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Scientific Peer Review

- Originally developed to decide about the suitability of articles proposed for publication in academic journals (17th century) - still probably the dominant mode essentially a judgement about scientific quality
- Much later (20th century), peer review was extended to play a ‘gate keeping’ role in the access to research resources via Research Councils
- In the late 20th century, the concept is extended further (‘extended peer review’) to tackle non-quality questions such as relevance (ex ante) and impact (ex post)
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Outside science

- Increasingly seeing forms of peer review outside the scientific arena
- Taking tools into new environments mean you need to adapt them:
  - who are the experts?
  - who chooses them?
  - what is the nature of their expertise?
  - how does their expertise differ from opinion?
  - what are the criteria used for assessment?
Examples

• **Policy Mix Peer Review**
  – Assessments of whole research and innovation systems
  – Focus is on analysis and assessment but also on learning from each other

• **Peer Learning Activity in the area of higher education**
  – Aim is not so much analysis and assessment but learning and new points illumination

• **BEST process evaluation of SME programmes**
  – Aim to assess national evaluations of SME support programmes
Peer learning in Higher Education Policy

- Education and Training 2010
- Bologna Process

- Curriculum Reform
- Governance Reform
- Funding Reform
Peer learning in Higher Education Policy

- **Who are the experts?**
  - Senior staff from education ministries plus topic experts
- **Who chooses them?**
  - National ministries
- **What is the nature of their expertise?**
  - Varied, but typically hold senior positions in ministries/universities
- **How does their expertise differ from opinion?**
  - Rooted in experience
- **What are the criteria used for assessment?**
  - Rooted in experience
  - “Best practice”
  - “transferability”
BEST assessment of SME support programmes

• “Small businesses are the lifeblood of the innovation system”
• Review of evaluation processes in a range of countries
• Outputs designed to be identification and sharing of good practice
BEST assessment of SME support programmes

- **Who are the experts?**
  - People nominated by Member States - ranged from civil servants to external experts (unpaid)
- **Who chooses them?**
  - National ministries
- **What is the nature of their expertise?**
  - Varied but mainly not evaluation
- **How does their expertise differ from opinion?**
  - ?
- **What are the criteria used for assessment?**
  - Evaluative criteria devised in the course of the work by secretariat
Key differences from “classic” peer review

- Assessment is not primary purpose
- Peers not disinterested
- Policy objectives of participants may be different from overall policy objectives
Issues

- How do you select peers for complex programme assessment?
- What is the place of expert opinion in the broader stakeholder analysis
- Tensions between expert opinion and policy objectives
- Tensions between independence and engagement
- Level of buy-in of “peers”
- What happens to the learning?
Conclusions

- Peer review can be a useful tool in a formative evaluation when it is used as a policy learning tool.
- Useful tool in assessing intangible or process issues.
- It is less useful - if not dangerous - in a summative evaluation when it used as an assessment tool without making the assessment criteria transparent.
- Select your experts very carefully.