



## EUROPE

THE ARTS  
CHILD POLICY  
CIVIL JUSTICE  
EDUCATION  
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT  
HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE  
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS  
NATIONAL SECURITY  
POPULATION AND AGING  
PUBLIC SAFETY  
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
SUBSTANCE ABUSE  
TERRORISM AND  
HOMELAND SECURITY  
TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE  
WORKFORCE AND WORKPLACE

This PDF document was made available from [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org) as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

[Jump down to document](#) ▼

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world.

### Support RAND

[Browse Books & Publications](#)

[Make a charitable contribution](#)

### For More Information

Visit RAND at [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org)

Explore [RAND Europe](#)

View [document details](#)

### Limited Electronic Distribution Rights

This document and trademark(s) contained herein are protected by law as indicated in a notice appearing later in this work. This electronic representation of RAND intellectual property is provided for non-commercial use only. Unauthorized posting of RAND PDFs to a non-RAND Web site is prohibited. RAND PDFs are protected under copyright law. Permission is required from RAND to reproduce, or reuse in another form, any of our research documents for commercial use. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please see [RAND Permissions](#).

This product is part of the RAND Corporation technical report series. Reports may include research findings on a specific topic that is limited in scope; present discussions of the methodology employed in research; provide literature reviews, survey instruments, modeling exercises, guidelines for practitioners and research professionals, and supporting documentation; or deliver preliminary findings. All RAND reports undergo rigorous peer review to ensure that they meet high standards for research quality and objectivity.

# Strengthening Research Portfolio Evaluation at the Medical Research Council

Developing a survey for the  
collection of information about  
research outputs

Sharif Ismail, Jan Tiessen, Steven Wooding

Sponsored by the Medical Research Council

The research described in this report was prepared for the Medical Research Council.

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit research organization providing objective analysis and effective solutions that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors around the world. RAND's publications do not necessarily reflect the opinions of its research clients and sponsors.

**RAND**® is a registered trademark.

© Copyright 2010 RAND Corporation

Permission is given to duplicate this document for personal use only, as long as it is unaltered and complete. Copies may not be duplicated for commercial purposes. Unauthorized posting of RAND documents to a non-RAND Web site is prohibited. RAND documents are protected under copyright law. For information on reprint and linking permissions, please visit the RAND permissions page (<http://www.rand.org/publications/permissions.html>).

Published 2010 by the RAND Corporation  
1776 Main Street, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138  
1200 South Hayes Street, Arlington, VA 22202-5050  
4570 Fifth Avenue, Suite 600, Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2665  
Westbrook Centre, Milton Road, Cambridge CB4 1YG, United Kingdom  
RAND URL: <http://www.rand.org>  
RAND Europe URL: <http://www.rand.org/randeurope>  
To order RAND documents or to obtain additional information, contact  
Distribution Services: Telephone: (310) 451-7002;  
Fax: (310) 451-6915; Email: [order@rand.org](mailto:order@rand.org)

# Summary

---

## The Project Brief

The MRC had three key aims for this project. It wished to:

1. Collect information on the range of outputs and outcomes from its funded research, in a way that was amenable to detailed analysis. It also wanted to collect information on impacts from knowledge production, through research capacity building to wider outputs including dissemination, policy impact and product and intervention development;
2. Build a better understanding of the range of research that it funds, across the spectrum from basic to clinical research;
3. Collect a combination of quantitative and qualitative information – on both the types of impacts produced by MRC funded research, and the perceptions of researchers themselves of the support they receive from the MRC.

## What we did

To help the MRC meet these objectives, RAND Europe was engaged to provide support in constructing an evaluation framework, building on an extensive body of research work in this field over the past few years. In particular, the project built on work jointly conducted by RAND Europe and the Health Economics Research Group (HERG) at Brunel University in recent years to develop a “Payback Framework” based on the following categories:

Knowledge production
Research targeting and capacity building
Informing policy and product development
Health and health sector benefits
Wider economic benefits

In order to better reflect the particular needs of the MRC, and reflecting the focus on collecting information from the researchers carrying out the research, the project team decided to focus the development of the new tool on:

- Research targeting and capacity building;
- A new category, for dissemination activities; and

- Informing policy and product development. Data on other categories in the framework, while important, were thought to be more efficiently gathered by other means.

We then evaluated a series of potential approaches to data collection. These included:

- Cataloguing tools, such as *tick-list* and *menu-based* approaches; *exemplar scales*; and *calibrators*
- Mapping tools, including *research pathways*<sup>2</sup>

In discussion with the MRC, it was decided that a tick-list based approach with additional questions to capture detailed information about research impacts, was best suited to this exercise. These discussions took into account well known challenges in research evaluation. These included the issue of the accuracy of researcher recall in systems reliant on self-reporting of outputs and impacts; and the problem of attribution, which for researchers holding multiple forms of funding support at the same time, can be significant. There was also debate about the appropriate level of detail to request from researchers and how to balance the MRC's need for detailed information against the likely burden on researchers.

Building on a tool produced through prior work with the Arthritis Research Council (ARC) in the UK, we then adapted and developed a survey questionnaire to respond to the MRC's evaluation requirements. This tool was tested through an advisory group workshop, stakeholder workshops with academic researchers (both intra- and extra-mural) and finally through cognitive interviews with a series of researchers.

The MRC used this tested instrument, with additional questions, as a basis for its new online questionnaire (the MRC Outputs Data Gathering Tool – ODTG). The ODTG was to be directed at all MRC-supported researchers and research establishments, both intramural (MRC Institutes, Centres and Units) and extramural (research funded through grants, studentships and fellowships outside intramural establishments). The questionnaire sought information on both short-term outputs from individual research grants, and longer-term outcomes reported by interviewed researchers. RAND assisted in testing this survey tool with MRC-supported researchers before the ODTG was launched in September 2008. Details of the results of this exercise are available separately from the MRC.<sup>3</sup> The ODTG experienced problems in its first year of operation and this led the MRC to review and improve the IT implementation as well as to simplify the data collection tool, the new tool has been named MRC e-Val and it due to be used for the first time in the autumn of 2009.

### **Key lessons learned**

Among the most important lessons from this project were the following:

---

<sup>2</sup> For further details on these approaches, please see Wooding, S. and S. Hoorens (2009), *Possible approaches for evaluating Arthritis Research Campaign grants*, Cambridge, UK: RAND Europe.

<sup>3</sup> The ODTG web page may be found here: <http://www.mrc.ac.uk/Achievementsimpact/ODGT/index.htm> (as of 23rd July 2009).

1. **Consider the ultimate objective of your framework.** Prior to developing a research evaluation framework it is crucial to define the ultimate purpose a framework should serve and to be very aware of the context it will operate in.
2. **Choose the right evaluation method.** There exists a wide range of different evaluation methods, ranging from bibliometric analysis to micro- or macro economic analysis of the economic return of research. Each has a specific set of advantages and disadvantages, and the selection should be closely linked to the objective research.
3. **Be aware of the conceptual difficulties.** Research evaluation exercises involve significant conceptual difficulties. While solutions to such problems are not necessarily easy to achieve, they should be at least acknowledged in the analysis of the results.
4. **Engage with stakeholder at every stage of the process of development.** Stakeholder engagement can prove essential in developing a framework, as experienced during this project.