European Commission

Reflection paper

Assessing national institutional capacity for evidence-informed policymaking: the role of a science-for-policy system

Input to JRC workshop "Developing an evaluation framework for science for policy ecosystems"

Kathryn Oliver

About the author:

Kathryn Oliver is an Associate Professor of Sociology and Public Health at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Please see her profile [here](#).

Disclaimer:

The views, thoughts, and opinions expressed in this reflection paper reflect the assessment of the author and may not in any circumstances be regarded as stating an official position of the authors' employer, organisation, other group or individual, or the European Commission.

This Reflection Paper was commissioned by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC) as an input to the project "Developing an evaluation framework for science for policy ecosystems".

This Reflection Paper will be officially released in a different format and layout at a later stage, and is now available for fostering discussion in preparation of the expert workshop "Developing an evaluation framework for science for policy ecosystems" to be held on 24 March 2022.

Joint
Research
Centre

Contents

1. Summary of report and indicators

This report sets out a conceptual map for potential elements of a science-for-policy advisory ecosystem. The aim of this map is not to propose an ideal system, but rather to highlight how elements need to connect with each other at multiple levels; to allow us to ask how all involved in evidence production, mobilisation and use can act to support more effective system functioning. This paper assumes that the goal of a science-for-policy system is *the delivery of relevant, robust evidence to people with the capacity to absorb and fully understand it, in order that it might inform their decision-making*. The proposed indicators therefore help identify opportunities for support, intervention, and more strategic use of resources to improve supply and demand of evidence.

If the system was working well towards this goal, we would see:

- A research community resourced, able, and willing to do research to help government address challenges
- A government able to access relevant evidence to help inform their decision-making
- Funders and intermediaries supporting excellent policy-relevant research and effective knowledge exchange
- Policies being made and implemented which generate positive social change

Indicators of systems readiness to do this might include:

Type of actor	Possible indicators
Funders	- Engage regularly and effectively with the research communities and with relevant policy teams to support policy-relevant research through shared problem-framing - Offer appropriate training and capacity building to research organisations and teams, who include support staff - Dedicated research funding for research into evidence production and use - Balance between responsive and policy challenge-led research funding
Research organisations	- Support diverse and skilled research workforce by offering appropriate degree and other training and capacity-building support - Reward and recognise policy-relevant research and engagement activities to policy
Researchers	- Appropriately skilled and diverse workforce - Produce interesting and novel research, or relevant syntheses - Routinely engage with evidence users as a legitimate part of their work
Intermediaries	- Have skilled workforce able to synthesise and mobilise evidence in range of ways, network, and support and advocate for evidence use - Recognised and resourced specialist units or organisations dedicated to knowledge exchange - Support shared problem-framing and deliberation between policymakers and stakeholders
Policymakers	Clearly stated knowledge needs

	• Capabilities within government to assess and absorb evidence of different kinds • Transparent mechanisms to solicit and engage with evidence and experts • Internal reflection and scrutiny of advisory systems
Parliament, media and other scrutiny bodies	• Existence of, and mandate for independent, evidence-capable body(ies) to scrutinise science-for-policy system and its elements, and hold to account • Science and evidence capabilities for general scrutiny of evidence use in policy-making at national, regional and local levels

2. Introduction: Context to this report

The EC Joint Research Centre is engaged in capacity-building efforts to support evidence used in policy. This report forms part of their work into developing toolkits to help member states consider appropriate ways to invest in effective science systems. However, the goal of this report is not to offer a clear pathway towards an 'effective' science system, but rather to help encourage debates about what 'effective' systems look like, what the constituent elements might be, and what the tensions and trade-offs are when making different choices to invest in science systems.

As an academic studying evidence production and use, and as a participant in the UK government science advisory system, my insights in this report are based on my experience, my research with colleagues (e.g. (Oliver and Boaz, 2019; Oliver *et al.*, 2022), and discussions with the other report authors and experts (Ingeborg Niestroy and Roger Strand, as well as Louis Meuleman) and JRC project officers (Kristian Krieger and Lorenzo Melchor Fernandez). All mistakes and omissions remain my own responsibility. The remarks made below should be read as provocations for debate and discussion rather than proposals for action.

There are many ways to approach the question of how evidence can, does or should interact with policymaking of different kinds. There are intellectual contributions to be made to this debate from most, if not all academic disciplines, with each providing its own framing, tools, concepts and terminology. For example, in engineering and technology studies, the translation of knowledge into concrete changes in the world is known as 'knowledge or tech transfer', commercialisation', 'innovation', or 'impact'. In health sciences, this process is known as 'knowledge mobilisation' or 'translation', with changes to practices, services, or patient outcomes as endpoints. This matters, because the ways in which different disciplines and sectors imagine the relationship between evidence production and use creates a normative framing with value judgements about what constitutes 'good' evidence, 'good' evidence use, and even the fundamental purpose of such a relationship.

It is not the purpose of this paper to set out all the potential normative framings, nor to explain the critical perspectives on them which derive from work in – for example – science and technology studies (giving rise to concepts such as "responsible innovation", history of science, public policy studies, sociology of knowledge, or philosophy. Rather, I describe a set of participants ("actors") who are involved in knowledge production and use, and describe some of the connections between them. If we imagine that these actors are linked through a common purpose – to deliver useful research evidence for policy decision-making – we can begin to ask questions about how these connections might be necessary to achieve this goal, and what this might look like.

The idealised elements of a science-for-policy system therefore below are there to enable discussion about shared and conflicting goals, ways to measure and support activities undertaken by these organisations, and to think critically about what it means to be part of or to lead a system. There is a lack of empirical evidence about how these kinds of systems work in practice, with most research on the area focused either on research assessment or on knowledge mobilisation activities. One positive outcome from the JRC's programme of work would be an increased awareness about the lack of empirical research, and the relative uselessness of the all-too-common punditry which this topic attracts.

3.   What is a science system?

There have been many attempts to map, visualise and or conceptualise 'science systems' (see, e.g. . (Shepherd, 2014; Dowling, 2015; Nurse, 2015; Alliance for Useful Evidence, 2016; Rudan and Sridhar, 2016; Government Office for Science, 2019; UKRI, 2019; Hanney *et al.*, 2020; Hopkins *et al.*, 2021). They are often created by researchers, and thus refer mostly to research funding and activity (e.g Katz, 1996). The system metaphor is both helpful and unhelpful. Unhelpful, because – within this field - it offers an inevitably over-simplified picture of the set of actors, processes and interactions by which evidence is produced, mobilised and used. Used well, systems tools are an attempt to reflect dynamic processes, such as non-linear change, transformation, and learning and adaptation feedback loops (see, e.g. Krieger, 2016). Yet there have been very few if any attempts to think about these dynamic processes in the context of evidence production and use. Instead, the systems thinking remains at a relatively simple level.

The system metaphor also suggests that these diverse actors share a common goal, which is to deliver the best (research) evidence for policy.


Figure 1: Example of science system visualisation from Shepherd (2014)

In reality, of course, people do research and knowledge exchange for lots of different reasons and individuals and organisations involved have multiple goals and purposes, and ways of working; For example, universities do education as well as research. The system metaphor can also give the impression that interventions could be implemented in a relatively simplistic way to achieve this goal (see e.g. Figure 1); whereas in reality, everything we know about complex systems tells us that they generate outcomes in the absence of central control, and that intervention often adds to a chaotic set of activities with unpredictable outcomes generated almost at random (Greenhalgh and Papoutsi, 2018). Some visualisations of the science system hint at this chaos, without indicating any potential organising principles (see, e.g. Figure 2).

Figure 2: Example of map of the science-industry-policy system in UK (Dowling 2015)

On the other hand, the idea of a system helps us to focus on knowledge production and use in terms of connections (processes, activities) between actors. And, even if not all actors would agree that they share the same purpose - that is, to improve how evidence is made and used for decision-making - conceptualising the actors, activities and processes involved as components within a research system is a useful exercise (see Fig 3 for a simplified, but relational model of the UK science advisory system).

Figure 3: A visualisation of the UK science system (Hopkins et al 2021)

Even if we cannot yet think clearly about the interconnections and processes, a systems perspective still enables identification of the key organisations and activities, allows us to ask questions about how these components fit and work together, what the desired goals might be at component- and system-level and how to measure these goals – and even, and what supports and changes might be required to optimise delivery of these outcomes. Many people are of course already asking questions about these components, processes, outcomes and interventions. For example, those working in research evaluation are concerned with how the *process* of peer review improves the quality of research, and whether this can be assessed by citation metrics (outcome measurement). Similarly, many interventions are being undertaken and evaluated, such as promoting increased academic engagement with policy through training and secondments (intervention) to increase evidence uptake in policy (outcome).

In many of these investigations and - more usually - commentaries, the overall goal of these activities or organisations is implicit, but rarely stated clearly. For example, a goal of the system might be improved research quality, or increased 'evidence use' (e.g Lavis *et al.*, 2003; Gluckman, 2014). Even if not stated clearly, commentators are operating with an implicit understanding of a research system, even if not clearly conceptualised. Increasingly, systems approaches are being explicitly taken by both policy and research organisations (Government Office for Science, 2019; Hanney *et al.*, 2020; The Global Commission on Evidence, 2022).

4. Guiding principles from the literature on evidence-informed policymaking

The literature on evidence-informed policymaking, on the other hand, has a clear, albeit very broad goal – that of increasing or improving research evidence use in policy. The extensive literature on evidence and policy studies suggests that there are fundamental ways of working and goals which underpin successful delivery of evidence to policymakers at the point of need, and uptake of that evidence. A large, interdisciplinary literature tells us of the importance of:

(i)   Transparency

Clear and transparent processes to generate and assess evidence engender confidence in the findings (Parkhurst, 2017; JRC, 2019; The Global Commission on Evidence, 2022). When research is reproducible and a clear line can be traced between research question, methods, results and conclusions, it is easier for others to assess the validity of claims made. The same principle applies to the mobilisation and use of evidence. Transparent systems to select, prioritise, and interpret research, and to offer recommendations for action enable observers to understand where policies and practices come from. There is evidence that transparency around science advice in particular leads to greater trust in governments (Cvitanovic *et al.*, 2021). Being able to see how decision-makers approach problems, and the process by which they assemble evidence to move towards a decision builds confidence in democratic processes.

(ii)   Quality and rigour

Much of the literature on evidence use in policy is concerned with appropriateness, quality, rigour and robustness of evidence (Parkhurst and Abeysinghe, 2016). Often, this is taken to mean evidence of particular types generated using specific methods (such as randomised controlled trial evidence, or systematic reviews). There is also a widespread concern about the quality of reporting of research, such that it would become reproducible (Nosek and Errington, 2017). However, a more nuanced debate also seeks to understand the extent to which a body of knowledge is truly representative of the range of perspectives and interests relevant, making it more democratically legitimate; and through transparent processes and deliberative mechanisms, providing scrutiny opportunities for robust challenge and contestation.

(iii)   Credibility and legitimacy

For evidence and experts to be taken seriously, they have to be both credible and legitimate. Legitimacy is conferred by perceived fairness, processes and balancing of values, beliefs and interests; what political scientists refer to as input/output/throughput legitimacy (Cash *et al.*, 2003; Parkhurst, 2017). The concept of credibility gains salience whenever a provider of knowledge seeks to influence another. Consequently it has been a topic of scholarship in fields as diverse as communications studies (including science and risk communication), information science, marketing and management science that have variously treated credibility as a property of the source, the media and/or the information, acknowledging that these are

closely linked (Rieh and Danielson, 2007). Both credibility and legitimacy are properties of the message, and the messenger. Jasanoff explains that societies confer credibility on experts/expertise according to what we as societies consider to be characteristics of high-quality public knowledge. She explains that "In a litigious society such as that in the USA, expectations of openness, transparency, and the right to look behind formal claims are deeply engrained in a multiplicity of institutional practices. … Another society, with different traditions for producing and testing public knowledge, might dress up its expertise in other guises" (p.394, Jasanoff, 2003). In other words, epistemological criteria are not themselves enough to tell us who ought to be considered an expert, which is a value-judgment and ought to be explicitly addressed as such.

In terms of science systems, therefore, commentators debate what constitutes quality of evidence and expertise; the importance of diversity of perspective, of participant and of knowledge; and what constitutes authority, and how this can be exercised. Credibility also speaks to the democratic or formal official mandate which public scientists may have to represent and articulate evidence for decision-makers (Parkhurst, 2017). Transparency of process and of inputs allows challenge and scrutiny, which also generates credibility and trust in the system.

(iv)   Trust

An important facilitator of evidence use according to the literature is trust; in the experts, in the processes which generated evidence, and in the relationships which connect evidence producers to decision-makers. Trust can be achieved through appropriate ways of working within the science infrastructure, and by capacity and capabilities around effective and ethical engagement. Trust is a quality of relationships between individuals, and can be damaged by turnover, perceived or genuine bad-faith engagement, poor experiences and conflicting agendas (Cairney and Oliver, 2018; Oliver and Cairney, 2019).

These principles can help us to understand what elements might need to be included within a science-for-policy system, and how they may need to work with each other.

5. The goal of a science-for-policy system

We can therefore say that if goal of evidence informed policymaking is *the delivery of relevant, robust evidence to people with the capacity to absorb and fully understand it in order that it might inform their decision-making*.

We can call the ability and resource available to enable decision-makers to seek, assemble, and fully comprehend the strengths, weaknesses, and key implications from evidence *absorptive capacity*. This operates at individual and organisational levels. The science system ideally creates and sustains this capacity.

Much of the literature on evidence use in policy assumes that this goal will lead to improved decision-making, although insights from political science, science and technology studies, and indeed history tell us that this assumption is naïve at best and highly misleading. However, the goal can still be critically assessed, seeking to understand what might be required.

To unpack this a little, concepts which need to be clarified include:

- **Delivery: recognising there are multiple routes by which knowledge of different kinds reach decision-makers**
- **Relevance: How decision-makers frame problems dictates what they consider to be relevant evidence to bring in and consider. By making this as inclusive a process as possible, problems would be able to be framed with a broad understanding of context, actors, perspectives etc as possible**
- **Robustness: Historically, and still often, researchers interpret this to be essentially a methodological judgment about whether the correct design/methods have been selected and used as well as possible to address a problem. This is a very narrow conception about what robust might mean; for example, interdisciplinary, addressing different facets of a problem, transparently assembled and synthesised etc. Socially, politically robust.**
- **Inform: Where evidence informs decision-making, this can be either instrumentally (enables technocratic decision-making, in the sense that clear evaluated choices between policy options are offered by scientists) or via a more democratic, discursive process by which the strengths and weaknesses of different knowledges are offered and discussed (sometimes thought of as conceptual or ideational evidence use). Processes which lie closer to the second of these are likely associated with stronger and more credible science systems.**

Thus, we can define the science-for-policy system as the *entire system through which scientific knowledge is acquired, synthesised, translated, presented for use, and applied in the policymaking process*. One can take the view that a relatively discrete set of actors and roles who contribute (with some coordination and direction) towards a common goal constitute the science system. It is possible to define these actors, and the functions they need to fulfil, in order to achieve this goal, at a systemic level. Recognising that is a highly normative set of characteristics, which implies a shared and clear a purpose, we can nevertheless say that a fit-for-purpose science-for-policy system may:

- Have the goal of ensuring the comprehension of robust, policy-relevant evidence delivered at the point / time of need to decision-makers
- Be transparent about how this goal is achieved
- Have clear and defined roles and functions for actors within the system, which generates credibility for actors and legitimacy of the evidence
- Creates opportunities for shared problem-framing and evidence gap/needs identification, and
- Fosters opportunities for trust within relationships
- This perspective is different from most of the work in the field of scientific advice / science for policy, which focuses on measuring organisational (meso-level) and individual (micro-level) capacity of policymakers to engage with and use research (E.g) science capability, numbers of scientists in government).

However, we should recognise that a lot of science-for-policy work is self-tasked and not well-coordinated (neither within the supply nor between demand and supply sides).

6. Elements of the science-for-policy system, what they do, and how we can tell

This section of the report describes possible elements within a science-for-policy system, their roles and functions. I also reflect on the empirical evidence about each of these elements and their potential contributions to the science-policy system, and discuss the paucity of the empirical evidence base in this area. I also summarise potential activities, structures, patterns or processes which could be measured to assess the functioning of a science-for-policy system

Funders provide resources to support research activity. They can incentivise researchers through offering policy-relevant funding, e.g. through challenge-led calls. They also offer training and development of capacity and capability in research, support engagement activities. If working systemically to support a science-for-policy system, they would respond to policy priorities and knowledge needs. They could support career progression and cultures of professionalisation in evidence production, for researchers as well as knowledge brokers and other intermediaries. By engaging long term with policymakers, they can seek to both shape long-term policy agendas, and respond to policy needs. They can also support research into policy evaluation, to test the long-term impact of evidence use, and evaluate use of research evidence in producing, designing, implementing and evaluating policy.

- *There is little empirical research on the role and contribution of funders to science-policy ecosystems, and recent work suggests that their role within the system is less well-conceptualised than that of others (Tseng, 2022). Funders are potentially transformative within the system, as they have the power to allocate resources, incentivise shared-problem framing, and build skills and capacity. Most research on funder activity, however, focuses on research assessment processes (Clarke et al., 2016; Tamblyn et al., 2018), resource allocation methods (Barnett et al., 2015; Fang and Casadevall, 2016), or funding patterns (e.g. (Robson, Malik and Yentis, 2014). Enquiry into their activities and how they might support evidence-use is not always welcomed as a research topic in its own right, with many funders adopting a 'impact add-on' or otherwise non-strategic approach to research impact funding, which has led to a chaotic and messy academic-policy engagement space (Oliver et al., 2022). There is some evidence that funders globally are beginning to recognise their contribution at a systems level, and to investigate ways to collaborate and embed more effective working practices (Kamenetzky and Hinrichs-Krapels, 2020). Most funding for knowledge mobilisation takes the form of (i) research academic progression via different fellowships, (ii) engagement with industry with fellowships and placements, and more rarely and recently, (iii) engagement public administration and NGOs for policy issues.*

Possible indicators:

Type of actor	Activities – what might they need to do?	Possible indicators – how would we know these are being undertaken?
Funders	• To foster a culture of professionalisation in evidence production and mobilisation, supporting and promoting skills and careers to engage effectively and ethically • To engage with, respond to, and shape governmental knowledge needs and researcher-led priorities • To support and use research into effective knowledge systems	• Engage regularly and effectively with the research communities and with relevant policy teams to support policy-relevant research through shared problem-framing • Offer appropriate training and capacity building to research organisations and teams, who include support staff • Dedicated research funding for research into evidence production and use • Balance between responsive and policy challenge-led research funding organisations and teams, who include support staff • Dedicated research and knowledge exchange funding for research into impact and processes of evidence use in policy • Balance between independent, responsive research funding and policy relevant/challenge

Research organisations may support and reward this kind or research activity, which is designed to generate policy-relevant research. Although much research is conducted within university settings, research activities of course take place in other bodies, such as public or government-owned laboratories and research institutes, within government and local government, and (in particular evidence synthesis) in clearing-houses. These organisations could all promote and support skills for engaging effectively with policymakers, and base their recruitment, training and education strategies around long-term policy agendas to ensure that appropriately-skilled and talented researchers are being produced for the workforce. They could support career progression and cultures of professionalisation in evidence production, for researchers as well as knowledge brokers and other intermediaries. Within research organisations, universities and others, there are questions about the allocation of resources towards specialised services to support research engagement with policy – for example towards skilled staff to train and support researchers who want to participate in the science advisory system. At present, the staff who perform these services are often not given clear career progression support or recognised for the breadth of activities which they undertake and enable.

- *Universities in particular have sought to colonise the academic-policy engagement space through the creation of Policy Labs, Tech Transfer Units , Knowledge Transfer Units or similar (Oliver et al., 2022). These often seek primarily to promote the work of their own academics along the lines of any marketing or PR organisation, although in the UK the University Policy Engagement Network (UPEN) attempts to join forces makes an interesting offer (Stevenson, 2019). Evaluations of training offered by universities to promote appropriate skills is rare, although anecdotally tend to reward and create a homogenous set of academic participants in policy debates (Oliver and Cairney, 2019). More broadly, the failure of universities to promote or*

reward those seeking to build careers as academics or knowledge mobilisers more broadly is well-documented (Chang et al., 2005; Ward, 2017; Kislov et al., 2018). More generally, the evaluation and assessment of research organisations – which is almost exclusively aimed at universities – focuses on the activities of researchers, counting publications, citations and so on. There are few indicators, or indeed incentives aiming to galvanise engagement with policy. Actor-centric indicators of this kind fail to capture more systemic conditions and activities (which could include adapted career pathways, competence frameworks, university rankings on the basis of engagement).

Possible indicators:

Type of actor	Activities – what might they need to do?	Possible indicators – how would we know these are being undertaken?
Research organisations	• To support a diverse workforce equipped with skills and expertise relevant to policy challenges through relevant training, and capacity building opportunities • To reward and enable research engagement with policy and practice organisations	• Support diverse and skilled research workforce by offering appropriate degree and other training and capacity-building support • Reward and recognise policy-relevant research and engagement activities to policy • Supporting a diverse workforce with capabilities in knowledge exchange with policy

Researchers whether in universities or in other organisations might engage in policy-relevant research. They may be incentivised to do useful research, or choose to do so for ethical and moral reasons. They may engage with partners to enable this research to be framed in a useful way. The research workforce would be diverse and inclusive which is skilled and resource to investigate issues of importance to policy.

• *The evidence suggests that university researchers at present are not skilled at, rewarded for, and do not feel incentivised to undertake engagement with policy and practice (Upton, Vallance and Goddard, 2014). Where this kind of activity is undertaken, it is often because researchers feel it is morally or ethically correct, rather than a legitimate use of work time; rarely is it counted in work plans or job descriptions. Finding ways to help researchers build skills in is a priority for healthy science-policy systems (Bayley et al., 2018). It should be noted that many feel (as funders and peer review colleges often express) that engagement is a threat to academic identities and independence (Boaz et al., 2021). The challenge is to help participants in the science-for-policy system articulate the tensions between independence, robustness, relevance, and importance of different evidence types and activities, while seeking to understand how to navigate between different choices about how to engage, for what purpose, and with whom (Cairney and Oliver, 2018). As stated above, few researchers are assessed – or therefore incentivised - on their ability to successfully engage with policy at any level.*

→

Possible indicators:

Type of actor	Activities – what might they need to do?	Possible indicators – how would we know these are being undertaken?
Researchers	• **Produce interesting and novel research evidence relevant to policy challenges** • **To seek to support effective knowledge systems**	• **Appropriately skilled and diverse workforce** • **Produce interesting and novel research, or relevant syntheses** • **Routinely engage with evidence users as a legitimate part of their work**

Intermediaries support the mobilisation of this research, through synthesis, through training, through networking and convening, and through being trusted and credible sources of advice and evidence for policymakers. They may include synthesis clearing-houses, such as the What Works Network in the UK (Bristow, Carter and Martin, 2015; Gough, Maidment and Sharples, 2018) which brings together a set of organisations which (mostly) synthesise evidence on different policy sectors (Health, local economics, etc), and often focus on a particular set of evidence types such as systematic reviews. There are also learned societies, national academies, parliamentary bodies and public agencies (Nentwich 2019). Those intermediaries which interact more with policymakers are less synthesis-oriented and often house individuals who have backgrounds across policy, research and hybrid organisations. They tend to understand the research system better than other types of organisations, and hold deep expertise in convening and long-term policy engagement (Parker et al., 2014), although currently most large intermediaries are focused on using fellowships and secondments to promote their members' work.

- *Globally and at national levels, intermediary organizations are often supported through research or government funding. The role as advisers of these organisations is quite prominent in many countries (UK included). Some are also equipped with specialised policy staff who often hold deep expertise in convening and engaging effectively with both researchers and policymakers, often due to hybrid careers which span policy and research organisations. Yet it can be challenging to build long-term careers in this space, and there is little empirical evidence about where these intermediaries are best placed to act or how.*

Possible indicators:

Type of actor	Activities – what might they need to do?	Possible indicators – how would we know these are being undertaken?
Intermediaries	• To support effective functioning of the system through providing convening and network opportunities • Synthesise and mobilise evidence in range of ways	• Have skilled workforce able to synthesise and mobilise evidence in range of ways, network, and support and advocate for evidence use • Recognised and resourced specialist units or organisations dedicated to knowledge exchange • Support shared problem-framing and deliberation between policymakers and

Policymakers have a clear and transparent mechanisms to seek diverse, appropriate and relevant research evidence. They are able to actively and efficiently engage a range of perspectives in developing, implementing and evaluating policies, and provide opportunities for deliberation over policy goals and shared problem-framing with a range of stakeholders.

- *Much has been written about the ability of policymakers to respond to evidence, and the various challenges which hinder this process (Oliver, Lorenc and Innvær, 2014; Cairney, 2016; Parkhurst, 2017). Most interventions to address this problem assume that more evidence will improve decision-making (an un-evidenced assertion), and seek to increase dissemination or build relationships between researchers and decision-makers (('Supporting Policy In health with Research: an Intervention Trial (SPIRIT)-protocol for a stepped wedge trial.', 2014; Crowley, Scott and Fishbein, 2018). Investigations into science advisory systems tend towards the anecdotal or suffer from lack of day-to-day empirical insights into the machinery of government (Wilsdon, J and Doubleday, 2013). By contrast, strategic reports into policy processes which seek to engage with science and evidence within government offer clear recommendations about how to build capacity within government, but lack empirical insights about the rest of the system (Government Office for Science, 2019).*

Possible indicators:

Type of actor	Activities – what might they need to do?	Possible indicators – how would we know these are being undertaken?
Policymakers	• Internal capacity and capability to engage with shared problem framing, identify and seek out a range of diverse evidence types, and able to assess and comprehend evidence findings and implications • To state clearly their knowledge needs, and have clear and transparent evidence-informed mechanisms to seek diverse and appropriate evidence	• Existence of clearly stated knowledge needs • Range of capabilities within government to assess and absorb evidence of different kinds • Transparent mechanisms to solicit and engage with evidence and experts • Internal reflection and scrutiny of advisory systems

Scrutiny of science advisory processes and structures of science advice by parliament or equivalent would provide a good check on whether appropriately diverse, representative, and xmakers, advisors and scientists are all accountable to the public for their activities within the science-for-policy system.

- *Studies of science systems across the world tend to assert that few legislatures have good access to evidence, but on closer scrutiny it can be seen that this refers to a relatively narrow set of evidence types (such as health technology assessments) (Monaghan and Ward, 2022). Similarly although there are some studies of whether or not funded research matches the priorities of different groups (McLean et al., 2018; Luce and Simeone, 2019; Jo, 2020) , there are few empirical insight to draw at a systemic level. Yet again, there is almost no empirical evidence about the different mechanisms which governments use to bring in knowledges of different kinds, nor about how these processes and outcomes might be appropriately scrutinised. This leaves science advisors, and science systems in general open to opinionated punditry, which unfortunately stands in for good quality empirical and critical analysis which could guide future investment into science-for-policy systems.*

Possible indicators:

Type of actor	Activities – what might they need to do?	Possible indicators – how would we know these are being undertaken?
Parliament, media or others	• To provide effective scrutiny of effective systems functioning, include gaps between knowledge needs and produced research evidence, workforce diversity, and assessment systems • To enable government to identify what it does not yet know it needs to know	• Existence of, and mandate for independent, evidence-capable body(ies) to scrutinise science-for-policy system and its elements, and hold to account • Science and evidence capabilities for general scrutiny of evidence use in policy-making at national, regional and local levels

Overall, therefore, there may be ways to examine the roles, responsibilities, and pressures on different elements of, and actors in the science-for policy system.

7. Measuring the science-for-policy system: What can be measured, and does it tell us?

Although a simple and simplified set of elements and relationships, this set of elements nevertheless allows us to think about relationships, actors, processes, and outcomes which we may wish to see within the science-for-policy system. We therefore have, for this complex system, a goal or purpose, a structure and can begin to understand the rules which govern the interactions within this system.

There is, as noted above, almost no attempt to map activity of, or outputs from non-research actors in the science-for-policy system. Instead, we have measurement predominantly of research activity (often in terms of publications and citations, which is taken as a proxy for productivity or creativity), or impact (often measured effectively anecdotally). There is a long debate about the utility or otherwise of these metrics (see, e.g. Wilsdon, 2017). The academic consensus about these appears to be that we measure what can be measured, rather than what is useful to know. Publications are said to be a poor proxy for bodies of knowledge (Woelert, 2013), and citations affected by social biases like sexism, racism and desire for power and recognition (Oancea, 2019). The assessment of research has become, it is argued, a form of performance management within universities (Zait, Spalanzani and Rusu, 2010) which is highly costly (Petrova and Barclay, 2019) and often resented by researchers (Nolan 2008, Torrance, Shewan 2006, Tomlinson 2000). Constraining measurement in this way also creates perverse incentives around producing publications rather than socially useful knowledge, and disincentivise useful behaviours. Metrics can guide behaviours, rather than indicate activity. Part of this debate is essentially a response to greater scrutiny and management of researchers within universities and other research organisations – traditionally, in the UK at least, a sector with a very light-touch management culture. But much of the critique, while possibly accurate in terms of effects and perverse incentives, fails to acknowledge that the metrics available are simply not measuring what is useful to know. Thus, what might we wish to measure?

Summary of possible indicators:

Type of actor	Possible indicators
Funders	• Engage regularly and effectively with the research communities and with relevant policy teams to support policy-relevant research through shared problem-framing • Offer appropriate training and capacity building to research organisations and teams, who include support staff • Dedicated research and knowledge exchange funding for research into evidence production and use • Balance between responsive and policy challenge-led research funding
Research organisations	• Support diverse and skilled research workforce by offering appropriate degree and other training and capacity-building support • Reward and recognise policy-relevant research and engagement activities to policy

	• Supporting a diverse workforce with capabilities in knowledge exchange with policy
Researchers	• Appropriately skilled and diverse workforce
	• Produce interesting and novel research, or relevant syntheses
	• Routinely engage with evidence users as a legitimate part of their work
Intermediaries	• Have skilled workforce able to synthesise and mobilise evidence in range of ways, network, and support and advocate for evidence use
	• Recognised and resourced specialist units or organisations dedicated to knowledge exchange
	• Support shared problem-framing and deliberation between policymakers and stakeholders
Policymakers	• Clearly stated knowledge needs
	• Capabilities within government to assess and absorb evidence of different kinds
	• Transparent mechanisms to solicit and engage with evidence and experts
	• Internal reflection and scrutiny of advisory systems
Parliament, media and other scrutiny bodies	• Existence of, and mandate for independent, evidence-capable body(ies) to scrutinise science-for-policy system and its elements, and hold to account
	• Science and evidene capabilities for general scrutiny of evidence use in policy-making at national, regional and local levels

As discussed briefly above, these indicators can tell us much about the functioning of groups of actors, and all may be necessary to support the healthy functioning of a science-for-policy system. Yet, as adequately documented elsewhere, indicators can also drive perverse incentives (such as an over-focus on evidence production, or on activities rather than effectiveness and efficiency). Thus, as well as requiring element-functions indicators, we can also consider how we would assess the system as a whole. For example, could we examine concordance between identified policy knowledge need, and produced research / skilled individuals / data and evidence? Would evidence of long-term knowledge and research agendas meeting these needs suffice? How could these be assessed? As mentioned in the introduction, systems-thinking applied to this field is in its infancy, so these are merely suggestions to sketch out the level at which connectivity and learning might begin to be expressed in a science-for-policy system.

8.   A system within a system

Coming back to the key principles and goals, the potential map of elements (and recognising the paucity of empirical work in this area) allows us to ask questions about how these attributes of processes, individuals and relationships might enable evidence users and producers to share and discuss problems. If trust and credibility are key factors which functional systems require, how can this be fostered when actors have such different pressures and incentives working on them? What might the tensions be between transparency of activity, and independence of advice? How can opportunities to shape how researchers, funders, and decision-makers frame problems enables policy-relevant evidence to be generated and used most effectively? These tensions cannot be easily resolved, but should be borne in mind when considering what a 'good' system looks like, for whom, and how it can be measured.

For example, a system which operated solely for the benefit of government would have narrow problem spaces, funnel resources towards those, and have a strong evidence 'pull' mechanism. On the other hand, having no say over what research to do would probably lead to a demotivated and de-skilled research workforce. The argument is made that research-led, curiosity driven research is essential for the generation of robust evidence, presumably on the basis that only when truly interested can researchers perform well (Belcher, Suryadarma and Halimanjaya, 2017). However, in the absence of empirical evidence about the most effective research management methods, it is difficult to say what the "best" balance is between challenge- and curiosity-led funding. The same applies to the other challenges across the system – tensions need to be discussed in the light of empirical evidence about options.

The job for those constructing and supporting science-for-policy systems, therefore would be easier if there were greater reflection into, and enquiry into different models of evidence production and use. This type of research, (otherwise known as research on research, science of science, meta-research, evidence use, research on research use, meta-science, knowledge mobilisation, innovation studies, impact studies, and so on) is rarely considered a priority by research funders, and less so by peer review colleges. Where research investments are made, activity is almost exclusively focused on research assessment or practices (such as reproducibility) which is a minor aspect of the overall problem (Oliver and Boaz, 2019). The impact of this is the lack of empirical evidence on which to ground this report.

This conceptual map of the science-for-policy system is therefore just an idealised set of relationships and processes amongst existing actors. In reality, of course, this is a much more varied and patchy picture - for example, different policy areas will have their own sets of relationships and interactions, but may not interact much with each other. The science-for-policy system is a product of a particular lens which highlights particular elements. It is also a sub system embedded in much more complex systems, in which every stakeholder or partner have different often competing agendas. This wider system includes all producers of knowledge, who may or may not be incentivised to produce policy-relevant knowledge; it also includes funders, intermediaries like evidence synthesisers, and decision-makers whether or not they are actively seeking research evidence. Conceptualising this set of actors as a system implies a shared goal and shared purpose, whereas many, possibly most the activities of people and organisations in the system are not related to delivering science for policy. It

implies relatively simple interventions can improve the system, whereas we know that interventions in this space tend to add to a chaotic mass of activity rather than create streamlined strategic order, or even desired / desirable outcomes of the wider evidence-policy-practice system.

This wider system is likely to vary significantly across member states. For example, not all will have independent public funders or research; highly centralised research management and assessment; different governance systems which influence policymaking cultures and practices, and variation in service delivery models (Hanney *et al.*, 2020). Highlighting these differences across contexts and settings would be an important empirical contribution. It is not the purpose of this paper to suggest that the creation of a centralised system is possible, or even desirable. It would only be possible under certain circumstances, if accepted as legitimate and credible by other actors within the wider evidence system. The key implications of the principles and elements described above are:

- **Existence of actors, roles or initiatives is not sufficient to assume good 'systems functioning'**
- **An assessment of the degree to which their functions and activities contribute to the science system would be necessary**
- **We would need to understand how the science system is supported by the wider system, in terms of incentives, drivers and norms.**
- **Interventions to improve the science system would need to take account of competing initiatives and other systemic factors.**

Ultimately, it may not be possible to have a discrete 'excellent' science for policy system without a robust and productive wider science system; yet, we know little about how this wider system operates, nor how to support it well.

9. Questions to debate

(i) To what extent is leadership and coordination of the science-for-policy system desirable or possible, within the wider systems of governance, policy and knowledge?

The power to set questions, identify contributors, generate findings, and accept or ignore implications lies with the leaders of the science-for-policy system. Effective leadership might create opportunities for shared problem framing, but also seek to improve the system through transparency, incentivised connectedness and support for credible actors. Leadership and coordination might be visible through the creation of networks to help align interests and priorities, creating similar cultures of decision-making and institutional practices.

Leadership of science systems is often diffuse and, potentially, not even connected with each other. This is the case in the UK, where funders, decision-makers and researchers are incentivised and motivated in different directions. The existence of a centralised Government Science Advice system creates visible leadership and opportunities to coordinate with public funders of research, but the downstream activities at research organisation and researcher level remain driven by institutional or individual gain. This is often argued to be a positive attribute, widening diversity and plurality, as well as robustness of research outputs. Thus - should activities be streamlined and overseen (and by whom) or is a more organic, thousand-flowers-in-bloom approach more appropriate?

(ii) At what level should activities operate? What is the role of international, national, regional and local capacity in supporting effective science-for-policy systems?

Debates about scaling up of knowledge generation often focus on the local role of universities as generators of economic growth (although few studies of local science advice exist), but there are greater questions to be asked around economies of scale and appropriate levels for different elements and activities. One way to assess the strength of national systems might be to examine their links with international research and policy networks which would enable them to access a more diverse set of knowledges than exist locally. For example, what is the balance between EU- and member state-led public funding of research? Does the UK need capabilities in technical testing if they have access to European expertise and institutions? What can be scaled up and what needs to remain local?

(iii)   How comparable are science systems? Does the above level of conceptual abstraction work and can we create indicators meaningful to very diverse systems.

Do all science systems need the same elements, and to what extent should these be shaped by differing policy and governance systems? Does "healthy" system mean different things in different contexts (does evidence (production) need to look different in a centralised versus fragmented political system to be seen as legitimate and/or even considered by policymakers?) What are the implications of federal vs central state systems, or parliamentary versus semi-presidential versus presidential systems?

(iv)   What is the goal of a science-for-policy system?

Do we agree that the goal is to generate evidence for policy where and when it is needed? What are the tensions around independence of research and policy/practice need (quality, retaining workforce, robustness)? What is evidence for, and is impact a useful way to think about the purpose of this system? Where do opportunities lie to ascertain and deliver this goal (perhaps through shared problem framing?) This, admittedly highly functionalist framing omits the broader context of political decision-making, which occurs in very different ways (democratic, autocratic, technocratic) in different contexts. All flavours of government draw on evidence and knowledge in different ways; the question for science advisory systems and those who wish to support them is to what extent the science system can and should be used in support of these broader political aims.

(v)   How can this system be strengthened?

Intervening to improve the system tends to add to a chaotic mass of activity rather than create streamlined strategic order, or even desired / desirable outcomes. We cannot just look for what is in place (e.g. an intermediary at the Parliament; a funding scheme appreciating impact case studies; etc). Rather, we need to get an understanding of the extent/quality to/with which structures/actors in place engage with science for policy. In other words, what is the theory of change to which we are working, and for what purpose?

10. References

Alliance for Useful Evidence (2016) *The Alliance for Useful Evidence*. Available at: https://www.alliance4usefulevidence.org/ (Accessed: 14 February 2019).

Barnett, A. G. *et al.* (2015) 'Streamlined research funding using short proposals and accelerated peer review: An observational study', *BMC Health Services Research*. Queensland University of Technology (QUT), 60 Musk Ave, Kelvin Grove, Brisbane, QLD 4059, Australia   Australian Centre for Health Services Innovation (AusHSI), 60 Musk Ave, Kelvin Grove, Brisbane, QLD 4059, Australia   Cerebral Palsy Alliance, 187 Al, 15(1). Available at: https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84928028358&doi=10.1186%2Fs12913-015-0721-7&partnerID=40&md5=e33c5af96254f1c0d002b0de79b9c8e8.

Bayley, J. E. *et al.* (2018) 'Development of a framework for knowledge mobilisation and impact competencies', *EVIDENCE & POLICY*. UNIV BRISTOL, 1-9 OLD PARK HILL, BRISTOL BS2 8BB, ENGLAND: POLICY PRESS, 14(4), pp. 725–738. doi: 10.1332/174426417X14945838375124.

Belcher, B., Suryadarma, D. and Halimanjaya, A. (2017) 'Evaluating policy-relevant research: lessons from a series of theory-based outcomes assessments', *Palgrave Communications*. [Belcher, Brian] Royal Rd Univ, Victoria, BC, Canada. [Belcher, Brian; Suryadarma, Daniel] Ctr Int Forestry Res, Bogor, Indonesia. [Halimanjaya, Aidy] Padjadjaran State Univ, Sustainable Dev Goals Ctr, Bandung, Indonesia. [Halimanjaya, Aidy] Univ East Ang, 3, p. 16.

Boaz, A. *et al.* (2021) 'How far does an emphasis on stakeholder engagement and co-production in research present a threat to academic identity and autonomy? A prospective study across five European countries', *Research Evaluation*. Oxford Academic, 30(3), pp. 361–369. doi: 10.1093/RESEVAL/RVAB013.

Bristow, D., Carter, L. and Martin, S. (2015) 'Using evidence to improve policy and practice: the UK What Works Centres', *CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL SCIENCE*, 10(2), pp. 126–137. doi: 10.1080/21582041.2015.1061688.

Cairney, P. (2016) *The politics of evidence-based policymaking*. 1st edn. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-51781-4.

Cairney, P. and Oliver, K. (2018) 'How Should Academics Engage in Policymaking to Achieve Impact?', *Political Studies Review*, 18(2). doi: 10.1177/1478929918807714.

Cash, D. W. *et al.* (2003) 'Knowledge systems for sustainable development', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. National Academy of Sciences, 100(14), pp. 8086–8091. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1231332100.

Chang, S. *et al.* (2005) 'Adapting postdoctoral training to interdisciplinary science in the 21st century: The Cancer Prevention Fellowship Program at the National Cancer Institute', *Academic Medicine*. NCI, Off Prevent Oncol, Div Canc Prevent, NIH,DHHS,Program Evaluat & Career Dev, Bethesda, MD 20892 USA.   Chang, S (corresponding author), NCI, Off Prevent Oncol, Div Canc Prevent, NIH,DHHS,Program Evaluat & Career Dev, 6120 Execut Blvd,Suite T-41 MSC , 80(3), pp. 261–265.

Clarke, P. *et al.* (2016) 'A randomized trial of fellowships for early career researchers finds a high reliability in funding decisions', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. [Clarke, Philip] Univ Melbourne, Melbourne Sch Populat & Global Hlth, Melbourne, Vic 3010, Australia. [Herbert, Danielle; Graves, Nick; Barnett, Adrian G.] Queensland Univ Technol, Sch Publ Hlth & Social Work, Brisbane, Qld 4059, Australia. [Herbert, Dani, 69, pp. 147–151.

Crowley, M., Scott, J. T. B. and Fishbein, D. (2018) 'Translating Prevention Research for Evidence-Based Policymaking: Results from the Research-to-Policy Collaboration Pilot.', *Prevention science : the official journal of the Society for*

Prevention Research. United States, 19(2), pp. 260–270. doi: 10.1007/s11121-017-0833-x.

Cvitanovic, C. *et al.* (2021) 'Strategies for building and managing "trust" to enable knowledge exchange at the interface of environmental science and policy', *Environmental Science and Policy*, 123, pp. 179–189. doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2021.05.020.

Dowling, A. (2015) *The Dowling Review of Business-University Research Collaborations*, *BIS*. Available at: https://www.google.com/search?client=safari&rls=en&q=The+Dowling+Review+of+Business-University+Research+Collaborations&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8 (Accessed: 8 February 2022).

Fang, F. C. and Casadevall, A. (2016) 'Research Funding: the Case for a Modified Lottery', *mBio*. Fang, Ferric C. Departments of Laboratory Medicine and Microbiology, University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, Washington, USA fcfang@uw.edu.   Casadevall, Arturo. Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg , 7(2), pp. e00422-16. Available at: https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med13&AN=27073093 https://discover.lshtm.ac.uk/openurl/44HYG/44HYG_services_page?sid=OVID:medline&id=doi:10.1128%2FmBio.00422-16&id=pmid27073093&issn=2150-7511&isbn=&volume=7&issue=.

Gluckman, P. (2014) 'The art of science advice to the government', *Nature*, 507, pp. 163–165. doi: 10.1038/507163a.

Gough, D., Maidment, C. and Sharples, J. (2018) *UK What Works Centres: Aims, methods and contexts*. London. Available at: https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?tabid=3731 (Accessed: 27 February 2019).

Government Office for Science (2019) *Realising our ambition through science: a review of Government Science Capability*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-science-capability-review.

Greenhalgh, T. and Papoutsi, C. (2018) 'Studying complexity in health services research: Desperately seeking an overdue paradigm shift', *BMC Medicine*. doi: 10.1186/s12916-018-1089-4.

Hanney, S. R. *et al.* (2020) 'How to strengthen a health research system: WHO's review, whose literature and who is providing leadership?', *Health Research Policy and Systems*. doi: 10.1186/s12961-020-00581-1.

Hopkins, A. *et al.* (2021) 'Science Advice in the UK'. doi: 10.53289/GUTW3567.

Jasanoff, S. (2003) 'Breaking the Waves in Science Studies', *Social Studies of Science*. SAGE Publications, 33(3), pp. 389–400. doi: 10.1177/03063127030333004.

Jo, W. (2020) 'Funding sources and breast cancer research frame', *PLoS ONE*. (Jo) Department of Sociology, College of Social Science, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea (Jo) Institute for Social Development and Policy Research, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea   W. Jo, Department of Sociology, College of , 15(8). Available at: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0238026&type=printable https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=emexc&AN=2007608471 https://discover.lshtm.ac.uk/openurl/44HYG/44HYG_services_page?

JRC (2019) *Enlightenment 2.0 Flagship Report*. Brussels. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/enlightenment/call-experts-understanding-our-politcal-nature.

Kamenetzky, A. and Hinrichs-Krapels, S. (2020) 'How do organisations implement research impact assessment (RIA) principles and good practice? A narrative review and exploratory study of four international research funding and administrative organisations', *Health Research Policy & Systems*. Kamenetzky, Adam. National Institute for Health Research Central Commissioning Facility, Twickenham, TW1 3NL, United Kingdom. adam.kamenetzky@nihr.ac.uk.   Kamenetzky, Adam. Policy Institute at King's College London, Strand Campus, London, WC2B 6LE, Uni, 18(1), p. 6. Available at: https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med17&AN=31959198 https://discover.lshtm.ac.uk/openurl/44HYG/44HYG_services_page?sid=OVID:medline&id=doi:10.1186%2Fs12961-019-

0515-1&id=pmid31959198&issn=1478-4505&isbn=&volume=18&i.

Katz, J. S. and Hicks, D. M. (1996) 'A systemic view of British science', *Scientometrics*. Springer Netherlands, 35(1), pp. 133–154. doi: 10.1007/BF02018237.

Kislov, R. *et al.* (2018) 'Learning from the emergence of NIHR Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRCs): a systematic review of evaluations', *Implementation Science*. BioMed Central, 13(1), p. 111. doi: 10.1186/s13012-018-0805-y.

Krieger, K. (2016) *Resilience and risk studies*, *Routledge Handbook of Risk Studies*. Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9781315776835.

Lavis, J. N. *et al.* (2003) 'How can research organizations more effectively transfer research knowledge to decision makers?', *Milbank Quarterly*, 81(2), pp. 221–248. doi: 10.1111/1468-0009.t01-1-00052.

Luce, B. R. and Simeone, J. C. (2019) 'How different is research done by the Patient-centered Outcomes Research Institute, and what difference does it make?', *Journal of Comparative Effectiveness Research*. Luce, Bryan R. Comparative Health Outcomes, Policy and Economics (CHOICE), School of Pharmacy, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA. Luce, Bryan R. Real-world Evidence, Evidera, Inc., MD 20814, USA. Luce, Bryan R. Luce Outcomes Researc, 8(14), pp. 1239–1251. Available at: https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med16&AN=31436471 https://discover.lshtm.ac.uk/openurl/44HYG/44HYG_services_page?sid=OVID:medline&id=doi:10.2217%2Fcer-2019-0054&id=pmid31436471&issn=2042-6305&isbn=&volume=8&issue=.

McLean, R. K. D. *et al.* (2018) 'Translating research into action: An international study of the role of research funders', *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 16(1). doi: 10.1186/s12961-018-0316-y.

Monaghan, M. and Ward, V. (2022) 'We know how to collaborate across borders in science, but to address global challenges, we are going to need parliamentary collaboration too', *Transforming Evidence blog*.

Nosek, B. A. and Errington, T. M. (2017) 'Making sense of replications.', *eLife*. England, 6. doi: 10.7554/eLife.23383.

Nurse, P. (2015) *Ensuring a successful UK research endeavour: A review of the UK Research councils*. doi: BIS/15/625.

Oancea, A. (2019) 'Research governance and the future(s) of research assessment', *PALGRAVE COMMUNICATIONS*. BRUNEL RD BLDG, HOUNDMILLS, BASINGSTOKE RG21 6XS, HANTS, ENGLAND: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN LTD, 5. doi: 10.1057/s41599-018-0213-6.

Oliver, K. A. *et al.* (2022) 'What Works in Academic-Policy Engagement?', *Evidence and Policy*.

Oliver, K. and Boaz, A. (2019) 'Transforming evidence for policy and practice: creating space for new conversations', *Palgrave Communications*, 5(1). doi: 10.1057/s41599-019-0266-1.

Oliver, K. and Cairney, P. (2019) 'The dos and don'ts of influencing policy: a systematic review of advice to academics', *Palgrave Communications*, 5(1). doi: 10.1057/s41599-019-0232-y.

Oliver, K., Lorenc, T. and Innvær, S. (2014) 'New directions in evidence-based policy research: A critical analysis of the literature', *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 12(1), p. 34. doi: 10.1186/1478-4505-12-34.

Parker, M. *et al.* (2014) 'Identifying the Science and Technology Dimensions of Emerging Public Policy Issues through Horizon Scanning', *PLOS ONE*. Public Library of Science, 9(5), p. e96480. doi: 10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0096480.

Parkhurst, J. (2017) *The Politics of Evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence. Routledge Studies in Governance and Public Policy*. doi: doi:10.4324/9781315675008.

Parkhurst, J. O. and Abeysinghe, S. (2016) 'What Constitutes "Good" Evidence for Public Health and Social Policy-making?

From Hierarchies to Appropriateness', *Social Epistemology*, 30(5–6), pp. 665–679. doi: 10.1080/02691728.2016.1172365.

Petrova, M. and Barclay, S. (2019) 'Research approvals iceberg: How a "low-key" study in England needed 89 professionals to approve it and how we can do better', *BMC Medical Ethics*. BioMed Central, 20(1). doi: 10.1186/S12910-018-0339-5.

Rieh, S. Y. and Danielson, D. R. (2007) 'Credibility: A multidisciplinary framework', *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 41(1), pp. 307–364. doi: 10.1002/aris.2007.1440410114.

Robson, E. J., Malik, M. J. and Yentis, S. M. (2014) 'Research funding in obstetric anaesthesia: US vs. UK', *International Journal of Obstetric Anesthesia*. (Robson, Malik, Yentis) Department of Anaesthesia, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, London, United Kingdom   E.J. Robson, Department of Anaesthesia, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, London, United Kingdom,   23,   p.   S31.   Available   at: https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=emed15&AN=71494080 https://discover.lshtm.ac.uk/openurl/44HYG/44HYG_services_page?sid=OVID:embase&id=doi:10.1016%2Fj.ijoa.2014.03.0 11&id=pmid&issn=0959-289X&isbn=&volume=23&issue=SU.

Rudan, I. and Sridhar, D. (2016) 'Structure, function and five basic needs of the global health research system', *Journal of Global Health*. University of Edinburgh, 6(1). doi: 10.7189/JOGH.06.010505.

Shepherd, J. (2014) *Evidence and guidance for better public services: Making the most of the Evidence Ecosystem*.

Stevenson, O. (2019) *Making space for new models of academic-policy engagement*, *Universities Policy Engagement Network (UPEN) Blog*. Available at: http://www.upen.ac.uk/blogs/?action=story&id=41 (Accessed: 12 April 2019).

'Supporting Policy In health with Research: an Intervention Trial (SPIRIT)-protocol for a stepped wedge trial.' (2014) *BMJ open*. England, 4(7), p. e005293. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005293.

Tamblyn, R. *et al.* (2018) 'Assessment of potential bias in research grant peer review in Canada', *CMAJ Canadian Medical Association Journal*. Tamblyn, Robyn. Institute of Health Services and Policy Research (Tamblyn), Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Ottawa, Ont.; Departments of Medicine (Tamblyn) and Epidemiology, and Biostatistics (Girard, Qian, Hanley),   Faculty   of   Medicine,   McGill   Uni,   190(16),   pp.   E489–E499.   Available   at: https://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&CSC=Y&NEWS=N&PAGE=fulltext&D=med15&AN=29685909 https://discover.lshtm.ac.uk/openurl/44HYG/44HYG_services_page?sid=OVID:medline&id=doi:10.1503%2Fcmaj.170901&i d=pmid29685909&issn=0820-3946&isbn=&volume=190&issue=.

The   Global   Commission   on   Evidence   (2022)   'The   Evidence   Commission   report'.   Available   at: https://www.mcmasterforum.org/networks/evidence-commission/report/english (Accessed: 7 March 2022).

Tseng, V. (2022) *Research on Research Use: Building Theory, Empirical Evidence, and a Global Field*, *William T. Grant Foundation*.   Available   at: http://wtgrantfoundation.org/digest/research-on-research-use-building-theory-empirical-evidence-and-a-global-field (Accessed: 9 March 2022).

UKRI (2019) *Delivery Plan 2019*. Available at: https://www.ukri.org/files/about/dps/ukri-dp-2019/.

Upton, S., Vallance, P. and Goddard, J. (2014) 'From outcomes to process: evidence for a new approach to research impact assessment', *RESEARCH EVALUATION*. GREAT CLARENDON ST, OXFORD OX2 6DP, ENGLAND: OXFORD UNIV PRESS, 23(4), pp. 352–365. doi: 10.1093/reseval/rvu021.

Ward, V. (2017) 'Why, whose, what and how? A framework for knowledge mobilisers', *Evidence and Policy*. doi: 10.1332/174426416X14634763278725.

Wilsdon, J and Doubleday, R. (2013) *Future Directions for Scientific Advice in Whitehall*. London. Available at: https://www.google.com/search?q=Wilsdon%2C+J+and+Doubleday%2C+R+%282013%29+Future+Directions+for+Scientific

+Advice+in+Whitehall.+London%3A+Institute+for+Government%2FAlliance+for+Useful+Evidence%2FCSaP&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&client=firefox-b-ab (Accessed: 22 June 2018).

Wilsdon, J. (2017) *The Metric Tide: Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management*, *The Metric Tide: Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management*. doi: 10.4135/9781473978782.

Woelert, P. (2013) 'The "Economy of Memory": Publications, Citations, and the Paradox of Effective Research Governance', *Minerva*. Univ Melbourne, Melbourne Grad Sch Educ, Parkville, Vic 3010, Australia.   Woelert, P (corresponding author), Univ Melbourne, Melbourne Grad Sch Educ, 100 Leicester St, Parkville, Vic 3010, Australia.   pwoelert@unimelb.edu.au, 51(3), pp. 341–362.

Zait, D., Spalanzani, A. and Rusu, C. (2010) *CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION IN UNIVERSITY SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH*, *Quality Management in Higher Education, Vol 2*. [Zait, Dumitru] Alexandru Ioan Cuza Univ, Iasi, Romania.   dzait@uaic.ro; Alain.Spalanzani@bvra.upmf-grenoble.fr Iasi: Univ Tech Gheorghe Asachi Iasi.