#StrongerTogether: SSAH and the future of evidence-based policy making interactive conference – 06-07 May

Scoping Papers: All Sessions

Description

The present document presents a compilation of scoping papers for all the sessions that will take place throughout both days of the #StrongerTogether conference, on the 6th and 7th of May. These documents have been created by the Chairs of the sessions to provide guidance and structure to participants in preparation for the chosen session.

The conference will take place in an **interactive format**. Throughout each session there will be an opportunity to actively participate via diverse modalities in a form that will be divulged on the day of the chosen session. The interactive component of each session will endure for a minimum duration of thirty minutes.

The contents page below will direct you to the relevant scoping papers pertaining to your chosen session. We look forward to welcoming you to the #StrongerToghether: SSAH and the future of evidence-informed policymaking interactive conference on the 6th and 7th of May.

Contents

Session 1: Which incentives for stimulating interdisciplinary research?

Chair: Prof. Erik Mathijs (KU Leuven, chair of the SAPEA working group on sustainable food consumption)

Speakers: Prof. Daniel Carey (University of Galway, member of the ALLEA Working Group on the ERA)

Scope:

To address complex societal issues, the production of interdisciplinary evidence, or the coordination of expertise is required in a diversity of disciplines, although, these should never be taken for granted. Scholarly research still anchors itself in disciplines, often resulting in multidisciplinary endeavours. Creating mutual understanding between researchers remains difficult and time consuming, as it requires bridging the underlying discourses, narratives and paradigms of the disciplines involved. At the same time, with the rise of programmes specifically training scholars in an interdisciplinary way (e.g. sustainability science), an increasing number of knowledge brokers and boundary spanners is emerging, as is the number of scientific journals embracing inter- and even transdisciplinary work. At the same time, hiring and promoting policies of university departments diverge quite extensively with respect to how they handle interdisciplinary work.

Without ignoring the academic career paths, funding agencies may explore possible ways to stimulate interdisciplinary research further (notably within SSAH and with STEM),. The aim of this session is to formulate recommendations on how to do this by understanding the success factors of interdisciplinary research, in the perspective of providing evidence to policymakers. Several ideas may be discussed ranging from training (e.g. the role of doctoral schools), organisation (e.g. safe spaces, platforms, or laboratories) and funding (e.g. projects, networking or structural funding) for incentivizing researchers to engage in interdisciplinary research.

Session 2: AI for EIPM – new technological factors in science for policy

Chair: Alessandro ALLEGRA (EC RTD / University College London)

Speakers: Prof David BUDZ PEDERSEN (professor of science communication and impact studies, department of Communication and Psychology, Aalborg University), Bertrand DE LONGUEVILLE (Head of Text Mining and Analysis Competence Centre, JRC.T.5), Snezha KAZAKOVA (Head of Sector - Knowledge sharing and Collaboration, JRC.S.2)

Scope:

Artificial Intelligence applications open new possibilities for large-scale, dynamic, and tailored synthesis and analysis of multidisciplinary evidence. How can this be best leveraged in a policy context? What are possible applications and pitfalls to look out for?

- Chair: Alessandro ALLEGRA (EC RTD / University College London)
- Guest expert: Prof David BUDZ PEDERSEN (professor of science communication and impact studies, department of Communication and Psychology, Aalborg University)
- Case: the development and use of AI for policymaking by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC)
    - Bertrand DE LONGUEVILLE (Head of Text Mining and Analysis Competence Centre, JRC.T.5)
    - Snezha KAZAKOVA (Head of Sector - Knowledge sharing and Collaboration, JRC.S.2)

General framing of the issue and guiding questions

A new generation of AI-based tools could present an opportunity in the near-future to dramatically improve science for policy and EIPM, making it more agile, rigorous, and targeted. AI applications open new possibilities for large-scale, dynamic, and tailored synthesis and analysis of multidisciplinary evidence; and generative AI can assist in the preparations of briefings and summaries. But several challenges exist to ensure that the knowledge and advice produced are scientifically credible, politically legitimate, and relevant to the actual needs of policymakers (Tyler et al 2023). Leveraging such AI tools for good in a science for policy context will require science advisers, knowledge brokers and policy institutions to create guidelines and carefully consider the design and responsible use of the nascent technology, building on existing efforts to govern the use of AI in scientific research (ERA guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research) and in public administration. Multidisciplinary approaches will be central to the development, deployment and governance of such systems. What does a future scenario for the use of AI in EIPM look like?

Expected outcome of the session

A shared vision and forward-looking scenario of possible uses of AI for EIPM, and of how its governance should be organized.

Format of the interactive discussion

The **interactive discussion** will focus on the following guiding questions to co-create a common vision and forward-looking scenario for the use of AI tools in EIPM:

- What would the use of AI in EIPM look like in 2030?
- What are possible applications of AI in S4P/EIPM (eg evidence synthesis, analysis, production of summaries, tailoring of advice)?
    - Do you have examples of current or possible use cases from your organization?
    - How can AI technologies be best leveraged for multidisciplinary EIPM and further integration of SSAH into EIPM?
- What are potential limitations and pitfalls to look out for?
- What are the key principles and governance elements that should be developed?

References

- Tyler C, Akerlof KL, Allegra A, Arnold Z, Canino H, Doornenbal MA, Goldstein JA, Budtz Pedersen D, Sutherland WJ. *AI tools as science policy advisers? The potential and the pitfalls*. Nature. 2023 Oct;622(7981):27-30. doi: 10.1038/d41586-023-02999-3
- European Research Area Forum 2024, *Guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research*

Session 3: Providing evidence for funders/science policy makers: how to balance societal, research and policy needs

Chair: Gabi Lombardo (Director of EASSH – European Alliance for the Social Sciences and the Humanities)

Speakers: Anja Bechmann (Professor of Media Studies, Aarhus University, PI of the NORDIS project), Jonathan Deer (Director of Research and Enterprise at City University London, Treasurer of EASSH), Raf Guns (Researcher at the University of Antwerp in Belgium), Lizza Bomassi (Deputy Director of Carnegie Europe), Malwina Gębalska (Coordinator of the Collaboration of Humanities and Social Sciences in Europe (CHANSE) Cofund, Scientific coordinator at the National Science Centre, Poland (NCN)), Matthias Reiter-Pázmándy (Deputy Head of the Department for Social Sciences and Humanities in the Austrian Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Research - BMBWF)

Scope:

In this session, we pose the question: How can future calls from public and private funders, like research councils and ministries best initiate, inspire and support interdisciplinarity as a best practice research approach? One well-tuned to meet the diverse challenges of our age?

As important actors in the process associated with the generation of research results that inform evidence-based policymaking, research funding organisations (RFOs) walk a tight line between balancing policy and researcher needs. Interdisciplinarity is key and calls published and supported by public and private funders reflect the need to ensure an effective collaboration of researchers from both the SSAH and STEM disciplines.

The aim of the session is to think aloud about how to produce a feasible and functional environment for implementing inter/multi/transdisciplinary research, which is relevant to policy making. What sort of conditions need to be in place and how can these conditions be generated?

An additional aim is to come up with recommendations for research funding organisations on what can be done concretely to better enable these research forms in Europe, in the perspective of fostering EIPM.

The session has two parts.

Part 1 sets the scene by presenting a case study of successful collaboration of technical and social scientists in the EU-funded NORDIS project, led by Anja Bechmann, Professor & Director of DATALAB at Aarhus University. This project addresses how to create a model for tackling information disorders in digital media to ensure transparency in open democracies.

The case study will then be followed by a panel discussion on interdisciplinarity with funders and think tanks. The discussion will focus on how to produce a feasible and functional environment for the doing of interdisciplinary research. The discussion will address the question: What sort of conditions need to be in place and how can these conditions be generated?

The panel discussion will touch on SSAH research representation; scientific assets of SSAH in interdisciplinarity, and evidence-informed science policy perspective(s); the innovative potential of SSAH, and SSAH in partnership/missions, from the perspective of programme design. The discussion

should also touch on each stage of funders' programming, from programme conception, call drafting, to evaluation and monitoring.

Panel speakers: Lizza Bomassi, (Carnegie Europe), **Matthias Reiter-Pázmándy** (BMBWF), **Anja Bechmann** (Aarhus University), **Malwina Gębalska** (CHANSE)

Part 2 is focused on how research on research is needed to better understand how to successfully integrate SSH research into relevant topics in European programmes, particularly where those topics are STEM focussed. Evidence informs science policymakers.

EASSH, represented by Raf Guns (University of Antwerp) and Jon Deer (City, University of London), will present the results of an analysis of the SSAH research contributions across Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe. The analysis will take as a reference point the SSAH integration reports produced by the European Commission. Using a different methodology this analysis will look at call topics, project objectives and project related publications to identify the 'intensity' of SSH integration. The analysis will highlight where SSAH contributions have been successfully integrated in projects funded across the Societal Challenges (H2020) and Clusters (HEU). The Session will also look at recommendations to improve the integration of SSAH research where it is relevant to specific call topics, and across research programmes which have a clear 'social dimension'. The presentation will be followed by a short Q&A session. Also, researchers will ask the audience how to interpret data analysis visualization reporting new observations on H2020 and Horizon Europe about SSH integration.

Link to information on the EASSH website: https://eassh.eu/News/StrongerTogether--Belgian-Presidency-Conference--6-7-May-2024~n1373

Session 4: Cross-disciplinary, cross-domain policy advice from governmental and transnational bodies

Chair: Holger Strassheim (Professor of Political Sociology, Bielefeld University)

Speakers: Anne-Greet Keizer (Senior research fellow and International liaison, Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR)), Jaakko Kuosmanen (Academy Secretary, Finish Academy of Science and Letters), Kenneth Nsah (Coordinator of BRIDGES Hub for Planetary Wellbeing at the University of Cologne)

Scope:

Science-policy ecosystems are often pluralistic and decentralized. They consist of a wide range of scientific institutions from different disciplines, knowledge brokers, civil society activists and policymakers. The advisory landscape is broad: science advisers in Ministries, national academies of science, public research agencies, applied research units, and experts from universities are following various disciplinary perspectives.

The disciplinary diversity of science-policy ecosystems is only exacerbated by departmental silos and complex advisory mechanisms. This is especially challenging in a time when multiple crises ranging from global pandemics and climate change to geopolitical instabilities make it clear that disciplinary and departmental silos need to be overcome. Under these conditions, connectivity, collaboration, and multidisciplinary learning are key to achieve a more integrated evidence-informed policymaking (see the recent JRC external study report by Butz Pedersen on science-for-policy ecosystems).

This session focuses on bodies creating the conditions for a more connective advisory ecosystem. Governments and actors have established specific advisory bodies reaching across disciplines and administrative subunits. Among the paradigmatic examples are:

- the Science Advice Initiative of Finland (SOFI, now at the Finnish Academy of Science),
- the Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) and
- UNESCO-MOST BRIDGES, a transdisciplinary and cross-regional mechanism that provides humanities-driven science to member states.

The forms and functions of these cross-boundary organizations and platforms are manifold and depend on the constellations and dynamics of their advisory ecosystems. There is no 'one-size-fits-all' solution. Some bodies like the JRC science4policy provide information on how to compare and evaluate advisory ecosystems. Some experiment with new operating models and practices for better evidence-informed policymaking such as the Finish Academy of Science. The WRR analyses problems and unintended consequences on cross-cutting themes that require coordinated policymaking. Many of these bodies also connect representative from governments, policy, science, and civil society to build new institutional channels for integrated advisory activities beyond established formats. UNESCO-MOST BRIDGES acknowledges non-academic expertise and combines methods of the humanities to deliver solutions to social and environmental challenges.

The **goal of the session** is to bring representatives of these bodies together for a discussion on good examples, possible limitations and recommendations. Its goal is to inspire boundary-crossing strategies within and beyond government (cutting across SSAH/STEM disciplines and departmental silos) in delivering evidence for a more integrated science-for-policy ecosystem.

Structure

The structure of the panel is threefold: first, each member of the panel gives a very brief input focusing on **three key questions**:

1. What are the core mechanisms and instruments used by your organization when giving advice and fostering evidence-informed policymaking? Please give one characteristic example.
2. How would you describe the central principles of your organization's advisory strategy?
3. What major limitations and challenges did you encounter? How would you recommend dealing with them?

Second, after these brief overviews we will open the discussion to the auditorium for a Q&A.

Third, in a concluding round each panel participant summarizes the **outcomes** of the discussion by sketching out a core element – an institutional mechanism, a practice, a method – that is from her*his perspective essential in providing cross-disciplinary, cross-domain knowledge for policymaking in advisory ecosystems.

Session 5: Engagement of academic associations and scientific networks in multi-disciplinary science advice for policy

Chair: Gaby Umbach (Professor and Director of the Research Area 'Knowledge, Governance, Transformations', Global Governance Programme, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, European University Institute)

Speakers: Helen Eenmaa (Associate Professor of Governance and Legal Policy, University of Tartu, President of European Young Academies Science Advice Structure (YASAS)), Arlene Holmes-Henderson (Professor of Classics Education and Public Policy MBE, Durham University, Vice-chair Universities Policy Engagement Network (UPEN)), Eppo Bruins (Chairman of the AWTI), Stefaan Vaes (Professor of Mathematics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Chairperson of Metaforum, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)

Scope:
In evidence-informed policymaking (EIPM), science advice accelerates knowledge exchange and supports expertise-led policy-making practices. The key aim of science advice in EIPM is to inform (and ultimately improve) policymaking through scientific insights. It also fosters policy learning via knowledge transfer. Important questions related to such processes evolve around the role and relevance of expertise and knowledge in politics; the efficacy of types of expertise (e.g. disciplinary vs multi-disciplinary); as well as knowledge management and transfer from science to politics.

Alongside individual academic experts engaged in science advice for policy, various forms of scholarly associations, science academies, academic networks (such as young academies) and university alliances increasingly seek to strengthen, aggregate, and disseminate scientific knowledge. They also aim to improve the impact of science on evidence-informed policymaking. With these central objectives, they are becoming collective actors of science advice for policy.

Different from individual academic experts, collective academic actors seem better positioned to provide multi-disciplinary science advice due to their capacity to connect different academic silos. Moreover, they also play an active role in modern knowledge and science diplomacy. Here, they engage in trans-and international research promotion and cooperation in higher education to link different local, national and regional academic actors, individual and collective ones. A geostrategic and -political impact on research collaboration and science evolution, as well as stronger political attention and recognition is what follows from these activities.

The multidimensional actorness of collective academic actors exacerbates the different logics of collective and individual representation of scientific expertise for policy advice. While the former (i.e., the collective level) has the potential to promote multi-disciplinary science advice more easily, the latter (i.e., the individual scientist providing expertise to EIPM) seems to still be the more frequent approach to science advice for policy. Hence, certain trade-offs seem to emerge between individual and collective academic expertise for policy that centre around the capacity to provide either disciplinary or multi-disciplinary expertise.

Focus
While its focus is on identifying improvements of multi-disciplinary science advice for policy, the session will target three main dimensions of the ecosystem of science advice for evidence-informed policymaking:

- Role of collective academic actors in multi-disciplinary science advice.

- Impact of this role on science and academia as well as the relationship to politics and society.
- Improvements of this role in multi-disciplinary science-policy interactions.

References:

Bednarek, A. T., Wyborn, C., Cvitanovic, C., Meyer, R., Colvin, R. M., Addison, P. F. E., Close, S. L., Curran, K., Farooque, M., Goldman, E., Hart, D., Mannix, H., McGreavy, B., Parris, A., Posner, S., Robinson, C., Ryan, M., & Leith, P. (2018). Boundary spanning at the science–policy interface: The practitioners' perspectives. Sustainability Science, 13(4), 1175–1183.

Bowers, J., & Testa, P. F. (2019). Better Government, Better Science: The Promise of and Challenges Facing the Evidence-Informed Policy Movement. Annual Review of Political Science, 22, 521–542.

Cairney, P., & Oliver, K. (2017). Evidence-informed policymaking is not like evidence-informed medicine, so how far should you go to bridge the divide between evidence and policy? Health Research Policy and Systems, 1–11.

Christensen, J. (2021). Expert knowledge and policymaking: A multi-disciplinary research agenda. Policy & Politics, 49(3), 455–471.

Feeney, M., & Bernal, M. (2010). Women in STEM networks: Who seeks advice and support from women scientists? Scientometrics, 85(3), 767–790.

Flink, T. (2022). "Taking the pulse of science diplomacy and developing practices of valuation". Science and Public Policy, Volume 49, Issue 2, pp. 191-200.

Gluckman, P. (2016). The science–policy interface. Science, 353(6303), 969–969.

Gluckman, P. D., Bardsley, A., & Kaiser, M. (2021). Brokerage at the science–policy interface: From conceptual framework to practical guidance. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 8(1), 1–10.

Hyde, P., Braithwaite, J., Fitzgerald, A., Best, A., Terpstra, J. L., Moor, G., Riley, B., Norman, C. D., & Glasgow, R. E. (2009). Building knowledge integration systems for evidence-informed decisions. Journal of Health Organization and Management, 23(6), 627–641.

Jagannathan, K., Emmanuel, G., Arnott, J., Mach, K. J., Bamzai-Dodson, A., Goodrich, K., Meyer, R., Neff, M., Sjostrom, K. D., & Timm, K. M. (2023). A research agenda for the science of actionable knowledge: Drawing from a review of the most misguided to the most enlightened claims in the science-policy interface literature. Environmental Science & Policy, 144, 174–186.

López de San Román, A., and Schunz, S. (2018). "Understanding European Union Science Diplomacy". Journal of Common Market Studies, 56: 247–266.

Maas, T. Y., Pauwelussen, A., & Turnhout, E. (2022). Co-producing the science–policy interface: Towards common but differentiated responsibilities. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 9(1), 1–11.

Miedema, F. (2022). Open science: The very idea. Springer Nature.

Parkhurst, J. (2017). The politics of evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence. Taylor & Francis.

Poot, C. C., van der Kleij, R. M., Brakema, E. A., Vermond, D., Williams, S., Cragg, L., van den Broek, J. M., & Chavannes, N. H. (2018). From research to evidence-informed decision making: A systematic approach. Journal of Public Health, 40(suppl_1), i3–i12.

Van Enst, W. I., Driessen, P. P. J., & Runhaar, H. A. C. (2014). Towards productive science-policy interfaces: A research agenda. Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management, 16(01), 1450007.

Voros, J. (2003). A generic foresight process framework. Foresight, 5(3), 10–21.

Voros, J. (2017). Big History and anticipation: Using Big History as a framework for global foresight. Handbook of Anticipation: Theoretical and Applied Aspects of the Use of Future in Decision Making, 1–40.

Watson, R. T. (2005). Turning science into policy: Challenges and experiences from the science–policy interface. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 360(1454), 471–477.

Young, M. and Ravinet, P. (2022). "Knowledge power Europe". Journal of European Integration.

Session 6: The production of evidence-informed policies

Chair: Maxime Petit Jean, (Expert in Policy Analysis and Evaluation to the High Strategic Council, Walloon Region – Belgium)

Speakers: Françoise Lannoy (General Administrator, AVIQ – Walloon Health Agency), Anton Muyldermans (Cabinet of Thomas Dermine, State Secretary for Economic Recovery and Strategic Investments, in charge of Science Policy, added to the Minister of the Economy and Employment), Michael Callens (Medical adviser Flemish Deputy Prime Minister and Flemish Minister of Public Health Hilde Crevits)

Scope:

Evidence-informed policy refers to the use of knowledge and expertise in policymaking processes. Over recent years, there is a growing concern that policymakers do not use evidence to its full potential in such processes *(Boaz & Davies, 2019)*.

To stimulate such use, this session aims at exploring how we can collectively stimulate the demand for evidence and its integration into policymaking. Among the multiple issues that could looked at from this perspective, the session will focus on three specific aspects in which policymakers can play a role: (1) the demand for evidence and the underlying motivations for it; (2) the structuration of a science for policy ecosystem and (3) the use of evidence by policymakers.

First, **the demand and its formulation for evidence from policymakers vary according to the context and to the policy sector**. It also depends on the political will and rationality of the demander. In that regard, the institutional and discursive conventions defines what counts as evidence *(Strassheim, 2015)*.

In this context, one of the ways to improve such demand is to co-design it by involving political advisers, civil servants and researchers in the process of both formulating the demand. The session will therefore discuss the motivations and the ways to improve the formulation of the demand for evidence.

Second, **policymakers play a key role in structuring the science for policy ecosystem**, and therefore enhance the formulation and the use of scientific advice in policymaking. This can be done through multiple instruments such activities to improve access to and uptake of research findings (e.g.: portals, dissemination), governance mechanisms to facilitate knowledge coproduction (e.g.: instituting new actors or norms), funding mechanisms (e.g.: research funding) *(OECD, 2022)*.

In this regard, the session will also examine these issues of structuring the ecosystem, also considering that knowledge production is not a linear but an interactive process.

Third, **policymakers can use evidence in different ways**. One common distinction is between instrumental use (i.e.: using knowledge for action), conceptual use (i.e.: using knowledge for understanding) and symbolic use (i.e.: using knowledge for legitimation) *(Alkin & King, 2017)*.

The session will provide insights from policymakers regarding potentialities of research use.

The following 3 questions will structure the discussions:

- How could we improve the formulation of demand for policy-relevant interdisciplinary knowledge?
- How can we structure an ecosystem producing interdisciplinary knowledge for policy ?
- How could we improve the way policymakers use interdisciplinary research ?

References:

Alkin, M. C., & King, J. A. (2017). Definitions of Evaluation Use and Misuse, Evaluation Influence, and Factors Affecting Use. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *38*(3), 434-450. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214017717015

Boaz, A., & Davies, H. (2019). *What works now? : Evidence-informed policy and practice*. Policy Press.

OECD. (2022). *Who Cares about Using Education Research in Policy and Practice? : Strengthening Research Engagement*. OECD. https://doi.org/10.1787/d7ff793d-en

Strassheim, H. (2015). Politics and policy expertise : Towards a political epistemology. In F. Fischer, D. Torgerson, A. Durnová, & M. Orsini, *Handbook of Critical Policy Studies* (p. 319-340). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783472352.00026

Session 7: Communication between actors in the EIPM ecosystem

Chair: Ingrid van Marion (Science Communication Researcher, ULB)

Speakers: Maarten Vansteenkiste (Professor of Psychology, University of Ghent), Barend van der Meulen (Director of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), University of Twente)

Scope:

Discussion on science for policy often has a focus on knowledge transfer, but within this process the role of communication practices is often overlooked despite being acknowledged as crucial (Oliver and Cairney, 2019). At the EU's Joint Research Center, the biggest laboratory of EIPM to date, communication is identified as one of the five core necessary skills in science for policy activities (Schwendinger et al., 2022), without developing how to put it in action. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the need for stable structures, adequate capacities and good practices for EIPM, embracing multidisciplinary inputs and ethically robust relationships (OECD, 2023). Having the appropriate competencies is therefore not enough: creating favourable conditions for communication to take place is a requisite for successful EIPM.

This session will strive to open up the black box of science communication in evidence-informed policy making, inviting the participants to explore how to make it happen. The aim is to identify the hurdles that complicate communication between scientists and policymakers, and share best practices of what has worked in specific contexts, aware that those solutions may not be automatically transposed to other scenarios. We will focus on the following guiding questions:

- Which communication hurdles need to be overcome to improve inclusion of SSAH in EIPM?
- Which communication best practices should be further developed for the inclusion of SSAH in the EIPM process?
- 10 years from now, when the inclusion of SSAH in EIPM takes place "in an ideal European Union", what will have changed in terms of communication in comparison to the current situation?

Literature reviews show that EIPM empirical research tends to focus on the context and organisational aspects of the science for policy process, based on the self-perceptions of the actors involved (Head, 2010; Torenvlied et al., 2022). There are multiple aspects that deserve attention in order to understand how to achieve effective communication strategies:

- Finding the adequate partners and getting their attention
- Adapting the message to the target audience and their needs
- Choosing the most appropriate communication channel and the right timing
- Using storytelling techniques to convey emotions and not just facts
- Finding the right balance between clarity, simplicity and nuance
- Building a long-term relationship between the relevant actors
- Putting ethical considerations at the center of any interaction

The diversity of actors involved in EIPM processes requires more reflection, including the role of knowledge brokers. In a recent empirical study, policy makers self-reported a lack of expertise in translation of research into practical use, while those employees responsible for supply of scientific knowledge to policy makers mainly perceived the accessibility and quality of scientific research as the main obstacles (Torenvlied et al., 2022)

The specific challenges of social sciences, arts and humanities in EIPM have received less attention than STEM, and this session provides an opportunity to share experiences. Already, the "social sciences have provided research methods to investigate the various interfaces between different disciplines and their potential audiences" in science for policy (Oliver and Boaz, 2019:2), and researchers and science communication practitioners have reflected on how social sciences can inform the communication practices of EIPM. Phoenix *et al.* (2019) provide an account based on their own experience as knowledge brokers using social sciences methods to design adequate communication strategies and analyse their impact. Jones and Crow (2017) show how literature studies can inspire researchers to construct stories that resort to heroes and metaphors to make knowledge transfer more meaningful and memorable. And Cairney and Kwiatkowski (2017) tap on the knowledge of psychology and policy studies to propose evidence-based science communication recommendations.

References:

Cairney P, Kwiatkowski R (2017) How to communicate effectively with policy- makers: combine insights from psychology and policy studies. *Palgrave Communication,* 3:37.

Head B (2010b) Reconsidering evidence-based policy: key issues and challenges. *Policy and Society,* 29(2):77–94.

Jones MD, Crow A (2017) How can we use the 'science of stories' to produce persuasive scientific stories? *Palgrave Communication,* 3:53.

OECD (2023) COVID-19 and science for policy and society. *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers,* 154.

Oliver, K., & Boaz, A. (2019). Transforming evidence for policy and practice: creating space for new conversations. *Palgrave Communications,* 5(1), 1-10.

Oliver K, Cairney P (2019) The dos and don'ts of influencing policy: a systematic review of advice to academics. *Palgrave Communication,* 5:21.

Phoenix, J. H., Atkinson, L. G., & Baker, H. (2019). Creating and communicating social research for policymakers in government. *Palgrave Communications,* 5(1).

Schwendinger, F., Topp, L. and Kovacs, V. (2022) *Competences for Policymaking.* Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Torenvlied, R., de Boer, H. F., Couwenberg, S., Linnenbank, M., & van der Meulen, B. J. R. (2022). *Naar een meer evidence-based beleid binnen JenV.* Universiteit Twente.

Session 8: Which are the essential competences and skills for the actors of EIMP ecosystems, scientists and policymakers?

Chair: Anastasia Deligkiaouri (Policy Analyst, JRC, European Commission)

Speakers: Marek Havrda ((PhD) Principal Adviser, Member of the Regulatory Scrutiny Board at the European Commission), Stephany Mazon ((PhD), Scientific Policy Officer (SPO) representing the Young Academies Science Advice Structure (YASAS) in the SAPEA (Science Advice for Policy by European Academies) consortium), Gunnar Sivertsen (Research Professor at the Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education (NIFU) in Oslo, Norway)

Scope:

Evidence users (e.g. policymakers) and providers (e.g. researchers) are faced with an urgent need to increase the capacities for effective policymaking to rise to the global challenges, to deliver innovative and future-proof policy solutions and reinforce trust in both democracy and science. By developing cross-cutting competences to both actors we are starting to build the bridge between science and policy and an ecosystem which allows for systematic and well-defined procedures of interaction and collaboration. A systemic approach addresses science-policy interactions as interconnected and provides a comprehensive understanding on the procedures and principles that govern this engagement. The focus on Science for Policy competences – that come in addition to the usual competences scientists and policymakers should have – underline the distinct character of Science for Policy actions while highlighting possible career paths and evaluation frameworks, especially for young researchers.

Case study

The case study to be presented in this session will focus on the Competence Frameworks on Science for Policy (for researchers) and 'Innovative Policymaking' (for policymakers) that were developed by JRC as a response to the need to address the complex and 'wicked' modern problems and policy challenges that require scientific input in order to understand them and resolve them.

Structure of the session

This session has three parts. A panel discussion with Q and A (Part 1), **a participatory part with the audience** (Part2) and concludes with a short talk with remarks made by the chair (Part3) as these remarks will emerge and be developed collectively from the preceding discussion. Those few 'take away' points will inform the policy brief that will be produced by the end of the conference.

If participants wish to engage in advance of the session with the mindset and the main narrative that this session will follow, they may proceed to a self-reflection on the relevant competences via the Smart4Policy Tool which was developed by JRC and it is freely accessible to everyone.

Session 9: Defining roles and building trust in the EIPM ecosystem

Chair: Magnus Gulbrandsen (Professor at the University of Oslo and Director of the Oslo Institute for Research on the Impact of Science (OSIRIS))

Speakers: Olivier Luminet (Professor of psychology, Université Catholique de Louvain)

Scope:

*This session aims to generate a **discussion** and offer **practical advice** about how **trust can be improved** in evidence-informed policymaking (EIPM). After a short introduction and presentation of a central example tied to trust – vaccination during the recent pandemic – the audience will be split into three smaller groups to come up with recommendations to be shared at the end of the session.*

What is the issue? Key actors and mechanisms for building trust

Trust is a major theme in studies of the relationship between science and society in general and evidence-informed policymaking in particular. Three actors are particularly relevant for understanding key trust challenges in EIPM:

- **Policymakers**: can they have confidence in the data, analysis, and perspectives that they are offered by scientists, and do they trust the integrity and objectivity of the scientific institutions involved?
- **Scientists**: do they experience that their knowledge is included in policy discussions and decisions when relevant? Does this happen in a way that is perceived as fair, for example that data are not distorted, findings are not cherry-picked, and use of science is not simply symbolic to support established viewpoints?
- **The general public**: is evidence-informed policymaking viewed as legitimate, where actors' independence and impartiality are secured in a process that is open, transparent and allows for engagement and dialogue?

These challenges are fundamental, not least in social science and humanities research that often concerns complex issues with political disagreements and value heterogeneity. An interesting, related issue is whether trust in EIPM is specifically tied to policymakers' and the public's trust in science – a theme covered regularly by surveys in Europe and elsewhere that tend to show high scores and most often high scores tied to specific technologies. Alternatively, the broader general trust in public institutions may also influence EIPM heavily.

Three common framings are found in linking science and policymaking to deal with these challenges:

1. **Linear model**, where research results and perspectives are produced independently from policy needs, and therefore need to be communicated or transferred to relevant policy audiences that subsequently act based (at least partly) on this evidence. Key roles for building trust in this framing are tied to the actions and codes of conduct of researchers.
2. **Reverse linear model**, where policy needs and demands shape science in important ways. Here, research may need some form of protection to ensure integrity and impartiality, and this becomes an important role for policymakers in how they fund and interact with science.

3. **Co-production**, where science and policy depend on each other and where scientific results continuously help solve some policy problems while generating new ones. Characteristics of the co-production process are central to maintaining trust, for example its responsiveness, inclusion, and adherence to democratic principles to ensure that the use of scientific evidence contributes to more trustworthy policymaking.

Practical information

Case study presented to introduce the topic: how did trust come into play in the rollout of vaccination strategies in the Covid-19 pandemic?

Insights from Olivier Luminet (Professor of psychology, Université catholique de Louvain).

References:

Boswell, C., Smith, K. Rethinking policy 'impact': four models of research-policy relations. Palgrave Commun 3, 44 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-017-0042-z

Gluckman, P.D., Bardsley, A. & Kaiser, M. Brokerage at the science–policy interface: from conceptual framework to practical guidance. Humanit Soc Sci Commun 8, 84 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00756-3