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Context and objective of the project

Context

- National public research policies vary significantly across countries
- Spending is only one (quantitative) dimension
- Qualitative aspects of public research policies are not systematically captured

Project objective

Develop indicators that allow for systematic comparison of qualitative aspects of public research policies
Analytical framework: Focus on two aspects of public research policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Level of research policy decision-making: national, regional, transnational, institutional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination of research policy-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders participation in research policy-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy of high education institutions (HEIs) and public research institutes (PRIs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulations &amp; legal instruments</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research contracting &amp; consulting with industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IP ownership &amp; licensing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HEI /PRI spin-offs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility of researchers between university and industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance of public research policy

Regulatory & legal measures to enhance the contributions of HEIs and PRIs to innovation
Timeline (2015)

**TIP Meeting December 2014:**
Workshop and presentation of the extended terms of reference of the KT project and its modules [DSTI/STP/TIP(2015)17]

Development of methodology and questionnaire to obtain policy indicators

**December 2014**

**27-28 April 2015:** FCT-OECD Workshop on assessing the impacts of public research

- Discussion on best ways to expand knowledge on the impacts of public research and the need for further evidence,
- Discussion on possibilities and best approaches to develop indicators of public research policy

**TIP Meeting June 2015:**
Presentation of updated objectives for the KT project and the impacts module [DSTI/TIP(2015)/3] and [DSTI/TIP(2015)7]

**December 2015**
TIP Meeting December 2015:
Presentation of the framework and questionnaire for obtaining indicators of public research policy (DSTI/STP/TIP(2015)17)

September 2016: Collection of country information for most OECD countries for an improved set of indicators

Collection of country information

May 2016: Workshop on assessing the impacts of public research systems
- Presentation of first country results for a selection of indicators
- Discussion on selected indicators and possible additional dimensions to cover

TIP Meeting June 2016: Presentation of first analysis of the indicators for a selection of countries

TIP Meeting December 2016: Presentation of first analysis of the indicators for all countries

Today

December 2015

December 2016
Collecting of information on national public research policies for 15 countries ("OECD-15"): Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States

Country profiles present initial findings of the exercise
Indicators offer a **neutral description** of different policy approaches to public research: they do not allow for any judgement.

Findings presented are **provisional** and subject to finalisation of chosen indicators and country validation.

Most figures illustrate initial **results for OECD-15 countries**.
Challenges faced during the process of country data collection

**Challenges**

Avoid any room for **subjectivity** in responses

Some initial indicators were **too broad** and did not allow for fully capturing cross-country differences

There is **no national level decision** and HEIs/PRIs choose for themselves

**Information** on some dimensions was **not clear in available sources**

**Responses**

More **specific criteria** were defined to answer questions

**Redefine questions to capture key differences** leaving out broader indicators

Adjust indicators focusing on those **mainly in the domain of national policy**

Process of **validation by countries** becomes critical
The revised questionnaire is still preliminary.

What additional dimensions should be included in the questionnaire?
Example 1: What policy aspects are defined by the strategic frameworks?

(Percentage share of OECD-15 countries that have a strategic framework covering the policy aspects described below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plans regarding development specific research, technologies and economic fields**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget allocation decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quantitative targets and evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This figure corresponds to question 2.8.

**Interpretation of the figure:** The left bar says that in 80% of OECD-15 countries, strategic frameworks set plans regarding the development of specific scientific research, technologies and research fields.
Example 2: At which level are HEI policy decisions mainly taken across OECD-15 countries?

Level at which the policy decision is taken

Decentralisation

Ministerial level  
Agency level  
HEI level

Teaching curricula
- Ministerial level: FR, PT, C, J
- Agency level: POL
- HEI level: SWE, CHE, DNK, FIN, AUT, GBR, IRL, NLD

Human resources
- Ministerial level: FR, PT, DNK, POL
- Agency level: NLD, AUT
- HEI level: SWE, CHE, DNK, FIN, GBR, IRL, CZE, JPN, USA

Commercialisation/industry relations
- Ministerial level: FR, CHE, SWE, JPN, CZE, IRL
- Agency level: POL
- HEI level: DNK, USA, FIN, AUT, EST

Research equipment/infrastructures
- Ministerial level: DNK, JPN, CZE, FRA
- Agency level: POL
- HEI level: IRL, AUT, CHE

Note: Figure corresponds to question 1.1.A. Each country appears only once for each policy decision type. Interpretation of the figure: The top horizontal line on teaching curricula reads as follows: in 4 out of OECD-15 countries, decisions relating to teaching curricula in HEIs are taken by a central national body, often ministries, while in 1 (Poland) these decisions are mainly taken at national decentralised level (i.e. agency level) and in 10 at institutional level.
Example 3: Allocation of revenues from research contracting and consulting at HEIs: Is the decision taken at the national or at the HEI level?

(Percentage share of 14 OECD countries)

National 43%

HEI 57%

Note: This figure corresponds to question 5.1.A. Information on Estonia is not yet available.

Interpretation of the figure: Six of the 14 OECD countries included in the figure (i.e. 43% of them) have national provisions establishing the allocation of earnings from research contracting and consulting services at HEIs, while in the other 8 the allocation of revenues is decided at HEI level.
Next steps

TIP Meeting December 2015: Presentation of the framework and questionnaire for obtaining indicators of public research policy (DSTI/STP/TIP(2015)17)

Collection of country information

September 2016: Complete collection of country information for most OECD countries

May 2016: Workshop on assessing the impacts of public research systems
- Presentation of first country results for a selection of indicators
- Discussion on selected indicators and possible additional dimensions to cover

TIP Meeting June 2016: Presentation of initial set of the indicators for a selection of countries

TIP Meeting December 2016: Presentation of chosen indicators for all countries

Today

December 2015

December 2016
Immediate next steps

• Incorporate adjustments to the set of indicators following today’s discussions to define a final questionnaire

• Revision of information collected for countries included to date and expansion of countries covered

• Consultation with first set of countries to validate information
Topics for discussion

1. Feedback on research policy indicators design and analysis developed to date: relevance for national policy
2. What other key dimensions should be explored to map national public research policies?
3. Country information validation process: what would be most useful approaches?