

Report EIPPEE Partners Seminar 2015

Dates: 27 & 28 May 2015

Location: [The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research \(NWO\), Java Building at Laan van Nieuw Oost-Indië 300, The Hague](#), meeting room 300.

Hosts: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (OCW) and Netherlands Initiative for Education Research (NRO)

PARTICIPANTS

NRO (NL): Jelle Kaldewaij (Director)
Ruud Strijp (Senior policy officer)
Linda Sontag (Senior policy officer)
Marion Stenneke (Policy adviser knowledge use)
Niels Rijke (Policy officer)

OCW (NL): Rien Rouw (Senior adviser Evidence-Based Policy)
Ib Waterreus (Senior adviser Evidence-Based Policy)

RCN (NO): Solvi Lillejord (Director)

EPPI Centre (UK): David Gough (Director)

Min. Flanders (BE): Caroline Gijssels (Strategic policy adviser)

Danish Clearinghouse: Hanna Sommersel (Researcher)

EAPRIL: Frank de Jong (Chair)

NAE (SWE): Eva Minten (Director)

University Münster: Wolfgang Böttcher (Professor)

OECD: Tracey Burns (Project leader)

SKBF (SWI): Stefan Denzler (Researcher)

Research team: Andrew Morris (Freelancer)
Tomislav Tudjman (University of Rotterdam)
Anna Kristin Siguroardottir (University of Iceland)

IER (SWE): Mats Mjiland (Strategic adviser)
Jenny Rehnman (Strategic adviser)

ALL POWERPOINT PRESENTATIONS HAVE BEEN ATTACHED.

27 May 2015

13.00-13.30: Introduction and recap on action points of the meeting in London, October 2014 - moderator Rien Rouw

13.30-15.00: Presentations on and exchange of practices on use of education research, including review studies, in policy and practice in Norway and the Netherlands – Solvi Lillejord (Director Norwegian Knowledge Centre for Educational Research) and Jelle Kaldewaij (Director NRO) – moderator Niels Rijke

RCN and NRO will give a co-presentation on the use of education research, including review studies, in policy and practice. This reflects their closer cooperation since the EIPPEE meeting in October 2014. RCN visited NRO in January 2015. NRO will visit RCN in September 2015.

Solvi Lillejord will give a presentation of ongoing policy processes in Norway, illustrated by how recent systematic reviews and research mappings from the Norwegian Knowledge Centre may contribute to the knowledge base and support policy decisions.

- *How may context be taken into consideration in policy-processes?*
 - ***In Norway accidentally an interesting phenomenon came into being, parallel policy-processes. The Norwegian government asked the knowledge centre to carry out a scientific review. At the same time a committee of practitioners was assigned to come up with recommendations on the same issue based on their own experience. This led to a more convincing case for particular interventions that are now being piloted in schools.***
 - ***In specific cases involving parallel processes of systematic reviews of research and consultations to review experiential knowledge the outcomes were similar. This helped the credibility of the research findings for practitioners.***
- *What characterizes research that is "useful"?*
 - ***Discussion: Research is more than just results. Do we underutilise research? The research context and process are also relevant for teachers, in order to become reflective practitioners. Besides that, explanatory mechanisms behind it are important.***
- *Are teachers producers of knowledge?*
 - ***Discussion: Teachers are also producers of knowledge. They can also do a review study themselves, simultaneously with researchers.***

Jelle Kaldewaij will give a presentation on knowledge use through review studies.

- *What types of review studies exist?*
 - ***Jelle distinguished 5 types of reviews currently used by NRO:***
 - ***Meta-analysis of peer-reviewed articles***
 - ***Meta-analysis based on a broader range of publications***
 - ***Reviews based on various types of studies (besides published articles, primary research as well, e.g. secondary analysis of PISA-datat)***
 - ***Case-studies: as an enrichments of reviews***
 - ***Essays: containing a combination of evidence and expertise.***
- *What is necessary for a good review study?*
 - ***Discussion: This is a question to be further explored. The aim of the review study determines what is necessary for a good review study. Sometimes you can include non-peer-reviewed literature; what is more important than peer review is being clear about the nature of the evidence gathered.***
- *What are best practices on practice-oriented review studies?*
 - ***Discussion: Include practitioners in the whole research process. Factor in the prior theory the teacher has.***
 - ***Criteria for accepting practitioner knowledge include: is it documented, generalisable, collegial and from professionals themselves?***

- *How can we make use of review studies from other countries?*
 - **Discussion: A database on the EIPPEE website where all the partners upload English (summaries of) review studies done by them or financed by them.**
 - **Should EIPPEE propose a study of how to get most value out of international collaboration on systematic reviews?**
- *How can we include an international, comparative perspective in review studies?*
 - **Discussion: There is always an international, comparative perspective. EIPPEE could be important to complement each other's national perspectives.**
- *Which topics should be reviewed?*
 - **Discussion: Could we choose topics to do together? Topics mentioned by the partners: teacher educators, pupil participation, inclusion, ICT, language inclusion, foreign language learning, testing and drop-out.**
 - **There's a tendency to overdo fashionable topics and neglect others – can we space them out better?**

Actions EIPPEE:

- **Database on the EIPPEE website where all partners upload English (summaries of) review studies done by them or financed by them.**
- **To identify topics to be reviewed which are high on the political agenda's in different countries represented within EIPPEE. Then we could complement each other by reviewing literature in our own language.**

15.30-17.00: Discussion on results (publications, discussions etc.) and way forward SIG 'Knowledge centres' – Wolfgang Boettcher (lead) – moderator Tracey Burns

Discussion: The EIPPEE partners would welcome an elaborated paper from the SIG with an overview of knowledge centres for education research in Europe, to be published on the EIPPEE website and possibly in a journal.

Actions EIPPEE:

- **This Special Interest Group drafts a template for a paper with an overview of knowledge centres for education research in Europe.**

28 May 2015

09.30-11.00 Presentation from and discussion with Petra Jonkers from the Scientific Council for Government Policy in the Netherlands and Rien Rouw from the Ministry of Education on the use of research by policymakers – moderator Rien Rouw

*Petra Jonkers presents the report *Policymaking Using Behavioural Expertise (2014)*, of the Dutch Scientific Council for Government Policy. This report stresses the importance of using a behavioural scientific perspective during the whole policymaking process. The Council describes three ways to institutionalize the use of behavioural insights in the administration. Petra Jonkers will present these three ways & compare them with models of BIT (UK) and OIRA (US). Furthermore she will reflect on different ways of using behavioural insights in the evaluation practice.*

In addition Ib Waterreus from the Dutch Ministry of Education presents some examples in the context of education policy, and reflects on ways to move forward with behavioural insights in policy.

Topics for the conversation:

- *The role of systematic knowledge of behavioural insights in the design of ex-ante evaluations.*
- *Behavioural insights and the effects of the accumulation of (effective) interventions. For example, does the accumulation of relatively 'easy choices' lead to choice overload that burdens the mental capacity of people?*

- *Multiple values: behavioural sciences and the effects of interventions on other values, beside effectiveness.*
- *How to deal in policy making with strong intuitions & personal experiences in practice from a behavioural science perspective.*

Discussion:

- ***Behavioural sciences provide a valuable contribution to evidence based policy and practice. Behavioural insights contribute especially to ex ante evaluation of policies. Besides that the use behavioural insights can promote both the implementation of policy and the adoption of scientific research.***
- ***Important to find out whether 'nudging' is a suitable instrument for a particular issue and for which type of student : not 'one size fits all'.***
- ***Behavioural insights might enrich the conversation about interventions because they raise awareness of explanatory mechanisms. Furthermore, 'beliefs' should be included in discussions about what works in education policy and practice.***

11.15-12.15 Discussion on results (publications, discussions etc.) and way forward SIG 'School-university knowledge exchange schemes' – Anna Kristin Siguroardottir, Tomislav Tudjman and Andrew Morris (lead) – moderator Frank de Jong

In this session a paper was presented which sets out the learning within the SUKES project since it was initiated at the EIPPEE conference in Frankfurt in 2012. This is based on a small survey of schemes, discussions at EIPPEE workshops, descriptions of four cases and reference to theoretical perspectives.

The paper highlights the wide variety of purposes and modes of operation. For example, some focus on use of evidence in practice, some on diffusing research, others on developing knowledge communities. A key theme for all schemes is the nature and quality of the relationships between the parties.

A multi-stage process is outlined which begins with focussing all parties on the problem as it actually is, then moves on to understanding it, developing a commonly-held idea of change and working out what knowledge is needed for this to happen.

Questions

- *Does this analysis 'ring true' more widely across polities and cultures?*
- *Is it worth investing in studying whether such schemes make any significant impact on outcomes?*
- *Do the intrinsic differences of purpose and incentive between universities and schools make such schemes unsustainable, at scale, in the long run?*
- *If such schemes were to be promoted, should this be done through evidence of impact on learning or by their effectiveness as professional development?*

Discussion:

- ***The direct interaction between researchers and practitioners and policymakers on a local level seems to be a very fruitful and promising form of cooperation. Countries are trying out various ways to organize this interaction, such as 'university schools' in Norway.***
- ***Looking more in depth, several interesting approaches occur within schemes such as a buddy system in Rotterdam: a researcher as buddy of a teacher.***
- ***What kind of interaction between researchers and practitioners would be most fruitful? Consider the format of 'Cooking with cooks': participation instead of explanation.***
- ***The researcher community could be broadened by trying to develop stronger relationships with non-academic researchers and with teacher trainers.***
- ***More (rigorous) research is needed on how this interaction can be designed in the most effective way.***

Actions EIPPEE:

- The SUKES Group decided that they are going to go forward and write a full academic paper this summer and offer it as a workshop at the Copenhagen conference. Anna Kristin will take the lead on this.
- The SUKES experience is also a possible strand of activity within any proposal that EIPPEE makes under Erasmus Plus.
- A revised version of the practical paper presented at the seminar will be made and published on the EIPPEE website

12.15-13.15 Partners business meeting EIPPEE (including lunch) – moderator Niels Rijke

Action points EIPPEE network:

- Follow up SIGs
 - o **Conclusion: The SIGs will continue as formulated above.**
- Possibilities funding European Union
 - o **Conclusion: NRO and RCN will take the lead in exploring the possibility of a Strategic Partnership under Key Action 2 for Erasmus+, all EIPPEE partners are willing to contribute. The work of the SIGs could be included in the bid. We have to consider in which country the success rate for Erasmus+ proposals would be the highest and if the success rate is high enough. Administrative work for the agency which applies for the grant should be included in the bid. Before working further on an application we have to consider the administrative costs. Anna Kristin, Frank, David and Hannah indicated willingness to help with the proposal.**
- EIPPEE 2016
 - o **Conclusion: The Danish Clearinghouse will host the EIPPEE 2016 conference (also see above and refer to email of the Clearinghouse with the proposal for the programme).**
- All EIPPEE partners will consider the possibility to organize a partners seminar in the Fall of 2015 (possibly combined with a small scale meeting for a broader audience). Such a meeting should ideally focus on a specific topic.
- All EIPPEE partners will consider the possibility of hosting our 2017 conference.
- The EPPI-Centre will take care of reframing and rearranging the website, in cooperation with Danish Clearinghouse and NRO
- The cooperation between RCN and NRO will continue. At the end of September 2015 NRO will travel to Oslo in order to exchange practices and work on joint programming and the Erasmus plus bid.
- OCW, Flemish Ministry and NRO will explore the possibility of a call jointly funded by OCW and the Flemish Ministry. NRO could finance consortia composed of researchers from Flanders and The Netherlands.
- In Germany there is a movement towards a knowledge centre on educational research on the federal level. RCN is involved. Possibly other EIPPEE partners can also contribute.

Additional:

- *On an administrative level the proposal is to rotate the responsibility for the EIPPEE contact list and the maintenance of an overview of the follow-up on action points for all EIPPEE partners. NRO will be responsible for this for the coming months. At the end of the year 2015 the Danish Clearinghouse can take over, as they will organize the conference in 2016.*