretariat and country team levels. More work and support are needed if it is to achieve its vision of a Europe in which high-quality, context-sensitive evidence routinely informs health decision-making processes that ultimately serve to strengthen health outcomes across the Region.
Experimental Finland (Kokeileva Suomi) [Various](#), 2015-2019	Public Policy	Various, grey literature.	MM. Experiments and policy pilots, including RCTs, design experiments and co-design. Strategic level – pilot studies selected by the Government, such as pilots for basic income, service initiatives and local government trials Pooled pilots and partnerships level - pilot studies that promote the	Practice 3 (co-design)	Local government trials Designated minister: Anu Vehviläinen, Minister of Local Government and Public Reforms Execution: Completed Objective: To reduce local government duties and obligations. This range of trials and pilots includes trials about an integrated model for wellbeing, about educational

			objectives of the Government programme, executed in the regions, NGOs and business environment Grass-roots level – civil society.		services, about the supervision of local government activities, about housing services, about cooperation between local authorities and the Social Insurance Institution and about the youth guarantee.
French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS)	Research and Innovation	Internal Advisory committee evaluation, grey literature	In French	In French	In French
Global Young Academy	Sciences	Independent evaluation	Survey all GYA members, alumni, members of National Young Academies, and other young scientists inviting them to share their stories of the GYA. The survey was open from 22 Oct – 13 Nov 2018. Of the 683 people reached, 103 completed the survey.	Practice 5 Practice 6 "how the GYA has influenced our members, other scientist/researchers, their institutions, countries, science and the world. These may include (but are not limited to) skills building, personal development, friends, networks	Limited impact of policy engagement activity: GYA contribution to personal development and growth were most frequently mentioned, as well as increased confidence and helping to overcome discrimination. The most important kind of collaboration was with individual scientists / researchers from a range of countries, less so with other individuals or institutions in one's own country.

				and connections, mentorship, primary research collaboration, publications, qualifications, policy papers published, policies enacted or influenced etc."	
International Network for Advancing Science and Policy (INASP) How do our partners feel about working with INASP? (2020) See also various programme evaluations	Development	Internal assessment, Grey literature	Survey of 17 individuals representing 11 organisations	Practice 1 Practice 4	Partners value capacity building activities Dissemination least valued but not covered in survey due to nature of partnerships

| Joint Research Centre (JRC)

[Evaluation of Science meets Parliaments / Science meets Regions](#) (2020)

See multiple including ex-post of JRC | Research and Innovation | Internal evaluation, Grey literature | Qual. qualitative analysis based on a number of sources: the final reports submitted by the organisers as part of the tendering procedure, the questionnaires sent around to organisers a few months after their event had taken place and the reports of JRC staff attending the various events. Moreover, two online workshops were conducted towards the end of the project | Practice 4
Practice 6 (networks, dialogue)
Practice 7 (advocacy, leadership at member state level) | 'Science meets Parliaments / Science meets Regions' aims to promote evidence-informed policymaking across Europe and was centred around the following three actions: organising events; providing data and scientific evidence to support national and regional events; organising training and awareness raising to policymakers.
Sum: evaluation in general showed activities contributed to strengthening existing connections and supporting some short-term ones around the scheduled events.
Relevant outcomes:
1. Stakeholder cooperation: the interaction between all 'quadruple helix' actors (government, academia, businesses and civil society) at local, national and interregional level. The pilot project contributed to enhancing the cooperation among stakeholders at different levels. In the majority of cases, the collaboration started during the preparatory process of the event and sometimes generated new cooperation projects or activities after the conference/innovation camp
2. 'Bringing evidence across': dialogue between scientists and policymakers in order to promote the creation or enhancement of EIPM ecosystems. The evaluation exercise highlighted that in many cases the participation in this initiative has contributed to strengthening existing collaborations between policymakers and scientists.
3. The courses met with an overall extremely positive response. Asked whether the course was relevant for their day to day activities, a clear majority of respondents replied positively. A training component will have to be an important part of any continuation of the pilot. One element of concern in this regard is to tailor the course even better to the needs of individual participants. |

					To improve: The evaluation exercise highlighted the need to enhance this methodology in order to strengthen local science for policy ecosystems. Furthermore, the participants in the pilot project emphasised the need to build awareness, mutual understanding and agreement at regional, interregional and national level on policy-relevant questions and the kind of evidence needed to answer them. They also asked for the JRC's support in developing skills to assess and use evidence as well as engaging with citizens and stakeholders at local and European level. During the evaluation workshop, the idea to create a community of practitioners across Europe to share experiences and knowledge to enhance the local ecosystem for EIPM was proposed. Moreover, it was stressed how important it is to enhance the synergies with other policy initiatives and programmes which adopt the place-based ecosystem approach.
Knowledge Navigator [Making The Most Of Research Final Report of The ESRC Local Government Knowledge Navigator](#) (2015)	Local Government	Internal assessment, grey literature	Qual. Reflections report	Practice 3 (co-design, commissioning) Practice 6 (partnerships) Practice 9 (role)	The Local Government Knowledge Navigator sought to identify and document councils' evidence needs, develop and pilot ways of meeting these needs, and enable local government to exert greater influence over future research agendas. **Key findings:** - There are some impressive examples of collaboration but engagement is inconsistent, and often depends on existing links between individual researchers and local government officers or politicians; and - There is a need for a change of culture in both communities and the development of more systematic approaches to achieving connectivity between them. The barriers to engagement are not insuperable but local government, the research community and research funders need to take action to:

					Challenge existing cultures and mindsets; Stimulate demonstration projects and learn from them; Establish a web-enabled platform to better connect local government and research knowledge; Encourage the co-production of research agendas and projects; and Support strategic and scalable research interventions which are likely to have reach and impact in areas such as public health and social care.
Leading Places [Evaluation of Leading Places Phase 2 Programme](link) (2018) See also evaluation of pilot phase	Public Policy	Independent evaluation, grey literature	Not found	Practice 3 Practice 6	Aims and objectives of Leading Places "To build and transfer best practice in collaborative leadership between local authorities, universities and other local anchor institutions. In many places formal and informal relations already exist between universities and their civic partners. But common institutional barriers and related challenges often make working in partnership harder." **Achievements** • The projects have aligned with and contributed towards implementation of local economic, public health and environmental strategies • Provided concrete examples of place-based collaborations (important in context of future local industrial strategies) • Catalyst for 'inter-disciplinary' and applied forms of research • Provided space for places to identify new types of investment interventions **Challenges** • Some partnerships have been challenged by the timescales, but overall the timings of the programme have been fine • Mixed opportunities for review, but certainly greater recognition of value of reflection vis-à-vis LP1 • Local capacity, especially project management and co-ordination, is dependent upon commitment of certain individuals

| | | | | | • Facilitation could, at times, be more 'challenging' and more direct to local partnerships
• Increase the flexibility over the facilitation resource is used locally
• Pitching activity and events to the appropriate people
Sum: • LP has been a valuable mechanism for local institutions and actors to work across sector and organisational boundaries on particular place-based issues/challenges; Place-based collaboration is not a given. Requires leadership, vision, support and individual and institutional investment |
| **Lenfest Ocean Program**

Science-policy intermediaries from a practitioner's perspective: The Lenfest Ocean Program experience (2016) | Environment | Peer reviewed | Qual case studies | Practice 9 (roles – intermediaries)
Practice 1
Practice 3 | Connecting science and policy may often require a separate kind of expert: full-time intermediaries who facilitate the complicated exchange of information among scientists, policy-makers, and other stakeholders.
Importance of full-spectrum and full-time: an intermediary should be viewed not as a competitor to the scientist with a strong interest in shaping public policy, but as a potential collaborator who can leverage the scientist's expertise to make meaningful contributions to public discourse. We urge, however, that any of these efforts be undertaken with a great deal of pragmatism about the extent to which a full-time researcher can dedicate time and effort as well as develop non-science expertise to navigate the policy process.
These case studies suggest that science-policy intermediaries can help scientists make meaningful contributions to public discourse.
Assessing impact
The progression of case studies also shows the difficulties we faced in measuring success and how we have worked to develop a more systematic approach for doing so. We hope that this detailed description can help to illustrate the depth, complexity, and extent of science-policy intermediary work |

					and provide some insight into how to build upon these efforts.
Living With Environmental Change (LWEC) Evaluation of the Living with Environmental Change (LWEC) Citizens' Advisory Forum (2011)	Environment	Independent evaluation, grey literature	observation and informal interviews with public participants at a Forum meeting, questionnaires at all events, interviews with LWEC staff and others involved in delivering the process, and quantitative and qualitative analysis of all data collected.	Practice 1 dissemination	Evaluation of citizen's advisory forum with Science. Limited evaluation of policy engagement related outcomes. This evaluation is reporting very soon after the conclusion of the Forum activities, so it is too early to identify clear influence on policy at this stage. Although some LWEC partners interviewed had not used the results at the time of interview, others had already either used the results or had clear plans for doing so. • Close links are established between process design and policy targets. The people who will use the results of public dialogue must be involved in the identification and framing of topics for the Forum to discuss, and in the design and drafting of questions for the public, from the start and extensively throughout.
Local Authority Research Council Initiative (LARCI) 'The research councils of the UK and local government: co-producing knowledge to maximize public value'. Clive grace (2006).	Local Government	Internal assessment, grey literature	Reflections reports	Practice 3 Practice 6 Practice 9	The Grace Report (2006) highlighted the cultural and institutional divides between the research and local government communities and argued that there was a need for leadership if this was to be bridged. Following the Grace report (2006)1, the ESRC and other research councils came together with senior academics and representatives of local government to sponsor a much higher level initiative. However, an independent evaluation of this second phase of the LARCI2 concluded that whilst it produced some good work, it had not addressed the fundamental obstacles to engagement between local government and academic research. From Knowledge Navigator report: The general view was that: 3.1 it was instrumental in the delivery of a relatively small number of successful projects; but 3.2 for the resources put in, the successes were considered to be too few. 4. Once LARCI closed in March 2011, the principal

See also other reports, summaried.					funders commissioned a review by Dr Clive Grace of the Centre for Local and Regional Governance Research, Cardiff Business School, to examine its successes and the challenges it faced, from the perspectives of both local government and the research councils. Also research briefing Local Authority Research Council Initiative: a Review of Progress; a New Way Forward (Research briefing) Jan. 2002 by Dilys Huggins (Author). Papers on individual projects and themes e.g. Co-production https://www.govint.org/fileadmin/user_upload/publications/LARCI_CoproductionPapers_2010.pdf. "However, an independent evaluation of this second phase of the LARCI2 concluded that whilst it produced some good work, it had not addressed the fundamental obstacles to engagement between local government and academic research. The launch of the Navigator initiative was, in part, a response to that failure." (Navigator evaluation) See also Mawson, J. (2007) 'Research councils, universities and local government – building bridges ?', Public money and management., 27 (4). pp. 265-273.
N8 Policing Research Partnership (N8 PRP) 1. [The N8 Policing Research Partnership: Examining the first four]	Policing	Independent evaluation, grey literature	1. 20 qualitative interviews with senior police officers, Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) and national policy leads, all of whom were knowledgeable about the N8 PRP and evidence-based policing (EBP) and from a survey of staff in the N8 Policing Research Partnership (PRP) police forces 2. qualitative evaluation of this cohort's experience, with interviews held at the completion of the programme and after one year. Twenty analysts were	1. Practice 6 (partnerships) Practice 7 Practice 9 2. Practice 4 CPD	1. Key points • Interviewees thought that moving to EBP would involve significant cultural change, and that it would be wrong to expect any meaningful short-term changes in police use of research evidence • Establishing the organisational infrastructure for the N8 PRP was seen as a significant achievement • Interviewees thought that there needed to be more organisational support for embedding EBP • Interviewees thought that more needs to be done to ensure that research gets used and its recommendations are properly implemented. • Awareness of the partnership is high amongst senior staff, and lower amongst operational officers

years (2020) 2. A Need for Analysis: Evaluating a Continuing Professional Development Programme for Police Data Analysts (2019)			interviewed. Interviewees came from all 11 partner forces. They worked in a variety of analytical roles. The vast majority were experienced police analysts (4-17 years).		• Those who had used N8 PRP 'products', such as research reports, conferences and courses, valued them • Overall, attitudes towards EBP were very positive amongst senior staff, and positive amongst operational officers 2. In 2018, a team of academics and police practitioners led by Leeds and Lancaster universities developed a 6-month, 8- session Continuing Professional Development programme for police analysts. In the first cohort (in 2018), 34 data analysts from 11 partner force areas in the north of England undertook the course. Key findings: The CPD programme • Nearly all analysts were excited about commencing the CPD programme. Training opportunities are rare. • Interviewees widely praised the teaching team, but struggled to apply learning. • Some found the teaching too difficult; others too easy; others could not relate it to their role. • Analysts struggled with taught software. Installing software on police computers took months. • Learning outcomes did not always fit with analysts' working priorities (e.g. simplicity, visualisation). This made it harder to 'sell' new practices or processes in force. • Police data were rarely used, making it harder for analysts to see direct relevance to their work. • On returning to work, analysts often struggled to find the time to apply new techniques. Impact • Specific examples of applied learning or actual (rather than planned) changes in practice were hard to find. • More often, interviewees described expanded horizons and feeling better informed.

					• Analysts in about half of all force areas had contacted one or two other analysts to share data, collaborate on specific issues, or seek information about software. Few contacts were ongoing. • Engagement with the online forums is minimal. • Very few analysts subsequently engaged with other N8 PRP information or events.
National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence Report of the Triennial Review of the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2015)	Health	External review, Grey literature	NICE Triennial Review Team	Limited Practice 1	Limited focus on policy engagement
NIHR Clinical Research Networks (CRNs) NIHR Clinical Research Network: Impact and Value Assessment (2019)	Health	Independent evaluation, grey literature	economic impact methodology	None	This report considers the impact and value of the CRN – it considers the economic impact of all clinical research activity supported by the CRN, the monetary benefits to the NHS and the value added by the CRN's support services

Open Innovation Team The Open Innovation Team An Independent Evaluation of a Cabinet Office Initiative (2018)	Public Policy	Independent evaluation, grey literature	Co-design evaluation approach captures insights from 14 months of academic research with the OIT, in order to: ▪ Make visible the promising practices developed by the OIT, giving stakeholders a greater understanding of its strategic choices, operating structures, and ways of creating value. ▪ Shape management practice within the OIT through our analysis and recommendations. ▪ Provide an evaluation of the OIT that yields actionable information for all stakeholders. To achieve these three goals this review utilises an Open Valuation Framework (Appendix 1), a tool designed to guide the establishment, management and evaluation of open innovation initiatives.	Practice 3 (brokering) Practice 5 (PhD placements etc) Practice 6 (partnerships and collab)	Key findings The Open Innovation Team's partnership approach is proving successful and should be retained in phase two. The OIT has been very successful in leveraging its position at the academia-government nexus. The suite of OIT offerings for Whitehall has been clarified and made more accessible. Operating flexibly across both academia and government creates an impact tracking challenge. Key recommendations The development and management of team members needs attention. The OIT needs to help its partners do more of the groundwork for collaborations. The value to individual academics of engaging with the OIT needs to be audited. There needs to be a focus on high-value service to customers in Whitehall. Improved management systems for reviewing and valuing projects as they proceed are essential. Reporting approaches for diverse stakeholders need to be reviewed
Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions Annual Report 2020	Environment	Internal report, grey literature	MEL and reflections	Practice 3 Practice 6 Practice 9 (roles and PM)	MEL has identified need to deepen partnerships, formalise and improve collaborative project management processes. With the new PICS Strategic Plan 2017-2022 as our guide, PICS now offers a more in-depth and collaborative approach than ever before. The solution seekers—decision makers within government, industry, and our communities—will not only use and benefit from our research, but help design it in the first place. PICS supports research that will help transform our economy and communities to become net-negative carbon emitters, while being ready for the opportunities and challenges of a changing climate. The PICS advantage – our people, our independence, our research

					Our network of advisors, research teams and partner organizations brings together leading academic researchers and solution seekers from the public, private and non-profit sectors. Our stable, independent funding allows us to respond to urgent needs as well as plan ahead for long-term projects. We are an impartial, trusted source of factual, evidence-based knowledge that decision makers can turn to.
Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST) [The work and impact of POST](#) (2018)	Public Policy	Independent evaluation, grey literature	The findings presented in this report are based on three main strands: • A review of 13 previous studies examining the work of POST. • Data on awareness and use of POST obtained from a survey and interviews with 157 people across parliament, including MPs and Peers,1 their staff, and parliamentary staff in both Houses. • Data on POST's impact since 2015 based on download data information held by POST and citations of POST's work in the media, in academia and in parliamentary debate.	Practice 1	Dissemination Most (107) of the MPs, MPs' staff and parliamentary staff surveyed reported frequently consulting a range of different external sources to identify relevant research. Different groups of users reported differing levels of use of the various POST products. The number of outputs produced by POST (including POSTnotes and POSTbriefs) has increased an apparent six-fold between 2005 and 2017 from 28 to 182 outputs. Of the work done by POST since 2005, 36% was focused on producing POSTnotes and 40% has been for other teams across parliament. The main type of support provided to other teams since 2010 has been advice. Three-quarters of the study participants (118 of 157) were aware of POST. There were differences between groups however, with all 64 parliamentary staff surveyed aware of POST, falling to 16 of the 20 MPs' staff, 12 (of 16) Peers and 26 (of 36) MPs. Although, overall, there was a high level of awareness about POST, this study revealed that some people were unsure of what POST does and are unclear about its role, 11 of the 157 participants (around 7%) were not aware that POST's remit included social science. This study is unique among existing studies in developing proxy indicators to assess the impact of POST, using download data and citations in the media, academic material and parliamentary debate.

Police Knowledge Fund (PKF) Police Knowledge Fund Review (2018)	Policing	Internal review, grey literature	data collected and compiled through a range of methods including semi-structured interviews, an online survey and synthesis of the 14 projects' final reports	Practice 1 and 3 (KE) Practice 4 Practice 6 three key objectives, to: Build sustained capability among officers and staff to understand, critique and use research Embed or accelerate understanding of crime and policing issues and evidence-based problem-solving approaches Demonstrate innovation in building the research evidence base and applying it through	Examples of demonstrable impact on adopting an evidence-based approach to policing can be seen at a local, regional and national level. While it is too early to fully understand the impact of the individual collaborations and of the programme as a whole, the breadth and scale of the activity and outputs delivered across the programme is promising. **Practice 4** Built capability to use and understand research Across all PKF collaborations officers and staff have been engaged in a broad range of continuing professional development and learning activities around using and understanding research evidence. These activities have contributed to a shift in mind- sets towards evidence-based policing (EBP) across ranks and roles and increased capability of officers and staff to apply evidence-based approaches which can help them respond to new challenges in a more informed and cost-effective way. Accelerated understanding of crime and policing issues Across the programme, police and academics worked together to co-create, deliver and use quality research evidence to improve decision making and practice **Practice 1 and 3** Shared and translated knowledge PKF collaborations used a broad range of approaches to support the reciprocal sharing of knowledge, experience and expertise which have contributed to translating learning and applying it to police practice. **Practice 6** One of the key aims of the PKF was to facilitate and support the development of sustainable collaborative partnerships between police and academia. The review identifies and describes the following seven building blocks as underpinning a successful police-academic partnership: Common vision, objectives and goals

				knowledge exchange and translation across all levels of policing.	Effective management of the supporting infrastructure Compatible partners at an organisational and individual level Strong leadership by both police and academic partners Frequent and effective communication between participating partners Flexibility and tolerance to change, in terms of expectations and allocating resources Respect for cultural differences
Policy Research Unit - Older People and Frailty Audit of EDI	Health and Social Care	Internal audit, grey literature	Not found	None	In November 2020 we undertook an audit on all our current projects, assessing our current outputs against our overarching principles of equality, diversity and inclusion. We did this to give us insight into research areas where greater focus and attention was required as we co-develop and co-create the Unit's programme of work for the coming 2-3 years. We have also awarded a PhD studentship specifically looking at how to underpin considerations of equality and inequality in evidence synthesis addressing health and social care policy questions to find out more here is a video discussing the PhD.
Policy Research Unit in Policy Innovation and Evaluation Progress report, January 2011-August 2014	Health and Social Care	Internal review, grey literature	Not found	Practice 6 Practice 9	Unlike a number of the other DH PRUs that were re-tendered in 2009/10 and re-established in a different form starting in January 2011, PIRU had no precedent and no established ways of working with the Department. In particular, it has a much broader scope than the other Policy Research Units. As a result, the whole Department represented potential 'customers'. The Unit was hampered in identifying a standing 'customer group' among DH staff because the Department was going through a major restructuring and downsizing. The amount of planned work carried out by the Unit has been somewhat lower than envisaged in the first work programme, while the level of responsive work has been higher, though the mix is still consistent with the mission and objectives of the Unit described above. In large part, this is

					due to the fact that the Unit does not have a defined topic focus) and because the Unit has been much in demand.
					However, the larger than expected proportion of work originating in responsive requests from DH has not led to a work programme dominated by small scale or short term projects. In fact, many of the projects that originated from requests for responsive work have turned into substantial and important projects (e.g. the evaluation of the Responsibility Deal (RD) began as a relatively brief, small-scale project to scope a potential substantive evaluation, following which the Department decided that the Unit should continue to undertake the full evaluation after preparing a detailed proposal for external peer review). A On the other hand, the Unit has by no means shied away from short-term responsive work as Annexe 1 shows. Staff have been willing to advise on research priorities, advise on the design of evaluations and performance indicators, provide literature reviews and give presentations at very short notice.
Research and Practice Collaboratory Research + Practice Collaboratory Final Summative Evaluation Report (2019)	Education	Independent evaluation, grey literature	interviewed project leadership and professional association contacts, conducted observations at events, and reviewed documents to develop descriptions of strategies, activities, and routines. To examine the Collaboratory's outcomes, we used digital metrics (e.g., Google Analytics) to gauge the project's reach and the uptake of its products, and then benchmarked the results of this analysis against the same metrics from several other similar entities. We also used interviews and surveys	Practice 6 partnerships	SRI's evaluation questions were: 1. Regarding strategy: How do the design and function of the Collaboratory (including its focal themes and activities) collectively result in an innovative mechanism for productive engagements between research and practice? Strong alignment of values and approaches among Collaboratory leadership, and shared priorities in STEM improvement work, reinforced and supported its joint work. Specifically, SRI found that leaders shared the view that RPPs are design-research endeavors (see Fishman, Penuel, Allen, and Cheng, 2013) that foreground and promote equity, and can lead to sustainable education improvement and transformation.

			to gather the perspectives of people who partnered with the Collaboratory		The composition of Collaboratory leadership supported broad uptake of the project's work. The PI and three co-PIs are nationally known leaders in education improvement; The Collaboratory used its design-research approach in three layers of testing and improvement across its work, not only regarding (1) the focal STEM improvement topics and (2) supports for RPP work, but also (3) communications strategies for targeting and reaching broad audiences. At several points in the project, such flexibility ultimately supported far greater success 2. Regarding outcomes: To what degree have Collaboratory processes and products been taken up and, (a) affected professional development efforts, models, practices among researchers and practitioners; and, (b) facilitated cultural exchange and transformation within the Collaboratory's sphere of influence? The Collaboratory successfully demonstrated that research-practice partnerships can be a productive approach to sustainable education improvement. Education leaders in Collaboratory RPPs report that the work transformed how they approach improvement. They report being empowered to take on new leadership roles, including in professional associations, and to co- present at research conferences. Some report plans to use Collaboratory tools and approaches in other projects. Nearly all participants in Collaboratory workshops on RPPs reported gaining a better understanding of RPPs and how they function. Participants in an RPP workshop for early- career researchers were still engaged in RPP work two years later and optimistic regarding future involvement in RPPs. The Collaboratory was successful in foregrounding and advancing equity, both in its approach to and support of RPPs and in its STEM education improvement work. The Collaboratory is widely viewed as providing much-needed

					tools, resources, and approaches available from no other source.
Research to Policy Collaborative [Translating Prevention Research for Evidence-Based Policymaking: Results from the Research-to-Policy Collaboration Pilot](link) (2017)	Children and Young People	Peer reviewed	MM feasibility pilot. Included a cost analysis of implementation, an impact analysis of the three primary model goals (prevention scientists' legislative engagement, fostering legislative-researcher connections, and eliciting re- quests for evidence), and a cost-effectiveness analysis of the resources needed to produce incremental levels of impact. This pilot employed a mixed-method approach. Multiple sources of information were mined for data.	Practice 6 (network) Practice 3 (rapid response service and brokering)	This work reports on the feasibility of a model for overcoming these barriers—known as the Research-to-Policy Collaboration (RPC). The RPC employs strategic legislative needs assessments and a rapid response researcher network to accelerate the translation of research findings into usable knowledge for policymakers. Evaluation findings revealed that this model can successfully mobilize prevention scientists, engage legislative offices, connect policymakers and experts in prevention, and elicit congressional requests for evidence on effective prevention strategies. On average, the RPC model costs $3510 to implement per legislative office. The RPC can elicit requests for evidence at an average cost of $444 per request. The implications of this work, opportunities for optimizing project elements, and plans for future work are discussed. Ultimately, this project signals that the use of scientific knowledge of prevention in policymaking can be greatly augmented through strategic investment in translational efforts.. and Have started developing an evaluation framework https://www.research2policy.org/evaluation-efforts
SCIE	Social Care	Independent evaluation, grey literature	Webpage not working	Webpage not working	Webpage not working
Sciencewise [Evaluation of the Sciencewise Programme 2012-2015](link) (2015)	Public Engage ment	Independent evaluation, grey literature	Based on ToC. documentation review was conducted in order to gather evidence of progress under each of the indicators and included individual dialogue reports and evaluations, dialogue project case studies, previous programme level evaluation reports	Practice 1 and 3?? But focused on public dialogue	1. Sciencewise is unique as a co-design model of undertaking policy engagement and embedding it into policy making 2. The programme has delivered both hard and soft impacts on actual policy formation. Providing evidence of the impacts that the programme has achieved remains difficult. However, some clear evidence and good examples of reporting practice have been identified, for example those

| | | | from 2010 and 2013 and internal programme reports. The evaluation team approached sixty-three and subsequently interviewed forty-nine individuals during the course of the evaluation. | | resulting from the dialogues on mitochondrial replacement and managing radioactive waste safely
3. Sciencewise's funding, expertise and support throughout the entire dialogue process are strong incentives for government departments when deciding whether or not to approach the programme. Sciencewise project co-funding remains a significant enabler for many departments, in particular due to low level of funding for departmental R&D budgets
4. Sciencewise as a programme is exceptionally ambitious (both in the national and international contexts) and is making good, albeit uneven, progress in relation to its objective of embedding dialogue into the business of policymaking. Barriers exist to both structural and cultural change within government departments, but steps have been taken by Sciencewise to help overcome these and there is some evidence of a growing recognition of the value of public dialogue.

Evaluation focus:
1. Effective Advocacy – to create greater acceptability for the place and value of public dialogue (both by decision makers and by public participants),
2. Structural and cultural change – to create the structures and systems needed to support the use of public dialogue (by developing official guidance, incentives, rewards and skills), and
3. Creating evidence – to demonstrate the effectiveness of dialogue processes (by delivering and evaluating projects to provide evidence and learning for policy and decision making). |
| **Scottish Institute for Policing** | Policing | Independent evaluation, grey literature | Unclear. undertaken by the Scottish Funding Council's (SFC) Evaluation Team in 2016 | Practice 1
Practice 6 | This Review has established that SIPR has met and exceeded its original ambitions, creating significant value for its stakeholders. It has been an exemplary investment in the |

Research (SIPR) [Impact Review: The Scottish Institute for Policing Research](#) (2017)					extent of its success to date and it has significant potential to further enhance its impact. Agreed outcome 1: High quality, independent and relevant research on policing: Policing research in 2006 was dominated by small scale, practice-focussed projects. Measured against this baseline, SIPR has delivered significant outcomes in terms of enhancing the quality, breadth and relevance of policing research in Scotland. **Dissemination** Agreed outcome 2: Effective knowledge exchange between researchers and practitioners, including an improved evidence base for policing policy and practice: All respondents were unequivocally of the view that SIPR had not only achieved this outcome but had far exceeded what had been originally expected in terms of an ongoing, collaborative relationship on research between universities and the Police in Scotland. **Partnerships** Agreed outcome 3: Enhanced research capacity in Scotland's universities and the police service: Overall, there is evidence to show that this outcome has been met successfully with much strengthened research capacity in both academia and the police, and a large, committed cohort of early career researchers / postgraduate students. Stakeholders attribute SIPR's success to four main factors: • An effective governance and management infrastructure. • Development of strong collaborative communities of research interests around research and knowledge exchange networks. • Excellent communication and networking activities • High-quality leadership of the Institute by its Director and Co-ordinator since the outset.
Scottish Intercollegiat	Health	Internal assessment,	Stakeholder survey . As part of this project we engaged with over 620 SIGN stakeholders via focus groups,	Practice 1	We asked stakeholders about how they currently use SIGN guidelines, what they like and what they would like to change about them. The usage and awareness of SIGN

e Guidelines Network You said...we will do: SIGN stakeholder feedback report (2018)		grey literature	an online survey and semi structured interviews.		products is variable with the most well-known products, the full guideline and quick reference guide (QRG), also being the most used. The usage and awareness of the App and patient booklet were lower than expected. The majority of our stakeholders had applied a guideline in their practice. They cited the guideline being easy to find and read as enablers to this and lack of time and access to the recommended services as the barriers to this. Just over half of the survey respondents and all the strategic users suggested changes to the current way of developing and presenting SIGN guidelines. Keeping the guidelines up to date was the main issue survey respondents wanted changed.
Select Committees (UK) The effectiveness and influence of the select committee system (2019)	Public Policy	Liaison Committee report	Liaison Committee report including submissions of evidence	Practice 2	**Research evidence** We believe there is great merit in effective use of research information with best practice available. The Government often assembles research evidence in its policy making process which would be of great value to committees' work. However, this research is not always publicly available and can be hard to find. Select committees could ask departments to provide their evidence base before an inquiry began. Efforts to make best use of the research capacity and knowledge of academic institutions and other research-based organisations must continue. We need to build more systematic and better understood structures within which co-operation between select committees and the wider research community can be more effectively enabled and enhanced. We recommend that work with UKRI and other relevant bodies in building connections with the research community through outreach and the use of fellowships, secondments and short-term attachments be taken forward by POST and the Committee Office.

						The Association of Charitable Foundations has offered to facilitate better engagement with the charitable research foundations. We recommend that the Committee Office, working together with POST, should take up this offer.
						The most effective way for Committees to access research is to find ways to work in partnership with, and gain access to, not only the outputs of our publicly-funded research sector but also to its inputs, helping to influence (but not seeking to control) the priorities of the research funders and the criteria used in awarding grants. The publicly funded research sector should also continue to recognise the value in contributing to public debate and parliamentary scrutiny, and to reward academic institutions which contribute to this goal.
						We would encourage the research funders to look at ways of building collaborative and co-operative, thematically coherent research transmission hubs where meta-analyses and syntheses are prepared proactively and are readily accessible. These might form a basis, over the longer term, for some kind of "Office of Public Evidence" that would bring together some of the synthesis of research evidence, fact checking, and academic liaison functions for select committees.
						Other findings:
						Evidence, engagement and research
						Where possible, committees should seek to build in opportunities for stakeholders to engage in their work, such as consulting on inquiry topics. Timescales should be set to enable those with limited resources to respond. This includes allowing sufficient time for them to prepare written submissions or to prepare for an oral evidence session.
						Submitted evidence
						The current requirements for the format of written evidence to select committees are outdated. Committees should be able to accept evidence in a much wider range of formats, including, for example, video and audio clips and images

					Witnesses and oral evidence We also recommend a greater formalisation of the process by which witnesses are encouraged to declare all relevant financial interests when giving written or oral evidence. We have already set a target that, by the end of this Parliament, at least 40% of our discretionary witnesses should be female and that a panel of three or more discretionary witnesses should normally include at least one woman. We recommend that steps should be taken by the Committee Office to gather wider data on witness diversity and witnesses' feedback on oral evidence sessions, possibly by way of a questionnaire sent to witnesses after a session.
Social Work Teaching Partnership (SWTP) Social work teaching partnerships evaluation (2019)	Social Work	Independent evaluation, grey literature Also Peer reviewed discussion paper	The evaluation explored three main areas: key activity delivered by TPs; approaches to delivery; outcomes and impact. In addition, the evaluation captured learning about the experience of TPs and explored sustainability. The evaluation is predominantly a process evaluation and is largely based on qualitative methods.	Practice 4 Practice 5 Practice 6 Practice 9	Overall, partnerships report that the programme has formalised collaborative working and has been a catalyst for cultural change in the way partners work together as well as achieving faster and more effective operational progress. **Practice 6 and 9** The teaching partnerships programme has stimulated increased levels of collaboration to the way social work education is designed, planned and delivered across the six workstream areas. Partnerships most regularly cite collaborative culture as the most important benefit of the TP programme. Relationships are expected to continue beyond the funded period in the vast majority of TPs, albeit most likely on a more focused set of activity, some of which is already supported by embedded systems and processes. Project management and support roles (funded through the TP grant) have been critical in facilitating the effectiveness of governance systems. Plans for resourcing project managers are currently being explored by partnerships to retain momentum. Partnerships are looking at ways to fund key posts, reduce costs and generate income to support longer-term sustainability. **Practice 4 and 5**

					Practice placements Improved organisation, consistency and quality assurance of placements is commonly reported across all phases of partnerships, achieved through better planning, guidance and new processes. Curriculum Increases in the proportion of the curriculum delivered by practitioners7 are reported at both undergraduate and post graduate levels in phase one and two partnerships. Academic and practitioner collaboration Most partnerships have attempted activity that supports academics to spend time in frontline teams, refreshing their experience and observing contemporary practice. Feedback from participating academics acknowledges the value of immersion in everyday practice in terms of credibility, refreshing knowledge and learning about local tools and practices, but overall this area is less well advanced. A greater level of activity has been focused on developing joint learning between practitioners and academics. Workforce planning and continuing professional development Progress towards workforce analysis and strategic planning has taken place in all10 phase one and two partnerships, and in at least five partnerships in phase three (indicating faster progress than previous phases). Delivery has been affected by challenges including data availability, data protection, capacity and the complexity of the task. All partners report an increased continuing professional development (CPD) offer to practitioners.
The Center for Rapid Evidence Synthesis (ACRES) at	Public Policy	Peer reviewed.	We used existing research regarding evidence formats for policymakers to inform the initial version of rapid response brief format. We conducted user testing with healthcare policymakers at various levels of	Independent evaluation of KT strategy Practice 1 and 3	The participants generally found the format of the rapid response briefs usable, credible, desirable and of value. Participants expressed frustrations regarding several aspects of the document, including the absence of recommendations, lack of clarity about the type of document and its potential uses (especially for first time

Makerere University [Policymaker experiences with rapid response briefs to address health-system and technology questions in Uganda](#) (2017)			decision making in Uganda, employing a concurrent think-aloud method. We modified the rapid response briefs format based on the results of the user testing and sought feedback on the new format.		users), and a crowded front page. Participants offered conflicting feedback on preferred length of the briefs and use and placement of partner logos. Users had divided preferences for the older and newer formats. Conclusion Although the rapid response briefs were generally found to be of value, there are major and minor frustrations impeding an optimal user experience. Areas requiring further research include how to address policymakers' expectations of recommendations in these briefs and their optimal length.
UK Public Health Rapid Support Team (UK-PHRST) [Mid-point evaluation of the UK Public Health Rapid Support Team](#) (UK-PHRST) (2017)	Health	external performance evaluation and independent monitoring (PE&IM), grey literature	This report is based on the data collection and analysis work carried out between June and December 2019, including one country visit to Sierra Leone, and over 100 key informant interviews conducted with UK-PHRST and its stakeholders including consortium partners	Practice 3 Practice 4	EVALUATION QUESTION 1 How appropriate is UK-PHRST's integrated model and consortium approach in contributing to improved outbreak response? The novel approach of combining outbreak response deployments with research and capacity building is ahead of the curve and considered valuable, but its appropriateness cannot yet be fully assessed as strategies are still evolving and implementation limited. EVALUATION QUESTION 2 To what extent are UK-PHRST activities relevant, strategic and appropriate in relation to UK-PHRST programme goals? There is still a lack of clarity and cohesion around areas of UK- PHRST's approach EVALUATION QUESTION 3 How successfully has UK-PHRST been operationalised? The consortium model has conferred many benefits for UK-PHRST and is an important driver of success. Collaboration between the academic partners has been generally positive and occurs across the triple mandate, although to differing degrees. UK-PHRST is a highly professional, expert team,

					who are building a strong reputation for high-quality work in outbreak response.The consortium has not yet fully manifested a unified UK-PHRST identity, which impacts on both EVALUATION QUESTION 5 To what extent has UK-PHRST supported coherent and collaborative national and international health activities on response? UK-PHRST operates within a complex international GHS landscape and is only one of numerous actors supporting LMICs in epidemic preparedness and response. UK-PHRST has built on existing collaborative partnerships and forged new ones with LMIC, regional and global actors and is seen as a reputable, highly skilled and valuable partner. However, there is still need for increased awareness and visibility of UK- PHRST and continued focus on relationship building with key stakeholders at all levels. EVALUATION QUESTION 6 What contribution are UK-PHRST's deployment, research and capacity building outputs making to achieve programme outcomes? As discussed in our Inception Report, we have not carried out contribution analysis at mid-point. Moreover, the current UK-PHRST Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) framework is not adequately capturing changes at the outcome or impact level.
United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) Cluster Evaluation Of Unitar's	Public Policy	Internal evaluation MEL, grey literature	Using a mixed methods approach, the evaluation included an online survey to beneficiaries and key informant interviews and focus groups with UNITAR staff, partners and beneficiaries, along with a theory of change (ToC) reconstruction.	Practice 4	The evaluation identified the importance of assessing needs and ensuring medium to long-term institutional engagement, as well as partner ownership, buy-in and clarity of roles as important lessons.

Training Of Trainers Programming (2017) See other reports					
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation Evaluation of The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation's Organizational Effectiveness Program (2015)	Multiple policy areas	Independent evaluation, grey literature	Retrospective evaluation 1) a comprehensive analysis of 214 OE grants, (2) a survey of Hewlett Foundation program staff and a survey of OE grantees (3) program staff and grantee focus groups,;(4) interviews with recognized OE experts and former OE program staff; (5) review of other foundations' practice	Practice 7 advocacy	What is the OE program's impact on grantees' ability to achieve their goals and/or Hewlett's shared goals? What are insights on whether the OE theory of change has worked as envisioned?
William T Grant Foundation Henrick, E.C., Cobb, P., Penuel, W.R., Jackson, K., & Clark, T. (2017). Assessing Research-Practice Partnerships:	Children and Young People	Grey literature Also some peer reviewed	Review and synthesis of existing literature	Practice 6 (partnerships) Practice 9 (infrastructure)	The resulting framework is normative from the perspective of insiders—it reflects the desired goals of those currently engaged in RPP work, rather than descriptions of what RPPs have accomplished to this point. A recent study (Farrell et al., 2017) provides confirming evidence that goals from all five dimensions are pursued by partnerships of all types. The dimensions are, moreover, goals to which participants believe they should be held to account by stakeholders, including funding agencies. Dimensions of effectiveness: Dimension 1: Building trust and cultivating partnership relationships, Dimension 2: Conducting rigorous research to inform action

[Five Dimensions of Effectiveness.](#) New York, NY: William T. Grant Foundation. See also other reports on RPPs					Dimension 3: Supporting the partner practice organization in achieving its goals Dimension 4: Producing knowledge that can inform educational improvement efforts more broadly Dimension 5: Building the capacity of participating researchers, practitioners, practice organizations, and research organizations to engage in partnership work **See also** Farrell, C. C., Davidson, K. L., Repko-Erwin, M., Penuel, W. R., Herlihy, C., Potvin, A. S., & Hill, H. C. (2017). A descriptive study of the IES Researcher-Practitioner Partnerships in education research program: Interim Report. Boulder, CO: National Center for Research in Policy and Practice. Coburn, C.E., Penuel, W.R., & Geil, K.E. (2013). Research-Practice Partnerships: A Strategy for Leveraging Research for Educational Improvement in School Districts. William T. Grant Foundation, New York, NY. Farrell, Coburn & Chong (2018) Under What Conditions Do School Districts Learn From External Partners? The Role of Absorptive Capacity, American Educational Research Journal, 56 issue: 3, page(s): 955-994