

NOTE #12

The complexity of monitoring and assessing RRI structural change implementation and impact in research organisations within biosciences

By **Evanthia Kalpazidou Schmidt**



RRI IMPLEMENTATION IN BIOSCIENCE ORGANISATIONS

GUIDELINES FROM THE  STARBIOS2 PROJECT



Andrea Declich with the STARBIOS2 partners



STARBIOS2 project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 709517.



NOTE #12

The complexity of monitoring and assessing RRI structural change implementation and impact in research organisations within biosciences

By Evanthia Kalpazidou Schmidt

This section comprises a presentation of some key aspects of the monitoring and evaluation of the actual experience of promoting RRI structural change within research organisations in the STARBIOS2 project. The focus is on the role of monitoring and assessment in the design, implementation and impact of the actions and in particular on some critical issues in promoting RRI and triggering effective structural change processes.

In the last decades, evaluation of research and innovation has become a valuable instrument in policy-making within varied contexts as a means to use scientific knowledge to support decision making (Dahler-Larsen, 2006; Kalpazidou Schmidt, 2009). In the framework of the STARBIOS2 project, RRI evaluation has been perceived as a wide-ranging concept and has been employed as an efficient instrument in not only monitoring and assessing the implementation and impact of actions but has also been utilized as a continuous learning tool for the involved actors. As a learning instrument, it has been used for design and strategy-development, process assessment (opening the black box of the implementation process and providing feedback to address emerging issues and redesign actions) to assure the maintenance of high quality levels in the implementation of the tailor-made Action Plans throughout the duration of the project. Hence, a formative, developmental dimension, providing basis for adjustment and formative learning along the process, has been incorporated in the monitoring and assessment efforts. Similarly, a summative evaluation of outputs,

outcomes and impacts has been carried out to assess the degree to which the actions achieved their objectives or created the crucial conditions for RRI structural change to occur.

The main objectives of the monitoring and assessment activities have been: (i) to examine and assess the process and progress towards the objectives of the actions, (ii) to provide input as to the quality of the activities during the implementation process (in a learning and formative perspective), and (iii) to assess the achievement of planned objectives and expected impacts, in a summative perspective. The monitoring and assessment activities contributed also to RRI knowledge exchange and mutual learning. The activities in the specific context of the STARBIOS2project have thus been:

- Transversal: co-operation with all partners and facilitation of knowledge exchange.
- Communicative: identification of good practices, needs and potential benefits, encouraging critical self-reflection on the change process and the sustainability of the actions.
- Balancing an internal/external role and functioning as a critical partner, overseeing the flow of the Action Plans, mapping progress and enabling timely intervention.
- Accounting for the specificity of the project nature with distinct epistemic cultures and disciplines.
- Acknowledging the non-linearity of the transformation process.
- Considering the contextual conditions in complex, dynamic and adaptive systems.
- Adjusting evaluation design throughout the project to include emerging issues.

The internal role of the evaluators as embedded in the project provided the advantage of becoming acquainted with all actions in a high level of detail, aimed at utilizing this knowledge for the benefit of the implementation process, and allowed emerging issues to be addressed. This insight and understanding minimized the risk of an overly ethnocentric perspective with limited ability to capture the complex context-sensitive aspects of the implementation process in each Action

Plan in its cultural, institutional and national setting (Kalpazidou Schmidt & Cacace, 2017 and 2018). At the same time, innate in the evaluative task lay also an imperative to take on a more distanced perspective in order to allow for an independent assessment of the sufficiency of the project's development and progress. The monitoring and assessment standpoint mimicked an outside view and thus avoided "going native" (Lindlof, 1995) but functioned in a deeply committed participatory way.

In performing the monitoring and assessment of the RRI structural change actions, the criteria of *effectiveness* (attaining the objectives), *efficiency* (the implementation process, use of resources, managerial capacity), *relevance* (adequacy of the initiatives during the whole implementation process), *sustainability* (structural effects beyond the end of Action Plans), *transferability* (transferring actions to another context) and *impact* (short-, medium- and long-term impact) have been adopted (Kalpazidou Schmidt, 2016). Impact has been articulated in terms of *subjective impact* and *objective impact* (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Monitoring and assessment criteria

effectiveness	· attaining the objectives
efficiency	· implementation process and use of resources
relevance	· adequacy of the actions during the whole implementation process
sustainability	· structural effects beyond end of actions
transferability	· transferring actions to other contexts
impact	· subjective impact · objective impact

Subjective impact addressed the degree of approval among the beneficiaries of the various activities in the Action Plans, as well as the capacity to promote consensus about the activities among actors internal to the institutions, such as the staff and leadership, but also externally, reaching stakeholders from the local and/or national community. *Objective impact* referred to the effects obtained in terms of actual change within the implementing institutions, which may be expressed in numerical terms, but may also have a cultural, organisational or policy character, expressed in qualitative terms. Such impact may involve improved open access practices, increased share of women in senior and decision-making positions, change in the programmes, policies or work procedures of the institutions, adoption of the Action Plans processes and results by other R&I organisations or by subdivisions of the research institutions not initially involved in RRI activities. Objective impact may also comprise the creation of conditions that enable activation of further change processes.

As a first step in the assessment process, the strategic scope of the actions was scrutinized by examining the specific set of issues addressed and understanding them in relation to the particular contextual conditions and the objectives pursued by each RRI implementing organisation. The types of expected impacts were: (i) in the short-term, improvement of the uptake of RRI in the implementing research institutions; (ii) in the medium-term, production of tangible and measurable results in terms of organisational processes and structures, and making institutional change scalable to other institutions in the ERA; and (iii) in the long-term, increasing the ability of research institutions to generate innovation that reflects societal needs.

The monitoring and assessment activities have been performed on the basis of information derived from documents, information and data provided by the implementing teams and other stakeholders (such as other actors and beneficiaries); periodic bilateral monitoring sessions; various reporting activities and

information collected through monitoring schemes; mutual learning sessions; steering committee meetings; a range of bilateral *ad hoc* communication activities (such as support in developing survey questionnaires, evaluation templates, etc.); sessions with the coordinator and the technical-assistant partner; and on-site visits to the implementing institutions.

RRI structural change assessment in context

Besides the formative and summative elements, the monitoring and assessment activities aimed at, in a learning perspective, opening the black box of the space between the initiation of the actions and the impact by closely following the process of implementation to understand “what works better for whom in what circumstances, and why” (Pawson & Tilly, 1997).

Assessment of RRI implementation involves a range of challenges since RRI actions, themselves being complex, are carried out in complex environments. Such challenges comprise *attribution* problems (the effects of which are directly linked to the implementation of actions and how change has occurred), *measurement* problems (understanding the dynamics in complex contexts, availability of data and information, comparability of results, etc.), and *timing* problems (time lag from implementation until the generation of outputs and outcomes so that impact can be assessed).

Establishing a causal link between the RRI actions and the observed impacts requires the attribution of the observed change to the actions. However, in reality, implementations of complex concepts, such as RRI, in complex contexts, such as research institutions, make such pursuits challenging (cf. Cartwright & Hardie, 2012; Dahler-Larsen, 2012). The ability of RRI actions to foster the right conditions for change is therefore central in implementations in complex contexts (Reale et al., 2014), and impact assessment has to consider whether sufficient “conditions for impact” are created (Kalpazidou Schmidt & Cacace, 2017; Kalpazidou Schmidt et al., 2019). Thus, the following features have to be taken into account in complex system evaluations:

- RRI structural change actions are implemented at multiple levels in contexts that are complex, dynamic and adaptive.
- Complex systems involve multiple variables interacting in non-linear ways to produce outcomes and impacts.
- RRI is itself a complex concept implemented in complex systems.
- Establishing causal links between RRI actions and their effects pose a range of theoretical and methodological challenges.
- Complex systems respond to changes in the environment and adapt to new conditions – structures and cultures are resistant to change.
- The increased probability of change is part of the desirable effect of complex interventions (Kalpazidou Schmidt & Cacace, 2017).

A range of hybrid approaches seeks to address the above-mentioned challenges. One way to mitigate the risks connected to evaluation of RRI implementation is to use theory-based evaluations. Theory-driven evaluations focus on the questions: in which way and under which conditions a policy intervention causes the documented intended and unintended effects (Döring & Bortz, 2016). Theory-based approaches imply that the assessed variables are selected according to a theory that formulates implicit or explicit assumptions about interventions and their expected impact (Chen, 2012). Key elements in theory-based evaluations are (i) the design of an intervention theory and the theory of change of a particular intervention and (ii) the empirical investigation of the intervention theory. Such evaluations explore “not only whether the intervention works, but also how, for whom and in which context” (Van Belle et al, 2010). Understanding the contextual conditions not only enriches the assessment but may also support replication and generalizability of the outcomes of implementations (Rog, 2012).

Overall, to address the challenges related to monitoring and assessment of RRI structural change implementations some concrete lines of action are proposed: (i) adoption of a holistic approach that considers the constantly emerging needs; (ii) creation of a highly tailor-made monitoring and assessment design

involving all the stakeholders; (iii) incorporation of RRI action monitoring and assessment from the beginning in the process; (iv) the ability of RRI actions to foster the right conditions for change has to be central in dealing with the complexity of the systems; and finally (v) a theory-based evaluation approach may help mitigate the risks related to monitoring and assessing RRI implementation and support replication.

REFERENCES

- Ahuja, S.K., Aiuti, F., Berkhout, B., Biberfeld, P., Burton, D.R., Colizzi, V., Deeks, S.G., Desrosiers, R.C., Dierich, M.P., Doms, R.W., Emerman, M., Gallo, R.C., Girard, M., Greene, W.C., Hoxie, J.A., Hunter, E., Klein, G., Korber, B., Kuritzkes, D.R., Lederman, M.M., Malim, M.H., Marx, P.A., McCune, J.M., McMichael, A., Miller, C., Miller, V., Montagnier, L., Montefiori, D.C., Moore, J.P., Nixon, D.F., Overbaugh, J., Pauza, C.D., Richman, D.D., Saag, M.S., Sattentau, Q., Schooley, R.T., Shattock, R., Shaw, G.M., Stevenson, M., Trkola, A., Wainberg, M.A., Weiss, R.A., Wolinsky, S., Zack, J.A. (2006). A plea for justice for jailed medical workers. *Science*, 314(5801).
- Alberts, B., Kirschner, M.W., Tilghman, S., & Varmus, H. (2014). Rescuing US biomedical research from its system flaws. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(16).
- Alsop, R., Bertelsen, M., Holland, J. (2006). Empowerment in practice: from analysis to implementation, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.
- Ambrosio, A.M., Mariani, M.A., Maiza, A.S., Gamboa, G.S., Fossa, S.E., Bottale, A.J. (2018). Protocol for the production of a vaccine against Argentine Hemorrhagic Fever in Maria S. Salvato (ed.) Hemorrhagic Fever Viruses: Methods and Protocols. *Methods in Molecular Biology*, vol. 1604. Springer. Doi 10.1007/978-1-4939-6981-4_24.
- Andoh, C.T. (2011). Bioethics and the challenges to its growth in Africa. *Open journal of philosophy*. 1(02), 67-75. 10.4236/ojpp.2011.12012.
- Bamgbose, A. (2011). African languages today: The challenge of and prospects for empowerment under globalization. *In Selected proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. ed. Eyamba G. Bokamba, et al., 1-14. Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville. www.lingref.com, document #2561.
- Barugahare, J. (2018). African bioethics: methodological doubts and insights. *BMC medical ethics*. 19(1), 98. 10.1186/s12910-018-0338-6.
- Battilana, J., Leca B., and Boxenbaum E. (2009). "How actors change institutions: towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship." *Academy of Management annals* 3.1 (2009).
- BBSRC Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (2018). "Forward look for UK Bioscience" released on 29 September 2018. <https://bbsrc.ukri.org/documents/forward-look-for-uk-bioscience-pdf/> (accessed on: 05/09/2019).
- Beckert, J. (1999). Agency, entrepreneurs, and institutional change. The role of strategic choice and institutionalized practices in organisations. *Organisation studies*, 20(5).
- Bendels, M.H., Dietz, M.C., Brüggmann, D., Oremek, G.M., Schöffel, N., Groneberg, D.A. (2018). Gender disparities in high-quality dermatology research: a descriptive bibliometric study on scientific authorships. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:1-11. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020089

- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1969). *La costruzione sociale della realtà*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Besley, J.C., & Nisbet, M.C. (2013). How scientists view the public, the media and the political process. *Public Understanding of Science*, 22(6), 644–659. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662511418743>
- Bijker, W.E. & d'Andrea, L. (eds.) (2009). *Handbook on the Socialisation of Scientific and Technological Research, Social Sciences and European Research Capacities*, Rome: River Press Group.
- Boylan, J., Dacre, J., Gordon, H. (2019). Addressing women's under-representation in medical leadership. *The Lancet*. 2019; 393(10171): e14.
- Bromme, R. (2000). Beyond one's own perspective. The psychology of cognitive interdisciplinarity. In P. Weingart & N. Stehr (Eds.), *Practising interdisciplinarity* (pp. 115-133). Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Bubela, T. (2006). Science communication in transition: Genomics hype, public engagement, education and commercialization pressures. *Clinical Genetics*, 70(5), 445–450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-0004.2006.00693.x>
- Bubela, T., Hagen, G., & Einsiedel, E. (2012). Synthetic biology confronts publics and policy makers: Challenges for communication, regulation and commercialization. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 30(3), 132–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2011.10.003>
- Burchell, K. (2015). *Factors affecting public engagement by researchers: literature review*, Policy Studies Institute, London, <https://wellcome.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wtp060036.pdf> (accessed on: 24/07/2019).
- Burns, D., Squires, H., (2011). *Embedding public engagement in higher education: Final report of the national action research programme*, NCCPE. https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/action_research_report_0.pdf (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- Burns, T.W., O'Connor, D.J., & Stockmayer, S.M. (2003). Science communication: A contemporary definition. *Public Understanding of Science*, 12(2), 183–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09636625030122004>
- Capps, D.K., & Crawford, B.A. (2013). Inquiry-Based Instruction and Teaching About Nature of Science: Are They Happening? *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 24.
- Cartwright, N., & Hardie, J. (2012). *Evidence-based policy: A practical guide to doing it better*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caulfield, T. (2005). Popular Media, Biotechnology, and the “Cycle of Hype”. *Houston Journal of Health Law & Policy*, 337(2004).
- Chen, H.T. (2012). Evaluation von Programmen und Projekten für eine demokratische Kultur. In R. Strobl, O. Lobermeier, W. Heitmeyer (eds.). *Evaluation von Programmen und Projekten für eine demokratische Kultur*. Fachmedien Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organisational Pathways of Transformation*. Pergamon, http://blog.ub.ac.id/yogidwiatmoko/files/2012/12/gibb_hannon.pdf (accessed on: 17/09/2019).

- Clark, H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, L.J., & Kitney, R.I. (2016). Syntheticbiology in the UK—an outline of plans and progress. *Synthetic and systems biotechnology*, 1(4), (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5625736/> (accessed on: 18/07/2019).
- Colizzi V., de Oliveira T., Roberts R.J. (2007). Libya should stop denying scientific evidence on HIV. *Nature*; 448 (7157):992.
- Colizzi V., et al. (2019). Structural Transformation to Attain Responsible BIOSciences (STARBIOS2): Protocol for a Horizon 2020 Funded European Multicenter Project to Promote Responsible Research and Innovation. *JMIR Res Protocl* 8(3):e11745, <https://www.researchprotocols.org/2019/3/e11745/> (accessed on: 30/09/2019).
- Condit, C. (2001). What is “public opinion” about genetics? *Nature*, 2(10). <https://doi.org/10.1038/35093580>
- d’Andrea, L., Marta, F.L., Kahma, N. and Vase, S., (2017). FIT4RRI, Project Report on the Literature Review, Deliverable 1.1 (public), December 31st, 2017, <https://zenodo.org/record/1434349#.W8iFg3szbcs> (accessed on: 30/09/2019).
- d’Andrea, L., & Declich, A. (2005). The sociological nature of science communication. *JCOM*, 4(2).
- d’Andrea, L., Quaranta, G., & Quinti, G. (2005). *Manuale sui processi di socializzazione della ricerca scientifica e tecnologica*. CERFE, Rome.
- Dahler-Larsen, P. (2006). Evaluation after Disenchantment? Five Issues Shaping the Role of Evaluation in Society. In Shaw, I.F., Greene, J.C., Mark, M.M. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Evaluation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dahler-Larsen, P. (2012). *The evaluation society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- D’Armiento, J., Witte, S.S., Dutt, K. Wall, M., McAllister, G. (2019). Achieving women’s equity in academic medicine: challenging the standards. *The Lancet*. 2019; 393(10171).
- Declich G., d’Andrea, L. (2018), “Triggering Institutional Change Towards Gender Equality In Science. Final Guidelines of the TRIGGER Project”, project funded by the European Commission under the FP7 for Research.
- de Oliveira, T., Pybus, O.G., Rambaut, A., Salemi, M., Cassol, S., Ciccozzi, M., Rezza, G., Gattinara, G.C., D’Arrigo, R., Amicosante, M., Perrin, L., Colizzi, V., Perno, C.F. (2006). Benghazi Study Group. Molecular epidemiology: HIV-1 and HCV sequences from Libyan outbreak. *Nature*. 2006; 444.
- Döring, N., & Bortz, J. (2016). *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation in den Sozial- und Humanwissenschaften*. Berlin: Springer.
- Eden, G., Jirotko, M., & Stahl, B. (2013). Responsible research and innovation: Critical reflection into the potential social consequences of ICT. In *Research Challenges in Information Science (RCIS), 2013 IEEE Seventh International Conference on*. IEEE.
- Elster, D. (2016). Deliverable 5.1 First Interim Report, University of Bremen, Bremen.
- Elster, D., Barendziak, T., Birkholz, J. (2016). Science Education as a Trigger to Attain Responsible Research and Innovation. In *Pixel: New Perspectives in*

Science Education, Conference Proceedings 2017, Florence/LibreriaUniversitariaEdizioni.

- Elster, D., Barendziak, T., Birkholz, J. (2019). Towards a sustainable and open science. Enhancing responsible research and innovation in the biosciences at the University of Bremen. Bremen: University of Bremen.
- Equality Challenge Unit (2005). Athena SWAN Charter. 7th Floor, Queen's House, 55/56 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, WC2A 3LJ
<https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/>
- ERA CoBioTech (2018). Strategic Agenda – a vision for biotechnology in Europe, November 2018,
https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/7D5DE99D41EC4DCCE0539A695E869159/current/document/114492_ERA_CoBio_a_genda_final_high-res.pdf (accessed on 18/07/19)
- ERA CoBioTech (2018). Strategic Agenda – a vision for biotechnology in Europe,
https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/7D5DE99D41EC4DCCE0539A695E869159/current/document/114492_ERA_CoBio_a_genda_final_high-res.pdf (accessed on: 18/07/19)
- ESFRI European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (2006), Roadmap for European Research Infrastructure. Report of the Biology and Medical Science. Roadmap Working Group, October 2006,
https://ec.europa.eu/research/infrastructures/pdf/esfri/esfri_roadmap/roadmap_2006/bms-report-roadmap-wg-2006_en.pdf (accessed on: 05/09/2019).
- European Commission (2016). SheFigures 2015, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Brussels.
- Eze, M.O. (2008). What is African communitarianism? Against consensus as a regulative ideal. *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 27(4). 10.4314/sajpem.v27i4.31526
- Faria, N.R, Quick, J, Claro I.M, Theze, J, de Jesus, J.G, Giovanetti, M. et al. (2017). Establishment and cryptic transmission of Zika virus in Brazil and the Americas. *Nature* 546.
- Faria, N.R. et al. (2016). Mobile real-time surveillance of Zika virus in Brazil. *Genome Medicine*, 96.
- Felt, U., Fochler, M., & Sigl, L. (2017). IMAGINE RRI: A Card-based Method for Reflecting Responsibility in Life Science Re-search
- Filardo G, da Graca B, Sass DM, Pollock BD, Smith EB, Martinez MA. Trends and comparison of female first authorship in high impact medical journals: observational study (1994-2014). *BMJ* 2016;352:1-8. doi:10.1136/bmj.i847
- Flipse, S.M., Van der Sanden, M.C., & Osseweijer, P. (2014). Setting up spaces for collaboration in industry between researchers from the natural and social sciences. *Science and engineering ethics*, 20(1).
- France, B., Gilbert, J.K. (2006). A model of communication about biotechnology. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers in cooperation with The New Zealand Biotechnology Learning Hub.
- Gade, C.B. (2012). What is ubuntu? Different interpretations among South Africans of African descent. *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 31(3). 10.1080/02580136.2012.10751789

- Gardy, J.L., and Loman N.J. (2018). Towards a genomics-informed, real-time, global pathogen surveillance system. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 19(1).
- Gerber, A. (2018). RRI: How to 'mainstream' the 'upstream' engagement. *Journal of Science Communication*, 17(3), C06, https://jcom.sissa.it/sites/default/files/documents/JCOM_1703_2018_C06.pdf (accessed on: 21/07/2019)
- Gibb, A. and Hannon, P. (2006). "Towards the entrepreneurial University?, in *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, v. 4, http://blog.ub.ac.id/yogidwiatmoko/files/2012/12/gibb_hannon.pdf (accessed on: 30/10/2018)
- Gittelman, M., (2016). The revolution re-visited: Clinical and genetics research paradigms and the productivity paradox in drug discovery. *Res. Policy*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.01.007>
- GREAT (2013). *Annual report on the main trends of SiS, in particular the trends related to RRI*, http://www.great-project.eu/deliverables_files/deliverables05.
- Griffiths, R. (2004). Knowledge production and the research- teaching nexus: The case of the built environment disciplines. *Studies in Higher Education* 29, no. 6.
- Healey, M. (2005). Linking research and teaching: Exploring disciplinary spaces and the role of inquiry- based learning. In *Reshaping the University: New Relationships Between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*, edited by R. Barnett. Maiden head, UK: McGraw- Hill/Open University Press.
- Herschberg, C., Benschop, Y., & van denBrink, M. (2018). Precarious postdocs: A comparative study on recruitment and selection of early-career researchers. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 34(4).
- Herzog, C. (2016). Successful comeback of the single-dose live oral cholera vaccine CVD 103-HgR. *Travel medicine and infectious disease*, 14(4). doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2016.07.003.
- Hill, S.C. et al. (2019). Emergence of the Zika virus Asian lineage in Angola. *bioRxiv* 520437; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/520437>.
- Jagsi, R., Guancial, E., Worobey, C., Henault, L., Chang, Y., Starr, R., Tarbell, N., Hylek, E. (2006). The 'Gender Gap' in Authorship of Academic Medical Literature – A 35-Year Perspective. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355.
- Jenkins, A. (2004). *A Guide to the Research Evidence on Teaching- Research Relations*. York, UK: The Higher Education Academy. Available online: https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/id383_guide_to_research_evidence_on_teaching_research_relations.pdf (accessed on: 20/06/2019).
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E., Ovseik, P.V., Henderson, L.R., & Kiparoglou, V. (2019). Understanding the Athena SWAN award scheme for gender equality as a complex social intervention in a complex system: analysis of Silver award Action Plans in a comparative European perspective. *bioRxiv*. doi:10.1101/555482.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. & Cacace, M. (2017). Addressing gender inequality in science: the multifaceted challenge of assessing impact. *Research Evaluation*, vol. 26, no 2.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. & Cacace, M. (2018). Setting up a Dynamic Framework to Activate Gender Equality Structural Transformation in Research Organisations. *Science and Public Policy*, vol. 59.

- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. (2009). Evaluation, in Bijker W. E. & d'Andrea (eds.), *Handbook on the Socialisation of Scientific and Technological Research, Social Sciences and European Research Capacities*, pp. 169-189, Rome: River Press Group.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. (2016). Development of monitoring and assessment tools of structural transformation actions to attain responsible biosciences. STARBIOS2 report.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E.K., & Cacace, M. (2018). Setting up a Dynamic Framework to Activate Gender Equality Structural Transformation in Research Organisations. *Science and Public Policy*.
- Kuhlmann, S., Lindner, R., & Randles, S. (2016). Conclusion: making responsibility an institutionalised ambition. In *Navigating Towards Shared Responsibility in Research and Innovation: Approach, Process and Results of the Res-AGorA Project* (pp. 161-166). Fraunhofer ISI.
- Kwiek, M. (2015). "Academic Entrepreneurialism and the Changing Governance in Universities. Evidence from Empirical Studies", in Reihlen, W.M., Frost, J., Hattke, F. (eds.) *Multi-level Governance of Universities: The Role of Strategies, Structures, and Controls*
- Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of organisation. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1).
- Lederman, N. G., Antink, A., & Bartos, S. (2014). Nature of science, scientific inquiry, and socio-scientific issues arising from genetics: A pathway to developing a scientifically literate citizenry. *Science & Education*, 23(2).
- Lindlof, T.R. (1995). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- Lutz, D.W. (2009). African Ubuntu Philosophy and Global Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 84(3), 313-328. 10.1007/s10551-009-0204-z
- Mann, A., & Di Prete, T.A., (2013). Trends in gender segregation in the choice of science and engineering majors. *Social science research*, 42(6), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24090849> (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- March, J.G., Gherardi, S., & Cimmino, S. (1993). *Decisioni e organizzazioni*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Mezzana, D. (2018). Some Societal Factors Impacting on the Potentialities of Electronic Evidence, in M.A. Biasiotti et al. (eds.), *Handling and Exchanging Electronic Evidence Across Europe, Law, Governance and Technology Series 39*, Springer, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74872-6_14.
- Mezzana, D. (ed.) (2011), *Technological responsibility. Guidelines for a shared governance of the processes of socialisation of scientific research and innovation, within an interconnected world*, Roma, CNR: www.scienzecittadinanza.org/public/SetDevGuidelines.pdf (accessed on: 08/11/2018)
- Msoroka, M.S. & Amundsen, D. (2018). One size fits not quite all: Universal research ethics with diversity. *Research Ethics*. 14(3), 1-17. 10.1177/1747016117739939.
- Musselin, C. (2007). *The Transformation of Academic Work: Facts and Analysis*. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE. 4.07. *Center for studies in higher education*;

- Naveca, F.G. et al. (2019). Genomic, epidemiological and digital surveillance of Chikungunya virus in the Brazilian Amazon. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, 13, 3-0007065.
- Nowotny, H. (2007). Knowledge Production and its Constraints: epistemic and societal considerations, paper presented at the Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon, 2007, http://helga-nowotny.eu/downloads/helga_nowotny_b58.pdf (accessed on: 18/07/2019)
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P., Gibbons, M., & Scott, P.B. (2001). *Re-thinking science: Knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Owen, R., Forsberg, E-M., Shelley-Egan, C. (2019). RRI-Practice Policy Recommendations and Roadmaps, RRI-Practice project report. Deliverable 16.2, <https://www.rri-practice.eu/knowledge-repository/recommendations/> (accessed on: 21/07/2019)
- Pan-African Bioethics Initiative (PABIN), (2003). PABIN Third Conference: **Good Health Research Practices in Africa**. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Pawson, R. & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.
- Pierini, M. (2008). Le prix de la liberté: Libye, les coulisses d'une négociation, Actes Sud.
- Pinheiro, R., & Stensaker, B. (2014). Designing the entrepreneurial university: The interpretation of a global idea. *Public Organisation Review*, 14(4).
- Quaranta, G. (1985). L'era dello sviluppo, Franco Angeli, Milano.
- Quick, J., et al. (2017) Multiplex PCR method for MinION and Illumina sequencing of Zika and other virus genomes directly from clinical samples. *Nat Protoc*, 2017. 12(6).
- Reale, E., Nedeva, M., Thomas, D., & Primeri, E. (2014). Evaluation through impact: A different viewpoint. *Fteval Journal*, 39.
- Reydon, T.A., Kampourakis, K., & Patrinos, G.P. (2012). Genetics, genomics and society: the responsibilities of scientists for science communication and education. *Personalized Medicine*, 9(6). <https://doi.org/10.2217/pme.12.69>
- Rog, D.J. (2012). When background becomes foreground: Toward Context-Sensitive Evaluation Practice. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 135.
- Rome Declaration on Responsible Research and Innovation in Europe https://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/rome_declaration_RRI_final_21_November.pdf (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- Royal Society (2006). *Survey of factors affecting science communication by scientists and engineers*, the Royal Society, https://royalsociety.org/~media/Royal_Society_Content/policy/publications/2006/1111111395.pdf (accessed on: 24/07/2019).
- Ruggiu, D. (2015). Anchoring European governance: Two versions of responsible research and innovation and EU fundamental rights as 'Normative anchor points'. *NanoEthics*, 9(3).
- Sadler, T.D. (2011). Socio-scientific issues in the classroom. Heidelberg, Springer.
- Sambala, E.Z., Cooper, S. and Manderson, L. (2019). Ubuntu as a Framework for Ethical Decision Making in Africa: Responding to Epidemics. *Ethics & Behavior*. 10.1080/10508422.2019.1583565
- Shendure, J., Ji, H., (2008). Next-generation DNA sequencing. In *Nature Biotechnology*, 26.

- Smith, R.D.J., Scott, D., Kamwendo, Z.T., Calvert, J. (2019). An Agenda for Responsible Research and Innovation in ERA CoBioTech. Swindon, UK: Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council and ERA CoFund on Biotechnology
- https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/85886BE9C7161C71E0539A695E865A64/live/document/ERA_CoBioTech_RRI_Framework.pdf (accessed on: 18/07/19)
- Spruit, S.L., Hoople, G.D., & Rolfe, D.A. (2016). Just a cog in the machine? The individual responsibility of researchers in nanotechnology is a duty to collectivize. *Science and engineering ethics*, 22(3).
- Stephan, P. (2013). How to exploit postdocs. *BioScience*, 63(4).
- Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9).
- Sutcliffe, H. (2011). A report on Responsible Research and Innovation for the European Commission. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/rri-report-hilary-sutcliffe_en.pdf (accessed on: 30/9/2019).
- Temoshok, L.R., & Wald, R.L. (2008). Integrating multidimensional HIV prevention programs into healthcare settings. *Psychosomatic medicine*, 70(5). doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e31817739b4.
- Thézé, J. et al. (2018). Genomic Epidemiology Reconstructs the Introduction and Spread of Zika Virus in Central America and Mexico. *Cell Host Microbe*. 23.
- Van Belle, S.B., Marchal, B., Dubourg D. and Kegels, G. (2010). How to develop a theory-driven evaluation design? Lessons learned from an adolescent sexual and reproductive health programme in West Africa. *BMC Public Health*, 10, 741.
- Van Schomberg, V. & van Schomberg, R. (2013). A Vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. In Owen, R., Heintz, M. & Bessant J. (Eds.), *Responsible Innovation* (pp. 51-74). London: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Von Schomberg, R. (2019). Why Responsible Innovation. In *The International Handbook on Responsible Innovation. A Global Resource*. Von Schomberg, R. and Hankins, J. (Eds.). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. Forthcoming.
- Watermeyer, R. (2015). Lost in the 'third space': the impact of public engagement in higher education on academic identity, research practice and career progression. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 5:3, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/21568235.2015.1044546> (accessed on: 24/07/2019).

ABOUT THE 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.



LSC Laboratory of
Citizenship
Sciences

Universität Bremen



ABI

UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET



AARHUS UNIVERSITET

Ministero di Sanità
Fondazione Osservatorio Carlo
Poma-Cariparma



UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
of MARYLAND

