Factsheet of the td-net web portal for co-producing knowledge

Template for authors

1. **When writing the factsheet, please keep our selection criteria in mind:**

The main criterion for selecting methods and tools for the td-net web portal is: The method or tool supports the collaboration between experts and stakeholders from science and practice to tackle real-world, context-sensitive societal challenges. Other criteria include:

* The method or tool uses low-tech equipment;
* The method or tool mainly uses everyday language;
* The method or tool is described in a similar way as the methods are described in the td-net toolbox (e.g. brevity of text, ‘how-to’ procedure).
1. **Please state the name of the method here:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Please describe the method in one sentence here:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Please use the following tables to describe the method in jargon-free language and in as few words as possible:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Editors’ comments** |
| Strength of the method: | [completed by the editors] |
| To be considered: | [completed by the editors] |
| Factsheet rationale: | Read [here](https://naturalsciences.ch/co-producing-knowledge-explained/methods/method_factsheets) about the rationale of the brief factsheets (in comparison to method profiles of the [td-net toolbox](http://www.transdisciplinarity.ch/toolbox)). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Contributions to td processes** *(May be completed together with the editor)* |
| Goal |  |
| Location in td process phases: |  |
| Bridging thought styles: | [How does the method help to bridge different thought styles or to co-production of knowledge?] |

|  |
| --- |
| **Characteristics** |
| Time required to implement the method: |  |
| Preparation required: | * - Task 1
* - Task 2
* - …
 |
| Expertise required: |  |
| Convener & participants: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Source for detailed method description** |
| For a detailed description of the method (online, open access), please visit: | [Link to the description of the method] |
| Provided by: | [Name of the original authors of the method description] |
| Resource compilation in which it appears: | [Link to the resource compilation record on the td-net web portal, if available; indicate when resource compilation does not focus on research projects]] |
| Recommended by: | [Name of the person who recommended the method to td-net] |
| Language(s): | EN / DE / FR |

1. **Please indicate cited and/or suggested readings her:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Contact information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Surname & Last Name: |  |
| Affiliation: |  |
| Contact information: |  |
| External Link: | [LinkedIn-Profile preferred] |

1. **Did you apply this method? Would you be interested in providing an “**[**experience report**](https://naturwissenschaften.ch/topics/co-producing_knowledge/practical_experiences)**” with regard to the use of this method? Ore are there other references we could refer to?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Do you know other projects in which this method has been applied? If yes, please indicate them (ideally including a contact person):**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Search by key issues: Which of the challenges below can be addressed by the method? (Please place an “x” in the boxes in the left column.)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Identify actors, roles and expectations** |
| **Clarify who to involve** |
|  | We want to work together with various experts from science and practice and are unsure about who to involve and why.  |
|  | Our collaboration doesn’t work as anticipated. We need to find out whether the right people are on board. |
|  | We would like to clarify the power constellations around the problem situation that are relevant for the project: Who has which and how much influence? Who has no voice? How can this be considered in the project?  |
|  | We would like to get a better picture of how the problem is perceived and discussed by whom in which contexts.  |
|  | We would like to make sure that we have involved the people that are needed to act on the problem. |
| **Specify roles, tasks and responsibilities** |
|  | The rough goals of our project are set. We need to clarify who participateswhy and in which role. Either because we haven't done so yet or because we realise that roles are unclear or inadequate. |
|  | We have identified the relevant actors for our project. We need to define a) the role and tasks of our td group, b) rules of decision making and confidentiality, and c) intellectual property rights agreements.  |
|  | In order to develop a collaborative project, we would like to clarify what each of the involved partners (or subprojects) could contribute to the overall project and vice versa. Furthermore, it could be useful to know whether important topics are missing. |
|  | We have identified the relevant actors for our project. We need to define who to involve in which stage of the process, in which form and how intense. |
| **Clarify expectations** |
|  | Participant’s expectations regarding the project’s outcomes are unclear or differ. We need to clarify these expectations in order to agree on realistic project goals. |
| **Embrace differences, tensions and conflicts in a td group** |
| **Handle different perceptions of and opinions towards the issue**  |
|  | We have the impression that core actors of the project might be at cross-purposes. We want them to become aware of each other’s viewpoint, expertise and know-how in order to use the full potential for the benefit of the project. |
|  | We want to enhance mutual understanding of researchers with different disciplinary background through comparing conventions that are fundamental to their academic field (e.g. norms on knowledge generation, evidence, assumptions, values).  |
|  | Our co-production process is stuck because different experts disagree on strategies for solving a problem or answers to a key question. We would like to collect and weigh the underlying arguments and rationales. |
|  | Participant’s expectations regarding the project’s outcomes are unclear or differ. We need to clarify these expectations in order to agree on realistic project goals. |
|  | We would like to learn what the problem is for whom and how strongly we or other people agree on its framing. We want the various positions become explicit. |
|  | As laypersons in a certain field, we would like to scrutinise priorities, framings and models set by experts. We would like to uncover respective assumptions (e.g. system boundaries that were set when creating a model; aspects that are stressed or neglected in describing an issue).  |
| **Deal with power issues** |
|  | In our collaborative project there is a key person who tends to dominate plenary discussions. We would like to have an exchange that allows everyone to share his/her thoughts.  |
|  | We would like to clarify the power constellations in the td group that are relevant for the project: Who has which and how much influence? Who has no voice? How can this be considered in the project?  |
| **Deal with tensions in the td group** |
|  | Our collaboration doesn’t work as anticipated. We think we need to do something to resolve interpersonal tensions. |
| **Build ownership and trust** |
|  | We realise people are less and less motivated in participating actively in the knowledge co-production process. We assume this might be related with weak ownership and missing trust.  |
|  | We have the feeling the group is losing momentum and falling apart. We would like to review our collaboration through identifying which events the group members consider as key for the joint process. With this, we hope to enhance the team spirit. |
| **Strive for societal relevance** |
| **Review understandings of the societal problem situation** |
|  | We have the feeling our research project is too far away from practice, i.e. would profit by a dialogue with representatives from practice. To resolve this, we would like to bring together a group of actors to assist the td process.  |
|  | We want to come up with concrete transformation options developed in collaboration with actors and stakeholders relevant for dealing with a specific problem situation. The goal is clear, but we miss an overall picture of the situation, we don’t know where to set in.  |
|  | We realize we have to better understand the societal problem our research deals with, i.e. the problem’s actual dynamics, how it is being perceived or discussed by whom and in which context.  |
| **Question scientific framings** |
|  | We are not sure whether our research questions adequately respond to the societal knowledge demand we identified. We think it could be helpful to ask our research question in different ways. |
|  | As laypersons in a certain field, we would like to scrutinise priorities, framings and models set by experts. We would like to uncover respective assumptions (e.g. system boundaries that were set when creating a model; aspects that are stressed or neglected in describing an issue).  |
| **Navigate through normative goals** |
| **Relate research to normative principles (e.g. SD)** |
|  | *This section is under constructions, suggestions for specific situations are welcome* |
| **Identify and integrate differing normative positions in research** |
|  | *This section is under constructions, suggestions for specific situations are welcome* |
| **Integrate different fields of expertise**  |
| **Relate knowledge and perspectives on the issue** |
|  | We would like to learn what the problem is for whom and how strongly individual group members agree on its framing. We want the various perspectives become explicit. |
|  | We have a question to which there is no study, but there are some experts that, as a collective, have the knowledge and can provide relevant arguments to answer the question.  |
|  | Our co-production process is stuck because different experts disagree on strategies for solving a problem or answers to a key question. We would like to collect and weigh the underlying arguments and rationales. |
|  | We would like to collect and interrelate our group’s knowledge on a certain topic. We would like to use a means of expression that allows participants to work at eye level. |
|  | We want to enhance mutual understanding of researchers with different disciplinary background through comparing conventions that are fundamental to their academic field (e.g. norms on knowledge generation, evidence, assumptions, values).  |
| **Relate different languages, concepts and narratives** |
|  | We want to develop a set of possible future development scenarios with respect to a societal issue. For coherence, we would like to describe the different scenarios with the same variables.  |
|  | Our collaboration doesn’t work as anticipated. We think we need to do something about missing links between subprojects.  |
|  | We would like to discuss an issue more in-depth from the perspective of different fields in order to increase (mutual) understanding. |
|  | We want to enhance mutual understanding of researchers with different disciplinary background through comparing conventions that are fundamental to their academic field (e.g. norms on knowledge generation, evidence, assumptions, values).  |
| **Relate subtopics and develop a concept for integration** |
|  | Our collaboration doesn’t work as anticipated. We think we need to do something about missing links between subprojects.  |
|  | Our collaboration doesn’t work as anticipated. We think we need to clarify whether some subprojects deal with overlapping questions or issues. |
|  | We want to initiate a first exchange among (sub-) projects so that they start swapping ideas. |
| **Relate different quality standards** |
|  | We want to enhance mutual understanding of researchers with different disciplinary backgrounds through comparing conventions that are fundamental to their academic field (e.g. norms on knowledge generation, evidence, assumptions, values).  |
| **Review process and impacts** |
| **Assess a project's impact and related assumptions and expectations** |
|  | We need to clarify and/or review what impact our project realistically can have and how to assess it.  |
|  | Our envisaged project outcomes are clear. However, we are not sure about intended and unintended effects the project had. Therefore, we would like to identify them from the perspective of the various involved actors.  |
|  | We want to uncover desired changes and respective impact pathways participants implicitly have in mind. |
| **Reflect on process and research question** |
|  | We want to learn how participants have experienced the knowledge co-production process so far: What were important steps, events, influences, (team) dynamics etc. from their point of view?  |
|  | Given that our collaboration is somehow stuck, we would like to develop more understanding for each other through exchanging what so far has been particularly important to whom in the process. |
|  | As laypersons in a certain field, we would like to scrutinise priorities, framings and models set in the project. We would like to uncover respective assumptions (e.g. system boundaries that were set when creating a model; aspects that are stressed or neglected in describing an issue).  |
|  | We are not sure whether our research questions adequately respond to the societal knowledge demand we identified. We think it could be helpful to ask our research question in different ways. |

1. **Search by phases: Which of the challenges below can be addressed by the method? (Please place an “x” in the boxes in the left column.)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Jointly envisage a td project** |
| **Develop a rough project idea** |
|  | In a loose group of interested experts from science and practice and based on a shared concern, we would like to agree on a concrete societal problem situation to work on. |
|  | We would like to clarify what various interested experts from science and practice could contribute to and benefit from a joint project. Furthermore, it could be useful to know whether important topics are missing. |
|  | We have identified the relevant actors for our project. We would like to bring them together to put on the table desired goals, expectations and interests; and to develop pathways to impact and a strategy for the project. |
| **Clarify who to involve** |
|  | We want to discuss our rough project idea with various experts from science and practice and are unsure about who to involve.  |
| **Develop a rough procedure for co-producing knowledge** |
|  | We would like to jointly develop a procedure for our knowledge co-production process and don't know how to do that. |
|  | We have identified the relevant actors for our project. We need to define a) the role and tasks of our td group, b) rules of decision making and confidentiality, and c) intellectual property rights agreements. |
|  | We have identified relevant actors for our project. We need to define who to involve in which stage of the process, in which form and how intense. |
| **Jointly frame goals, problems and research** |
| **Identify relevant understandings of the problem situation** |
|  | We would like to discuss a problem situation more in-depth from the perspective of different fields from science and practice. |
|  | We would like to learn what the problem is for whom and how strongly we or other people agree on its framing. We want the various perspectives become explicit. |
|  | We realize we have to better understand the societal problem our research deals with, i.e. the problem’s actual dynamics, how it is being perceived or discussed by whom and in which context.  |
| **Identify societal knowledge demand** |
|  | We want to make sure our project asks relevant research questions from the point of view of the societal priorities. We want to identify the respective knowledge demand. |
| **Agree on problem framing and normative conception of a project** |
|  | We would like to develop a joint problem framing by making use of the collective knowledge of the group. To start we would like to summarize the knowledge on the topic and gain an overview. We would like to use a means of expression that allows participants to work at eye level. |
|  | We would like to make different problem framings explicit in order to agree on with which framing(s) to work in our project. |
|  | We have the feeling that there are hidden normative positions in our project. We don't know how to identify them and how to deal with them to meet scientific standards. |
| **Define achievable project goals** |
|  | Participants’ expectations regarding the project’s outcomes are unclear or differ. We need to clarify these expectations in order to agree on realistic project goals. |
| **Develop subtopics and a concept for integration** |
|  | Within a bigger project, we are several actors working at interface areas of several topics. We want to find out who of us works on similar intersections of topics.  |
|  | We would like to clarify what each of the involved partners (or subprojects) could contribute to and benefit from the overall project. Furthermore, it could be useful to know whether important topics are missing. |
|  | We want to initiate a more in-depth exchange among (sub-) projects so that they start swapping ideas. |
|  | We would like to develop a bridging concept and boundary objects that are tangible to all actors involved. |
| **Jointly conduct research** |
| **Jointly generate knowledge** |
|  | We want to generate a set of possible future development scenarios to allow developing a shared vision for the future. |
|  | We have a question to which there is no study, but there are some experts that, as a collective, have the knowledge and can provide relevant arguments to answer the question.  |
|  | We want to collaboratively develop an experiment or an intervention, repectively, in a test setting (or as a real-world experiment??) and evaluate the outcomes.  |
| **Integrate knowledge** |
|  | We feel the various parts of our co-production project have lost their interconnections or have developed in different directions. We would like to find out whether and which (new) links can be made. |
|  | Our collaboration doesn’t work as anticipated. We think we need to clarify whether some subprojects deal with overlapping questions or issues. |
|  | We would like to discuss an issue more in-depth from the perspective of different fields in order to increase understanding. |
|  | We want to jointly advance the work of various (sub-) projects or project parts. We hope that, by doing so, we get a better and more comprehensive picture of the project as a whole |
|  | Being part of a bigger project, I would like to get feedback from other subprojects on my research idea, research questions and approach. |
|  | We would like to collect and interrelate our group’s knowledge on a certain topic. We would like to use a means of expression that allows participants to work at eye level.  |
|  | Different group members disagree about which facts are relevant, which interpretations (of facts) are adequate, and which strategies are useful for solving a problem. We would like to collect, weigh and decide on underlying arguments and rationales. |
|  | We want to develop a set of possible future development scenarios with respect to a societal issue. For coherence, we would like to describe the different scenarios with the same variables.  |
| **Jointly assess quality with respect to scientific rigour, social robustness and practical relevance** |
|  | As laypersons in a certain field, we would like to scrutinise priorities, framings and models set by experts. We would like to uncover respective assumptions (e.g. system boundaries that were set when creating a model; aspects that are stressed or neglected in describing an issue). |
| **Jointly explore ways to impact in science and society** |
| **Jointly reconsider ways to impact** |
|  | We would like to test or evaluate the assumptions and hypotheses about how our research would lead or contribute to a process of (societal) change. |
| **Jointly develop and test ideas, measures and solutions** |
|  | We want to produce concrete transformation options taking actors and stakeholders' needs into account.  |
|  | We are a heterogeneous group of experts and would like to collectively publish the insights gained in our project. |
| **Jointly evaluate impact** |
|  | Our envisaged project outcomes are clear. However, we are not sure about intended and unintended effects the project had. Therefore, we would like to identify them from the perspective of the various involved actors.  |