Competence framework for policymakers

*This competence framework ‘unpacks”, at four proficiency levels, the collective set of transversal skills, knowledge and attitudes desired for policymakers across the different roles and profiles.*

**Background**

Policymaking, the profession at the core of the Commissions’ activities, is undergoing substantial changes, driven by twin digital and climate transition, the complex geopolitical situation, the coronavirus pandemic, an ageing population, and other global trends. Since its launch in March 2020, the EU Policymaking Hub offers a platform for policymakers to learn, collaborate and share knowledge in EU policymaking, introducing new capacity building offers, a summer as well as an autumn school.

The European Commission aims to be at the forefront of excellence in policymaking in Europe and worldwide through anticipating, developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating policies in an evidence-informed, transparent, and collaborative way with stakeholders, citizens and experts. Providing the policymaking community with a framework for long-term competence development will strengthen the profession, make it fit for the future, contribute to colleagues’ motivation and help the Commission to achieve its goals.

**The competence framework**

The purpose of providing detailed descriptions of competences is to inform and develop useful career guidance instruments based on this work, set out a vision for policymaking, highlight novel approaches and provide a more systematic overview. It is therefore not meant to be an end in itself but a useful resource which to draw upon and develop further, based on new evidence, insights and learnings. The framework, is describing a collective set of transversal competences relevant for effective competences and for different roles within the policymaking profession. It is inspired by the EntreComp model ([European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework](https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC101581)), outlining, for each of the 8 competence clusters, four levels of progression: Foundational, Intermediate, Advanced and Expert.

The competence framework for policymaking is featuring a collective set of transversal competences (attitudes, skills, knowledge and understanding[[1]](#footnote-2)) that need for effective policymaking throughout the policy cycle and across the many different roles and profiles within the policymaking profession. The framework captures and unpacks competences from a policy perspective in the areas of evidence informed policymaking, collaboration, citizen engagement, communication, critical and systems thinking, anticipation and foresight at four levels of progression.

**Working with this draft version**

This document is a draft, the table format is not the intended end-result but a’ working scaffold’, the grouping of competences therefore at this stage only indicative; one competence could also be assigned to a different cluster if found relevant in another competence area or context e.g. facilitation. Overlaps and relationships between elements will be addressed during the next phase of the project. Competences are described as a combination of attitudes, skills knowledge and understanding and unpacked across four levels of increasing proficiency, describing how each competence manifests in terms of ‘observable behaviours’ and learning outcomes. **Feel invited to explore this draft and share your feedback and ideas in track changes or comments. If you are interested in getting more closely involved in the conversation and participate in a workshop during the next phase of the project, please reach out to** [**floran.schwendinger@ec.europa.eu**](mailto:floran.schwendinger@ec.europa.eu)**.**

**Competence Cluster: Evidence informed policymaking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Progression level | | | |
| Competence | **Foundational** | **Intermediate** | **Advanced** | **Expert** |
| Exploring and framing a policy problem  ATTITUDE:   * Is willing to engage with policy issues with a positive and holistic regard. * Is convinced of the importance of citizens’ and stakeholder needs and interests and is ready to deal with their complexity.   SKILLS:   * Can deploy methodologies for gathering multi-disciplinary information and exploring the needs and interests of citizens and stakeholders.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands existing relevant policy issues in the field. * Can identify new, emerging issues. * Is able to design conceptual frameworks for policy process in a way that reconciles evidence and value orientations. | Keeps track of salient policy issues in one’s policy area and public discourse on them.  Expresses how policy initiatives relate to stakeholder and citizen interests and needs.  Establishes a link to the administration’s superordinate political priorities.  Looks not just at the problem but also at aspects that are working well when analysing a policy issue. | Draws upon multi-disciplinary scientific evidence along with citizen, and stakeholder inputs, as well as other types of evidence to better understand a policy problem and ensure the initial framing is evidence informed.  Enriches the administrations’ understanding of a policy problem through inquiry (‘is this really the problem that needs to be addressed?’), applying i.e. anticipatory and foresight approaches and design methods etc., interrogating the evidence base, assumptions made and investigating citizens’ and stakeholder needs and interests. | Can draft a coherent policy narrative.  Explores potential future scenarios considering the needs and interests of citizens and stakeholders.  Identifies important new evidence or viewpoints of previously unknown policy relevance.  Supports colleagues in framing policy problems using a holistic, evidence informed and opportunity focused perspective." | Can transform the understanding/framing of a policy narrative by exploring the underlying issues through different “value-lenses” of citizens and stakeholders, multi-disciplinary evidence and competing political framings.  Can define a policy context and problem in such a persuasive way that it becomes a reference point in the policy debate.  Makes significant contributions towards shaping and establishing a definition of a controversial policy issue that effectively reconciles evidence and value orientations, and is widely supported. |
| Scientific literacy  ATTITUDE:   * Is keen to engage with a diversity of points of view and values transparency. * Believes that evidence informed policy making is highly beneficial to the maintenance of a democratic society and good governance. * Acknowledges scientific (un-) certainty, ambiguities, and assumptions.   SKILLS:   * Infers the main argument(s), conclusion(s) and assumptions from academic papers. * Can distinguish correlation from causation; integrates evidence from a diversity of sources and activities for policymaking.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows basic scientific principles and the terminology in a policy area; can distinguish academic and other types of sources. * Knows basic statistical concepts (such as confidence intervals, significance, and variance, sampling, control group, etc.) and explains implications and uncertainties of scientific findings or model-based evidence. | Understands the difference between a hypothesis and an established theory.  Knows what role peer review and replicability play in corroborating the validity of research results.  Makes adequate distinctions between types of sources (such as academic peer reviewed articles, pre-prints, meta-analysis, conference papers, opinions, position papers, grey literature, media, interest groups and stakeholder’s reports, business lobbying briefs, etc.)  Understands basic scientific principles and the terminology in a policy area.  Can identify the main arguments, assumptions, and conclusions, when reading an academic literature (academic paper, a literature review, meta/synthesis reports).  Is familiar with basic statistical concepts (such as confidence intervals, significance, and variance, sampling, control group, etc.) and can distinguish correlation from causation. | Can contextualise scientific findings vis-à-vis a policy issue and is knowledgeable about the most important scientific findings and gaps in relation to one’s policy area.  Can articulate the added value and importance of the scientific method for society and as a corner stone of democracy.  Is at ease inferring the main argument(s), conclusion(s) and assumptions from academic literature.  Can make accurate, informed statements about scientific (un-)certainty, ambiguities, and assumptions. | Can build in-depth, cross-disciplinary expertise in the most policy relevant research in one’s area and can point to gaps, contradictions, and controversies in and between disciplines that mostly go unnoticed.  Has a conceptual understanding about the “weight of evidence” and has contributed, in a transparent manner, to integrating evidence from a diversity of sources and activities such as foresight, modelling, design thinking. | Has a track-record of articulating well- founded perspectives on the interplay of science and policy, expressed in policy documents and debates.  Can effectively present policy perspectives to the scientific community, thereby informing their understanding of the policy context.  Conveys the implications and uncertainties of scientific findings or model-based evidence in laymen’s terms to a non-policy and/or non-scientific audience. |
| Identifying evidence needs  ATTITUDE:   * Checks own biases and remains open to forming a policy decision considering all sorts of evidence, not only evidence corroborating previous positions.   SKILLS:   * Identifies main questions in a policy issue and infers the need for scientific or other types of evidence. * Produces analysis of evidence-needs to inform further action.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows strategies for identifying evidence needs and exploring the policy context. | Engages with a policy problem by identifying the main questions it carries and inferring the need for scientific, or other types of evidence, to ensure inclusion of relevant perspectives.  Can identify major evidence gaps, formulate problem statements and design an intervention logic, and can find resources to address these gaps, (e.g. in-house knowledge brokers and evaluation reports, foresight reports, political priorities).  Seeks and accepts evidence from diverse sources. Can change a policy orientation when faced with evidence that refutes the soundness of previous positions. | Can p Produce, with the help of knowledge brokers, an analysis of the evidence-needs to inform further action to address these needs, e.g. by issuing a ´call for evidence ´ for a policy initiative.  Involves knowledge brokers to jointly identify and make an informed judgment about which scientific disciplines and expert communities to involve in evidence-informed policymaking.  Liaises with experts continuously throughout the policy process to monitor the evidence landscapes, emerging needs and gaps both from a policy and science perspective. | Can draft, within a policy initiative, a knowledge strategy for assessing and defining evidence needs and gaps, that lives up to international benchmarks,  Can coordinate or supervise, in collaboration with experts, the inquiry and exploration of different types of evidence to ensure diversity and inclusiveness drawing upon methods like modelling, foresight, engaging with citizens or scientific networks. | Can supervise the planning and implementation of knowledge strategies for new or ongoing policy initiatives, ensuring a 360-degree exploration and inclusion of relevant perspectives.  Consistently anticipates identifying evidence needs in emerging policy scenarios or in fast paced policy debates. |
| Building expert relationships and networks  ATTITUDE:   * Believes in the importance of building networks to gather and triangulate evidence findings. * Recognises the value of promoting, in own circles and beyond, the consideration of evidence as the base of the policy process.   SKILLS:   * Can map key expertise in the field of work. * Is able to convene knowledge brokers and create opportunities for interdisciplinary exchange.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows the key stakeholders in the relevant area of work inside and outside the administration. * Shares information and knowledge with colleagues and the wider community concerned by the policy area. | Maps the key stakeholders and experts in the relevant area of work inside and outside the administration.  Follows the conversation, publications and media contributions of experts, policy influencers and key stakeholders in the relevant policy area to catch the pulse of the debate and understand recent political developments. | Interacts regularly with knowledge brokers, researchers and experts and invests in building both formal and informal networks that may be harnessed in case of need.  Helps colleagues to stay informed about issues affecting their work by regularly sharing evidence, expertise, speeches, and other policy insights. | Convenes knowledge brokers and creates opportunities for interdisciplinary exchange and a safe space for an informal expert network to continuously exchange with the policy community.  Shares state of the art, latest expertise and evidence including learnings from evaluating success and failure of policy measures. | Is recognised by colleagues and stakeholders as a reference point and one of the leading experts in the policy field  Is consulted by stakeholders beyond own organisation and network (e.g., by highest level of governance, academia or media).  Has access to and can influence high-level politicians, through direct contact and even at short notice. |
| Finding and commissioning scientific evidence  ATTITUDE:   * Considers scientific contributions in their context and demonstrates vigilance in ensuring that evidence collected or commissioned is diverse in perspective. * Values transparency in dealing with evidence.   SKILLS:   * Can operate search queries on scientific databases with accuracy. * Can collaborate with experts from different disciplines and backgrounds. * Can source scientific evidence and data from state of the art and scientifically sound research.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Can identify, and mobilise robust, pertinent evidence into the policymaking process; supports policy statements with both qualitative and quantitative scientific evidence and reliable, recent data; | Identifies and collaborates with knowledge brokers in one’s policy area to find evidence to inform policy design, decision-making and supports statements with scientific evidence and reliable data.  Knows how to access library and archival services as well as easily accessible public data and research to draw upon synthesised evidence (research and evaluation reports, impact assessments, case studies, grey literature).  Can use search queries on scientific databases with accuracy, to identify peer reviewed articles with pertinent content. | Can plan and execute a systematic search for scientific evidence and data or a `call for evidence´, enabling a more holistic perspective on the state of science on a policy issue.  Is aware that scientific communities are composed of a variety of schools of thought and considers theoretical and methodological contribution. as highly contextualised resources.  Can source state of the art scientific evidence and data primarily from scientifically peer reviewed journals, internal knowledge for policy repositories, and statistical offices.  Operates transparently with expert communities and academia. | Can identify ‘evidence gaps’ by commissioning or leading work to generate evidence from new data or analysis, i.e., model based, crowd sourced or experimental, both qualitative and quantitative.  Is aware of the historical context, as well as relevant organisational memory (what exists already, what are the gaps in previous inquiries).  Demonstrates vigilance in ensuring that evidence collected or commissioned is fit for purpose and diverse in perspective, inclusive of different academic disciplines, empirical knowledge, historical context and organisational memory. | Commissions, or identifies and extracts scientific evidence that may have a pivotal impact on the policy measures developed or decision taken to address an issue, particularly in circumstances in which shifting political priorities and debates create ad-hoc, new evidence needs.  Fosters teams, processes, and a culture in the policy environment, that is conducive to the identification, creation, sharing and integration of robust, pertinent evidence into the policymaking process. |
| Appraising the quality and pertinence of evidence by scrutiny, evaluation, and feedback  ATTITUDE:   * Is aware of personal biases and assumptions; is attentive to limitations, ambiguities and uncertainties. * Believes in the value of feedback and appraisal to enrich the evidence informed approach.   SKILLS:   * Collaborates with knowledge brokers and experts to cross-reference and crosscheck multiple sources. * Articulates results of the scrutiny process.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands the need to assess the reliability of data sources. * Knows definitions related to and methodologies for the implementation of feedback loops. * Ensures the evaluation of applicability, validity, and reliability of evidence, within a policy forming process. | Involves in-house and external knowledge brokers and experts to scrutinise quality and pertinence of evidence and data.  Prompts appraisals that openly lay out limitations, primary assumptions and ambiguities.  Seeks to rely on multiple sources and corrects overapplication of and over-reliance on a single piece of evidence or data. | Evaluates and draws conclusions, with experts and stakeholders, about robustness, trustworthiness, policy relevance, and context sensitivity.  Prompts appraisals that openly lay out limitations, primary assumptions, ambiguities, and uncertainties, by analysing methodologies, sample size, control group, replicability issues, (vested) interests and values, disciplinary or personal biases.  Comprehensively articulates results of the scrutiny process in a way that can be understood by non-scientists and is fit for policy integration. | Supervises the process of scrutinising and weighing the diversity of evidence on a policy initiative in a way that ensures that rigor and transparency is applied to evidence.  Has created opportunities to collect data as part of the policy process and benefit from short-feedback loops e.g. real-time data from citizens and stakeholders to increase policy effectiveness.  Can identify and evaluate evidence emerging through in-depth expert scrutiny during the policy process or political debate, and in particular identify flawed, contradicting or contested evidence . | Can incorporate a variety of evidence types and supervising the scrutiny and appraisal process of evidence related to a major policy initiative spanning several policy areas.  Has uncovered major flaws that led to a review or retraction of research or reconsidering the application of a piece of evidence for policymaking. |
| Managing procurement contracts  ATTITUDE:   * Values transparency and is willing to align with regulations and standards in the procurement process.   SKILLS:   * Can implement the internal procurement support process.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows the internal procurement support services. * Assesses the need for procurement in cases where the internal knowledge service is not suited. | Is familiar with the internal procurement support services.  Can provide a description of the purpose of the procurement activity and approximate budgetary need.  Knows what happens in the different phases of the procurement lifecycle and is familiar with the procurement types and procedures relevant for a line of policy.  Is transparent and follows imposed regulations and standards in the procurement process, the award process and contract closing. | Assesses the need for procurement in cases where the internal knowledge service is not well placed to provide needed evidence or cannot commission needed inputs in time.  Identifies the most appropriate type of procedure and knows when and how and whom to contact when they want to launch one.  Can draft ‘Terms of Reference’, evaluate offers and launch an award procedure for simple procurement processes. | Can conduct market research on markets’ capacity to deliver and attract competitive offers, in view of quality, cost and scope, complementary to the internal services.  Is able to implement all relevant procurement tasks including establishing terms of reference, tendering, monitoring and evaluation, financial management and contract closing. | Is widely trusted for the ability to commission research which fills major evidence gaps and becomes a beacon of evidence used in policy debate .  Has led the complete evidence procurement process for entire policy initiatives. |
| Managing data for policy  ATTITUDE:   * Finds ‘working with data’ important and encourages others to engage with data in a structured, transparent, and accessible way. * Has a cooperative disposition to make data accessible.   SKILLS:   * Assesses if data is trustworthy, valid, reliable and pertinent by asking questions on data sources and data analysis. * Can implement good practices in data storage; makes non-sensitive data easily accessible. * Includes findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable (FAIR) evidence in data sets.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands legal and ethical issues associated with the use of data. * Understands the virtue of the commons and the culture and technologies of open data. | Looks for information about sources, or asks for expert support, to decide on data usage and interpretation.  Asks pertinent questions on data sources and data analysis to assess if data is trustworthy, valid, reliable and pertinent  Understands legal and ethical issues associated with the use of data.  Uses non-sensitive data for policy transparently, and makes sure data is stored in accordance with legal and privacy requirements. | Can apply data analysis tools in collaboration with data/ knowledge management experts and integrate data management plans in knowledge strategies.  Evaluates data sources and data analysis to assess if data is trustworthy and pertinent, and substitutes alternative sources or alternative information to replace unreliable data  Makes non-sensitive data easily accessible by default e.g. for research and not out of contest.  Includes findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable (FAIR) evidence in data sets. | Can organise and analyse data in a policy context, and apply metrics to evaluate the success of data initiatives.  Empowers other team members to ‘work with data’ in a structured, transparent, and accessible way. | Can collect or co-create policy relevant data sets e.g. anonymized real time data that enable more effective or dynamic policy making or developed metrics that make data more comprehensible for policy.  Has a track record of making non-sensitive data easily accessible, contextualized, and fit for use to inform political debates, media a broader non-expert audience.  Is instrumental in ensuring data transparency, openness and accessibility as well as cultivating a culture of open data in the team or policy initiative. |
| Working with models  ATTITUDES:   * Believes in modelling as support to decision making. * Is critical about modelling outputs and assumptions.   SKILLS:   * Can identify salient aspects of the models to address policy issues. * Can validate models against experimental evidence. * Can identify loopholes and criticalities in models. * Can work with uncertainty related to model outputs.   KNOWLDEGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands numerical modelling, its limitations, and ingrained uncertainties. * Knows predictive techniques. | Makes projections and assesses past behaviour of a system mindful of assumptions, limitations, uncertainties and context dependencies.  Identifies and asks key questions about model-based evidence regarding its salience (ability to address policy issues), legitimacy (inclusive process involving all stakeholders) and credibility (uncertainty, sensitivity, peer review, assumptions and coherency with similar studies).  Relies on collaboration with knowledge brokers and experts to make sense of and integrate model-based evidence in policy. | Draws upon model-based evidence for predictions, assessing or choosing among policy options. Assesses models against experimental evidence.  Evaluates information about model salience, legitimacy and credibility. Draws on multiple models to “triangulate” model-based evidence where possible.  Has experience in navigating and using modelling inventory and knowledge management platforms | Runs models to interrogate data on interdisciplinary policy problems understand patterns, predict or retrodict, estimate impacts of different policy options.  Incorporates and communicates model-based evidence in a transparent & open, trustworthy, and effective way for policy impact. | Is a recognised expert in one’s policy area and has a track record of running and/or co-creating models, ensuring maximum salience, legitimacy and credibility which allows full scrutiny and future reuse. |

**Competence Cluster: Critical and Systems Thinking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Progression level | | | |
| Competence | **Foundational** | **Intermediate** | **Advanced** | **Expert** |
| Systems thinking  ATTITUDES:   * Believes that there are no silver-bullet solutions to complex problems. * Approaches complex problems with a holistic and inclusive mind-set.   SKILLS:   * Can identify and map systems and the relationship between their parts. * Can explore wicked problems, identify and weigh trade-offs. * Can engage with complexity to tackle problems considering the needs of stakeholders.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands the complexity of policy issues. * Understands the diversity of drivers behind political decisions. | Seeks to understand how one’s own work and objectives intersect with and impact other projects or policy issues.  Invests time to properly explore the diversity of external factors that could influence one’s own file (out-of-the-box thinking).  Is aware that many other drivers influence political decision-making in addition to facts and logic, such as relations and interdependencies, historical, psycho-social, economic and political context, values and beliefs etc. | Applies techniques to see the big picture, to map and understand systems and the relationships between its parts.  Identifies the main properties of a system when working on a policy initiative including assumptions, boundary conditions, uncertainties, and ambiguities.  Takes integrative steps and limits fragmentation by setting and managing basic constraints and executing preconceived contingency that increase manageability. | Deals with `systemic policy issues´ and ‘wicked’ problems and places them in a broad and long-term multi-stakeholder perspective.  Maps the ‘evidence landscape’ and sees citizens’ values orientation throughout the policy process.  Supports the emergence of collective intelligence with structures, processes, and behaviours. Enables others to appreciate and manage complex policy challenges by facilitating collective sense making and creating opportunities to appreciate complexity. | Makes key contributions to institutionalise a systematic and integrated organisation of intelligence.  Enables “system cognition” to address a policy challenge, whereby elements in a system are comprehensibly analysed, integrated, and managed to benefit from collective intelligence and to enable systemic responses. |
| Critical thinking  ATTITUDES:   * Is humble and open to listen to other points of view. * Appreciates the impact of cognitive biases and tries to mitigate it.   SKILLS:   * Can concede to stronger arguments and accepts diverse opinions. * Can spot and correct biased thinking. * Can facilitate collaborative processes.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands how thinking is influenced by cognitive biases. * Understands how participatory collaboration, systemic and design thinking, mathematical modelling or anticipation and foresight work. | Practices “intellectual humility” acknowledging the limitations of one’s knowledge and expertise independent of hierarchical status; seeks and includes perspective that does not confirm one’s own.  Seeks diversity in perspective and evidence; pushes oneself to listen to and appreciate divergent perspectives by seeking to understand and integrate.  Shows willingness to challenge and if proven wrong, abandon one’s own ideas and thoughts in face of conflicting evidence and new data. | Takes steps to identify and document the assumptions, risks, ambiguities, and uncertainties pertaining to one’s work in a transparent manner.  In projects takes measures to spot and minimise the effect of biased thinking and behaviour like cognitive dissonance, identity bias, (un-)attentional bias, confirmation bias. | Selects and applies methods and approaches to ensure critical thinking in policy projects to increase diversity of perspective and minimised bias.  Enables teams to think critically and minimises common group bias like group think. | Cultivates a team environment in which critical thinking is a group norm and part of standard procedures, also across hierarchies.  Skilfully facilitates collaborative processes, which encourage voicing, creating and scrutinizing perspectives and evidence openly, creating space and opportunity for controlled experimentation and learning from failure. |
| Curiosity and inquiry  ATTITUDES:   * Has a curious mind-set by default, which allows listening openly without judging (“tell me more” attitude). * Strives to grow with formal and informal learning.   SKILLS:   * Can pose challenging and critical questions (both to oneself and to others). * Can cope with different inquiry styles and facilitate constructive discussions.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understand the importance of self-inquiry. * Knows different approaches to inquiry. | Strives to know or learn more about something and turns challenges into learning opportunities.  Prone to asking questions to oneself (self-inquiry) and to others appreciating divergent thinking, aware that inquiry helps one adopt a wider perspective. | Asks expansive questions that enable others to enrich their perspective and understanding of an issue.  Explores others’ ideas or perception with genuine curiosity to understand the other person’s viewpoint on a policy challenge.  Approaches challenges as self-improvement, growth and learn opportunities. | Uses different styles of inquiry when one is stuck in their thinking and need to broaden perspective.  Fosters collaboration in a team by effectively selecting and applying inquiry methods. | Triggers curiosity and openness in others, i.e. by opening policy challenges to everyone, so that curiosity becomes “contagious”.  Aims for collective attention and intention through inquiry.  Bridges differences by understanding one’s own and others’ inquiry styles. |
| Reflecting and  (un-) learning  ATTITUDES:   * Believes that (un-)learning processes should be part of the organisational culture.   SKILLS:   * Can provide honest and constructive feedback. * Can exploit peer-to-peer learning opportunities to capture and retain tacit knowledge and share learnings.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands the importance to reflect, learn as well as (un-) learn from experiences to improve predictions and judgement. | Seeks to learn though experience, takes advantage of capacity building offers and keeps a learning diary.  Scans and keeps track of failures that have created learning or led to valuable achievements and reflects on the appropriateness of approaches chosen. | Is willing to (un-)learn from experience via ‘safe-to-fail experiments’, prototyping, peer2peer learning etc. and other experiential learning formats.  Reflects on failures (own and other people’s) analysing the suitability of the approaches adopted and one’s capacity to respond rather than focusing on cause and effect.  Judges if and how one has achieved goals, to evaluate one’s own performance and learn from it. | Takes the team or the organisation to a higher level of performance, by creating space, opportunities, and processes for reflection and collective (un-) learning from achievements and failures.  Facilitates reflection and learning from complex policy initiatives on achievements and temporary failures as things develop.  Is a catalyst of synergies, competence networks and peer learning helping others reflect on their achievements and temporary failures by providing honest and constructive feedback. | Makes key contributions to establishing or improving the administrations’ capacity for long-term collective memory by implementing knowledge strategies, learning across policy areas on key issues or establishing an evidence base for a policy initiative.  Transforms the administration’s culture towards one of continuous, ritualised (un-)learning. |
| Coping with uncertainty and ambiguity  ATTITUDES:   * Tolerates failure, is ready to evaluate uncertainty in a positive manner to deal with ambiguity and uncertainty constructively.   SKILLS:   * Can identify how uncertainty affects oneself and stakeholders and how it is perceived. * Can discuss the role that information plays in working with and reducing uncertainty, ambiguity, and risk. * Can cope with incomplete information.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands and recognizes different sources of uncertainty (natural vs. technological, voluntary vs. involuntary, etc). * Understands the importance of plurality of information sources. | Explores own ways to achieve things.  Appraises uncertainties related to one’s policy area by defining the characteristics of the uncertainty who the uncertainty is likely to affect and what the perception of the uncertainty is likely to be/already is (e.g. is the uncertainty highly stigmatised?). | Looks actively for, compares and contrasts different sources of information that help reduce ambiguity, uncertainty, and risks in making decisions.  Evaluates uncertainty in a positive manner to deal with ambiguity and uncertainty constructively. | Finds ways of making decisions when the information is incomplete.  Pulls together different viewpoints to take informed decisions when the degree of uncertainty is high. | Makes decisions evaluating the different elements in a situation that is uncertain and ambiguous. |

**Competence Cluster: Collaboration**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Progression level | | | |
| Competence | **Foundational** | **Intermediate** | **Advanced** | **Expert** |
| Collaboration- mind-set  ATTITUDE:   * Strives to achieve synergies and partnerships for mutual benefit, constructive relationships and sharing. * Is sensitive to diversity and seeks to include different cultures and values in their worldview.   SKILL:   * Deals constructively with interpersonal differences. * Is able to develop mutually beneficial relationships. * Can identify and integrate differing values and perspectives.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows how group dynamics influence collaboration and have an overview of inclusive hosting techniques. * Understands the importance of cultural sensitivity in policy implementation. | Seeks collaboration and building relationships by default.  Is aware that group members may hold different motives and interests that influence collaboration.  Displays behaviour and attitude that can be described as open-minded, empathic, curious, and appreciative of diverging perspectives and evidence.  Understands that one’s culture is just one among many others and accepts cultural differences (e.g., values), although not necessarily agreeing with them. | Seeks mutual gains in relationships and demonstrates a non-defensive presence in collaboration. Shows willingness to deal with difficult interpersonal issues.  Seeks to understand the unique way one thinks, learns, and communicates; learns and un-learns with others constantly.  Has an expanded worldview and demonstrates empathy towards others’ cultures and values orientations. | Identifies the specific ways of thinking that energises oneself and others – i.e., thinking talents, the blind spots of individuals and teams.  Seeks to understand one’s own and others’ feelings, fears, intentions, and patterns of behaviours, increasing the awareness of conditions that maximise how one’s and other people’s thinking is affected by various kinds of input.  Demonstrates an integration of different cultural worldviews in one’s own, with none being central. | Demonstrates and has been recognised for having a “mind-share” mindset i.e., uses influence with others to connect, leads as a host, dignifies differences as a resource, “the more we share, the more we have”.  Asks what can be possible, considers value to be created by and carried by exchange of ideas and connections, appreciate and cultivates interdependence. |
| Listening  ATTITUDES:   * Believes in the importance of including others’ perspectives * Is open and patient with the interlocutor   SKILLS:   * Can listen with interest and curiosity * Can establish an emotional connection with the interlocutor and understands their perspective   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands and strives to apply the basic behaviours of ‘listening with attention and speaking with intention’. * Knows how to improve communication in order to clearly convey one’s message | Understands and strives to apply the basic behaviours of ‘listening with attention and speaking with intention’ (factually and empathically).  Listens equally to everyone. and reaches out to the underserved and those whose voices are commonly absent from the conversation.  Encourages the speaker to communicate fully, openly, and honestly. | Expresses active interest and curiosity in what the other person has to say and makes him or her feel heard. Takes the time to hear out without interrupting, makes eye contact, takes notes, etc.  ‘Sees’ through the other person’s eye and establishes emotional connection. | Arrives at a shared and agreed understanding and acceptances of both sides' views. Practises empathic listening “Let me reflect what I hear you saying and feeling”.  Helps speakers who are less able to convey the message to communicate in a better way (pace, tone of voice, accent, others’ interruptions). | Develops a selflessness approach, putting the speaker first, not having preconceived ideas.  Listens through even when being or feeling verbally attacked or criticised. Keeps calm, understands what is being said. Asks clarifying questions without hitting back, etc. |
| Working with empathy & emotion  ATTITUDE:   * Commits to a value-based and non-judgemental mindset.   SKILL:   * Cultivates own and other’s emotional capacities, to facilitate cooperation and trust, and contributes to the emotional intelligence of the organisation.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Understands the role of emotions in cognitive processes, collaboration and decision-making. | Shows empathy, not judgment towards others. Recognises the role of one’s own emotions, attitudes, and behaviours in shaping other people's attitude and behaviours.  Commits to uphold a non-defensive attitude towards others even in disagreement. | Proactively explores and cultivates one’s own emotional and values landscape as well as learns about the values landscape of others.  Demonstrates behaviour that leverages emotions to enhance cognitive processes and decision making, by generating and maintaining engagement, co-operation, and trust. | Helps colleagues to explore, express and expand their empathy and emotional capacities and develop values empathy, e.g., by studying information about the diversity of values in the population.  Valorises individual or group contributions and facilitates non-defensive collaborative atmosphere even in disagreement. | Has a significant impact in establishing and applying empathy for values towards citizens and other stakeholders in the policy making process. Cultivates the emotional intelligence of the organisation. |
| Planning and practicing collaboration  ATTITUDE:   * Recognises the importance of cultivating a collaborative culture, developing collective intelligence as well as identifying and developing collaborative opportunities.   SKILL:   * Can steer group dynamics and manages information sharing and participatory processes in different settings.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows how to select and/or develop the appropriate collaborative format for the purpose and audience. | Understands the importance of planning collaborative processes in function of their purpose to benefit from collective intelligence.  Manages information sharing with regards to level of detail and type (e.g. data, conclusions, evaluation). Shares relevant information without needing to be prompted.  Is inclusive of relevant expertise, strives for diversity in perspective, both face-to-face and online. Ensures continuity, integration, and follow-up with regards to outputs. | Chooses collaboration formats, methods, and spaces, in function of purpose, seeking to include relevant expertise, diversity in perspective and to cultivate an environment of trust and safety.  Has experience in participating and organising participatory processes also in interdisciplinary and intercultural settings.  Uses techniques to mitigate adverse group dynamics and biases like group think e.g., by considering opposite possibilities. | Runs collaborative processes in high profile, politically sensitive contexts (i.e. interservice collaborations, cabinet meetings, inter-institutional or multilateral negotiations) in a way that enables systems thinking and benefitting from collective intelligence.  Inspires others to collaborate better by creating more opportunities, better spaces and tools that can be deployed rapidly.  Is recognised for cultivating a practice and culture of collaboration in the team or projects measurably improving policy quality or increasing policy impact. | Plans and leads collaborative processes, marked by political sensitivity, conflicting interests and thematic complexity that enables systems thinking and benefitting from collective intelligence.  Introduces novel ways of collaboration, e.g. using technology to enable collaborative systems, deliberative processes, or crowd-sourced initiatives.  Facilitates collaboration in and across teams resulting in lasting interdependence capable to address complex policy whereby “the whole is something elsethan the sum of its parts”.[[2]](#endnote-2) |
| Facilitation  ATTITUDE:   * Believes in a culture of trust, reconciliation, compromise and consensus.   SKILL:   * Can apply discussion, debating and negotiation techniques, in view of mutual understanding and agreement.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows different facilitation types, tools, techniques and methods, and knows when they suit different purposes. | Understands the philosophies and goals of different types of facilitation (e.g., moderation, hosting, chairing, negotiation, etc.) and knows how to run (online) meetings in an effective way, deploying suitable software tools, techniques and methods.  Knows how to trigger discussion and guides participants. Gets to the outputs and ensures the integration of outputs from previous steps and execution of follow-ups.    Considers it a collective responsibility that everyone participates and invites to share divergent perspectives openly. | Facilitates face-to-face and online meetings, using different formats and methods (e.g., moderation, hosting, chairing, negotiation, etc.) depending on the collaboration format and purpose.  Has experience in facilitating policy debates or discussions and using deliberative means to improve the understanding of stakeholders involved.  Applies techniques to gauge and cultivate a group’s emotional self-awareness, synthesise inputs and seeks to establish group norms broadly supported within the group. | Has extensive practice in facilitating panel debates at large-scale conferences and workshops.  Has a track record of successfully addressing and reconciling motives, interests, and perspectives, surfacing consensus, enabling compromise, and facilitating the design of effective policy solutions.  Is experienced in nurturing a culture of collaboration in which it feels safe to raise difficult issues and divergent views. | Has experience in facilitating high-level and highly political collaboration and negotiation processes such as the coordination or adoption of legislative files or major policy initiatives.  Constructively facilitates value-laden and polarised dialogues.  Contributes to innovation on facilitation and contextualisation in policymaking. |
| Navigating team dynamics and conflict  ATTITUDE:   * Believes in the importance of assertive and authentic communication.   SKILL:   * Can practice active listening, give constructive feedback * Can identify causes of conflict and practice non-assertive communication.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Has an overview of why different types of conflicts occurs and knows which techniques can be used to address them | Expresses ideas assertively. Uses clean language and questions both to clarify specific aspects of an issue (depth) and to broaden perspectives (width) (e.g. “What kind of X is X?”, “Is there anything else about X?”) | Identifies the causes of a conflict in collaboration. Helps colleagues in expressing their ideas and needs, so to minimise the risk of unclear or incomplete communication.  Uses and delivers feedback – evidence, inference, impact in plain language and commits to speak truthfully and listen, requiring a culture where it feels safe to raise difficult questions. | Identifies and differentiates between value and moral conflicts and interest-based conflicts and the different ways to solve them.  Coaches colleagues in dealing with non-assertive behaviours possibly disrupting the value-creating activities of individuals or teams. Gives regular feedback in plain language and in a constructive manner, regardless of hierarchy levels. | Stimulates creative cross-fertilisation, agility, and resolution as a leader.  Influences or shapes group norms in a way that nurtures group performance/collective intelligence and the transformative capacity of the administration. |
| Working through Communities of Practice  ATTITUDE:   * Recognises the importance of knowledge sharing and collective intelligence to the benefit of the quality of policymaking.   SKILL:   * Can strengthen the cohesion of a community of practice by instilling trust, a sense of purpose, a sense of community and interaction between its members.     KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Has an overview of social/group dynamics and techniques to manage a community of practice. | Contributes to the work of a community related to one’s policy field and explores communities of practice one could contribute to or learn from.  Shares knowledge related to one’s practice, and is open and willing to learn about others’ insights and perspectives. | Contributes to the setup of a community, together with a core group of peers and/or with a sponsor/manager.  Works with a core group on the vision and purpose, governance including stakeholders’ and knowledge mapping.  Easily interacts with community members, onboard new members and connect members. | Convenes the community on a regular basis related to one’s practice, convinced by working through communities bringing value to the quality.  Facilitates the development of a common sense of purpose in a community, followed by a greater sense of trust and a connection between members.  Acts confidently as a community manager or a community leader (member of a community core group) of the community of practice. | Leads a community and commits to the role effectively.  Performs the role of a catalyst for the community, ensuring connections, creating boundary spanning, interaction opportunities and regularly linking achievements to the organisation’s goals.  Shares the community leadership with several members and actively contributes to maintain a high level of trust and mutual respect within the community. |

**Competence Cluster: Communication**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Progression Level | | | |
| Competence | **Foundational** | **Intermediate** | **Advanced** | **Expert** |
| Strategic Communication  ATTITUDE:   * Recognizes the importance of tailoring the message to different audiences, and the challenges that communication of policy work entails.   SKILL:   * Can navigate a changing media landscape and communicate with various audiences.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows how and why communication strategies are important for the policymaking cycle. | Knows the basics about communication strategies, and why awareness of this is important for the policymaking cycle.  Understands the challenges of raising public awareness of policy work, and the role of the media and social media in doing so.  Understands the changing media landscape and media consumption patterns of various target audiences | Knows one’s responsibilities to the local communication unit, press team Spokespersons’ Service as well as the key role of the administrations’ representations.  Knows how to time an announcement about a policy initiative for maximum impact. | Proves good judgment in timing for ‘going public’ with one’s policy initiative for maximum impact.  Develops effective social media strategy to support  outreach and engagement work with one’s stakeholders and various sections of the public.  Applies key metrics to optimise online content created in their policy area for the social media. | Has built-up in-depth expertise on handling mis- and disinformation, polarisation and the role of ‘leaks’ and has deployed measures that effectively prevented or minimising these issues on an important or controversial policy initiative.  Is interacting with leading policy influencers, experts and media and is getting work promoted by leading influencers or media. |
| Interacting with news media and media organisations  ATTITUDE:   * Recognises the importance of conveying a message correctly to the media, and the importance of not overstepping rules and procedures.   SKILL:   * Can handle tricky media situations and convey a message in different media outlets, such as radio, television, written media and web communication.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Has an overview of useful media relation strategies and knowledge about which procedures to follow when representing the administration in specific policy areas. | Has a basic grounding in how to deal with journalists’ requests for written material and live or recorded interviews.  Knows about the role of the Spokespersons’ Service and ‘mandated staff’ who regularly interact with the media. Is familiar with the pitfalls and traps set by journalists in their quest for a ‘story’.  Knows what to do if the department has decided to use the services of a contractor to do some external communication on one’s policy area. | Knows the principles to apply when being interviewed on television, radio or for YouTube or other social media channels.  Follows the given procedure when granted permission to represent the administration in the media in the policy area. | Efficiently deals with journalists when selected as a spokesperson for a policy area.  Can develop a media plan with an external PR consultant. | Has been the go-to person for many years when journalists seek for spokesperson for one or multiple policy areas. |
| Writing clearly and well, online and offline  ATTITUDE:   * Recognizes the importance of engagement and clear messages when communicating online and offline. * Is open to apply different communication platforms depending on message and target audience.   SKILL:   * Can effectively communicate online and offline and develop strategies to support outreach and engagement.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows the differences between communicating online and offline. * Knows which tools and methods to use to analyse popularity, spread and engagement of a message. | Knows about the differences between writing for an online and an offline audience.  Knows how to tailor writing to the target audience, avoiding jargon where possible and appropriate, and has learned the basic principles of effective administrative writing.  Is familiar with the different social media platforms, their audience profiles and one’s own use of them for professional needs. | Is aware of the different styles of writing in online and offline content and can decide on the most effective style to use depending on ones’ audience, media format and channel of communication.  Reliably drafts effective key messages to convey. Identifies the most appropriate target audiences and chooses the most effective channels and format/media to reach them. | Uses the ‘upside-down triangle’ approach to online content presentation, and pays close attention to the importance of good titles and recalling online user behaviour and its implications for written content.  Pays attention to the implication language and culture have on what is communicated. | Consistently writes good content for the audio-visual and written media, producing texts, which have demonstrated very high user engagement.  Has shown to use good titles and to recall online user behaviour and its implications for written content. |
| Visual presentation techniques  ATTITUDE:   * Understands the importance of conveying complex policy issues in accessible and comprehensive ways and that target audiences are open to different types of communication styles.   SKILL:   * Can use visualisation techniques to convey complex policy issues in a comprehensible way.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows which approaches and techniques to use to convey complex policy issues with comprehensible visual techniques. | Recognises the importance of using visuals e.g. infographics to illustrate one’s points.  Is familiar with the different ways of presenting information in visual forms (bar graphs, timelines, pie charts, etc.). | Knows the principles, techniques, and methods for improving the impact of one’s visual presentations.  Is adapting visual presentations (tone and form) to non-scientific audience, without misrepresenting data or delivering contradictory messages. | Demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the methods/ techniques to visually convey complex policy issues in an accurate and accessible way to enable deliberation and collaboration. | Develops visualisations that becomes reference points for policy or public debate e.g. massively shared by high-level policymakers/politicians (online and offline). |
| Preparing briefings  ATTITUDE:   * Recognises the importance of adapting the briefings to its intended recipient understanding of policy and its political implications.   SKILLS:   * Can prepare briefings that convey complex policy issues in a clear and accessible way.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Has an overview of reporting techniques suitable to different styles of briefings. | Prepares briefings that express evidence in an accurate, accessible way, in compliance with the preferred style within the organisation or of the briefings’ addressee.  Seeks to understand the role, context and need of the addressee and to write briefings that are fit for that purpose e.g. background material for the Spokespersons’ Service, briefing note for a Director General or Commissioner. | Prepares briefings tailored to the needs of the addressee and embedded into the policy and political context.  Has been chef-de-file (e.g. at least twice during the last year) for a briefing that received positive feedback as excellent, fit-for-purpose e.g. from a Director or Director General, Spokesperson or Commissioner. | Prepares briefings that convey complex scientific or policy aspects accessibly as well as enriching the addressee’s understanding about policy and political implications (e.g. citizens’ value landscape, likely political reception, potential controversy, etc.) of the underlying issue.  Has been chef-de-file for briefings that have informed statements in interinstitutional meetings, towards negotiating partners, media or reinforced and sustained engagement between the directorates or institutions. | Prepares briefings notes that achieves reach across hierarchies or beyond organisational boundaries in the policy debate, e.g. transforming the framing, the narrative, the actors invited to participate or the policy outcome.  Has been chef-de-file for a briefing that was used by a Spokesperson, a high-level political representative or to inform public debate. |
| Speaking in public  ATTITUDE:   * Understands the importance of listening with attention and speaking with intention and to foster audience engagement.   SKILL:   * Can deliver key messages clearly and calmly to a wide audience   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows essential public speaking techniques and strategies for handling critical questions. | Identifies and delivers key messages clearly, while keeping nerves under control.  Listens with attention and speaks with intention. Knows the principles and approaches to effective rebuttal. | Supports oral delivery with clear and effective visual supports.    Applies techniques to ‘Stand the ground’ when under attack in a debate or public discussion. | Uses narratives and storytelling to foster audience engagement.    Effectively handles Q&A, critical audiences, heckling and technical breakdowns. | Listens intently and uses the narratives and opinions of others to meaningfully bridge to one’s own key messages.  Speaks in a convincing, persuasive and engaging manner, adapting to different audiences and media. |
| Debating  ATTITUDE:   * Recognises the importance of strategic thinking and understanding of different positions, arguments and their framing in view of an objective.   SKILLS:   * Identifies core concepts of a policy issue and their framing. * Can articulate clear arguments both in support and in opposition to the policy issue.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Has the vocabulary to articulate arguments, values and conclusions. | Can – with sufficient time and information – extract and understand the core concepts of a policy issue and identify the different framings and arguments in a policy debate.  Lists arguments from each side and ascribes weights to the arguments in function of evidence, rational, assumptions, etc. and present each argument in an understandable and structured way.  Understands why certain policy implications are drawn based on the weight of the arguments in a debate. | Captures core concepts of a policy issue, also when information available is limited, to enable deliberation or debate.  Clearly articulates policy implications of arguments in a debate, in function of their weight | Quickly grasps the core concepts of a policy issue and can explain the weight of the different arguments, identify relevant values, beliefs and assumptions that inform these arguments.  Identifies and develops arguments in a meaningful way, which reflects their weight in the debate based on evidence, values and interests. | Demonstrates ability to swiftly grasp and explain how different beliefs and values change the weight and structure of the arguments for each side of the policy in question, spotting hardly surmountable and insurmountable differences.  Confidently draws policy conclusions from weighing the arguments, based on different beliefs and values, in a wide variety of policy fields. |
| Communicating uncertainty  ATTITUDE:   * Understands the importance of being humble when communicating uncertain policy processes and results. * Values making non-expert audiences understand the complexity in decision-making processes.   SKILL:   * Can apply strategies for closing the gap between people’s intuition and the scientific evidence, while addressing uncertainties related to the policy area   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows how to design and collaboratively develop communication approaches to address uncertainties related to the policy area, as perceived by non-experts. | Appraises uncertainties related to the policy initiative through the lens of non-expert audiences, i.e. defines the characteristics of the uncertainty, who the uncertainty is likely to affect, and what the likely perception of it will be.  Uses analogies from ‘everyday life’ to obtain buy-in from non-expert audiences that uncertainties are everywhere, not only in science and policy. | Can design a communication strategy (developed collaboratively and containing three main elements: risk appraisal, situational analysis and source analysis) addressing the uncertainties related to the policy area as perceived by non-expert audiences.  Makes non-experts understand the role uncertainty play in decision-making processes (or procedures | Successfully implements communication strategies addressing the uncertainties related to the policy area, as perceived by non-expert audiences.  Successfully applies strategies for closing the gap between people’s intuitions and the scientific evidence | Establishes a culture in the team or organisation, which is committed and equipped to communicate on uncertainty following principles and strategies agreed upon.  Is considered one of the top experts in one’s field, qualified to provide high-quality advice on technical and political aspects, trade-offs on a policy-file, called upon in situations of e.g. high uncertainty and complexity, crisis, or public controversy. |
| Advising and influencing  ATTITUDE:   * Recognises the importance of understanding the role, context and need of the addressee, and why policy issues should be communicated in different ways to different audiences.   SKILL:   * Can articulate policy effects in a comprehensive and clear way and how to advice and influence the right people with tailored communication.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Has an overview of different communication techniques and knows for which purposes they are used. | Breaks down and communicates complex issues and focuses on addressees’ needs.  Avoids jargon, and is honest about risks, assumptions, and limitations with regards to evidence and policy options.  Positions work or advice visibly and timely expressing where and how it could add value to policy.  Builds coalitions to support or champion one’s work. | Provides evidence informed policy advice, both written and oral to personal briefings, debates or collaborative processes in an accessible manner, fit to be taken up in legislative or accompanying documents or to be cited at a management or cabinet level.  Articulates the implications of evidence on policy e.g. trade-offs, spill over effects, limitations and uncertainties, comprehensively and accurately.  Seeks to invest in building trust.  Speaks “truth to power” addressing inconvenient aspects i.e., misrepresentation of evidence, and does so in a manner that does not appear resistant to the preferred political course of action. | Provide advice consistently to decision makers in the policy-process, also at short notice, that enables taking sound decisions even when evidence is incomplete.  Efficiently positions important evidence that has only emerged late in the policy process i.e. by creating a persuasive narrative that clearly expressed its pivotal impact on planned policy measures, citizens and stakeholders. | Is considered one of the top experts in one’s field, qualified to provide high-quality advice on technical and political aspects, trade-offs on a policy-file, called upon in situations of e.g. high uncertainty and complexity, crisis, or public controversy.  Has consistently received feedback by senior management or political leadership that the advice provided was empowering e.g., in political debate providing effective evidence, messages or rebuttals.  Consistently speaks “truth to power”, in a constructive, politically sensible manner that safeguarded the accurate representation of evidence and its policy impact, even at the risk of professional detriment. |

**Competence Cluster: Citizen Engagement (CE)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Progression Level | | | |
| Competence | **Foundational** | **Intermediate** | **Advanced** | **Expert** |
| Adhering to and understanding Citizens Engagement  ATTITUDES:   * Recognises the purpose and value of citizen engagement, and of co-creation and deliberative practices, as well as their expected contribution to policy.   SKILLS:   * Can choose the appropriate type of CE engagement for different stages of the policy cycle and different policy contexts.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows the design of CE “cycle” and the types of engagement that are relevant for different stages of the policy process. * Knows various networks in the field of citizen engagement and participatory and deliberative democracy, both at the internal level and the external level. | Can identify the purpose of citizen engagement and of co-creation and deliberative practices, as well as their expected contribution to policy i.e., extending the knowledge base, reducing social polarisation over a controversial policy issue.  Recognises citizens as knowledge-holders with the ability and the legitimacy to enrich policy with new and different perspectives, ideas, concerns, visioning and, the scientific and technical knowledge base. | Has a working grasp of the design of CE “cycle” and the types of engagement that are relevant for different stages of the policy process.  Can explain the policy context in which citizen engagement should be carried out and the expected value of citizen engagement in such context. | Proficiently applies the CE “cycle” and diverse formats of engagement that are relevant and suitable at different stages of the policy process as well as the Commission services involved.  Contributes to various networks in the field of citizen engagement and participatory and deliberative democracy, both at the internal level (e.g. Community of Practice on Citizen Engagement and Deliberative Democracy) and the external level.  Identifies and provides evidence for the added value of citizen engagement activities/process. | Advocates for citizen engagement activities/process to be integrated at specific stages of the policy cycle.  Confidently advises on where citizen engagement is necessary in the policy cycle. |
| Planning and designing citizen engagement  ATTITUDE:   * Recognises the importance of involving experts and the target group already in the planning phase.   SKILLS:   * Can involve and engage experts and intended target group in the design of plans for CE and deliberative processes.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows how to design an efficient citizen engagement plan with clear objectives and alignment between the stages in the policy cycle. * Can anticipate issues that often occur in CE processes and projects. | Knows how to identify the right experts for the policy initiative.  Knows how to identify organisations and institutions that have the capacity to engage and involve the intended target group.  Collaborates with experts for planning and calibrating the level of ambition of CE activities with practical constraints linked to budget availability, feasibility, and policy commitment.  Distinguishes between all major preparatory work phases and methodological approaches to implement CE activities. | Sets clear objectives for the citizen engagement process and aligns them with the stage(s) of the policy cycle in which the engagement activities are expected to contribute.  Can Identify and have access to the right experts and organisations and institutions that involve and engage the intended target group.  Knows how to define which phases of the CE cycle need to be outsourced (e.g. recruitment, facilitation in local language, etc.).  Collaborates with different types of external providers in executing preparatory tasks. | Plans and sets up engagement processes i.e., establishing the number of events, partnerships, sampling of participants, duration, venue, agenda, expert information to participants, and local moderation team(s) both online and in physical events.  Can develop concepts and implementation guidance for all phases of CE planning and execution adapted to the specificities of the policy area. | Has served as reference point for other policymakers in the unit/directorate for planning and designing citizen engagement.  Has extensive practice in planning CE and deliberative processes at scale that have been approved and successfully equipped with resources for implementation. |
| Conducting citizen engagement  ATTITUDE:   * Is open to diversity of views and values mutual respect.   SKILLS:   * Is able to coordinate and implement CE processes.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows the principles and methodologies supporting the implementation of the CE process. | Actively contributes to running a CE activity e.g. co-facilitating conversations; synthesising inputs, drafting reports;  Integrates a diversity of views, debates, and possible disagreements between participants.  Knows where to get help from, especially for sensitive issues (e.g. communication with media, stakeholders mapping and involvement, etc.) | Confidently runs a citizen engagement activity under the guidance of experts for a policy initiative.  Clearly communicates the intent of the CE process, as well as its scope, stages and how results will be utilised and by whom.  Clearly communicates the scope of participation or the outcome, especially media, to raise public visibility. | Supervises at different stages of implementation CE activities and train others on citizen engagement.  Adapts methodological choices to new, unexpected circumstances (including changing choreography during the engagement process) while maintaining its validity and legitimacy intact before the participants *and* the administration. | Has extensive practice in coordinating and running CE (and in particular, co-creation or deliberative processes) at scale that led to policies that effectively reconcile policy objectives and citizen values and expectations.  Has piloted new methodological designs for CE resulting in new ways to inform/enrich policy development. |
| Processing citizen inputs into knowledge to inform policy  ATTITUDES:   * Is open to convey any conclusion, in a clear and transparent way.   SKILLS:   * Can design and execute reporting in a clear and transparent manner articulating knowledge and values. * Can obtain feedback from citizens, stakeholders and media, process it into policy recommendations and obtain validation .from relevant policymakers. * Can build bridges in multistakeholder processes.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows the different evaluation and reporting methods and criteria specific to the CE methodology chosen. | Distinguishes between co-creation and deliberative reporting and knows the different reporting methods and criteria specific to the CE methodology chosen.  Establishes procedures for keeping track of deliberation and discourses (i.e. rules for note-taking) to enable analytical processing of the outputs by CE specialists. | Designs and executes reporting of a CE process in a manner regarded as clear and transparent – both downstream (to participants) and upstream (to the requesting institution).  Articulates the knowledge and values inputs from citizen engagement into a valid and comprehensive strand of knowledge for policy. | Obtains feedback from citizens, stakeholders and /or media confirming that the reporting clearly and accurately articulated the interplay between specific individual or collective concerns and wider societal discourses/narratives.  Translates outputs of CE activities e.g. into actionable advice to policymakers, concrete policy options etc. according to the expectations raised with participants.  Obtains feedback from policymakers or politicians confirming that reporting outputs are fit and/ or value adding for policy integration. | Has triangulated outputs’ interpretation with relevant studies, including media-analyses and fed the results into the policy process.  Employs qualitative methods to conduct reflexive evaluation of CE with a focus on learning and policy utilisation.  Has designed reporting formats that serve as reference to policymakers. |

**Competence Cluster: Futures Literacy - anticipation and foresight**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Progression Level | | | | |
| Competence level | | **Foundational** | **Intermediate** | **Advanced** | **Expert** |
| Anticipation  ATTITUDES:   * Recognises the need of policy action in view of changes that are occurring, about to occur or desired.   SKILLS:   * Can connect observed changes to own policymaking work and act accordingly.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows the link between observed changes and the factors driving them. | | Recognises that policy action might be needed in view of changes that are occurring, about to occur or desired. | Can explain the observed changes and identifies what drives these changes. | Can identify the observed changes and connects them to own policymaking work. | Adapts actions according to the likely short-term consequences of the observed changes. |
| Foresight  ATTITUDES:   * Recognises the capacity of policy to chart long-term courses, and how long-term trends influence policy topics.   SKILLS:   * Can envision multiple futures and their possible consequences for policy in order to initiate policy change.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows how policy planning and policy topics interplay in the long-term. | | Can explain the capacity of policy to chart a long-term course towards the future. | Can describe long-term trends and how these might influence policy topics. | Envisions multiple futures and their possible consequences for policy. | Relates the possible futures of one’s own policy topic with multiple other futures of other topics around. |
| Spot change, scan the horizon  ATTITUDE:   * Is curious, observing and open towards new things happening.   SKILLS:   * Can keep track and monitor changes within a policy domain to identify trends and make use of the information.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows different types of trends and is familiar with policy monitoring and analysis tools. | | Keeps track of what is happening *(e.g., reading broadly, visiting fairs and exhibitions, following start-ups, talking with experts, etc.)* | Is able to identify signals of change and trends.  Uses a basic system to monitor changes within a particular area of interest or policy domain *(e.g., European Media Monitor, Google alert, etc.)* | Participates in a scanning system related to their topic and can make sense of the scans and identify relevant trends.  Makes adequate use of this information in own policymaking work, possibly with close colleagues. *(e.g. horizon scanning system, sensemaking session)* | Can identify the different types and levels of trends, in the different domains, and the possible cross-implications they might have.  Uses relevant tools to go further with the analysis to indicate possible policy consequences *(e.g. futures wheel, x, etc).* |
| Understand change and its possible impacts  ATTITUDE:   * Is aware of the interaction of multiple policies and drivers within a system.   SKILLS:   * Can identify significant drivers within a policy area and envision future scenarios to test possible impacts of policy proposals.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows trends and methods to simulate their possible long-term effects within a systemic approach. | | Can describe a system and its drivers of change.  Analyses trends and their possible long-term effects. *(e.g. STEEP framework, Megatrend implication assessment, structural analysis)* | Can identify how drivers can take different directions of change.  Can identify which drivers are the most significant for the policy area of interest and which influence each might have over the long term. *(e.g. ‘what if?’ cards, systems thinking, etc.)* | Envisions diverse complex futures.  Can identify the different types of uncertainty affecting the drivers of change.  Develops a good systemic understanding of the policy area.  Engages in structured collective exercises to bring broad and diverse expertise together.  Conceptualises various potential futures in which the policy could exist. *(e.g. scenario building, reference scenarios)* | Uses complex scenarios to stress-test policy proposals and imagine how concurrent developments might affect each other.  Creates suitable (qualitative and/or quantitative) simulation models.  Can spot the dynamic interactions of multiple policies and drivers in shaping various futures.  Effectively uses scenarios. (*e.g. ex ante impact assessment, weighing of policy options, stress-testing, wind tunnelling)* |
| Orient change, help give it a direction  ATTITUDE:   * Acknowledges different perspectives and values around the topic and understands long-term consequences of possible futures.   SKILLS:   * Can imagine and think long-term, and use scenarios to design and adjust a vision towards robust future perspectives shared by the stakeholders.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING:   * Knows policymaking and the roles, agency and agendas of relevant stakeholders. | | Can identify what a long-term vision is.  Distinguishes different perspectives and values existing around the topic.  Uses imagination and long-term thinking methods as a basis to formulate and justify desirable policy objectives.  *(e.g. Thing of the Future, Sarkar game)* | Can identify the different (positive and negative) long-term consequences of possible futures.  Describes policymaking and the roles, agency and agendas of relevant stakeholders.  Knows how to use scenarios. *(e.g. Scenario Exploration system, Future stories database)* | Designs a common future perspective together.  Engages with all relevant parties in an effective way.  Develops a clear perspective of what the future of the policy could look like and when to anticipate or adjust the vision. *(e.g. visioning, forward-looking monitoring system, policy-driven co-creation workshops, etc.)* | Brings together people to embrace a vision.  Tests the future perspective as robust (realistic, resilient and coherent with other policies and values) and shared among the stakeholders. *(e.g. Policy mapping tool, Next Generation Assessment, stakeholder engagement)*  Knows how to identify possible regulatory needs. |
| EFFECT CHANGE AND MAKE IT ACTIONABLE  ATTITUDE:   * Recognises the role of each stakeholder and own group in achieving a vision for the future of the EU.   SKILLS:   * Can conceptualise steps towards a vision, identify the actions and engage with stakeholders to co-create a roadmap to implement the actions.   KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANIDNG:   * Knows the policymaking process, its capacity to chart a long-term course towards the future and the role of each stakeholder in achieving a vision, along with adequate methodology. | | Recognises and apply a logical sequence of actions.  Effectively recognises and refers to the agency of own group and stakeholders.  Can identify the different elements, actors and interactions that make up the policymaking system.  Can easily explain to others the capacity of policy to chart a long-term course towards the future. *(e.g. Better Regulation Toolbox, stakeholder mapping, stakeholder engagement)* | Points out the likely part each stakeholder would play in achieving a vision.  Conceptualises steps towards the vision. *(e.g. Causal Layered Analysis, back casting, vision radar)* | Can describe the actions needed to achieve the policy.  Engages with all the stakeholders with agency on the issue to co-create roadmaps towards the vision. *(e.g. road mapping, concept design, policy-driven co-creation workshops)* | Brings roadmaps into the policy process to implement the actions needed to achieve the policy objectives.  Implements co-creation processes to ensure a robust and coherent set of policies in different areas to achieve policies to work together for the future of the EU. *(e.g. policy-driven co-creation workshops, concept implementation, institutional processes)* |

1. Competences are defined as a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes, where: 1) knowledge is composed of the facts and figures, concepts, ideas and theories which are already established and support the understanding of a certain area or subject; 2) skills are defined as the ability and capacity to carry out the processes and use the existing knowledge to achieve results; and 3) attitudes describe the disposition and mind-sets to act or react to ideas, persons or situations. Source: Annex of [Council Recommendation of 22 May 2018 on key competences for lifelong learning](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C_.2018.189.01.0001.01.ENG&toc=OJ:C:2018:189:TOC).  [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Kurt Koffka [↑](#endnote-ref-2)