



D5.2: Methodologies and tools for Internal Formative Evaluation

Set of turn-key evaluation designs including questionnaires and templates to perform formative evaluation processes throughout the project.

Smallman, M; Handler, K; Schrammel, M; Hofer, M; Miller, S.; Voigt, C.

UCL

ZSI



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 612393

www.rri-tools.eu

Document description

Document Name	Methodologies and tools for Internal Formative Evaluation
Document ID	D5.2
Revision	V1
Revision Date	22 July 2015
Author(s)	Smallman, M; Handler, K; Schrammel,M; Hofer, M; Miller, S;Voigt, C,

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Introduction	4
2.1. The purpose of formative evaluation	4
2.2. Objectives of the RRI Tools project	5
2.3. Expected impact of the RRI Toolkit project	5
3. Evaluation concept	5
4. Evaluation criteria and instruments	7
5. Instruments	12
5.1. Overview and description of evaluation instruments	12
5.1.1. Quantitative instruments.....	12
5.1.2. Qualitative instruments	14
6. Feedback of results	15
7. Ethical issues	15
Annex 1: Template of Feedback Questionnaire for project meetings16
Annex 2: Feedback questionnaire for stakeholder consultation workshop.....	17
Annex 3: Guideline for Feedback workshop for trainers.....	19
Annex 4 Feedback questionnaire for training participants	22
Annex 5 Regular online survey for WP leaders.....	26
Annex 6 Participants Agreement	33
References	35

D5.2: Set of turn-key evaluation designs including questionnaires and templates to perform formative evaluation processes throughout the project

1. Executive Summary

*This document provides the explanation, guidance and materials needed **for formative evaluation**. It aims to provide project members with the material they need to gain feedback and to evaluate their workpackages, at the earliest stages – while the project activities are developing and at a point when they can be changed – and to feedback to the project team.*

NB – this is not the evaluation plan for the whole RRI Tools project

2. Introduction

This document, D5.2, sets out the RRI toolkit's formative evaluation plan and instruments.

This is an internal, inward looking evaluation which has been designed to provide quick feedback on the **quality, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact-orientation** of each major task carried out in the different workpackages in order to improve downstream or repeating processes.

This document sits beside the overall RRI toolkit evaluation (D. 5.3) and feedback produced from the formative evaluation will be centrally analysed and the findings communicated to partners, by ZSI as part of WP5.

2.1. The purpose of formative evaluation

Formative evaluation takes place before or during a project, with the aim of improving a project's design and focus:

- Is the project meeting its objectives and goals and if not, what changes do we need to make?
- What is working well and what is not? What obstacles and opportunities are arising?

As such, we propose that the formative evaluation should focus on the goals and objectives of the project overall:

2.2. Objectives of the RRI Tools project

1. **To raise awareness on Responsible Research and Innovation among all societal actors (e.g. civil society, researchers, policy makers, business...)**
2. **Producing a responsible Research and Innovation Training and Dissemination Toolkit** that addresses the various components of Responsible Research and innovation:
 - a. Governance of Research and Innovation;
 - b. Engaging society;
 - c. Gender;
 - d. Access to scientific information;
 - e. Science education (formal/informal);
 - f. Ethics
3. **Ensuring the toolkit is coproduced with and used** by the societal actors in the maximum EU 27 Members States as well as Associated Countries
4. **Building a community of practice** that will assure the use, evolution and enrichment of the toolkit.

2.3. Expected impact of the RRI Toolkit project

The Toolkit will raise awareness of Responsible Research and Innovation among all societal actors with a specific focus on national and regional policy makers across the European Research Area (including Member States, Associated Countries and regions less advanced in the Research and Innovation governance fields) in order to make change the research and innovation process. It will also enhance the creativity throughout Europe through the use of good governance practices in Responsible Research and Innovation fields to respond adequately to societal challenges.

3. Evaluation concept

Formative evaluation takes place before or during a project, with the aim of improving a project's design and focus – evaluating one event to make sure the next one is better, for example. The RRI tools formative evaluation therefore focuses on the goals and objectives of the project overall – whether the aspects of RRI are addressed by the different aspects of the project (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact-orientation). It also focused on repeat activities – those which are one off events will be subject to the overall project evaluation.

Set of turn-key evaluation designs to perform internal formative evaluation processes throughout the project

The formative evaluation will also aim to generate quick feedback on the quality, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness (including outreach) and impact-orientation of each major task carried out in the different work packages. Data gathered will be analysed centrally by ZSI and the management team and feedback provided to the relevant WP leaders.

The user-friendliness, acceptance and perceived usefulness of the RRI toolkit by users does not form part of this task, but instead is part of T5.3.

4. Evaluation criteria and instruments

Criteria	Question	Indicator	Instrument
1. Relevance	<p>1.1 Headline Assessment</p> <p>How will this activity contribute to the development of training material on RRI or raise awareness of RRI? Could it be more focused?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular online surveys for WP leaders • Feedback questionnaire from external contributors/participants • Potential feedback emails from participants
	<p>1.2 Reaching Stakeholders</p> <p>a. Have all of the stakeholder groups been reached?</p> <p>If no, which of the stakeholder groups was it targeted at and why? How could more stakeholders have been involved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder groups targeted and reached • Number of stakeholders reached • Lessons learned and suggestions for improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular online survey for WP leaders • Participant data • Feedback from advocacy meetings • Feedback questionnaires from trainings • Participatory feedback workshop for trainers
	<p>1.3 Covering relevant aspects of RRI</p> <p>How does the activity assist the project's overall delivery of the policy agendas that underpin RRI?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All policy agendas being reflected in WP activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal audit • Regular online survey for WP leaders • Participatory feedback workshop for trainers

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance of Research and Innovation; • Engaging society; • Gender; • Access to scientific information; • Science education (formal/informal); • Ethics. 		
2. Efficiency	2.1 Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could this have been done with fewer resources? • Did you need more resources? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impressions of participants and team members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular online survey for WP leaders • Feedback questionnaires from participants
	2.2 Involving others <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were stakeholders able to input into the development of the activity? If so, how did this happen? • Did stakeholders feel their input had been used/valued? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and range of stakeholders involved • Level and spread of feedback from stakeholders • Number of suggestions/comments made by stakeholders (eg case studies submitted to WP2) • Views of stakeholders invited to be involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project data • Feedback questionnaires • Participatory feedback workshop for trainers • Feedback from advocacy meetings (report from hubs)

	<p>2.3 Using existing material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was existing material surveyed? • Was existing material made use of – if not, why not? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of references to existing material 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project data/outputs • Reports from WP leaders • Regular online survey for WP leaders
3.Effectiveness	<p>3.1 Coproduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were stakeholders satisfied with their involvement/do they now feel ownership of the deliverable? • Will participants have the opportunity to bring new ideas to the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of repeat participants • Number of participants joining the online COP • Number of participants adding to the website • Level of follow up from participants (eg number of suggestions made regarding the project after the event) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from project activities • Data from website • Feedback questionnaires
	<p>3.2 Building a Community of practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do participants want to remain involved in the project? • How will contact be maintained with the participants? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of repeat participants • Number of participants joining the online COP • Number of online comments and discussions mentioning project • Number of external projects making reference to RRI tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from project activities • Data from website • Feedback questionnaires • Regular online survey for WP leaders

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will participants be in contact with the project next? • Will participants be able to find out who else is involved? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of external projects asking for advice/help from RRI tools • Number of invitations to speak at external events • Communication and advocacy plan 	
4. Impact orientation	<p>4.1 Change What will change/is changing as a result of the activity?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback/follow up questions from participants • Requests for speakers/articles for external events and publications • Online discussion and comments in social media • External references to RRI tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular online survey for WP leaders • Feedback questionnaires from participants • Website, media and social media monitoring
	<p>4.2 Asking for action Were participants asked to do something in their own institutions as a result of this activity?</p> <p>What support and follow up was in place to ensure that this happened?</p> <p>What was the takeup?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plans of project • No of requests for help after the event 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular online surveys for WP leaders • Project data

	4.2 After effects What discussions have taken place as a result of this activity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Feedback from participants• Online discussions• Requests to speak or write for external channels	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Regular online survey for WP leaders• Media monitoring
--	---	--	---

5. Instruments

5.1. Overview and description of evaluation instruments

The following section gives an overview on the instruments to be used for the formative evaluation. Qualitative and quantitative instruments have been developed to evaluate i) the general project management and project progress (WP6, WP7) and ii) activities and events of Hubs (WP1, WP2, WP3 and WP4).

The assessment of the tools developed in WP3 will be done by task 5.3. In the framework of WP6 regularly web-statistics and login data are collected and documented.

Furthermore the quantitative and qualitative evaluation instruments are introduced in detail in the following section. It provides an in-depth description of each instrument, the involved target groups, distribution channels and applied languages.

5.1.1. Quantitative instruments

Quantitative instruments comprise:

- Feedback questionnaires at meetings, events and workshops
- Regular online survey for WP leaders
- Website/login statistics (Employed by WP6)
- Media and social media tracking (gathered by WP6)
- Pop up questionnaires / Tools assessment questionnaires (developed and employed by task 5.3)

The quantitative instruments serve best to collect feedback from bigger amounts of respondents as on events, meetings, or workshops or also concerning web activities. The questionnaires cover different aspects of the addressed activities and enable the participants to express their attitude and opinions.

Feedback questionnaires

Feedback questionnaires are provided after each consortium meeting or other general project meeting, stakeholder consultation workshop, and after each training workshop. These activities will happen face to face and therefore the most efficient way to get feedback is a direct and quantitative one. According to the topics and foci of the single activities the feedback questionnaires are provided to assess quality of the activity, including content and outcomes and to collect the participants' opinion on the usefulness as well as on its positive aspects and negative aspects, by using simple

evaluation questions. The results will influence on the improvement of future activities.

These questionnaires are the core element to collect feedback on various activities. On one hand the consortium and all its participants are the main target group to evaluate the internal meetings on the other hand stakeholders who participated in hubs activities like the stakeholder consultation workshop and participants of the training activities are addressed. The feedback questionnaires are adapted to the different target groups.

Feedback questionnaires addressing the stakeholder consultation workshops and the training workshops are available in English and will be translated into the Hubs languages. The questionnaires will be distributed and collected by the moderators at the end of each event. The NHCs feed answers in an English online survey tool to build up a common database for the assessment of all stakeholder consultation and training workshops carried out within the RRI-Tools-Project, which is further used for a descriptive analysis and to visualise the results. The questionnaires also contain open questions providing space for written statements. These, translated by the local partners, are analysed with content analysis methods, identifying the most relevant aspects.

The questionnaires addressing the consortium and general projects meetings are in English and are distributed and collected on paper at the end of each meeting. The analysis will be performed in a descriptive way.

Regular online surveys for WP leaders

The regular online surveys for WP leaders are aimed to monitor the progress of each work package according to the relevance of activities, the efficiency, the effectiveness, and the impact orientation of the different activities implemented, in order to support the management board and WP leaders with relevant information for the management control.

The questionnaire for WP-leaders will be conducted twice a year. It will contain quantitative as well as qualitative questions, asking for explanation of the quantitative answers and for specific suggestions for improvement.

The online survey will be implemented using the software lime-survey and will be analysed using descriptive analysis.

Website and media data

The rri-tools.eu website and blog metrics are gathered in Google Analytics. Regarding social media statistics, the project is mainly presented though Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn.

To monitor the results on the different social media websites we rely on the following tools:

- Regarding Twitter: Twitter Analytics (<http://analytics.twitter.com>), Tweetchup (<http://tweetchup.com>), and Mentionmap (<http://mentionmapp.com/>) to monitor the results on Twitter.
- Regarding Facebook: Facebook Statistics (<https://www.facebook.com/RRI.Tools.Project/insights/>) and Fanpage Karma (<http://www.fanpagekarma.com/>) to follow up our performance on Facebook.
- And, the LinkedIn group statistics dashboard is used to measure our results on LinkedIn (<http://www.linkedin.com/groups?groupDashboard=&gid=8111598>).

The email marketing solution is used to send newsletters. We resort to the campaign reports available on MailChimp to track the progress.

This data will be fed back to the evaluation team twice a year in coherence with the regular online survey for the WP leaders.

5.1.2. Qualitative instruments

To evaluate and improve activities, such as the training workshops, participatory workshops will be held. Qualitative instruments focus on the collection of individual experiences and opinions on the activities, involving only smaller amounts of people. This helps to improve further planned activities and to document lessons learned.

The participatory workshop, which is the main instrument for the qualitative evaluation, will be held after the training activities. Furthermore qualitative parts can also be found in the feedback questionnaires as well as in the regular online surveys for WP leaders (see above).

Feedback workshop for trainers

The feedback workshop for trainers is used as an evaluation instrument for gathering feedback from the trainers¹. In this case we aim to improve the trainings, learn from the trainers and collect their opinions on the tools chosen for trainings, on the importance of different topics as well as general ratings on methods used. It is related to the feedback questionnaire, as this qualitative data collection instrument aims to get a deeper understanding of the main issues investigated. The workshop targets the trainers of these activities. The workshops will take place in the framework of a hubs

¹ The participants of the train the trainers activities will give their feedback through a questionnaire.

meeting and it will be held in English. It will last 90 minutes using interactive participatory assessment and dialogue activities along a structured guideline.

The workshop will be conducted and recorded by the evaluation team. A detailed protocol of the workshop will be prepared as basis for the analysis, which will provide a summary identifying relevant aspects for general recommendations. Participants of the workshops will be anonymised for the analysis.

6. Feedback of results

After the analysis of each evaluation instrument implemented the results will be fed back to the relevant audience:

- Results of the evaluation of the project meetings will be provided to the whole consortium one week after the meeting
- Results of the evaluation of the stakeholder consultation workshops will be integrated into deliverable D2.2, which is available on public level
- Results of the evaluation of the trainings will be integrated into D4.3
- Results of the assessment of the WP leaders will – together with results of the media monitoring of WP6 – provided to the coordinators and the workpackage leaders two weeks after the end of the survey.

7. Ethical issues

In order to achieve the goals within the RRI Tools project, the partner have to collect data from the participants of the stakeholder consultation workshop and the train the trainer activities. During the data collection the data protection issues involved with handling of personal data will be addressed by the following strategies:

- Volunteers to be enrolled in the qualitative data collection of the participatory workshop or the trainings will be exhaustively informed, so that they are able to autonomously decide whether they consent to participate or not. In participants agreement ([see Annex 6](#)), the purpose of the research, the procedures, potential discomforts or benefits as well as the handling of their data (protection, save storage) will be explained. In order to make the RRI Tools project transparent, workshop participants will have to sign this form.
- The data exploitation will be in line with the respective national data protection acts. Data privacy may be under threat, when data can be tracked back to individuals. To avoid the data identification and abuse, all data will be anonymised.

Annex 1: Template of Feedback Questionnaire for project meetings (to be adapted according to aim of meeting)



Feedback Sheet

Title of Meeting

Date, Location

|

Please give us your opinion on the following items:

I have enough understanding of our project's concept of RRI and feel confident to start talking about it with different stakeholders

--	--	--

I understand how to carry out stakeholder consultation methodologies

--	--	--

I know where to find materials to carry out my project activities

--	--	--

I know how to start and support a community of practice in my hub

--	--	--

Overall, the meeting was useful for me

--	--	--

My recommendations for the next consortium meetings are:

.....

.....

Thank you!

ZSI



7. What did you like least about this event?

Why?

8. Please circle ONE rate for each 'Before' and 'After' the event statements.

	Not very well	Somewhat well	Moderately well	Very well
a) I understood the principles of RRI.				
a. Before the event?	1	2	3	4
b. After the event?	1	2	3	4

b) I know how to implement RRI aspects in my daily working environment.

a. Before the event?	1	2	3	4
b. After the event?	1	2	3	4

c) I am aware of the needs, possible solutions and necessary tools of my stakeholder group for implementing RRI.

a. Before the event?	1	2	3	4
b. After the event?	1	2	3	4

9. Do you plan to use the information from this workshop?

Yes No

If yes, how?

My general comments and suggestions for improving this workshop are:

Thank you for your time!
Please return this questionnaire to the organiser!



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 612393



Annex 3: Guideline for Feedback workshop for trainers

Participatory Workshop for Trainers – Guideline

Topic	Lead Question	Sub-questions	Materials needed	Time
Introduction	Introduction of the participants, introduce yourself and the purpose of the workshop. “This workshop with the trainers of the RRI-Tools trainings should help to assess the trainings’ quality, outcomes and impacts. Explain rules (taping, confidential, length, function of moderator,...)			10
Setting (Positioning and Inventory taking)	How do the trainers assess the setting of the trainings?	Inventory taking: How was the location like? How was the participant constellation? (from mixed group to homogenous stakeholders) How to you assess the structure of the training? How do you assess the duration of the training?	Flip Charts, sticky cards, ask people to put cards according to their answers on the flipchart for visualisation (Moderator should take care that ALL participants participate and observer takes notes)	20
Training Content	Assessment of the tools chosen for the trainings:	Was the number of tools presented in the training appropriate? Which tools have been chosen? <i>(depending on the training concepts - in case different</i>	Structured Discussion guided by Moderator Important points will be noted on flipcharts	20

	Assessment of the topic and content of the trainings:	<p><i>tools are chosen for different trainings</i>) Why? Were there “problem tools”? Which? Were there “super tools”? Which? Were there tools missing? Which?</p> <p>Which topics were absolutely necessary? Which topics were not useful? Which topics were “problem ones”? Which topics were “super important ones”? Which topics were missing?</p>	(Observer takes notes)	
Methods of Trainings	Rating of the used methods:	Which methods have been conducted? General rating. Which methods made problems? Which methods were useful?	Collect answers on coloured cards (one colour per questions). Cluster cards on wall and note comments on flipchart Discussion on outcomes in plenum. (Observer takes notes)	20
Suggestions and Comments	Suggestions and Comments to improve the trainings.		Collect findings on flipcharts (Observer takes notes)	10
Feedback	Everybody is invited		No more	9

and open questions	to make a final statement on the trainings and on today's workshop including things that are important and have not been said yet		discussion, everybody says something and is not interrupted	
Conclusion	Thank you for the discussion			1

Annex 4 Feedback questionnaire for training participants

Feedback questionnaire Training

City:
Country:
Date:

Please take 5 minutes to evaluate today's training.

1. Are you:

- female male
 other

2. To which stakeholder group do you feel affiliated?

- Civil Society Policymakers (incl. funding)
 Education (formal, informal) Research
 Industry or business Other: _____

3. To what extent was attending this workshop worth your time?

- not at all slightly moderate very extremely

4. How would you rate each of the following?

	poor	fair	good	Very good
Exercises	1	2	3	4
Discussion/Interaction	1	2	3	4
Moderation	1	2	3	4
Location	1	2	3	4
Time	1	2	3	4
Group composition	1	2	3	4

5. How useful have the following topics been to you?

	Not useful	Quite useful	Very Useful	Extremely useful	Did not understand
..... (according to training concept)	1	2	3	4	5
.....	1	2	3	4	5
....	1	2	3	4	5
....	1	2	3	4	5
....	1	2	3	4	5

6. What did you like most about this training?

Why?

7. What did you like least about this training?

Why?

8. Which tool(s) presented did you like best?

Why?

9. Which tool(s) presented did you like least?

Why?

10. Please circle ONE rate for each 'before' and 'after' the training statements:

Not at all Not very well Moderately well Very well

a) I know what RRI-tools look like in practice.

a. Before the training?	1	2	3	4
b. After the training?	1	2	3	4

b) I know how to implement RRI in my daily working environment.

a. Before the training?	1	2	3	4
b. After the training?	1	2	3	4

c) I know where to find the appropriate RRI tools and resources.

a. Before the training?	1	2	3	4
b. After the event?	1	2	3	4

d) More questions according to training concept

a. Before the training?	1	2	3	4
b. After the event?	1	2	3	4

11. Are you planning to use the information gained in this training?

Yes No

If yes, how?

12. Are you planning to use the RRI tools and resources presented in this training?

Yes No

If yes, how?

13. Did this training make you change your attitude on RRI?

Yes No Don't know

If yes, how?

14. Would you be interested in participating in follow-up trainings:

Yes

No

Don't know

15. My general comments and suggestions:

Thank you for your time!
Please return this questionnaire to your trainers!

Annex 5 Regular online survey for WP leaders

Questionnaire for WP leaders RRI Tools

The aim of this survey is to monitor the progress of each work package according to the relevance of activities, the efficiency, the effectiveness, and the impact orientation, in order to support the management board and WP leaders with relevant information for the management control and specific monitoring.

The questionnaire for WP-leaders will be sent twice a year.

Filling in the questionnaire will take 25 minutes. The questionnaire is accessible until(fill in date).....

Questionnaire for Workpackage leaders

I am leader of *

Please choose only one of the following

- WP 1 – Definition and compilation of RRI best practices
- WP 2 – Mapping RRI stakeholders
- WP 3 – Production of the RRI Toolkit
- WP 4 – Training and advocacy on the RRI Toolkit
- WP 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation
- WP 6 – Dissemination
- WP 7 - Management

1 Relevance

1.1 How does your WP contribute to the development of training material on RRI and raise awareness of RRI?

Please write your answer here

1.2 Are all stakeholder groups reached within the activities of your WP?

Please choose only one of the following

- Yes
- No

1.2.1 Why not?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 1.2 (Are all stakeholder groups reached within the activities of your WP?)

Please write your answer here:

1.2.2 Which measures will be set for improvement?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 1.2 (Are all stakeholder groups reached within the activities of your WP?)

Please write your answer here:

1.3 Are all policy agendas reflected in the WP activities?

Please choose only one of the following

- Yes
- No

1.3.1 Why not?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 1.3 (Are all policy agendas reflected in the WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

1.3.2 Which measures will be set for improvement?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 1.3 (Are all policy agendas reflected in the WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

2 Efficiency

2.1 Did the planned resources match the effort needed?

Please choose only one of the following

- Yes
- No

2.1.1 Why not?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 2.1 (Did the planned resources match the effort needed?)

Please write your answer here:

2.2 Which stakeholders were engaged in the WP activities?

Please choose

- Policy makers
- Education representatives
- Civil Society Organisation
- Researchers
- Industry and Business representatives
- There were no stakeholders engaged

2.2.1 Why not?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was "There is no stakeholder engaged" at question 2.2 (Which stakeholders were engaged in the WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

2.2.2 Which measures will be set for improvement?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was "There is no stakeholder engaged" at question 2.2 (Which stakeholders were engaged in the WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

2.3 Was already existing material used for the WP activities?

Please choose only one of the following

- Yes
- No

2.3.1 Why not?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was "No" at question 2.3 (Was already existing material used for the WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

3 Effectiveness

3.1 In your opinion, were stakeholders satisfied with their involvement in your WP activities?

Please choose only one of the following

- Yes
- No

3.1.1 Why not?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 3.1 (In your opinion, were stakeholders satisfied with their involvement in your WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

3.1.2 Which measures will be set for improvement?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 3.1 (In your opinion, were stakeholders satisfied with their involvement in your WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

3.2 How will contact be maintained with stakeholders/participants?

Please specify:

3.3 Will already involved stakeholders be in regular contact with further WP activities?

Please choose only one of the following

- Yes
- No

3.3.1 If yes, how?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “Yes” at question 3.3 (Will already involved stakeholders be in regular contact with further WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

3.3.1 Why not?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 3.3 (Will already involved stakeholders be in regular contact with further WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

4 Impact orientation

4.1 What will change/is changing as a result of the WP activities?

Please specify:

4.2 Were participants asked to do something in their own institutions as a result of the WP activities?

Please choose only one of the following

- Yes
- No

4.2.1 If yes, what?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “Yes” at question 4.2 (Were participants asked to do something in their own institutions as a result of the WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

4.2.2 Why not?

Only answer this question if the following conditions are met:

Answer was “No” at question 4.2 (Were participants asked to do something in their own institutions as a result of the WP activities?)

Please write your answer here:

4.1 What discussions have taken place as a result of the WP activities within the consortium?

Please specify:

Annex 6 Participants Agreement



Fostering Responsible Research and Innovation

4. Informed consent

RRI Tools – A project to foster responsible research and innovation for society, with society

European Commission 7th Framework Project (FP7)

(Coordination and Support Action – Grant Agreement No. 612393)

Declaration of Consent

Name of participant:

Name of contact *[Insert local host here before printing]*

Project aims

RRI Tools is a 3-year FP7 project that seeks to develop adequate methods and tools to promote RRI and to make it applicable and verifiable, building a wide Community of Practice to assure the use, evolution and enrichment of the concept and the tools. The RRI Tools Consortium includes 26 institutions, covering 30 countries of the European Research Area through 19 Hubs.

In its first year RRI Tools is conducting stakeholder consultation activities in the 30 countries involved. Participatory Consultation Workshops are part of these activities, whose results will be analysed to update and finalize the common definition of RRI, collect promising RRI practices and tail the tools to the stakeholder needs.

Participation in the workshop

Participation in this workshop should take about 8 hours. Risks for participation should be negligible, but it can happen that you share sensitive opinions or confidential information inadvertently. Participation in the workshop is always voluntary: you may choose not to respond any question or discuss a particular topic, and you can leave the debate at your will.

Storage of personal data

During the course of the project, personal data will be collected by means of observation, interviews and group discussions. This data will be used to develop and to evaluate stakeholders' needs in the context of RRI, and requirements on RRI communication and training in particular.

Personal data will be used only within the framework of the RRI Tools project, and will not be made accessible for any third party. It will not be stored after the end of the project.

Personal data do not contain the names or addresses of participants and will be edited for full anonymity before being processed (e.g., in project reports).

Nature of data from group workshops

The organizers commit to maintain full confidentiality of data resulting from the workshop. Beware though that this will be a group discussion. The organization will ask participants to respect confidentiality, but this cannot be guaranteed.



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 612393

www.rri-tools.eu

81



Audiovisual material

Videos and photographs taken during the course of the project may contain the pictures of participants. RRI Tools may use these materials in public forums, conferences or on websites to inform about the project. Each participant allows RRI Tools to use the said materials.

Each participant may demand removal of photographs or videos from websites and public forums by simple request. Subject to technical feasibility, RRI Tools agrees to remove the requested items without delay.

Instructions and advice

An identified contact person (National Hub Coordinator) will be available for project-related instructions and advice. Each participant may gladly discuss questions and problems with this person at any time.

Code of Conduct

Participation in RRI Tools is meant to be as agreeable and pleasant as possible for all those involved. Therefore, all participants agree to respect the following rules:

- Racism and discrimination: racist comments, discrimination on the basis of sex, age, or disability, publication of racist or sexist pictures and insulting persons are strictly banned.
- RRI Tools may not be abused for political, religious or advertising purposes.
- Infringements of copyright laws are not permitted.
- All participants' conduct towards other users should always be appropriate and never offensive or depreciating.
- All participants will abstain from taking pictures or recording the workshop.

Consent

After having stated these general conditions and rules, we are looking forward to a good cooperation and positive project results. We would like to thank you in advance for your participation in the project RRI Tools.

The undersigned declare that they understand and consent to the conditions and rules of RRI Tools. Both parties receive a copy of this declaration of consent.

I hereby release RRI Tools and any of its associated or affiliated institutions, their directors, officers, agents, employees and customers from all claims of every kind on account of such use.

Participant's signature:

Location, day/month/year

Contact's signature:

Location, day/month/year



This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 612393

www.rri-tools.eu

82

References

- Buckingham, A. and Saunders, P. (2004). The Survey Methods Workbook. Polity
- Czaja, R. and Blair, J. (2005). Designing Surveys. SAGE Publications
- Diekmann, A. (2005). Empirische Sozialforschung. Grundlagen. Methoden. Anwendungen. Rohwohlt
- Flick, U., Kardorff, E. von, Keupp, H., Rosenstiel, L. von, & Wolff, S. 1995. Handbuch Qualitative Sozialforschung: Grundlagen, Konzepte, Methoden und Anwendungen (2. Aufl.). Beltz.
- Mayring, P. (2008). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken. Beltz.
- Semir, V., Revuelta, G., Dimopoulos, K., & Peter, H.P. (2001). Toolkit for the Impact Assessment of Science Communication Initiatives and Policies. PLACES project.