# Competence Framework – ‘Evidence for policy’ for researcher

This competence framework ‘unpacks”, at four proficiency levels, the collective set of skills, knowledge and attitudes desired for researchers working at the science-policy interface

**Background**

The ‘Evidence for Policy’ competence framework outlines the collective set of competencies (skills, knowledge and attitudes)[[1]](#footnote-2) desired for research organisations working at the science-policy interface. Itexpresses proficiency not as a yes/no aspect, but rather as a matter of growing capacity. Wherever you are in your career path, you can always go one-step up and keep developing throughout your career.

The continuous development of primary research competencies are outside the scope of this framework. What is more the competence framework is based on the assumption that the organisation already possesses these skills.

**Competence Framework for “Evidence for Policy”**

‘Evidence for policy’ is about ensuring that the most useful and robust facts are provided and understood in good time for them to be taken into account by policymakers throughout the policy cycle. This requires:

* the development of stronger research synthesis skills to distil the key reliable evidence down to a few pertinent facts;
* community management skills to effectively harness the "wisdom of crowds" to identify the salient facts and draw relevant expertise from different disciplines;
* stronger systems-thinking skills and the ability to integrate different disciplines;
* better political intelligence and listening skills, so that researchers can identify when exactly to present the key facts but also "make sense" of the science, as the meaning and policy consequences will come equally from the political debate as from the science; and
* stronger citizen engagement and communication skills, notably making use of framing, visualisation, narratives and deliberative instruments.

The JRC has, in consultation with leading experts, developed a framework of eight (8) competence clusters required when working at the science-policy interface

Figure 1: Competence Framework for “Evidence for Policy”



The competences are presented and analysed in-depth in the peer-reviewed article “[Knowledge management for policy impact: the case of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-018-0143-3)" published in 2018.

**The competence framework and how it can be used**

The ’Evidence for policy’ competence framework 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 learning, and hence the progression to the next level, comes through dedicated (online) training courses, on-the-job training, peer-to-peer learning, coaching and mentoring**. The competence framework “unpacks” the skills, knowledge and attitudes required for each proficiency level.

**The framework can be used at both organisational and individual level,** in example to:

* map an individual researcher’s level of ’Evidence for policy’ skills, knowledge and attitudes
* Map a unit’s collective ‘Evidence for policy’ set of skills, knowledge and attitudes
* determine if the collective set of skills, knowledge and attitudes of research teams are ‘fit for purpose’; are some skills/knowledge/attitudes missing/redundant to achieve the mission/project objectives?
* draw up job descriptions and to assess job applications
* draw attention to the skills, knowledge and attitudes required when working at the science-policy interface
* support the design of training courses and learning outcomes.

Competence Framework – ‘Evidence for policy’ for researchers

*This competence framework ‘unpacks”, at four proficiency levels, the collective set of skills, knowledge and attitudes desired for researchers*

**Understanding Policy & Science**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Competence/Progression level | Foundational | Intermediate  | Advanced | Expert |
| Identifying evidence needsATTITUDES: * remains open-minded when considering the intersection between own research and policy context;
* uses prospective thinking to anticipate on evidence needs;
* is open to listening to policymakers to support bridging the academic and policy cultures and structures.

SKILLS: * Identifies main questions in a policy challenge and infers or corroborates the need for scientific evidence;
* produces analysis of evidence-needs and relates these to own research field;
* can design and implement a knowledge strategy for a policy field.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * is familiar with all aspect related to ‘calls for evidence’;
* knows about strategies for identifying evidence needs when exploring the policy context.

  | Is familiar with the Mission letters, Work Programmes, Action Plans, Communications, horizon scanning of relevant policy fields.Identifies the relevant policy priorities and legislative proposals and understands how they link to own work. | Can clearly explain how their research area contributes directly to the administrations’ policy priorities and proposals. Can follow and contribute to the design and implementation of a knowledge strategy for a policy field.Negotiates time and space with policy makers to better understand their evidence needs in relation to the policy priorities and legislative proposals. | Can design and implement a knowledge strategy for a policy field assessing evidence needs, clearly defining gaps and when necessary, identify scientific evidence of previously unknown policy relevance.Embraces new developments in policy priorities by consistently considering the purpose of the investigation and the research results. | Demonstrates the ability to anticipate and assess evidence needs in view of emerging policy challenges and/or fast-paced issues and debates.Helps policy counterparts to think ahead about their evidence needs. Consistently uses the best available evidence in designing policy. |
| Building relationships and networksATTITUDES: * believes in the importance of building networks to deepen the understanding of issues;
* fosters a culture of openness to sharing ideas and learning.

SKILL:* can map key expertise in the field of work; is able to convene knowledge brokers and create opportunities for interdisciplinary exchange.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * knows the key stakeholders in the relevant area of work inside the administration;
* shares information and knowledge with colleagues and the wider community concerned by the policy area.
 | Maps the key stakeholders in their area of work inside the administrations. | Interacts regularly with knowledge brokers, policy makers and researchers and invests in building both formal and informal networks that may be harnessed in case of need. | Convenes knowledge brokers and colleagues to provide a safe space for interdisciplinary exchange and cultivate an informal expert network that continuously exchanges with the administration between disciplines. Shares state of the art, latest expertise and evidence, and examples of success and failure of evidence informed policy measures. | Is consulted as one of the world-leading experts in own field, within and beyond own personal network (e.g., by highest level of governance, academia or media). Is consulted by leading experts in science, high-level politicians and granted direct contact including at short notice.  |
| Putting research into a policy context ATTITUDE: * Believes that evidence-informed policy making is relevant for society at large.

SKILL: * Can identify the connections between research results and policy issues

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Knows how to communicate to policy makers
 | Follows the conversations and contributions of key stakeholders, policy experts and influencers in their policy field to catch the pulse of the debate and recent political developments.Identifies the most important policy drivers in their area of work. | Helps colleagues to stay informed about issues relevant to their work and the wider ecosystem around it, by regularly sharing speeches, podcasts, social media posts, articles and other policy insights. | By regularly contributing to policy networks, inside and outside the administration, the researcher increases the uptake of their work by policy makers.Identifies the key facts to respond to the key current issues in the policy debate. | Contributes with relevant and impactful insights to policy-related events.Contributes at high-level decision-making meetings.  |

**Participating in Policymaking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Competence/Progression level | Foundational | Intermediate  | Advanced | Expert |
| Knowledge brokeringATTITUDE: * Understands the importance of providing evidence that is robust, timely and relevant for policy makers.

SKILL: * Can take appropriate steps to feed knowledge from research findings back to policy makers and is able to prepare proposals for policy makers.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Is familiar with the governments’ political priorities, policy challenges and the broader policy debate.
 | Can contextualise research findings, and consequently reduce ambiguity, into the political priorities and the broader policy debate. | Proposes policy implications and fit-for-purpose policy options from the evidence (the ‘so what for this policy’ of different evidence claims), by using their policy intelligence  | Influences *policies* through presenting compelling evidence of challenges or reframing of challenges. | Influences government political *priorities* by presenting compelling evidence of challenges or reframing of challenges. |
| Working with valuesATTITUDE: * Is aware of and recognises the dominant values that are in play in their area of research.
* Recognises the importance of the inclusion of diverse values in contributing to better policy.

SKILL: * can orient policymakers to distinguish between evidence, values and interests, and their impact on evidence to inform policy options.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * knows the dominant values in the area of research and their impact on the policymaking process.
 | Is aware of and can identify the dominant values that are in play in their area of research. | Effectively helps policymakers distinguish between debates about facts and debates about values. | Serves as a reliable knowledge broker to policy makers.Is proficient at brokering knowledge to policymakers highlighting trade-offs between evidence, values and interest in decision-making.  | Has transparently and comprehensibly expressed the impact of values on the evidence and on how this evidence could inform policy optionsHas initiated the inclusion of a diversity of values as part of the policymaking process, contributing to better policies. |
| Political savvinessATTITUDE: * is aware of politically sensitive topics around their research area.

SKILLS: * can anticipate, handle and communicate politically sensitive topics in line with the administration’s policy.;
* can facilitate evidence-informed discussion on politically sensitive topics around their research area at highest political level.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * is familiar with political and public debates surrounding their research area.
 | Can identify political and public debates surrounding their research area. | Can identify if an issue related to their research is likely to become politically sensitive.  | Effectively handles the politically sensitive topics around their research area and communicates on them in line with the administration’s policy. | Has proficiently facilitated evidence-informed discussion on politically sensitive topics around their research area at highest political level. |

**COMMUNICATION WITH A NON-SCIENTIFIC AUDIENCE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Competence/Progression level | Foundational | Intermediate  | Advanced | Expert |
| Prepare Briefings ATTITUDE: * Values the role, context and need of the briefings’ addressee and acknowledges the importance of writing briefings that are fit for that purpose.

SKILL: * Uses scientific evidence in the most accurate and understandable way to prepare high-quality briefings for decision makers.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Knows the role, context and need of of the briefings’ addressee.
* Chooses the right briefing style to convey complex scientific aspects and enrich as such the addressee’s understanding about policy and political implications.
 | Prepares briefings that express evidence in an accurate way, in compliance with the preferred style within the organisation or of the briefings’ addressee.Understands the role, context and need of the addressee and writes briefings that are fit for that purpose. | Provides evidence informed, policy recommendations, both written and oral to personal briefings, debates or collaborative processes, tailored to the needs of the addressee, in an accessible manner, fit to be taken up in legislative or enclosed documents or to be cited at a management or cabinet level. | Can prepare briefings that convey complex scientific 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.  | Can prepare 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. |
| Write science-for-policy outputs targeting a non-scientific audience ATTITUDE: * Recognises the importance of written science-for-policy outputs for non-scientific audience.

SKILL: * Can contribute and draft science-for-policy outputs; is able to initiate the process of effective science-for policy outputs.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Is aware of the different elements that must be covered in a written science-for-policy outputs for non-scientific audience.
 | Contributes to and is aware of written science-for-policy outputs cited or used by policy makers within/outside the administration, stakeholders and/or citizens. | Writes, as the penholder, science-for-policy outputs cited or used by policymakers within/outside the administration, stakeholders and/or citizens. | Initiates science-for policy outputs that transform the policy debate, i.e. transform the framing, the narrative, the actors invited to participate and the policy outcomes.  | Initiates science-for policy outputs that transform the policy debate, i.e. transform the framing, the narrative, the actors invited to participate and the policy outcomes.  |
| Visual presentation techniques and delivering visual presentation of data.ATTITUDE: * Acknowledges the importance and the impact of using visuals for presenting scientific data and information.

SKILL: * Can produce a visualisation that presents the scientific data and information in the most effective and accurate way

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Knows the principles, techniques and methods of visual presentation.
 | Recognises the importance of using visuals to illustrate their points.Is aware of techniques and methods. | Knows the principles, techniques, and methods for improving the impact of one’s visual presentations.Is adapting visual presentations (tone and form) to each non-scientific audience and without misrepresenting data or delivering contradictory messages. | Is conveying complex scientific evidence in accurate and accessible way by using visual presentation techniques. | Has developed a visualisation that has become a reference point for public policy or public debate, e.g. massively shared by high-level policymakers/politicians (online and offline)  |
| Engaging with non-scientific audiences online – the social mediaATTITUDE: * Values the importance of social media and the contributions of stakeholders and citizens groups.

SKILLS: * Can catch the pulse of a debate; knows how to outreach and interact with different interest groups;
* Is capable of developing a strategy and optimizing the content.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Is familiar with the world of social media; knows about a social media strategy and the main metrics used in social media.
 | Is following stakeholders and citizens groups on social media to catch the pulse of a debate in his/her area of research.  | Understands and uses main metrics to optimise the online content created in their research area for social media. | Develops a social media strategy to support their outreach and interaction with policymakers, stakeholders and citizens.Interacts with leading policy influencers online and is getting work promoted online by leading influencers.  |  |
| Speaking in public to a non-scientific audience  ATTITUDES: * Is an engaged speaker and presenter of the value of policies and the evidence they are based on;
* Appreciates and values the contributions of non-scientific audience.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Is knowledgeable about argumentation and presentation techniques and models;
* Knows about active listening techniques.

SKILLS: * Can demonstrate the value of policies and the evidence they are based on to a non-scientific audience;
* Can interact with a non-scientific audience and knows how to handle difficult situations in a discussion / debate / presentation.
 | Knows the basics of non-scientific argumentation. Can re-structure their scientific argument in discussions with a non-scientific audience. Listens with attention and speaks with intention and respect for. Knows the principles and approaches to effective rebuttal. | Knows how to present the value of policies and the evidence they are based on, to a non-scientific audience.Is familiar with TED or Pecha Kucha style talks, blogs, podcasts, exhibitions or citizen dialogues.Applies techniques to ‘Stand their ground’ when under attack in a debate or public discussion. | Can present and discuss complex issues with a non-scientific audience, demonstrating the value of policies, and the evidence they are based on, in the eyes of citizens, stakeholders and policymakers. Can effectively handle Q&A, critical audiences, heckling and technical breakdowns. | Is leading debates/discussions with a non-scientific audience that transforms the policy debate, i.e. transforms the framing, the narrative and/or the actors invited to participate. Listens intently and uses the narratives and opinions of others to meaningfully bridge to one’s own key messages. |
| Communicating uncertaintyATTITUDES: * understands the importance of being humble when communicating on uncertainties, and values making non-scientific audiences understand the complexity in decision-making.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * knows how to design and collaboratively develop communication approaches to address uncertainties related to the policy area, as perceived by non-scientific audiences.

SKILLS: * Can apply strategies for closing the gap between people’s intuition and the scientific evidence, while addressing uncertainties related to the policy area.
 | Can appraise uncertainties related to their research through the lens of non-scientific audiences, i.e. defining the characteristics of the uncertainty, who the uncertainty is likely to affect and what the likely perception of it will be. Can use analogies from ‘everyday life’ to obtain buy-in from non-scientific audiences that uncertainties are everywhere, not only in science. | Can design a communication strategy (developed collaboratively and containing three main elements: risk appraisal, situational analysis and source analysis) addressing the uncertainties related to their research as perceived by non-scientific audiences.   | Can successfully implement a communication strategy addressing the uncertainties related to the policy area, as perceived by non-scientific audiences. Can successfully apply strategies for closing the gap between people’s intuitions and the scientific evidence. | Has established a culture in the team, which is committed and equipped to communicate on uncertainty following principles and strategies agreed upon.Is considered one of the top experts in the their field, qualified to provide advice on technical and political aspects, trade-offs on a policy file, called upon in situations of e.g. high uncertainty and complexity, crises or public controversy. |

**CITIZENS ENGAGEMENT (CE)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Competence/Progression level | Foundational | Intermediate  | Advanced | Expert |
| Adhering to and understanding Citizens EngagementATTITUDE: * Recognises the purpose and value of citizens engagement, and of co-creation and deliberative practices, as well as their expected contribution to policy.

SKILL: * Can choose the appropriate type of CE engagement for different stages of the policy cycle and different policy contexts.

KNOWLEDGE & 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 the expected contribution, 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, doubts, and visioning, the scientific and technical knowledge base. | Has a working grasp of the “CE cycle” and the types of engagement that are relevant for different stages of the policy process as well as what services in the administration are to be involved.  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 deliberative democracy, both at the internal level (e.g. Community of Practice on Citizen Engagement) and the external level. Effectively identifies the added value of the citizen engagement activities/process. | Advocates for citizen engagement activities / processes to be integrated at specific stages of the policy cycle. Confidently advises on where citizen engagement is necessary in the policy cycle.  |
| Planning Citizen EngagementATTITUDE: * Recognises the importance of involving experts and the target group already in the planning phase.

SKILL: * Can involve and engage experts and intended target group in the design of plans for CE and deliberative processes.

KNOWLEDGE & 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. Relies on expert guidance 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, duration, venue, agenda, expert information to participants and local moderation team(s) both online and offline. Develops concepts and implementation guidance for all phases of CE planning and execution adapted to the specificities of their policy area.  | Has served as reference point for other researchers in their unit / directorate for planning 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 EngagementATTITUDE: * recognises the utility odf deliberative and participatory methods. Is open to diversity of views and values mutual respect.

SKILL: * Is able to implement CE processes.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Knows the principles and methodologies supporting the implementation of the CE process.
 | Recognises the utility of deliberative and participatory methods to define policy. Contributes productively to and support running a CE exercise e.g. by co-facilitating conversations; synthesising inputs, drafting reports. Integrates a diversity of views, debates, and possible disagreements between participants in a way that does not interfere with the relationship of trust with and among participants.  Knows where to get help from, especially for sensitive issues (e.g. communication with media, stakeholders mapping and involvement, etc.)  | Can confidently run 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, resulting in a relationship of trust with participants, organisations and any other party with a potential interest in the process.Clearly communicates the scope of participation or the outcome, especially media, in order to raise public visibility. | Supervises, at different stages of the implementation process, CE activities and train others on citizen engagement.  Adapts methodological choices to new, unexpected circumstances (including changing methodology during the engagement process) while maintaining its validity and legitimacy intact before the participants *and*the administration.  | Has extensive practice in running CE and deliberative processes at scale that led to policies that effectively reconcile policy objectives and citizen values and needs. Has piloted new methodological designs for CE resulting in new ways to inform/enrich policy development.  |
| Processing citizens input into knowledgeATTITUDE: * 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, thus building bridges in multi-stakeholders processes.

KNOWLEDGE & 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) in order 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 where 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.   Has conducted reflexive evaluation of CE with a focus on learning and policy utilisation by employing qualitative methods.   |

**Synthesising** **and Integrating Evidence for Policy makers**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Competence/Progression level | Foundational | Intermediate  | Advanced | Expert |
| Synthesising and integrating evidence fit-for-purpose for policy makersATTITUDE:* Supports a concise, multi-source and cross-disciplinary synthesis of existing knowledge base fit-for-purpose for policy makers.

SKILLS: * Can assess requests, deploy and combine a range of research synthesis methods;
* Is able to provide a comprehensive fit-for-purpose evidence synthesis.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Is confident with multiple research sources and cross disciplines as well as research synthesising methods.

  | Can do a comprehensive literature review in the context of a policy challenge. Assesses requests from policy makers and determines whether a synthesis of existing evidence or new research is required to provide a fit-for-purpose response. | Provides policy makers with a multi-source and cross-disciplinary evidence synthesis on policy challenges, by deploying and combining a range of simple research synthesis methods, e.g. Evidence Mapping and Rapid Evidence Assessment. | Provides policy makers with a multi-source and cross-disciplinary evidence synthesis on policy challenges, by deploying and combining a range of advanced research synthesis methods, including Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. | Provides policy makers with a comprehensive (multiple sources and cross-disciplinary) fit-for-purpose evidence synthesis, which includes tacit knowledge about the dominant views and values of citizens.  |

**Managing Expert Communities**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Competence/Progression level | Foundational | Intermediate  | Advanced | Expert |
| Working through Communities of Practice (CoP)ATTITUDE: * Recognises the importance of knowledge sharing and collective intelligence to the benefit of the quality of policy making.

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 & 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 their research area and explores communities of practice one could contribute to or learn from.Shares knowledge related to their practice and 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 their practice, convinced by working through communities brings added value to the quality.Facilitates the development of a common sense of purpose, followed by a greater sense of trust and a connection between members.Acts confidently as a community manager (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 their 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. |
| FacilitationATTITUDE: * 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 & UNDERSTANDING: * Knows different facilitation types, tools, techniques and methods, and when they suit different purposes.

 | Understands the philosophies and goals behind different types of facilitation (e.g. moderation, hosting, chairing, negotiation, etc.) and knows how to run (online) in an effective way, deploying the most 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. | Has facilitated face-to-face and online meetings (with participation of scientists and policymakers) using different formats and methods (e.g. moderation, hosting, chairing, negotiation, etc.) depending on the collaboration format and purpose.Has experience in facilitating debates or discussions their own research field and using deliberative means to improve the understanding of stakeholders involved.Applies techniques to gauge and cultivate a group’s emotional self-awareness, 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, 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 involving policymakers and researchers from different disciplines, 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 research. |

**Interpersonal skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Competence/Progression level | Foundational | Intermediate  | Advanced | Expert |
| Group dynamicsATTITUDE: * Values active listening to others;
* Is open to and tolerates the contributions of others;
* Allows effective interactions among interlocutors

SKILLS: * Knows how to communicate clearly by using verbal and non-verbal communication;
* Knows how to handle conflict situations and non-assertive behaviours;
* Can coach colleagues on effective communication

KNOWLEDGE &UNDERSTANDING: * Knows the rules of effective discussion and communication;
* Is familiar with facilitation of interactions / discussions as well as conflict management techniques.
 | Demonstrates ability to listen to other people's ideas without showing prejudice.Understands and avoids behaviours, which may prevent an effective interaction. | Identifies causes of a conflict.Helps their interlocutors in expressing their ideas and needs, so to minimise the risk of unclear or incomplete communication.    | Uses non-verbal communication to facilitate interaction among their interlocutors. Supports colleagues in dealing with non-assertive behaviours possibly disrupting the value-creating activities of individuals or teams. | Can shape group norms that ensure the transformative capacity of the organisation.   |
| 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 & UNDERSTANDING: * Understands the role of emotions in cognitive processes and decision-making.
 | Shows empathy towards, not judgement, towards others. Recognise the role of their 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 their 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.  | Has helped colleagues to explore, express and expand their empathy and emotional capacities and develop a value empathy, e.g., by learning about the diversity of values in the population. Valorises their individual or group contributions and facilitates non-defensive, collaborative atmosphere even in disagreement. | Has had significant impact on establishing and applying values empathy towards citizens and other stakeholders in the research process and cultivating the emotional intelligence of the organisation.Cultivates the emotional intelligence of the organisation.  |
| Intercultural sensitivityATTITUDE: * Is sensitive to and seeks to include different cultures and values in their worldview.

SKILL: * Can identify and integrate differing values and views.

KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Understands the importance of cultural sensitivity in research.
 | Understands that their culture is just one among many others and accepts cultural, e.g., values, differences, although not necessarily agreeing with them. | Has an expanded worldview and has expressed empathy towards others’ cultures and values orientation. | Has integrated different cultural worldviews in their own, with none being central. | Increases the effectiveness, acceptance and legitimacy of decisions in research by acting upon their intercultural sensitivity and evidence about values orientation.  |
| 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.  |

**Monitoring & Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Competence/Progression level | Foundational | Intermediate  | Advanced | Expert |
| Monitoring and evaluation of impact of evidence on the policy making processATTITUDE: * Leads by example to instil and nurture a better use of evidence in policymaking.

SKILLS: * Can monitor and evaluate their work appropriately and knows when to apply corrective measures;

Can use the intelligence gathered from the ongoing monitoring and evaluation process to facilitate a better use of evidence in policymaking.KNOWLEDGE & UNDERSTANDING: * Is knowledgeable about key performance indicators;
* Knows about the monitoring and evaluation steps of the impact of evidence on the policy making process.
 | Develops key performance indicators (qualitative and quantitative) to monitor the use and citation of their work in the policy making process.Leads by example to instil and nurture a policy impact-driven culture in the organisation. | Deploys key performance indicators (qualitative and quantitative) to monitor the use and citation of their work in the policy making process.Identifies and initiates corrective measures in response to the results of ongoing monitoring of the use and citation of their work in the policy making process. | Facilitates a better use of evidence in policy making processes through the intelligence gathered from the monitoring and evaluation of the impact of evidence on the policy making process. | N/A |

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)