

Evaluating major STI Instruments: the SHOKing truth

Wolfgang POLT (Joanneum Research - POLICIES)

with inputs from

Kaisa LÄHTENMÄKI-SMITH (Ramboll MC)

Kimmo HALME (Ramboll MC)

FTEVAL Conference 14/15 November 2013 / Vienna

THE INNOVATION COMPANY www.joanneum.at



Background

- Based on the evaluation of the finnish Strategic Centres for Science, Technology and Innovation (SHOKs)
- carried out by Ramboll Managment Consulting, Gaia Consulting Oy and Joanneum Research Policies (2012/13)

9



The SHOKs (I)

- Characterization of the SHOK Programme:
 - Launched in 2006 (but had a slow start)
 - Between 09/2008 and 09/2012: 343 Mio € from TEKES + 40% from involved companies + monies from the Academy of Finland (but much less than anticipated)
 - Currently 6 SHOKs in operation (in the areas of environment&energy, metal industry, built environment, bioeconomy,health/well-being, ICT&digital services)

2



The SHOKs(II)

- Industry/sector-wide centres
- Organised as limited companies
- Defining strategic research agendas for the sector
- Time-span: 5-10 years
- Responsible for defining projects and channeling the funding

THE INNOVATION COMPANY



What is remarkable about the SHOKs?

- Program is meant to induce mayor structural changes:
 - Induce structural change in finnish industry → to make the country an internationally <u>leading</u> and <u>attractive</u> innovation environment
 - Provide the frame for long-term strategic collaboration between industry and science → to achieve <u>breakthrough</u> innovations
 - Put industry in the driving seat



Novelty of programme – novelty of evaluation?

- The programme definitively is meant to be a ,new type of instrumentin several aspects...
- ...but was evaluated with fairly standard evaluation approaches, e.g.
 - Peer-assements
 - Logic-models
 - Focus groups and interviews
 - Participant survey
 - International benchmarking with similar programmes



Need for new (evaluation) approaches?

- The evaluation challenge:
 - Have we missed out on some of the effects and impacts of the programme (e.g. long-term behavioural effects or larger societal benefits)?
 → Definitively, but this was not the point of this evaluation!
 - The evaluation was able to detect major flaws in the design of the programme and provide policy with options for future actions



Evaluation results: flaws at the programme design level

- Slow buy-in of companies (perception of too much complexity in the programme)
- Reluctance/too little incentive from academia to engage
- Role of incumbents too strong to expect radical shifts
- apart from some positive results at the level of individual SHOKs: → TOO LITTLE (SCIENTIFIC) EXCELLENCE, TOO LITTLE RELEVANCE (FOR MAJOR STRUCTURAL CHANGE)



Need for new (policy) approaches?

- The policy challenge: to rectify
 - (over)ambitious targets
 - Ill-defined programme concept
 - Indication: slow buy-in even of industry, let alone academia...
 - tensions between instruments/incentives and the programme goals:
 - How much interaction with the science system can you get from an industry-led programme?
 - How much structural change can you expect from a strategic research agenda which is defined by incumbents?



Some findings and further questions

- Evaluation of SHOKs
 - adds to a growing literature which cautions against too great expectations from large-scale collaborative schemes (in terms of radical, breakthrough innovations)
 - Reminds one that a clear intervention logic is paramount for success
 - Underlines the necessity for good programme documentation and data gathering from the start
 - (luckily) was not charged with the task to identify longerterm structural effects and impacts on society ... (for which we would really have needed some new approaches ...)



Thank you for your attention!

Wolfgang POLT
POLICIESZentrum für Wirtschaftsund Innovationsforschung
Sensengasse 1
1090 Wien, Austria
policies-tip@joanneum.at
www.joanneum.at