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Carnegie Foundation-classified as ‘research intensive’ (1 of 147 in U.S.)*

One of only 90 U.S. universities with both a law and medical school*

Oldest (nearly 50 years) evaluation center in the world

Has produced some of evaluation’s most prominent theorists and practitioners

Original home of *The Program Evaluation Standards*

First (and currently, only) Ph.D. in evaluation program in the world

*There are more than 2,500 universities in the U.S.*
Professor of Evaluation, Measurement, & Research (EMR)

Director of Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Evaluation (IDPE) program

100+ peer-reviewed publications

≈ USD $6 million in external funding (since 2008)

Specializes in evaluation of science policy & research funding

Has conducted (funded) research & evaluation in 16 countries
Purposes (Aims)

- Summative: Accountability & decision making
- Formative: Improvement
Evaluation questions

1. Support of ‘excellent’ research?
2. Accessibility of information?
3. CORE Junior?
4. Fairness?
5. Transparency?
6. Impartiality?

7. Comparison to international standards?

8. Recommendations for improvement relative to international standards?

9. Recommendations for improvement to better serve stakeholders?
Methods

Utilization-focused
Intended to be ‘used’ and have a meaningful impact

Mixed-method
Simultaneous, equal priority given to quantitative & qualitative methods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Applicants</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Reviewers</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Applications</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panelists</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel observations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding agencies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = population*

*n = sample*

*P = response rate or proportion sampled*
Findings & conclusions

- CORE funds ‘excellent’ research
- No (statistical) biases in selection
- Applicants & reviewers satisfied
- Exceeding international standards
- See full report for detailed statistics
The FNR's CORE selection procedure is transparent, fair, unbiased, and impartial."
"[The] FNR has **high standards** compared to other funding agencies"

"The reviews are of **higher quality** at the FNR than anywhere else"
“[The] FNR’s application review approach (qualitative assessment) is perceived as superior to approaches used by many other European research funding agencies (quantitative assessment)"
Recommendations

1. Limit number of resubmissions
   *(interpreted as a ‘rebuttal’ of a previously unfunded application)*

2. Clarify CORE Junior

3. Expand CORE InfoDay

4. Periodic evaluations
Thank you!

chris.coryn@wmich.edu