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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Background

1.1 Over recent years Scottish Executive Analytical Service Divisions (ASDs)—whether implicitly or explicitly at the portfolio level—have taken forward knowledge management, knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage activity in partnership with colleagues in relevant policy, academic and practice communities across a range of social and economic public policy issues. In parallel to this activity, Office of Chief Researcher has developed a strategic dialogue on knowledge transfer with the academic sector, and other relevant partners, which resulted in the establishment of an OCR Knowledge Transfer Team in Spring 2005. The team provides a dedicated resource which leads on Scottish Executive social research knowledge transfer issues; provides advice and support on knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage to colleagues in Analytical Service Divisions; and when appropriate collaborates with the Science and Research Group (SRG) on multi-disciplinary elements of the SRG research programmes. Current key external partners the work of the team are Economic and Social Research Council, and Scottish Higher Education Funding Council.

1.2 The Knowledge Transfer team takes a strategic Executive-wide approach to Knowledge Transfer, however, this first KT team briefing paper reports on the health-focused Scottish Academy for Health Policy and Management pilot project which tested the theory and practice of knowledge transfer at a Corporate and Departmental level in the Scottish Executive; explored new ways of working with the academic and practice communities; and informed the current work programme of the Knowledge Transfer team.

1.3 This paper provides a report on the knowledge management, knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage activity of the SAHPM team, and it is anticipated that it will be the first in a series of KT briefing papers and bulletins to support the KT agenda in Scotland.

2. The SAHPM Initiative as a Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Brokerage Pilot

2.1 The SEHD SAHPM project commenced in January 2003 and concluded in April 2005. SAHPM was a research and policy development initiative supported by Scottish Executive (SE) and National Health Service Scotland (NHSS). SEHD wished to use the SAHPM project to adopt and develop current practice in the field of knowledge management and transfer in order to explore the best means or providing a forum that would bring together SEHD, the NHSS and partners, and the academic community to support health policy development and implementation in Scotland.
2.2 The SAHM initiative therefore explored the potential of:

- a collaborative network to identify and co-ordinate clearly defined research and evidence to support policy, strategy and service development in SEHD, NHSS and other partner organisations
- dedicated resources to support policy implementation, service development and management practice
- management education and skills development to support implementation and improved service delivery
- a ‘knowledge exchange’ facility to store and disseminate knowledge and learning

2.3 The SAHPM Team was based in St Andrew’s House, Edinburgh and comprised of a Director, a Principal Research Officer on loan to SEHD from Office of Chief Researcher, and an SEHD administrative officer. The project was overseen by joint SEHD/NHSS Steering, Reference, and Delivery Groups, and the Head of Health Department/Chief Executive of NHSS.

2.4 The outcomes of the SAHPM project informed the recent changes to SEHD infrastructure, and made an important contribution to a wider understanding of how development and research resources are currently identified, accessed, shared, stored and disseminated in SEHD. The KM, KT, and KB elements of the SAHPM project provided a useful pilot which informed the current programme of the SE:OCR KT team, and has provided sustainable benefits to the wider Executive.

3. Knowledge Management, Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Brokerage

3.1 The theory and practice of knowledge management (KM), knowledge transfer (KT) and Knowledge Brokerage (KB) is an emerging field and had been deployed by organisations such as the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation (see http://www.chsrf.ca/).

3.2 The SAHPM Team KT/KB Objectives were to bring together people to achieve KM, KT and KB which would inform SEHD and OCR. Specific KM/KT/KB objectives included action to:

- foster research activity which would have a direct impact on policy development and implementation, and practitioner and organisational practice
- link with, and build on, the experiences of existing education and research providers
- be informed by the work of existing centres of expertise in Scotland
- provide a connective medium to create synergies between policy makers, practitioners and researchers in Scotland, Europe and further afield
- provide linkages between individuals and communities of practice on specific policy relevant topics, themes and issues
- improve SEHD policy administrators’ understanding of the potential for using evidence in the policy cycle
3.3 Overall, it was anticipated that these processes would increase the use of evidence in the SEHD policy cycle and NHSS practice and service delivery. The work of the SAHPM team also emphasised:

- obtaining the best available range of knowledge and information which would both support, and in some cases challenge, policy development and implementation
- prioritising knowledge generation arising from dynamic human interaction created through face to face encounters above traditional research practices
- embedding working processes and outcomes into departments in the course of the SAHPM project
- tailoring brokerage activity to suit different partners ranging from Ministers, NHSS Chief Executives, the Senior Civil Service and Scottish Universities; through the different layers of the academic community, NHSS front line staff, and diverse public and private sector evidence providers; to grass roots community groups and social enterprises across Scotland with an interest in engaging in the policy process.

3.4 The theory of KM, KT and KB has been practically applied within the UK private sector and in the United States and Canada, however, the SAHPM team appears to be the first to formally identify and apply KM, KT and KB techniques as civil servants in a Scottish government department. In doing so, the team aimed to implement a wide ranging programme of work and to offer academics the opportunity to put into action long-standing requests for a greater degree of engagement and collaboration with civil servants on particular policy issues.

4. The SAHPM Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Brokerage Process

4.1 The work of the SAHPM team demonstrated the successful application of knowledge brokerage and knowledge transfer theory through practical activity including:

**Using Electronic Communication** to enable innovative liaison with stakeholders and potential partners in electronic consultation and research mapping exercises

**Development of Networks and Communities of Practice** through: targeted face to face encounters with civil service colleagues creating new dialogues on analytical issues; strategic liaison with Scottish, UK and international universities, NHSS, and industry; brokerage of academic discussion forums; exploration of new ways of working with evidence providers; and building direct relationships with relevant Scottish, UK and EU funding councils and bodies.

**Locating Evidence Provision in Scotland in a European and International Context** through brokering a place for Scotland in European Science Foundation research networks; hosting an ESF COST Action meeting; and building relationships with relevant European and international networks through face to face and virtual discussion.

**Practical KT/KB Project Examples** were provided by the team through using KB and KT techniques to support policy delivery. Contribution to HD Partnership Agreement delivery
included: SAHPM facilitation of knowledge sharing events on health improvement and social inclusion; Health and Environment cross cutting policy theme development; convention of expert roundtable to consider health service delivery in remote and rural areas; management of the Sexual Health and Relationship Strategy consultation analysis process; management of SEHD consultation on analysis 2004-5; brokering research issue and topic liaison for SEHD; and creating an SEHD publication series.

5. Partnership working between the policy, practice and academic communities

5.1 The work of the SAHPM Team has revealed the potential for a range of cultural and communication misunderstandings between the policy community and the academic community. To create a collaborative working environment, further work is required on improving understanding of cultural differences between protocols and practice in the academic and government sectors. A number relational issues between those involved in the KT and KB process need to be addressed if future interaction is to be effective.

6. Sustainable Benefits for SEHD; Government Social Research; and Scottish Executive

6.1 In addition to supporting the overarching SAHPM initiative, the work of the team has resulted in sustainable benefits including:

- The SAHPM team led liaison with ESRC to develop a joint PhD sponsorship programme resulting in the development of an SE wide joint SE/ESRC programme;
- The development of proposals for a joint ESRC/SE public policy seminar series for Scotland
- Project support for research to explore ways in which public sector delivery could be improved through using action research to inform evidence based practice.

7. Implications and Options for Future Movement

7.1 The SAHPM team’s work identified:

- implications for the policy, practice and academic worlds drawn from understanding and knowledge grounded in practical activity.
- a need for ‘brokercrats’ (knowledge broker bureaucrats) working within SE; and/or a new breed of knowledge brokers operating as go-betweens linking the policy, public sector practice, industry, and academic communities.

7.2 SE is currently taking forward liaison with a range of internal and external stakeholders (notably SHEFC), and considering options for future movement in the field of knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage.
7.3 The work of the SAHPM team has provided a useful pilot on these issues for SE, however, any future movement would be informed by current practice in Analytical Service Divisions; the work of the Social Research Knowledge Transfer Working Group; strategic liaison with SEHFC and Universities Scotland; collaboration with ‘knowledge stimulation’ bodies including Scottish Council Foundation, David Hume Institute, and Royal Society of Edinburgh; and the experience of a wider field of knowledge transfer activity in Scotland, Europe and further afield.

8. Conclusion

8.1 The work of the SAHPM team has tested the theory and practice of knowledge brokerage within the limits of civil service protocols and current academic operational boundaries. The process has demonstrated the validity of a KB focus on human dynamics. It also showed that: KT and KB is possible; the theory of KT and KB works in practice; and the delivery of utilitarian products to support the policy cycle is possible.

8.2 The SAHPM experience appears to represent the first application of KB in a government department, and valuable lessons were learned for all communities of interest who have engaged in the process. Specifically, the application of KT and KB theory has: resulted in increased research utilisation within SEHD and the brokerage of inventive alliances leading to the generation of new knowledge; brought enhanced knowledge to the policy process; and moved tacit knowledge into utilitarian outputs. The SAHPM project has also reinforced that KT and KB requires appropriately skilled people to make more efficient use of resources.

9. Contact Information

The SAHPM Director was Liz Kelly of SEHD and the Principal Researcher was Dr Gill Clark. For further information about Knowledge Transfer at Scottish Executive contact gill.clark@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
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CHAPTER 1 BACKGROUND, INTRODUCTION AND SAHPM OVERVIEW

1.1 Purpose of Briefing Paper

The purpose of this briefing paper is to provide a report of the work carried out by the Office of Chief Researcher (OCR) Scottish Executive Health Department (SEHD) Scottish Academy for Health Policy and Management (SAHPM) team testing the theory and practice of Knowledge Management, Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Brokerage at a corporate and departmental level in Scottish Executive.

The paper provides a brief record of the pilot project described within the theoretical framework of Knowledge Management (KM), Knowledge Transfer (KT) and Knowledge Brokerage (KB). The paper primarily reports on the processes and behaviours which comprised the KT and KB elements of the SAHPM initiative, and provides supporting commentary on the opportunity costs of KT/KB work and the resource implications of adopting this approach to evidence provision to inform policy development and policy delivery. The paper focuses primarily on the work of the team on SEHD priorities; however, the process described has the potential to be applied across a range of policy areas, and several of the issues raised in the report are now being considered by the SE Knowledge Transfer Team, recently established in Office of Chief Researcher.

Drawing on the practical experience of the SAHPM knowledge brokers working within the Scottish Executive and with external communities of practice, the paper identifies implications for future KM/KT&KB initiatives in policy, practice and academic worlds. The paper draws a distinction between the particular skills and expertise of government ‘system aware’ ‘brokercrats’ (civil service ‘bureaucrats’ working within Scottish Executive (SE) as knowledge brokers—primarily social researchers); and the need for the creation of a new breed of external knowledge brokers operating as go-betweens who would link the policy, public sector practice, industry, and academic communities. Again, the implications of these outcomes are now being discussed by the KT team with relevant partners and internal and external stakeholders.

Other elements of the SAHPM initiative work programme have been reported through the production of a feasibility study Scottish Academy for Health Policy and Management Feasibility Study and Supporting Business Case written by Firn Crichton Roberts Ltd; a business plan Scottish Academy for Health Policy and Management Business Plan and two SAHPM Bulletins (web links provided in Annex A).

1.2 Overview of SAHPM Project

The SEHD SAHPM project commenced in January 2003 and concluded in March 2005. SEHD used the SAHPM project to adopt and develop current practice in the field of knowledge management and transfer; and to explore the best means of providing a forum that would bring together SEHD, the NHSS and partners, and the academic community to support health policy development and implementation in Scotland. The SAHPM team explored the potential of:
• a collaborative network to identify and co-ordinate clearly defined research and evidence to support policy, strategy and service development in SEHD, NHSS and other partner organisations
• dedicated resources to support policy implementation, service development and management practice
• management education and skills development to support implementation and improved service delivery
• a ‘knowledge exchange’ facility to store and disseminate knowledge and learning

The SAHPM Team was based in St Andrew’s House, Edinburgh and comprised of a Director, a Principal Research Officer on loan to SEHD from Office of Chief Researcher, and an SEHD administrative officer. The project was overseen by joint SEHD/NHSS Steering, Reference, and Delivery Groups, and the Head of Health Department/Chief Executive of NHSS.

‘System awareness’ of the civil service and a working knowledge (based on practical experience) of NHSS, pure and applied research practice in academia, and wider European and International networks were important competencies underpinning the successful KT and KB delivered by the SAHPM Team.

1.3 Knowledge Management, Knowledge Transfer, Knowledge Brokerage: Definitions and SAHPM Objectives

1.31 Definitions

The theory and practice of KM, KT, and KB is an emerging field, and useful definitions include:

_Knowledge Management_  
"Knowledge Management caters to the critical issues of organizational adaptation, survival, and competence in face of increasingly discontinuous environmental change.... Essentially, it embodies organizational processes that seek synergistic combination of data and information processing capacity of information technologies, and the creative and innovative capacity of human beings."  
(WWW Virtual Library on Knowledge Management quoted on http://www.mywiseowl.com/articles/Knowledge_management)

“In simpler terms, Knowledge Management seeks to make the best use of the knowledge that is available to an organization, creating new knowledge in the process.

It is helpful to make a clear distinction between knowledge on the one hand, and information and data on the other.  
Information can be considered as a message. It typically has a sender and a receiver. Information is the sort of stuff that can, at least potentially, be saved.
onto a computer. Data is a type of information that is structured, but has not been interpreted.

Knowledge might be described as information that has a use or purpose. Whereas information can be placed onto a computer, knowledge exists in the heads of people. Knowledge is information to which an intent has been attached.”
(http://www.mywiseowl.com/articles/Knowledge_management)

Knowledge Transfer

“Knowledge exchange (formerly knowledge transfer): Knowledge exchange is collaborative problem-solving between researchers and decision makers that happens through linkage and exchange. Effective knowledge exchange involves interaction between decision makers and researchers and results in mutual learning through the process of planning, producing, disseminating, and applying existing or new research in decision-making.”
(Canadian Health Services Research Foundation)

“Knowledge transfer is a two-way, continuous process where research information is exchanged between the research community and the community of potential users. The two-way exchange of information informs decision-making at all levels of the health care system through interactive engagement and participation.”
(Nova Scotia Health Research Foundation)

“Knowledge Transfer has been defined by the Social Research Knowledge Management working group as ‘the interactive delivery of external social research knowledge and expertise to Ministers, and policy and analytical colleagues’. This definition embraces both knowledge—‘know-how’ and ‘know-who’—and evidence—‘know-what’”
(Scottish Executive Social Research Knowledge Management Group)

Knowledge Brokerage

“Knowledge brokering links researchers and decision makers together, facilitating their interaction so that they are able to better understand each other's goals and professional culture, influence each other's work, forge new partnerships, and use research-based evidence. Brokering is ultimately about supporting evidence-based decision-making in the organization, management, and delivery of health services.

The study and organization of knowledge brokering is an emerging activity in the field of knowledge exchange, intended to encourage and facilitate knowledge exchange and embed it into the operational culture of the health services field.

Knowledge brokering brings people—health services researchers, decision makers, practitioners, and policy makers—together to build relationships among
them. Individuals working as brokers have broad skills that include a thorough understanding of Canada’s healthcare system and knowledge of marketing and communications, as well as the ability to:

- link people together and facilitate their interaction;
- find academic research and other evidence to shape decisions;
- assess evidence, interpret it, and adapt it to circumstances;
- identify emerging management and policy issues which research could help solve; and
- create knowledge networks.

To find a Knowledge Broker, look for someone who has a network of contacts in various professions throughout the health services system, who can link people and facilitate their interaction.” (Canadian Health Services Research Foundation: http://www.chsrf.ca/)

Community of Practice

“The organizational development (OD) concept of a community of practice (often abbreviated as CoP) refers to the process of social learning that occurs when people who have a common interest in some subject or problem, collaborate to share ideas, find solutions, and build innovations.

The term was first used in 1991 by Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger who used it in relation to situated learning. In 1998, the theorist Etienne Wenger (http://www.ewenger.com/) extended the concept and applied it to a commercial setting. More recently Communities of Practice have become associated with knowledge management as people have begun to see them as ways of cultivating or nurturing new knowledge or sharing existing tacit knowledge within an organisation.”

( http://www.mywiseowl.com/articles/Community_of_practice)

Organisations who explicitly refer to their work using KM, KT, and KB definitions include:

- Canadian Health Services Research Foundation
  http://www.chsrf.ca/
- AcademyHealth
  http://www.academyhealth.org/
- United States Department of Health and Human Resources [Federal]
  Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
  http://www.ahrq.gov/
1.32 SAHPM KM/KT/KB Definitions and SAHPM KM/KT/KB Objectives

The SAHPM Team KT/KB Objectives were to bring together people to achieve KM, KT and KB which would inform SEHD and OCR. Specific KM/KT/KB objectives included action to:

- foster research activity which would have a direct impact on policy development and implementation, and practitioner and organisational practice
- link with, and build on, the experiences of existing education and research providers
- be informed by the work of existing centres of expertise in Scotland
- provide a connective medium to create synergies between policy makers, practitioners and researchers in Scotland, Europe and further afield
- provide linkages between individuals and communities of practice on specific policy relevant topics, themes and issues
- improve SEHD policy administrators’ understanding of the potential for using evidence in the policy cycle

Overall, it was anticipated that in the course of the project these processes would increase the use of evidence in the SEHD policy cycle and NHSS practice and service delivery. The work of the SAHPM team also emphasised:

- obtaining the best available range of knowledge and information which would both support, and in some cases challenge, policy development and implementation
- prioritising knowledge generation arising from dynamic human interaction created through face to face encounters above traditional transactional models of research/policy knowledge exchange
- embedding working processes and outcomes into departments in the course of the SAHPM project
- tailoring brokerage activity to suit different partners ranging from Ministers, NHSS Chief Executives, the Senior Civil Service and Scottish Universities; through the different layers of the academic community, NHSS front line staff, and diverse public and private sector evidence providers; to grass roots community groups and social enterprises across Scotland with an interest in engaging in the policy process.

The theory of KM, KT and KB has been practically applied within the UK private sector and in the United States and Canada, however, the SAHPM team appears to be the first to formally identify and apply KM, KT and KB techniques as civil servants in a Scottish government department. In doing so, the team aimed to implement a wide ranging programme of work and to offer academics the opportunity to put in to action long-standing requests for a greater degree of engagement and collaboration with civil servants on particular policy issues.
1.4 Final Pilot Project Outcomes and Direction of Travel for Knowledge Transfer

Over recent years each Analytical Service Division (ASD)—whether implicitly or explicitly at the portfolio level—has taken forward knowledge management, knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage activity in partnership with colleagues in relevant policy, academic and practice communities across a range of social and economic public policy issues.

In parallel to this activity Office of Chief Researcher developed a strategic dialogue on knowledge transfer with the academic sector, and other relevant partners, which resulted in the establishment of an OCR Knowledge Transfer Team in Spring 2005. The team now (Autumn 2005) provides a dedicated resource which leads on Scottish Executive social research knowledge transfer issues; provides advice and support on knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage to colleagues in Analytical Service Divisions; and when appropriate collaborates with the Science and Research Group (SRG) on multi-disciplinary elements of the SRG research programmes. Current key external partners the work of the team are Economic and Social Research Council, Scottish Higher Education Funding Council, and European Science Foundation.

The Knowledge Transfer team takes a strategic Executive-wide approach to Knowledge Transfer, however the health-focused SAHPM Pilot informed the current work programme of the Knowledge Transfer team, in particular their work on testing the theory and practice of knowledge transfer within and between the civil service and academic community; and locating evidence for policy in Scotland within a wider UK, European and international context.

The outcomes of the SAHPM project also informed the recent changes to SEHD infrastructure, and made an important contribution to a wider understanding of how development and research resources are currently identified, accessed, shared, stored and disseminated in SEHD.
“Knowledge brokering is one of the human forces behind knowledge transfer. It’s a dynamic activity that goes well beyond the standard notion of transfer as a collection of activities that helps move information from a source to a recipient. Brokering focuses on identifying and bringing together people interested in an issue, people who can help each other develop evidence-based solutions. It helps build relationships and network sharing existing research and ideas and stimulating new work. Knowledge brokering supports evidence-based decision-making by encouraging the connections that ease knowledge transfer. By definition, they are go-betweens; their core function is connecting people to share and exchange knowledge.”


This section of the briefing paper provides an overview of the KT and KB processes deployed in the course of the SAHPM project.

2.1 Stakeholder Buy In

Face to Face Meetings with Key Stakeholders in NHSS and Partner Organisations

The SAHPM Team held targeted meetings with key stakeholders in NHSS and other potential partner organisations to ensure stakeholder buy in to the SAHPM process from the outset. Meetings were initially arranged through the team’s existing networks and personal contacts, and then further face-to-face meetings were scheduled with lead individuals in NHSS and partner organisations who were identified through recognised ‘snowballing’ techniques. The team also initiated dialogues with NHSS suppliers and industry groups. This way of working ensured engagement with a wide range of stakeholders and potential partners to ensure that the benefits and potential of SAHPM were determined at an early stage before the foundation and implementation programmes were rolled out.

Making use of Technology

The SAHPM team prioritised face-to-face engagement with colleagues and potential partners, but also made innovative use of technology to ensure timely, open and transparent dialogue with stakeholders. Following SE consultation good practice guidance and utilising OCR systems and the expertise of the OCR Civic Participation Team, SAHPM successfully piloted and then deployed an electronic consultation questionnaire. This was used to consult with key potential SAHPM users in SEHD; other relevant SE Departments; NHSS; and other partner organisations and agencies with an interest in health in its widest interpretation. A Consultation Paper and Questionnaire were issued in early June 2003 and the consultation closed in mid July 2003. In total 175 responses were received from individuals, groups and organisations. A number of responses were submitted on behalf of NHSS Board Areas. 157 questionnaires were completed, and 18 respondents submitted their views in other formats.
This represented a positive response, and an opportunity to enable virtual dialogue with colleagues and partners who were located in rural and remote parts of Scotland.

2.2 Developing Networks and Identifying Communities of Practice

Developing networks and identifying communities of practice within SE, Scotland, the European Union, and the wider international context was a priority area of activity for SAHPM, and resulted in a process, described below, that created immediate benefits for SEHD and the wider Executive.

2.2.1 Networks and Communities of Practice within SE

Groundwork within SEHD

It was anticipated that the future success of knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage would be directly related to the demand for evidence from colleagues in SEHD. Therefore the process to create evidence-oriented networks and communities of practice within SEHD was a priority for the SAHPM team and focused on three main areas of activity: identifying priorities; identifying resources available to SEHD; and making connections:

Identifying Priorities
In the initial phases of the project SAHPM team created opportunities to hold face-to-face meetings with a range of SEHD Directors; staff in Chief Medical Office (CMO); staff in Chief Scientist Office (CSO); and policy administrators with lead responsibility for high profile policy issues during 2003-4 and 2004-5. SAHPM team discussed present and future evidence requirements, key target dates, and the potential for evidence to be used in support of Partnership Agreement commitments. These discussions enabled SAHPM team to target effective and timely support for SEHD throughout the project.

Identifying Resources
Initial discussions revealed that colleagues in SEHD had low awareness of the analytical support available to them within SEHD and the wider Executive. SAHPM team carried out considerable work in 2003-4 to raise awareness of the expertise available to SEHD in Health Department Analytical Services Division (HD:ASD), and the seven academic units funded by SEHD through CSO. SAHPM also identified resources in other Departmental ASDs which could inform cross cutting HD policy priorities; and the availability to SEHD of other in-house technical expertise provided by specialists such as the Scottish Executive Geographical Information Service (SEGIS); and the Scottish Procurement Directorate (SPD).

Making Connections
The SAHPM team contextualised their work with SEHD within wider change processes and initiatives taking place within SE in 2003-4 and 2004-5. The SAHPM team made early alliances with the Change to Deliver (C2D) Team and the Policy Makers Network (PMN) and provided extensive support to both C2D and PMN in their strategic and practical engagement with SEHD.
In 2003-4 SAHPM organised and facilitated the Policy Makers Network ‘ASD Awareness Raising Seminar’ on behalf of PMN and HD:ASD. SAHPM designed the seminar to raise awareness of analytical resources available in HD. Colleagues were asked to break into working groups to consider evidence requirements focusing on the a case study topic linked to a Partnership Agreement commitment. This example also brokered common signposting and links to analytical support for other policy colleagues.

Following on from the PMN network, SAHPM established the SEHD Knowledge Management Group (KMG), a group established to enable colleagues to discuss evidence requirements for priority policy issues. The KMG was piloted in the first half of 2004, and was attended by the Health Minister, Head of Department and senior policy officials.

This initial work provided the connections and networks which enabled SAHPM to engage in KT and KB to assist SEHD on priority policy issues, and in practical project work to inform policy development and implementation.

Groundwork across the Executive

In the early stages of the SAHPM project, the SAHPM team identified an immediate need to support dialogue between HD and other Executive Departments on cross cutting policy issues. Throughout 2003-4 and 2004-5 SAHPM stimulated informal and formal discussion between policy colleagues, and targeted movement and action around areas of common interest through the use of formal and opportunistic networks. As a result, new dialogues were opened between analysts and policy colleagues in HD and other areas of the Executive. SAHPM activity included:

- SAHPM face-to-face meetings with relevant Division Heads on priority cross cutting issues
- co-ordination of social research liaison on cross cutting health issues with Social Research team leaders in all SE ASDs
- establishment of cross cutting networks of relevance to Health Department on Partnership Agreement priorities (notably Social Justice, Social Inclusion, Social Economy/Voluntary Issues, and Environmental Justice)
- brokerage of meetings between relevant SE colleagues in Education Department and Voluntary Issues Division and external stakeholders involved in SAHPM activity
- brokerage of liaison between HD and Environment and Rural Affairs Department (ERAD) on health and environment research themes
- brokerage of SE Agency funding for horizon scanning work on Health and Environment issues
- contribution to research liaison and development work between Communities Scotland, Scottish Centre for Regeneration, DD and HD
2.2.2 Networks and Communities of Practice within Scotland

Groundwork across Scotland
A range of activities were undertaken in Scotland to create networks and communities of practice to link with SAHPM objectives. These included:

SAHPM Research Mapping Exercise
Following on from the SAHPM consultation exercise, in the second half of 2003 SAHPM invited Scottish universities; research and evidence providers in NHSS; and independent consultants and consultancies to contribute to a ‘Research Mapping Exercise’. The research mapping paper was sent to the research and innovation units of all Scottish universities and cascaded through existing academic and university networks. Special Health Boards (notably NHS Health Scotland), individual academics and research consultants were also invited to share the mapping paper with interested colleagues. 54 responses were returned from a wide range of academic departments, independent researchers, government and local authority researchers, NHSS clinicians, and universities responding as corporate bodies. The mapping exercise provided a useful benchmark for considering self-identified evidence providers for policy, and the process revealed helpful information regarding the relationship between SE and research and innovation units within the universities, and perception of SE by these units.

Creating Strategic and Practical Connections with Scottish Universities
The SAHPM team formed strategic relationships with the Convener of Universities Scotland and Scottish University Principals, and SAHPM brokered a meeting between University Principals; SEHD Head of Department; and Chief Executive of NHS Education for Scotland (NES). The SAHPM team were invited to meetings at Glasgow University and Glasgow Caledonian University to discuss areas of future collaboration. All other universities expressed an interest in future liaison meetings, and face-to-face meetings were held with academics from most Scottish Universities. The SAHPM team placed an emphasis on ensuring all universities had the opportunity to engage with SAHPM and made relevant contacts with the ‘new universities’ as well as Scotland’s established university institutions to ensure that an inclusive approach was taken to SAHPM development across the Higher Education sector in Scotland.

Topic and Theme Meetings
The team held meetings to discuss the evidence requirements for a range of policy issues with relevant evidence providers and policy administrators, and facilitated dialogue and meetings that brought together evidence providers and evidence users (Ministers, analysts or administrators) to discuss areas of common interest. Topics and themes covered included: action and applied research in NHSS; medical ethics; organ retention and donation; gender and health; geographical information system data; health and forestry; health and environment; community health partnerships; intermediate care; social enterprise and health; cross cutting links between education and health research networks; genomics; accessibility and health; rural health; diet and health improvement; complementary therapy; and arts culture and health.
Targeted Invitation Meetings
The SAHPM team reviewed SEHD Partnership Agreement commitments and identified academics and other evidence providers in Scotland and further afield who were working on research which had the potential to inform PA commitments. A number of these academics had not previously engaged with SE, and were invited to meet the SAHPM team and take part in discussions regarding how their work could be disseminated to a policy audience. These individuals were invited to subsequent SAHPM events and meetings, and made a series of useful contributions to discussions on KM/KT and KB; and to changes in culture and processes which would assist improved utilisation of evidence in the policy cycle.

Academic Evidence Providers Meet NHS Practitioners and Managers
SAHPM collaborated with University of Glasgow to create a forum for evidence providers to meet with NHSS and discuss the relationship between academic evidence providers and those in the NHSS wishing to use evidence to improve policy implementation and service delivery. SAHPM brought together senior academics from University of Glasgow and NHSS Chief Executives to discuss these issues, resulting in useful discussion. This revealed the importance of knowledge brokers who can act as go-betweens with the capacity to facilitate effective interactions between the very different worlds of the policy, public sector practice, industry, and academic communities.

Academic Roundtable Group
The academic community showed significant interest in a relationship with SE knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage activity throughout the initiative. From the outset the SAHPM team expressed an interest in exploring the potential of the SAHPM project or other KT/KB organisations acting as a potential ‘neutral platform’ or ‘honest broker organisation’ which could in the future initiate and sustain collaboration between disciplines and academics in Scotland. It was envisaged that such an arrangement could in the future assist academic and policy communities to move away from a transactional model of exchange to a more cooperative process to provide evidence for policy. To this end, a meeting described as the SAHPM ‘Academic Roundtable’ was convened in September 2003, and an invitation list was drawn up the basis of discipline, relevance of expertise to SEHD PA commitments, and institutional affiliation (to ensure the inclusion of all Scottish Universities). The meeting was facilitated by the SAHPM team and for many of the 18 academics who were able to attend, offered an opportunity to meet colleagues from other Scottish Universities for the first time. The meeting laid the foundations for further productive dialogue between SAHPM and the academic community throughout 2004-5.

Academic Forums on ‘New Ways of Working’ with SE
Liaison with academics resulted in in-depth discussion of issues such as the impact of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and other barriers to effective academic engagement in the development of research activity to inform policy (see section 3). As a result two meetings were arranged in late 2004 with the aim of asking leading Scottish academics to focus on discussion of options for developing new or innovative working relationships between SE and the academic community. The first was held in Edinburgh in October with four of the Directors of the Centre for Research on Families and Relationships (University of Edinburgh); the second was held in Glasgow
Caledonian University in December, and attended by Glasgow Caledonian University academics and invited NHSS staff.

**Building Direct Relationships with Scottish Funders and UK Funders**
Scottish Higher Education Funding Council (SHEFC) were represented on the SAHPM Steering and Reference Groups, and a range of discussions were held with SFC staff on SFC funding mechanisms to support KM/KT and KB activity. At a UK Funding Council level the team initiated discussion with ESRC Head of Knowledge Transfer at the Government Social Research (GSR) conference in March 2004 and subsequently facilitated discussions between SAHPM, OCR and wider SE interests on future collaboration between ESRC and SE on a number of KM/KT and KB initiatives, resulting in lasting benefits for SE (see Section 2.4). The team also initiated cross cutting contact with Natural Environment Research Council (NERC); and Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC); and has explored the potential of collaboration with SE Science Research Group (SRG)—formerly Agriculture and Biological Research Group (ABRG) —to support cross cutting work on health and environment issues to inform policy development and implementation under the SRG strategic research programme (Programme 4: Impacts on Human Health). These contacts and themed discussions are now being taken forward by the SE OCR KT team.

**Cross Cutting with Other Relevant Bodies in Scotland**
The work of SAHPM team in the initial part of the project demonstrated the importance of wider-than-academic knowledge/evidence provision in the policy process. Therefore, throughout the project, the SAHPM team focused on engagement of, and collaboration with non-academic evidence providers including: the Improvement Service (IS); Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations (SCVO); Scottish Local Authority Chief Executive’s Network (SOLACE); staff involved in evidence gathering and research in NHSS; and individuals in a wide range of NDPBs and NGOs.

**Innovative Collaboration in Scotland**
The network development outlined above also resulted in SAHPM team being able to take forward KT and KB through novel collaboration processes. All SAHPM activity, events and project work demonstrated a commitment to closing the opportunity gap, and the SAHPM team made direct connections to innovative organisations such as Columba 1400, Scotland UnLtd and their awardee organisations. These organisations have the potential to work in future with SE or NHSS at a strategic or grassroots level on social inclusion, voluntary issues, or broader health and wellbeing initiatives. In addition, the team’s pre-existing relationship of research collaboration with Forestry Commission enabled SAHPM to create a new alliance between SEHD and FC leading to mutually beneficial engagement in the emerging field of health and environment research.

Maintaining the positive engagement of academics and other evidence providers with SAHPM and the wider SE was a key component of the creation of networks and communities of practice. The above activity resulted in the generation of a working confidence between the SAHPM team and those engaged in SAHPM liaison, resulting in a number of requests from contacts based in Scotland for formal engagement with SE. These included institutional alignment; knowledge transfer placement suggestions; secondment requests; and joint sponsorship of project work, MScs, and PhDs.
2.2.3 Networks and Communities of Practice outwith Scotland

Groundwork across the United Kingdom

The SAHPM team made a wide range of virtual and face-to-face contacts with social science academics and other evidence providers across the UK through utilising mainstream academic research and NHS networks; and identifying opportunities for liaison with networks of cross-cutting relevance to SEHD such as the Countryside Recreation Network (CRN).

The team’s initial contact with the team behind the Welsh (2002) study A Co-operative Research and Development Network for Wales. Linking the academic institutions, the NHS, local authority and voluntary provider organisations and subsequent liaison with the Department of Health’s Strategy Unit influenced SAHPM development. Key players in relevant Departments and organisations were subsequently identified through the NHS Service Delivery and Organisation (SDO) and Government Social Research (GSR) networks, and invited to engage with SAHPM through face-to-face meetings. The SAHPM team also made a joint workshop presentation on improving utilisation of research evidence with Office of Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) at the GSR Conference in March 2004.

In late 2004 the SAHPM team and SE Chief Social Researcher met with The Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) to explore the potential of future joint working on Knowledge Transfer between JRF, SE and NHSS.

Groundwork Internationally

International network and communities of practice liaison was developed through a targeted approach focusing on European liaison; North American liaison (United States of America and Canada); wider international liaison; and developing countries liaison.

The team initiated European liaison by using participation in EU funded events to target entry points for SAHPM in European Expert Networks and European Science Foundation networks (through the European Science Foundation (ESF) Cooperation in the Field of Scientific and Technical Research—COST—Action network); and to horizon scan for, or identify, future EU policy and research funding priorities. This work subsequently dovetailed with OCR activity in this area and is now being taken forward by the SE OCR KT team.

At the start of the SAHPM project the team made virtual contact with leading KM/KT/KB experts in the United States, and supplemented this liaison with face-to-face encounters when these experts visited the United Kingdom. The founder of the Centre for Health Management and Research (CHMR), took part in initial discussion of the SAHPM concept with the team and subsequently made an active contribution to the SAHPM feasibility study. In March 2004, following liaison with SE External Relations and Social Inclusion colleagues, the SAHPM team were invited by the Canadian Government and academic community to contribute to a one week series of workshops and meetings to address health and social policy issues in Nova Scotia and other Canadian Maritime provinces. This work supported SAHPM’s virtual discussions with Canadian colleagues.
The SAHPM consultation paper offered the option of future SAHPM activity involving liaison with health service providers in developing countries. In the course of exploring future directions on this issue for SAHPM, SAHPM has formed connections with the British Council; contributed to SEHD’s liaison with SE International Relations division; and identified lead academics and NHSS staff in Scotland with an interest in harnessing mutually beneficial relationships between health professionals in Scotland and those in developing countries.

### 2.3 Practical SAHPM Project Examples

In the course of the SAHPM project, the team engaged in practical projects for SEHD (using KB and KT techniques) as a mechanism to establish credibility for knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage as a concept, and a way of working, which would be able to improve the delivery of (in this case) SEHD policy objectives through better utilisation of evidence and social research in the policy cycle.

Examples of the work carried out by the SAHPM Team are provided below. The areas of activity were piloted to test KT and KB theory and practice, and did not necessarily represent NHSS priorities, however, all activity linked directly to SEHD Partnership Agreement commitments.

**SAHPM facilitation of knowledge sharing events to inform SEHD policy priorities**

The SAHPM team facilitated SEHD and OCR engagement in a range of knowledge sharing events throughout 2004-5. These events included:

- University of Edinburgh seminar *The Scottish Executive health improvement policy agenda: opportunities and challenges for research/policy collaboration* (May 2004).

- SAHPM presentation at Glasgow Caledonian University (October 2004) as part of a seminar series designed to provide a discussion forum between the University and policy community.

- *Open Space People Space Conference* Plenary Session, demonstrating cross cutting working between Health, Planning, and Social Economy/Voluntary Issues to a domestic and international audience (October 2004)

- Scottish School of Primary Care (SSPC) end of initiative event *From Joint Future to Community Health Partnerships and beyond: making research, audit, and performance measurement an asset to joint local working* (November 2004)

- *Caring for Health: Families and the NHSS* (Jan 2005). A University of Edinburgh Centre for Research on Families and Relationships event to explore ways in which evidence providers can contribute to a better understanding of the role of families as potential partners in the development of the NHSS for the 21st Century.
The events were important in identifying differences in approach to KT and KB events between the policy and academic communities; and provided a useful understanding of policy and academic boundary definitions on which topics, disciplines, and networks were suitable for inclusion in events to inform policy development or implementation. The events also provided Scottish academics with new opportunities for direct engagement with policy administrators.

**Health and Environment cross cutting policy theme development**

Groundwork on network development in the Executive, and liaison with partner organisations (notably research management colleagues in Forestry Commission) converged to identify health and environment as a emerging research theme within the UK and European Union—a topic which also chimed with SE’s commitment to Environmental Justice. As a result, SAHPM took forward opportunities in this area:

- SAHPM team brokered Forestry Commission funding for a PhD to be taken forward at a CSO funded Unit (Research Unit in Health and Behavioural Change—RUHBC).

- SAHPM team had an interest in engagement with the ESF COST Action network in order to identify ways in which SE can encourage Scottish institutions to maximise the benefits offered by European Union funding for research and networking. The SAHPM team participated in the first Management Committee meeting of the E39 COST Action _Forests, Trees and Human Health and Wellbeing_ in May 2004, and subsequently (in collaboration with Forestry Commission and ESF) organised the inaugural meeting of the E39 COST Action in October 2004. This Conference included five working groups, and showcased innovative Scottish health improvement projects linked to the forest environment. 85 high profile European researchers attended the meeting and the Deputy Minister for Health hosted a reception for delegates at Bute House. Immediate outcomes of SAHPM organising the inaugural meeting were to enhance the visibility of Scotland in European networks; and to increase SE’s understanding of the potential of COST Actions prior to possible SE liaison with COST officials in 2005. Scottish Academics have encountered difficulty breaking into European funding and policy development networks and OCR is now taking forward liaison which may have the potential to improve Scottish access to European Science Foundation (ESF) funded research networks, and knowledge of other European Union funding mechanisms. SAHPM team also embedded SE policy engagement in the four year COST Action through supporting SE analysts’ membership of Working Groups on forest products and health; and the mental health benefits of forests.

- As part of ongoing liaison with Countryside Recreation Network the SAHPM PRO identified suitable Scottish case studies for the groundbreaking piece of CRN commissioned work by Professor Jules Pretty on identifying links between countryside recreation and health _A Countryside for Human Health and Wellbeing_. SAHPM brokered SE CMO involvement in the launch of the
report, and OCR KT team has continued cross cutting liaison within SE on health and environment themes.

Convention of expert roundtable to consider health service delivery in remote and rural areas
The SAHPM Consultation in 2003 drew a strong rural response and as part of wider networking activity, SAHPM developed national, European and international connections with rural health experts. As a result of this engagement, and following on from assistance provided to policy colleagues on rural health issues in 2003-4, SAHPM brokered a roundtable meeting in Inverness in November 2004 with the Centre for Rural Health (see www.abdn.ac.uk/crh); NHSS; Highlands and Islands Enterprise; SE; academics from University of the Highlands and Islands and University of Glasgow; and the Voluntary Sector to discuss priority issues in rural health. This meeting provided useful soundings from rural health interests for SE following conclusion of the Rural and Remote Areas Research Initiative (RARARI). SAHPM liaison on rural health issues has also enabled SEHD to consider options for increased public, patient and voluntary sector involvement in discussion of health service delivery in rural and remote parts of Scotland.

Management of the Draft Sexual Health and Relationship Strategy consultation and consultation responses analysis
SAHPM project managed the Draft Sexual Health and Relationship Strategy consultation process, and supervised the analysis of written and non-written responses to the consultation. SAHPM also provided close management of the publication and dissemination of the analysis of consultation responses, demonstrating the benefits of team working between analysts and policy teams in SEHD.

Management and review of SEHD consultation analysis 2004-5
In addition to their work on the above consultation, SAHPM was called upon to project manage the analysis and dissemination of the responses to a further seven SEHD consultations. This involved close team working with a range of policy administrators in SEHD. In the light of the demand for analytical support for consultation project management and analysis of responses SAHPM conducted a review of current and projected future SEHD analytical requirements in relation to consultation processes.

Brokering research issues and topic liaison for SEHD
Throughout the project, SAHPM Team have offered professional research support and advice to colleagues in SEHD on a wide range of issues including intelligence gathering on partnership agreement commitments; procurement; project specification; consultation management; liaison with external experts; and guidance on outward focus research related engagement with stakeholders and interest groups. SAHPM has also liaised with the recently established ESRC Genomics Research Forum and identified the cross cutting nature of SE engagement with genomics research.

Creating an SEHD publication series.
The SAHPM team identified that no publication series was available for publication of HD research and consultancy reports, and used the OCR Dissemination Team to
establish a publication series which can be used to publish and disseminate SEHD research and consultancy outputs.

The project work carried out by SAHPM team has demonstrated the potential for knowledge brokers in SEHD to provide an efficient interface between the SEHD demands for evidence to inform policy, and the academic community and other evidence providers.

2.4 Sustainable Benefits for SEHD; Government Social Research; and Scottish Executive

2.4.1 Joint Working with ESRC on KM/KT and KB Schemes

SAHPM and OCR collaborated with ESRC throughout 2004-5 on piloting KT and capacity building schemes to improve the levels of working confidence between the policy and academic communities in Scotland and have created the circumstances for positive movement in the three areas of activity outlined below. These three initiatives are now being taken forward by the OCR KT team to support Executive-wide knowledge transfer.

SEHD/SAHPM/ESRC Sponsored PhD Scheme

The SAHPM team took forward extensive liaison regarding engagement with ESRC Collaborative Awards for Science and Engineering (CASE) studentship proposals and development of policy relevant/applied PhDs. Discussions were held with target academics and potential PhD students; the academic manager of the current ODPM/ESRC sponsored PHD scheme; and with lead officials at ESRC. The purpose of SAHPM developing CASE applications was to:

- Support PhD research to inform the development or implementation of Scottish Executive policy
- Encourage the use of applied research to inform public sector service delivery
- Build knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage capacity in a PhD cohort group
- Create a collaborative network of informed and engaged PhD supervisors supporting policy relevant research in Scotland
- Encourage the potential for Scottish, and wider UK, Universities to retain and grow emerging academic talent with the skill set to provide utilitarian research output for a policy audience

As a result of these discussions, SE is now working with ESRC to take forward a generic SE/ESRC sponsored PhD programme. A PhD scheme offers immediate benefit to participating academics and Universities (through the RAE scheme); and longer term benefit to the policy community by increasing the capacity of academics of the future to engage in policy relevant research. NHSS also has the potential to consider cloning the systems anticipated to develop through the SE/ESRC scheme.

Following discussions with NHSS, SAHPM team have flagged that PhD students undertaking work with NHSS would be expected to contribute to improving health service delivery and health outcomes. Likewise, SE has expressed an intention for the proposed
scheme to include significant blocks of work experience in SE. The proposed scheme has the potential to offer value for money for SE, SEHD, and NHSS if collaboration on supervision, training and work experience arrangements can be coordinated centrally.

**ESRC Knowledge Transfer Placements**

Scottish Executive has previously seconded academics to policy or research teams under a variety of arrangements, and SAHPM/OCR held discussions with ESRC on whether SEHD, SAHPM or NHSS would wish to engage with the proposed ESRC Knowledge Transfer Placement Scheme. The SAHPM team flagged the importance of this scheme attracting high quality placements who intended to ‘return to base’ after their placement rather than viewing this as a stepping stone to an alternative career. SE OCR KT team are now (autumn 2005) leading discussions leading discussions with ESRC on piloting this scheme in SE.

**ESRC Public Policy Seminars**

ESRC Public Policy Seminars aim to present independent research in key policy areas to potential users in government, politics the media and private and voluntary sectors. Following discussions initiated by the SAHPM team liaison on joint ESRC/SE seminars, SE OCR Knowledge Transfer team are taking forward discussions with ESRC with a view to establishing a biannual Scottish policy seminar series.

**2.4.2 Innovation in Applied and Action Research**

SAHPM has liaised through the project with researchers whose work advocates the development of collaborative working in the generation, creation, dissemination and utilisation of knowledge, and who argue that traditional models of research isolate knowledge and researchers from practice and context, hence creating an unnecessary distance between research and practice. SAHPM argued that research produced in this way is perceived to be abstract, with little relevance to the complicated work environments of NHSS, and has therefore advocated NHSS engagement in action research and applied research and organisational learning from the outset.

Supporting this assumption, the SAHPM consultation showed that stakeholders prioritised applied research and action research, and SAHPM subsequently brokered liaison between Research for Real, a leading Scottish action research company, and NHS Argyll and Clyde to develop ideas for taking forward action research practice in the NHSS. Following a meeting of the SAHPM Action Research Topic Group, Argyll and Clyde NHSS hosted a practice-oriented workshop ‘Action Research: Developing Leadership Capacity’.

SE Office of Chief Researcher has subsequently funded a short piece of work to explore the potential of action research to improve public sector delivery (using NHSS as an initial test-bed) which is due to be disseminated in autumn 2005.
2.5 SAHPM Brokerage of Education and Learning Provision

NHSS contains self organising communities of knowledge and practice, and formal and informal networks comprising of groups and individuals who are equipped with the knowledge and experience to improve service delivery in NHSS. This organisational context led the SAHPM team to engage in work to ensure that the intellectual assets, organisational learning, and expertise of front line staff had the potential to be captured and shared. As a result SAHPM team identified options for the provision of a co-ordinating framework to enable relationships between these communities to develop and grow to mutual benefit. The SAHPM team’s activity in this area included:

- exploration of the potential for NHSS front line staff to undertake internal consultancy
- work with the Continuing Professional Development providers in Scotland and the Improvement Service to explore how Scottish providers can be responsive to the needs of the health service and public sector partners
- facilitation of Johnson and Johnson industry sponsorship of two NHSS attendees at the INSEAD management training programme
- facilitation of liaison between University of Tilburg, NHSS, and University of Glasgow to discuss the potential for a European health management development programme
- collaborative management training and development
- facilitation of ongoing dialogue between SEHD, NHSS and e-learning providers
- discussion between UK and overseas potential contributors to a virtual SAHPM faculty
- legitimisation of social and organisational learning through engagement with field leaders in e-learning

2.6 SAHPM KT/KB Process: Concluding Observations

The work of the SAHPM team reported in section 2 showed that networks and communities of practice have a key role to play in knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage. From the outset the SAHPM project has focused on ‘relationships between people’ rather than traditional transactional models of research interaction, and recognised the importance of the human dynamic in KT and KB. The SAHPM project has also emphasised the importance of key competencies and ‘people skills’ which create the environment for KT and KB to occur.
CHAPTER 3 DISCUSSION

This section of the briefing paper considers the learning experiences drawn from SAHPM in the policy community; practice community; and academic community—three very different environments.

“[Research is under-utilised in policy development because]…there are fundamental differences between the research and policy communities that sometimes act as barriers to effective communication between the two, such as different time frames for results; different languages for communication; different priorities for knowledge; and lack of understanding about the realities of each other’s work environments.”

An important part of SAHPM pilot success and learning was the ability of the SAHPM team to draw on experiences of challenging exchanges with external stakeholders, as well as examples of successful KT and KB. SAHPM invited frank discussions around ‘them and us’ on the part of policy makers and academics. As a result, the work of the team has illuminated areas of cultural misunderstanding; common prejudices and misconceptions; and a number of areas where more work is required to develop a working confidence, and relationships of trust with the academic community and other evidence providers.

Some of the issues raised in the course of the project are outlined below. It should be emphasised that both the academic and policy communities contributed views on areas for improvement with the intention of creating a platform for future positive collaboration; and the process surrounding the exchange of views on these issues was viewed as positive, constructive and productive by both communities.

3.1 The Policy Community

Perceptions of the Policy Community in Scotland

The work of the SAHPM team has invited honest and robust debate on the policy, practice and research interfaces between the academic and policy communities. These discussions revealed a number of areas where academics felt that Scottish Executive and the wider policy community could do more to improve their interactions with academic evidence providers.

In discussions, academics raised a number of issues which they suggested presented their community with difficulty. These included assertions that the policy community:

- worked to unrealistic, short term timescales
- frequently asked academics to ‘dumb down’ their research findings
- sometimes ‘moved the goal posts’ half way through a research project
- apparently ignored some research outcomes from projects
- did not always take the time to read and analyse full academic outputs
- sometimes lost interest in projects or events when policy priorities changed
• did not appear to be interested in conceptual or blue sky thinking
• usually adopted a formal style in email exchanges
• seemed unable to commit to engagement without extensive liaison with colleagues in SE and elsewhere
• requested too much detailed background information for events weeks or months in advance of events
• provided too many briefing notes for speakers and chairs at events, and appeared to be more concerned with process than content or ideas
• seemed to be repeatedly asking academics to take part in events or engagements of which academics did not understand the significance

In general, the academics identified civil servants as having a singularity of identity, background and purpose, and academics and their administrative staff (like their civil service counterparts) often lapsed into discussion of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ stereotypes when discussing bureaucratic processes and civil servants. Likewise the policy community used similar stereotypes when discussing Universities and academics.

Regarding knowledge of the role of research in the policy cycle, even those academics who represent the leading edge of ‘knowledge transfer’ in Scottish academic circles demonstrated limited understanding of the working environment and real politik of the civil service and/or Ministers’ requirements and timescales. This situation is well recognised and documented in academic and funding council literature, and also reflects the findings of the SAHPM consultation exercise and the SAHPM feasibility study.

NHSS colleagues were also candid in their criticisms of SEHD’s (and the wider civil service) apparent shortcomings and academics and wider stakeholders expressed a degree of scepticism about whether change programmes within Scottish Executive (such as Change to Deliver) would bring about a culture change within the civil service. However, the SAHPM pilot was viewed as welcome example of potential culture and practice change and widely supported by the academic and practice communities.

Perceptions of Government Analysts

It was significant that the academic and other external stakeholders engaging with SAHPM had no or very little awareness of the presence or role of government analysts—statisticians, economists or social researchers—in Scottish Executive or other Government Departments. Whilst academics regularly recognised the need to foster links and working relationships with government intermediaries, they did not seem to be aware that there was a professional group of government analysts (Social Researchers, Economists and Statisticians) whose work focused on acting as intermediaries between the academic and policy worlds.

Likewise, the ESRC publication *Influencing the UK policymaking process* provides a useful broad-brush overview. However, in the section ‘communicating with policymakers’, for example, does not mention Government Social Researchers as potential brokers, or different mechanisms for engaging with analysts in devolved administrations.

It was apparent that academics closely involved with SEHD (including those with posts funded by SEHD) routinely misinterpreted the role of analysts as individuals who, rather than bringing funding or analytical support to a steering or advisory group would be bringing ‘political interference’ to a project. In the process of KT/KB it also became apparent that
analysts were seen by many academics as people to bypass to obtain access to those holding funds or those with ‘real influence’ on the policy process.

**Academic Perceptions of the Civil Service Working Environment**

Academic perceptions of the civil service working environment were relevant in the context of collaborative discussion of secondments (below); proposed external research on knowledge transfer in government; and joint PhD schemes. In discussions, academics assumed that it would be possible to parachute PhD students and interested academics or external researchers into SE ASDs or policy teams, and revealed their assumptions about their perception of a civil service office environment with limitless access space, computers and administrative resources; and of civil servants with short working days and low work loads.

**Improving understanding through secondments?**

Current academic thinking on interaction between the academic and policy worlds suggests that communication is limited because of fundamental differences in working cultures and practices, and academics with an interest in this area, for example Research Unit for Research Utilisation (RURU), have proposed that a more interaction between academic and policy worlds would promote improved utilisation of research.

Bearing these perceptions in mind, in the course of the SAHPM project the ‘simple solution’ offered by many academics to address misunderstanding and misconception between policy and academic communities was to second civil service administrators into academic units or Departments to enable civil servants to understand the pressures and rhythms of academic life; and to second academics in to policy teams in SE so that SE could understand and utilise their expert knowledge. However, in all discussions on secondments, academics did not appear to be aware that they would benefit from learning about working in the civil service, or that civil servants, or government analysts would have skill sets which would be of use in their Units or Departments.

Academics were also only positive about secondments which would enable them to take an ‘expert’ or ‘external adviser’ role in a policy team, and were not enthusiastic about taking up opportunities to carry out more routine work experience with analysts or policy teams. Where academics had an interest in analysis of the knowledge transfer process they appeared to be reluctant to consider adopting a methodological strategy of ‘walking a mile in a civil servants shoes’—using participation as an end in itself—and instead were more interested in gathering and recording observational ‘data’ which they would interpret, elsewhere, after their placement experience.

Discussions with academics seemed to suggest that in the past secondments have simply served to illuminate the differences between policy and academic worlds rather than improve knowledge transfer mechanisms, or research utilisation. However, many academics still appeared to think that secondments offering academic expertise would offer a ‘quick fix’ to understanding the civil service, and did not think it was necessary to gain an understanding of the complexity of the civil service through experiential learning within the system.
The work of the SAHPM team suggested that effective KT and KB between worlds, rather than in-depth ethnographic understanding of alien worlds by individuals, would be the most cost effective and efficient way to improve the utility and quality of evidence available for use in the policy cycle and meet the needs of Ministers.

Discussions between SAHPM, academics, OCR and ESRC have established that further negotiation is required at an institutional level to take forward a ‘people transfer’ scheme, and that there is a need to consider appropriate location and support for ‘people transfer’ to ensure that those transferred gain ‘system awareness’ and an appreciation of the real politik of KM, KT and policy development, rather than an simply an awareness of cultural and organisational difference. OCR KT team is now (autumn 2005) taking forward negotiations on this with ESRC and identifying options which would provide real and lasting widespread benefits rather than short term insights for individuals.

Speaking the same language – avoiding the potential for misinterpretation in translation; and the potential for coaching and influencing

On a practical level it would be possible to avoid cultural misunderstandings between policy and academic communities if both sides checked on use of language, and confirmed at early stages of projects what policy and academic communities mean in the use of particular terms. For example, the term ‘briefing’ appears to have different meaning in the policy and academic worlds: at one meeting policy administrators discussed ‘briefing’ on the understanding that it comprised of one or two pages of A4 containing key facts and data which could be produced by an academic expert in a matter of hours. However academics at the same meeting interpreted ‘briefing’ as a 12-16 page dense academic review paper which would be produced following the intensive effort of two academics over a fortnight.

At a strategic level, academics welcomed the potential to receive coaching on influencing skills; advice on how to ‘start a conversation’ and ‘keep the conversation going’ with Scottish Executive; and ‘navigation training’ on effective liaison routes with the Executive.

Getting the research message across: future opportunities

The work of the SAHPM team suggested that it was not clear whether academics across disciplines and institutions were familiar with the implications of devolution and the different evidence and analysis requirements of devolved administrations. Where academics were interested in policy-relevant research discussions suggested that an engagement in UK level (notably England oriented) policy research was considered to be more attractive to academics and to peer reviewers than what could be interpreted as a more (in some UK academic circles) ‘provincial’ Scottish focus. Some academics could not distinguish between the work and roles of the Parliament and the Executive, and it was clear that SE has further work to do in raising awareness of the policy environment post-devolution—critically on opportunities available to academics for new or innovative research; and the benefits of engagement with the devolved administration.

Throughout the SAHPM project, the team have assessed what work the policy community can take forward to improve understanding of the type of information which would be useful in the policy cycle. Critically for SE, meetings with academics revealed that the academics were not aware of the SE Partnership Agreement which drives the work of the Scottish
Executive, and therefore were unable to suggest connections between their ongoing research activity and possible SE interest.

In addition, discussions with SAHPM also showed that academics had little or no awareness of:

- how to identify relevant policy teams or officials with an interest in topical issues
- how to request to face meetings, or to send material to brief officials in SEHD on ongoing research activity
- how to propose SE engagement on steering groups for academic research
- how to inform Ministers or officials of research outcomes
- how to connect EU funding opportunities to policy priorities in Scotland
- how to seek to broker funding discussions between potential funders to seek support for cross cutting research

Where academics did hold this knowledge it appeared that they were reluctant to share this knowledge brokerage ‘know how’ with colleagues and competitors because they felt that the access to, and engagement of, SE derived from their KB work gave them a competitive edge over other academics.

These are issues where the policy community has the potential to provide guidance and easy-to-understand ‘how to’ information to the academic community to improve the potential utility of current and developing research projects. It is also incumbent on the policy community to be more proactive in inviting, and following through with, the engagement the academics (in most cases) currently do not appear to know how to solicit.

3.2 The Practice Community

The work of the SAHPM team suggested that the practice world considers that much of the health research carried out in Scotland does not translate or cross over readily into NHSS to make an impact on policy development or service delivery. NHSS stakeholders recognised that most academics are passionate and committed to their research areas, but suggested that more could be done to make a connection with the NHSS managers and health care professionals who would benefit from their work. NHSS managers emphasised that there was a major gap in the research market for utilitarian, meaningful, relevant and timely work to inform management priorities in NHSS and the creation of an evidence base for NHSS managers to parallel the comprehensive evidence base available to NHSS health care professionals.

SAHPM and NHSS stakeholders also identified the potential for knowledge to be drawn from ‘internal consultants’ in the NHSS—NHSS employees with vast public sector experience and knowledge which has not yet been captured or shared.

From an NHSS perspective the work of the SAHPM team provided the potential to provide a solid foundation for future joint working on evidence gathering, action research and organisational learning. However, NHSS staff emphasised the pressures faced by NHSS employees, and that engagement by NHSS staff in research activity must be able to provide immediate benefits to NHSS. From an evidence provider and research funder perspective it would appear that there is a need for future positive movement in this area to tackle the
current discontinuity between knowledge and evidence generated by the academic community and use of this information by NHSS.

3.3 The Academic Community

Over the course of the SAHPM project the team discussed a wide range of issues with a large number of academics in Scotland, Europe and further afield. Key issues relating to learning experiences drawn from, and for, the academic world are outlined below.

*The Overarching/Overwhelming Influence of the RAE*

Arguments about the influence of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) are well rehearsed, and were discussed in all meetings held between SAHPM and academics. The RAE rewards peer reviewed academic excellence (in the form of published journal articles), and in the RAE there is no reward for, or recognition of the value of, work carried out for the policy community. Although the policy community, academic community, and funding councils agree that recognition should be given to policy research, it would appear unlikely that the RAE will change significantly before the middle of the 2010s. The impact of the RAE is a clear risk factor in engaging academics in policy and practice relevant work, and although academics were very keen to engage in the proposed KT and KB activity, it was flagged repeatedly that the KT and KB activity proposed was work which the RAE does not reward.

The SAHPM team also discussed with academics and funding councils processes for assessing the value or utility of policy relevant research, and it was agreed that the ‘impact’ and ‘value’ of policy research reports is contingent on a wide range of contributing factors. Critically, evidence ‘does not speak for itself’, and within SE for example, the role of professional research managers in Analytical Service Divisions and the engagement of policy administrators is critical to research making an impact.

In support of developing strategies to ‘make an impact’ with research SAHPM reviewed the potential for academics to engage in creative dissemination or ‘influencing’ through presentations to Ministers and policy administrators; participation in roundtable meetings; and/or informal discussions. However, academics at all stages of their careers were understandably reluctant to devote time to engaging in time-consuming dissemination processes which would draw them even further away from activity which the RAE rewards.

*Perceptions of Government Funding*

Academic engagement with the SAHPM team revealed a range of attitudes towards ‘government funding’ and the status of funding provided to the academic community. Academics showed a tendency to view government funding, even for short term policy projects, as ‘grant’ money, and of ‘lower status’ than funding provided by funding councils. In some cases similar ambivalence was shown towards funding obtained for academic research from the European Union.
It was clear that academic enthusiasm for future engagement with SE was, to some extent, based on the initial assumption by academics that the main outcome of their engagement would be ‘no strings attached’ grants for further academic work on their specialist area of interest. When the SAHPM team pressed academics on the need for utilitarian as well as academic output (in line with current ESRC and SHEFC guidance), several academics suggested that such an approach would encroach on academic freedom of expression and place them in a compromised situation.

When discussing future scenarios for joint working with Scottish Executive, some academics expressed reservations about accepting funding from ‘the Government’ (i.e. Scottish Executive). It appeared that direct funding from Departments was perceived to be different, and in some instances viewed in a negative light, when compared to ‘Government Funding’ issued via funded units or independent Funding Councils.

The work of the SAHPM team in engaging with CSO funded units also suggested that there may be scope for SEHD to consider whether it would be possible for improved links to be made between academic units funded by HD and relevant policy divisions who would be able to use their research to inform policy development and service delivery.

**Increasing the Range and Scope of Expert Engagement**

The SAHPM team explored the potential of increasing the range and scope of expert engagement with SEHD and NHSS through a variety of possible mechanisms. Discussions with academics revealed a willingness amongst the academic community to engage at short notice on their own terms, on their speciality topic, but understandably a reluctance to turn their attention to intellectual consideration of an issue (for example a priority policy issue) which did not directly relate to their own area of academic expertise.

Mechanisms for engagement discussed included placements, exchanges and secondments. The lead in time to arrange such schemes to enable academics to contribute to policy development or implementation was estimated by academics as between 12 to 24 months. However, a number of academics provided the caveat that much more flexibility could be provided where there was a convergence of their personal research interest and SE’s policy interest.

Some academics contributing to the SAHPM team’s work suggested that CSO had the opportunity to test increasing the scope of expert engagement by encouraging SEHD funded academics to focus on SEHD short term policy priority issues as well as their longer term academic objectives.

Regarding academic participation in wider KB/KT events, discussions revealed academics and other evidence providers to be discriminatory about the invitations they were willing to accept from SE to attend round table or discussion meetings or other opportunities for networking. Academics focused on networking at events with each other, but placed much less significance on networking in government circles. In particular, awareness of opportunities to influence or inform administrators or Ministers at government events appeared to be low, or perhaps of no interest, to a wide range of academics who engaged with SAHPM.
Collaboration on Evidence-for-Policy Projects

Academics had their own specific preferences for academic and policy collaborators based on positive and negative experiences of previous interactions, and in the course of the project SAHPM team discussed ground rules for future possible collaborations with SE. Conditions set by academics for collaboration included: SE would have to act as an honest, disciplined and even handed broker; the rules of engagement would have to be clearly articulated prior to project commencement; SE would have to be aware of academic rivalries, divisions and fault lines (and be explicit in how these would affect collaboration); and SE would arbitrate and monitor output to ensure that agreed dissemination strategies were adhered to (specifically in relation to single authored journal articles).

Joint Policy and Academic Knowledge Brokerage Events: expectations and outcomes

Offering the academic community the opportunity to engage closely with SE on event planning has enabled SE to learn important lessons about the priorities of academics and the extent of their operational boundaries. Lessons learned included:

- Feedback from a wider stakeholder group (and academics themselves) suggested that academics were more experienced at organising events for academics, or the voluntary sector rather than events targeting senior government administrators, Ministers, or public or private sector Chief Executives

- Management of Knowledge Transfer events which will achieve policy community objectives, and/or involve Ministers (at a UK or devolved level) require a high level of detailed co-ordination and planning with Departments and officials, and some academics and universities were reluctant to engage in the level of detailed planning required

- When considering preferences for the format of events, academics demonstrated a preference for fluid events without consideration of targeted outcomes, and/or concluding agreements on ‘next steps’. Formal meeting or seminar facilitation was also resisted by some academic collaborators. Academics have suggested that this may be due to the individualistic nature of the academic community, and again, the academic focus on peer review journal articles or books as their target output.

- Existing divisions in the academic community created challenges for academics who wish to act as ‘honest brokers’ in event organisation—particularly events which would cut across networks, institutions or disciplines.

- The academic community tended to prioritise academic perspectives on issues, and draw evidence from particular projects. This contrasted with the SE prioritisation of inclusive Scotland-wide discussion on key issues for the Scottish Executive

- At a European network level academic world colleagues from Europe appeared to be unfamiliar with developing policy relevant outputs from academic meetings and events; and were unfamiliar with the concept of including grass roots organisations or frontline public sector staff in events attended by academics
As a result of lessons learned:

- The SAHPM team suggested that a productive way forward would be to use the ESRC as a disinterested ‘honest broker’ to host public policy seminars. This would make best use of academic’s intellectual assets in combination with complementary policy oriented, strategic skill sets. The OCR KT team is now taking forward plans for a Scottish seminar series.

- The SAHPM team discussed improving KT through effective facilitation provided by ESRC or other stakeholders. There is the potential for KT events to have improved facilitation, and follow up, by KT specialists asking participants to identify agreed next steps, and then at a set time after the event, for example, to identify ‘what they have done’ and compare that to ‘what they intended to do’ on leaving the event.

- SE needs to conduct further outreach work to clarify advance planning requirements for Chief Executives, Scottish and UK Ministers. Whilst strategic contacts in the Universities appreciated the opportunities provided by Ministerial engagement in events, academics were less interested in attracting Ministers or (in the case of this pilot) senior NHSS officials to their events.

3.4 The Private Sector Community

Much of the work of the SAHPM team on knowledge brokerage focused on establishing relationships and laying the foundations for future collaboration with the academic sector. However, it was clear that a number of other potential evidence providers were in a state of readiness for engagement with SE. These were primarily hybrid individuals crossing between the world of academia and private sector consultancy, or private sector consultants who ‘converted’ the work of academics into utilitarian products.

Interest was also expressed by a number of private sector consultancy firms in future engagement with SE. However, there were few opportunities to take forward joint work with private sector consultancy as part of testing the theory and practice of KB/KT due to the limited capacity of private sector to engage in loss-leading activity. This was an interesting contrast to SAHPM academic collaborators who had more capacity to engage in testing the theory and practice of KT and KB.

The SAHPM consultation responses endorsed the suggestion that SAHPM should endeavour to work towards providing an ethical means of establishing constructive and positive relations with major suppliers to the NHSS. NHSS is a multi-billion pound organisation and major purchaser of goods and services, and as a result many suppliers seek to influence the NHSS through a range of marketing activities which have been open to misinterpretation and public criticism. The SAHPM team opened a dialogue with health industry representatives, resulting in interest from industry in SEHD creating a forum for future discussions between industry and NHSS.
3.5 Effective Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Brokerage between research, policy and practice communities

The project also revealed a number of areas of cultural misunderstandings between the policy community and the academic community. To create a collaborative working environment based on relationships of trust and respect, further work is required on improving understanding of the different protocols and practice in the academic and government sector.

The SAHPM team demonstrated that it is possible to apply the theory and practice of KB and KT in Scotland, however, in doing so SAHPM has revealed a number relational issues between those involved in the KT and KB process that need to be addressed if future interaction is to be effective.
CHAPTER 4  NEW DIRECTIONS FOR KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER AND KNOWLEDGE BROKERAGE IN SCOTLAND.

- Getting the right mix of people and information together to tackle the right issue at the right time is the essence of brokering.
- Brokers put those who need to know things in touch with people with expertise; they connect people across organizational boundaries. They are recognized as resources, and they follow up ideas and information they care about.
- Brokers also act on behalf of Ministers and Policy Administrators by keeping in touch with academics and other evidence providers, so there is a channel for evidence into the organization, even when it hasn’t been solicited.

(Canadian Health Services Research Foundation
http://www.chsrn.ca/brokering/pdf/Theory_and_Practice_e.pdf)

The Scottish Executive commitment to evidence-based policy making has driven an increase in demand for knowledge and information across all departments of SE; and created an environment where all policy administrators require advice on gathering and utilising evidence in the policy process. In most areas of SE these needs are met by analytical support provided by ASDs, and the work of SAHPM has highlighted how Health Department, and other areas of the Executive, can improve knowledge management and knowledge transfer through deployment of knowledge brokerage theory and practice.

The work of the SAHPM team has revealed a wide range of possibilities for positive future movement, provided a snapshot of assumptions and behaviours which affect knowledge management, transfer and brokerage. This work has provided a baseline against which to measure future progress, and a sound foundation for future collaboration.

This section of the report provides options for next steps in developing knowledge brokerage in SE as a whole, and will be considered by SE alongside a range of other KT developments, notably the work of the Social Research Knowledge Transfer Working Group.

4.1 Working in the Gap: Deploying Knowledge Brokers

More work is required from the policy, practice and academic communities to: encourage a policy and service delivery focus from the academic community; and to provide clear articulation of policy relevant output requirements from the policy side. The work of the SAHPM team showed that the key factors in successful knowledge brokerage and collaboration are relationships of trust and confidence with known individuals and experts; and that the dynamic human relationships involved in effective KT and KB are fluid, flexible, complex, and nuanced.

Existing activity in the United Kingdom (UK) on KM/KT/KB work favours metaphors which refer to ‘bridging the gap’ between the policy community and academic and other evidence
provider communities as if permanent structures could be built (academic units are usually suggested). It is also suggested that individuals could be appointed to ‘bridge the gap’ again usually through the secondment, or increased funding of, academics. Whilst this presents a persuasive academic narrative, in reality, evidence from the organisations referenced in Section 1 and the work of the SAHPM team suggests that specialist knowledge brokers are required to broker the relationship between policy makers (Ministers), policy administrators (civil servants or ‘bureaucrats’); public sector practitioners; and evidence providers. To be effective, these knowledge brokers must have an understanding of the realpolitik of policy development and implementation. As previously discussed, the work of the SAHPM team suggests that academics would not be able to easily acquire, and indeed may not wish to develop, this expertise.

The work of the SAHPM team has shown that a more creative and dynamic approach is required to create the circumstances for effective engagement in the policy development and implementation process and environment. Rather than using the static metaphor of ‘bridging the gap’ between research, policy and practice worlds, the work of SAHPM suggests that it may be more appropriate to discuss working ‘within the gap’ between the policy and academic community in order to strengthen the working confidence already established by the SAHPM team and others, and to relieve the stresses and tensions created when academics and civil servants reach out to collaborate across what is—in reality—in many cases a ‘great divide’ rather than a small gap. Different types of structures, individuals and teams are required for different policy areas and issues. The skill of a knowledge broker in these situations is to work creatively ‘within the gap’ to assemble and dismantle bridging structures as required, and for ‘brokercrats’ (knowledge broker bureaucrats) or knowledge management teams (within the civil service) to ensure that the knowledge or information will be utilised once it has crossed the gap.

An important aspect of the SAHPM team’s work was to operationalise KT. The transition from theory to practice, and from ‘discussion of stereotypes’ to ‘practical, pragmatic collaboration’ was not comfortable for several collaborators. As a result, a key conclusion from the work of the SAHPM team is that it would be helpful to focus on building KT/KB capacity in the academic community as a long term investment; and in the short to medium term train a new breed of specialist knowledge brokers whose careers were focused on KT; and who would deliver the KT functions which currently are neither rewarded or resourced. The work of the SAHPM team suggested that at present only specialist knowledge brokers would be able to provide the KT/KB processes and utilitarian products required by the policy community.

The experience of the SAHPM team suggested that taking forward a KM/KT/KB agenda will be challenging, with opportunity costs for the academic, policy and practice communities. However, the potential benefits in improved utilisation of evidence to inform policy would appear to outweigh these initial opportunity costs. The work of the SAHPM team has provided an important platform for future movement ensuring that future investment is based on a realistic assessment of the current situation, grounded in experience, rather than on an untested model or theory.
Internal ‘Brokercrats’ and External Knowledge Brokers

The work of SAHPM suggests it would be helpful to draw a distinction between the particular skills and expertise of government ‘system aware’ ‘brokercrats’ (‘bureaucrats’/civil servants working within SE as knowledge brokers, primarily social researchers); and a new breed of external knowledge brokers operating as go-betweens who would link the policy, public sector practice, industry, and academic communities. Although policy administrators and academics involved in the SAHPM project identified the need for the academic and policy communities to gain greater understanding of each other’s worlds, in reality, there is little reward or motivation for either to participate in cross cultural immersion.

Internal ‘Brokercrats’

The work of SAHPM suggests that SE ‘system awareness’ is the key to KB/KT success within SE. System awareness is knowledge and experience that has to be learned, acquired and ‘experienced as performed’. Understanding gained in this way remains grounded in a field of practical activity (in this case the civil service) and therefore enables the ‘brokercrat’ to work in a way which is compatible with the practice of policy administrators. System awareness is contingent on relationships of trust and working confidence with individuals in the system, and the ability to operate effectively as a brokercrat takes time to acquire.

Within SE, much of the ‘brokercrat’ work is currently carried out by social researchers willing to ‘push the envelope’ of research/policy interaction, and at present, this brokerage work is a layer of ‘extra effort’ applied over their mainstream work programmes, a position apparent also in other parts of the world. It is possible that knowledge brokerage work may in the future be formally recognised as a part of social researchers’ work within SE and to be prioritised above the ‘traditional’ social research roles within ASDs.

If knowledge broker ‘brokercrat’ posts were formally recognised within SE, their roles and the focus of effort would have to be delineated and new mechanisms for performance management designed to fit these posts. Under current performance assessment systems much of the knowledge brokers work would be difficult to measure. It is self evident that being a brokercrat is a different kind of job to mainstream civil service roles and the work of the SAHPM team has identified areas of administrative friction that would need to be addressed should SE wish to take forward a KB agenda.

Buy in from policy administrators would also be essential for future KB to be effective and brokercrats who were parachuted in to an area would be unlikely to succeed—the success of much of the SAHPM brokerage activity was built on the SAHPM team being well-known and disinterested brokers, and having long standing relationships of trust and an established working confidence with their collaborators.

The work of SAHPM demonstrated that the work of the knowledge broker is ‘not just about social science’, and good contacts are required with scientific colleagues (at a departmental and funding council level) to take forward effective KT for policy development. Some of the SAHPM collaborators were reluctant to engage across University faculties, however, SAHPM’s work, and that of new ESRC KT centres such as Genomics Research Forum have identified the value of the multi-disciplinary approach which reflects the cross cutting nature of the policy agenda on a number of key issues.
Brokercrats also have a key role to play in identifying ‘windows of opportunity’ for the contribution of evidence in the policy cycle. Brokercrats are uniquely placed to identify the potential convergence of Ministerial interest, policy administrator engagement, and emerging research agendas, and then to bring people together to create what the Social Research Knowledge Management Working Group referred to as the (not-there-by-chance) X factor (right people, right time, right place) around a successfully, and strategically brokered project.

Finally, it is clear that the evidence ‘does not speak for itself’ and brokercrats have a lead role to play in vital face to face interactions within the Scottish Executive to ensure that the key findings from research are represented at relevant policy discussions.

External Knowledge Brokers

From the outset the SAHPM project advocated the creation of a new breed of external knowledge brokers operating as go-betweens linking the policy, public sector practice, industry, and academic communities. In contrast to civil service brokercrats, such external go-betweens would have the ability to work without what some may consider to be the constraints of civil service and in contrast to working only for Scottish Ministers, would have the capacity to work for a range of funders and interests.

The role they would be likely to be perform is exemplified by the listing provided in the CHSRF literature review (see http://www.chsrf.ca/brokering/documents_e.php), who suggest that the external knowledge brokers’ (in this case working in the area of health services) tasks include:

- bringing researchers and decision makers together to exchange information and work together;
- helping groups communicate and understand each other's needs and abilities;
- sustaining and maintaining exchange of information between researchers and decision makers;
- promoting the use of evidence in planning and delivering healthcare services;
- monitoring and evaluating knowledge brokering practices to identify successes or needed changes;
- transforming management issues into research questions;
- helping decision makers establish their priorities;
- 'navigating' or guiding decision makers through sources of research;
- helping decision makers find or commission synthesized research; and
- creating knowledge networks of researchers and decision makers who have common interests in health services issues.
SAHPM has demonstrated that there is potential for such individuals to be deployed to serve the interests of SE and a range of public sector interests, including NHSS. Taking such a suggestion forward would involve the identification and training of relevant individuals and a formal programme would have the potential to assist with that process.

4.2 Options for Future Movement

The Office of Chief Researcher is currently taking forward liaison with a range of internal and external stakeholders (notably SHEFC), and considering options for future movement in the field of knowledge transfer and knowledge brokerage.

The work of the SAHPM team has provided a useful pilot on these issues for SE, however, any future movement would be informed by current practice in Analytical Service Divisions; the work of the Social Research Knowledge Transfer Working Group; strategic liaison with SEHFC and Universities Scotland; collaboration with ‘knowledge stimulation’ bodies including Scottish Council Foundation, David Hume Institute, and Royal Society of Edinburgh; and the experience of a wider field of knowledge transfer activity in Scotland, Europe and further afield.
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The work of the SAHPM team tested the theory and practice of knowledge brokerage within the limits of civil service protocols and academic operational boundaries. The process has demonstrated the validity of a KT and KB focus on human dynamics and has shown that KT and KB is possible, the theory works in practice, and the delivery of utilitarian products to support the policy cycle is possible.

The SAHPM experience would appear to represent the first operationalisation of KB in a government department, and valuable lessons have been learned for all communities of interest who have engaged in the process. Specifically, the application of KT and KB theory has: resulted in increased research utilisation within SEHD and the brokerage of inventive alliances leading to the generation of new knowledge; brought enhanced knowledge to the policy process; and moved tacit knowledge into utilitarian outputs. The SAHPM project also reinforced that KT and KB requires appropriately skilled people to make more efficient use of resources.
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**RESEARCH - PUBLICATIONS LIST FROM 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Status of Traditional Scottish Animal Breeds and Plant Varieties</td>
<td>I.A. Wright and A.J.I Dalziel (MacAuley Institute) and R.P. Ellis (Scottish Crop Research Institute).</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>£5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Implications for Biodiversity:</td>
<td>Summary available: Countryside and Natural Heritage Research Findings No.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary available: Development Department Research Findings No.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Care and Regulation of Care Services in Scotland:</td>
<td>Charlotte Pearson and Sheila Riddell (Strathclyde Centre for Disability Research).</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>£5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary available: Health and Community Care Research Findings No.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and Criminal Justice Research Agenda</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Research Branch.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>£5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Arrears and Repossessions in Scotland:</td>
<td>Emma McCallum and Ewan McCaig (MVA).</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>£5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary available: Development Department Research Findings No.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on a Physical Activity Strategy for Scotland:</td>
<td>Sheila Henderson; (Reid-Howie Associates).</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>£5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>2003</td>
<td>£5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks:</td>
<td>Summary available: Countryside and Natural Heritage Research Findings No.26</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking Homelessness: A Feasibility Study:</td>
<td>Kevin Pickering, Suzanne Fitzpatrick, Kerstin Hinds, Peter Lynn and Sarah Tipping.</td>
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Summary available: General Research Findings No.14/2004
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Monitoring Free Local Off-Peak Bus Travel for Older and Disabled People:
Technological Report 1: Passenger Generation Surveys
Technological Report 2: Bus Occupancy Surveys
Technological Report 3: User Surveys
Technological Report 4: Bus Boarding Data
Technological Report 5: Demographic Model
Colin Buchanan and Partners. (2004) (Web only)


Summary available: Development Department Research Findings No.178/2004
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Summary only available: Legal Studies Research Findings No.55/2005
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Assessing the Effectiveness of Variable Messaging Signs to Inform Beach Users about Bathing Water Quality: MRUK. (2005) (Web only) Summary available: Office of Chief Researcher Research Findings No.8/2005 (Web only)


Scottish Executive Education Department

Communications Strategy Research: TNS System Three. (2005) (Web only)
Summary available: Office of Chief Research Research Findings No.11/2005 (Web only)

Investigation of Access to Public Services in Scotland using British Sign Language: Jim Kyle, Anna Marie Reilly, Lorna Allsop, Monica Clark and Alexy Dury (Deaf Studies Trust). (2005) (£5.00)
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