

OIS Experimentation Session

Policy intervention ideas developed by the groups related to the following task:

Develop an idea for a concrete policy intervention that the Danish government could use to increase the societal impact of research within the next 2-5 years?

→ *Policy making on this topic also occurs at the university level. In this session, however, we seek **proposals for interventions at the national policy level** - such as frameworks, support mechanisms, changes in public funding approaches - to help achieve this goal.*

Group 1 (facilitator: Susanne)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Ad-hoc expert groups in communes and ministries (e.g., for advising for solutions). Expert selection depends on topic, but it should be academic and non-academic researchers. Develop clear national rules/framework how to select them and how they are engaged.

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

Because you help decision makers to make evidence-based decision (not on their values).

Group 2 (facilitator: Henry)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Some sort of mechanism to provide better knowledge for Danish parliament. They currently have no support (vs. government which has much more input). This would make for better policy. So, come up with a policy mechanism specifically to policy makers, specifically to parliament. Not easy - scientists need to know the language and processes etc. and don't have much time.

Science communication is really important overall - this mechanism will help develop skills in that area. They also need to understand how the general public is approaching and perceiving things.

→**Proposal:** an organization within the Danish parliament where scientists get connected and can translate towards parliamentarians. 1-2 days per week working for that unit. Should be interdisciplinary. It should be voluntary with the support of the institution but with financial support. Payoff for researchers: they get training in communication and should also get more money. Money could come out of parliament.

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

Parliament gets science-based input; this mechanism will help also the scientists improve science communication, which is essential more broadly.

Group 3 (facilitator: Paolo)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Re(build) trust of the public in science

“Living labs”: spaces where scientists interact with local politicians, citizens and companies. The purpose is to promote a close and interactive dialogue between science and society. Non-scientists can provide input and feedback to scientists. Science would be perceived as more accessible, and this would mitigate the problem of “misinformation disorder” and lack of trust in science.

We believe that local policy-makers should play a role in this context in order to strengthen the dialogue between science and citizens.

Universities should promote the efforts of scientists: their time in participating in living labs should be rewarded in terms of academic career.

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

In order for science to have a societal impact, it is important to re(build) trust of the public in science!

Group 4 (facilitator: Astrid)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Create a national framework that strengthens university-based innovation hubs and incubators to foster closer collaboration between academia and industry. The framework would improve companies' access to university environments, support joint research and commercialization activities, and provide targeted funding for projects with commercial and societal potential.

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

This policy would increase societal impact by making it easier for research to be translated into practical, socially and economically valuable applications through stronger academia-industry collaboration and institutional support.

Group 5 (facilitator: Mercedes)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Science is everywhere and for everyone. Initiative to increase dissemination of science/trust/solve local and national problems.

It will include QR codes about science (even in toilets)+Hackathons +science summer camps

Multi-stakeholder: scientists + local communities + schools

Incentivize scientists by recognizing the effort to co-develop these initiatives with the local and national communities

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

Increase trust and interest on on science

Group 6 (facilitator: Frank)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

OBJECTIVE: OVERCOME THE DIVIDE BETWEEN PHARMA INDUSTRY RESEARCH AND ACADEMIC RESEARCH

Collaborative co-creation framework program to engage with stakeholders from industry and academia and patient organisation motivated to overcome divide between industry and academia to create patient welfare

- New kind of industrial PhD program educating a new generation of experts/researchers that know both sides (*focused on a specific "urgent" domain area*)
- Common online space for problem definition between researchers, industry and patients =>
- Funding for selected research projects part of grant selection criteria that really honors collaborations btw industry and academia
- (perhaps hosted in a joint physical space for also informal collaboration)
- Implement recruitment policies at science departments universities to be much more open for people joining from industry (e.g. like adjunct profs in business school) => new kind of professorship

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

Start at the culture. We need an intervention that really changes the culture so that both sides better understand and value each other.

Group 7 (facilitator: Christoph) continued on next slide

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Core policy problem: ministry that is providing the funding is not reaping the benefits from the funding, e.g. industrial policy has favoured entrepreneurship and established industries, but has disregarded how to improve the public sector, such as schools etc. How does research benefit the public sector? You could throw money at the problem, but the more interesting question is what else can be done within the current funding priorities to let the public sector benefit from university research. Is it a measurement problem or a substantive problem? What about incentives? Translation of academic research on the public sector into something that is actually implemented in the public sector and has an impact there.

Ideas for policy interventions

- Secondment of researchers to a public institution for some time (cf. Maryann Feldman at the NSF)
- Forcing a dialogue between researchers and public sector representatives (such as from schools)
- Changing the incentive system of scientists
- Giving the real stakeholders (such as teachers in school) a say in what is getting funded
- Include stakeholders/industry/citizens in research funding panels, such as the DFF
- Influencing the set of research questions that are being asked
- Providing municipalities with their own research funds that they can hand out to researchers, OR giving access to data, i.e. municipalities as research facilitators
- Patient and public involvement as reviewers in funding bodies

Group 7 (facilitator: Christoph) continued from previous slide

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Chosen intervention: Install a “public review board” in funding decisions, i.e. there is a group of reviewers from the public that join the panel discussions and provide their input in the decision-making process. This function should be taken up civil society organizations, such as patient advocacy groups. Similar to patient and public reviewers in journal reviews.

Issues to be clarified:

- The nomination process for this needs to be clarified.
- Civil society organizations or advocacy groups also need to build up some capacity and research orientation to fruitfully participate in these meetings and contribute to meaningful decisions

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

Because the research funded and conducted will presumably address more relevant problems and increase buy-in and legitimacy..

Group 8 (facilitator: Gabriel)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

The policy proposes European-level adaptive innovation consortia that bring together universities, firms, policymakers, and intermediaries through staged funding mechanisms that move from broad exploration to targeted industrial scaling. Rather than funding only individual projects, the intervention funds the coordination process itself, enabling continuous adaptation of research directions to industrial and societal needs through close science-industry interaction. The goal is to improve Europe's ability to translate scientific advances into scalable industrial capabilities in strategically important sectors through evidence-based calls, knowledge dissemination, and long-term innovation communities

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

The rationale is that scientific breakthroughs in Europe often fail to scale economically because fragmented coordination between researchers, industry, and policymakers prevents promising technologies from being adapted, commercialized, and deployed effectively

Group 9 (facilitator: Johanna)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Problem: Bad student results for PISA study at the municipality level. Facilitating exchange b/w scientists and municipalities.

Idea must be multi-structured/multi-layered.

- Part-time position of people/PhDs at schools and universities, should be permanent position
- Submission of proposals by teachers (what can we do to improve student outcomes, possibly by creating a better link to science), then selection

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

Still unclear what policy would work – so bottom-up approach needed where teachers are heard.

Group 10 (facilitator: Marion)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

The problem with social impact assessment is the amount of time that is needed to assess the impact. For this reason, funding for a position, e.g., “impact manager”, will provide the opportunity for one person or a team of impact managers to assess the social impact even after the projects have ended (e.g., 5 or 10 years after the project ends). It would also be very helpful to have a digital tool to collect the needed data so that the impact manager can access the needed data more easily.

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

It will be assessed and made visible.

Group 11 (facilitator: Theresa)

Short description of policy intervention idea:

Broker that brings the parties close together (including citizens/companies to academic bubble)

One-sentence rationale: Why would this policy intervention increase the societal impact of scientific research?

- include requirements in promotion criteria
- launch innovation index instead of h index
- Perception of what is considered impact
- knowledge transfer partnerships
- measure better and capture more
- training program