NOTE #13

Technical Assistance in the STARBIOS2 project

By Giovanni Caiati and Claudia Colonnello

RRI IMPLEMENTATION
IN BIOSCIENCE ORGANISATIONS

GUIDELINES FROM THE STARBIOS2 PROJECT

Andrea Declich with the STARBIOS2 partners

NOTE #13

Technical Assistance in the STARBIOS2 project

By Giovanni Caiati and Claudia Colonnello

In the STARBIOS2 project, Technical Assistance (TA) has been a service provided by the STARBIOS2 Consortium as a whole to help the Core Teams in carrying out their individual Action Plans (APs). TA has been implemented by a dedicated team of people external to the individual Core Teams composed of social researchers with experience in RRI, in project management, and in structural change initiatives.

More specifically, the support provided by TA has been aimed at **helping the Core Teams to drive the APs successfully** from the detailed design phase to completion. The **specific objectives** of the TA were to:

- **Support the implementation** of the activities and overcome emerging problems and issues
- **Reflect upon the AP activities**, results and reactions, and on this basis provide advice for developing a strategic approach in order to orient such activities toward the goal of structural change
- **Promote mutual learning** from other similar experiences inside the Consortium, in Europe and worldwide and, in general, improve the quality of their actions.

The TA activity is, by its nature, a reflexive and participatory exercise. In the STARBIOS2 project, it began with a reflection on the TA Team contribution to the life of the AP. Such reflection was presented and discussed with the AP Core Teams and, once their feedback was collected, was adopted as a general framework within which the TA played its role. TA started by considering three methodological lines.

a) **TA team as a "liminal" agent** – between outsider and insider. In fact, the TA team was an "outsider" since it was not part of the organisations where each AP was taking place. At the same time the Technical Assistance was part of the STARBIOS2 project and this made the TA team an "insider". This situation informed all the work of the TA team, which was not directly implied in and kept abreast of all the dynamics (resistances, drivers, institutional mechanisms) that characterized the research organisation implementing the APs. On the other hand, because it shared the same goals of the Core Teams, the TA team was in the position of providing advice, suggestions and observations, free from the biases deriving from being an insider of the research institution where the AP was taking place. This particular position helped the TA team in being accepted as an "assistant" by the AP Core Teams.

b) **TA as a bridge between the AP and other experiences** (inside and outside the project). The TA team was composed of social scientists, researchers and experts in RRI, Structural Change, Gender in science, Education and socialization of scientific research. Nevertheless, it was impossible to cover all the expertise related to the implementation of the APs that are wide in scope (the 5+1 keys of RRI) and whit diverse national background; for this reason, the TA acted not only on the basis of its own expertise but also as a bridge with expertise developed in all the APs (and those existing within their institutions), with the international partners (covering the experiences from outside Europe), and with other experiences and projects (on RRI or on each of the 5+1 keys) present in Europe. This was particularly useful for the implementation of APs within bioscience organisations in which, obviously, an internal expertise and specialization in RRI and social science was not prevalent (indeed, various AP Core Teams included also social scientists with experience in RRI; but nevertheless, they were composed mainly by bioscientists operating within bioscience research organisations).

c) **TA as a "non-invasive" action.** TA activities had to deal with the time constraints that the APs were facing since they were very ambitious in terms of tasks and activities to be carried out. In this framework, it is to be considered that the Core Teams were composed of researchers, professors, PhD students, etc. that have many research, institutional and teaching-related duties beyond the implementation of the APs. In order to cope with this situation, from the beginning the TA approach has stressed the quality of AP Core Teams time spent interacting with the AP Core Teams, over the quantity of interactions. This has meant a careful preparation of the meetings, their scheduling in advance (as far as possible), recording of what was said in feedback sheets, and having a dedicated space and time for the team without other interruptions.

In practice, the main areas in which the assistance to the APs took place are described below.

- Area 1: support the **APs design and reporting activities**. In this area fall all the activities that are related to designing and revising the AP, as well as the reporting activities foreseen in the project. The effort of the TA in these actions was at two levels. At a first level, TA supported the AP Teams to deliver the plans or the reports in time and in good shape. At the second level TA facilitated the use of these occasions as opportunities for reflection and for ensuring a strategic use of the AP. All the plans and reports delivered by the 6 AP teams followed an itinerary of discussion, reflection, review and suggestion in interaction with the Technical Assistance team.
- Area 2: support the **APs implementation**. Under this area fall all the activities connected with the everyday work of the AP teams. The effort of the TA in this area was trying to sustain the AP Teams in order to help them to achieve the goals they had established and to make their action more effective and efficient. Under this area lie activities such as: the periodic overview of the activities carried out in the APs (and related suggestions), the development of "joint activities" (between the AP and the TA teams); the supply of "on demand" support actions, sharing and presenting useful material for the development of the APs (toolkit, questionnaire models,

examples of similar actions, etc.), the identification of useful contacts for the implementation of the APs, etc.

- Area 3: activation and coordination of **mutual learning among the APs**. In this area fall the activities related to the learning across the different APs of the project. In this respect annual mutual learning meetings among the APs were organised. Moreover, the mutual learning was favoured through many different means by the TA team such as: suggestions, exchange of information, exchange of documents and tools, etc. Finally TA activated a cycle of remote Multilateral Sessions at a distance each one dedicated to sharing experiences inside the Consortium on one of the five RRI keys (Societal Engagement, Gender, Education, Open Access and Ethics). The mutual learning activities were oriented toward two goals: sustaining the implementation of the AP – even if indirectly; fuelling the general learning process in each AP team and in the project as a whole.

These three areas of action are obviously overlapping to certain extent. Nevertheless they catch very well the territory where the Technical Assistance operated for supporting the 6 APs.

The TA activities related to the three areas described above were implemented through a set of tools that were made available by the project, and namely:

- Assistance sessions at a distance
- Periodic on-site visits
- Mutual learning meetings
- On-demand support actions.

ABOUT THE ⟨STARBIOS2 logo⟩ STARBIOS2 GUIDELINES

This guideline aims to help readers formalize and trigger structural change aimed at introducing appropriate RRI-related practices to their own organisations. This is not a series of prescriptions, but an itinerary of reflection and self-interpretation addressed to different actors within the biosciences. To support this itinerary of reflection and self-interpretation, the document provides...

· a description of a general RRI Model for research organisations within the biosciences, that is a set of ideas, premises and "principles of action" that define the practice of RRI in bioscience research organisations,

· some practical guidance for designing interventions to promote RRI in research organisations in the Biosciences, putting into practice the RRI Model,

· a set of useful practices in implementing the structural change process,

· and information on particular STARBIOS2 cases and experiences, as well as materials, tools and sources, are also provided in the Appendix and in the Annex.