



## The Blueprint: Paradigm Project Updates

---

### At a Glance...

- The Design Teams make progress on their prototypes and move closer to larger-scale tests.
- In other news:
  - Two Frontiers articles examine the role of attitudes and policies in the promotion of open science.
  - A New York Times article takes a closer look at the scientific publishing industry and its role in racial equity.
  - Articles on battling misinformation and influencing public policy reassert the importance of effective communication.
  - An example of patient-led research supplements the work of the merged Design Team.



### Latest Paradigm Project Updates

All five active Design Teams are immersed in the human-centered design process as they test and refine the prototypes of their ideas. The prototypes currently take form as a PowerPoint slide deck, screenshots of a preprint server, or a storyboard, for example. The Design Teams will continue to modify their prototypes as they move closer to larger-scale tests.

The prototypes are meant to be simple contraptions that mimic an end-user's experience so that the Design Teams can "fail early" and rapidly adjust their prototypes based on feedback they receive during testing conversations. The "fail early" mentality of human-

centered design is just one manifestation of the agility and empathy that are inherent to the process, a powerful and unique facet of the Project's methodology.



## In Other News...

Below are relevant articles that touch on some of the Paradigm Project's six challenges. We hope you find these useful as you work to make a difference in your own communities and institutions.

**NOTE:** In keeping with the Paradigm Project's work to foster creative thinking by engaging with uncommon and new perspectives, articles may include provocative or non-traditional points of view. Inclusion of these articles doesn't imply endorsement, and all opinions are the authors' own.



## On Scientific Publishing...

ASAPbio is using human-centered design to address the issue of preprints. They hosted a Design Sprint on November 13 for participants to “collaboratively propose, critique, and develop potential interventions” that will promote preprints and the “review of work beyond well-known authors and institutions.” You can participate in the following session on December 3, where you'll have the opportunity to hear project leads present on these potential interventions to judges, who will then award recognition to the most promising projects. Find out more about the Design Sprint on their [event page](#).

The two following Frontiers articles examine the role of attitudes and policies in the uptake and promotion of open science.

First, [here's](#) an article on the drivers and obstacles of open access publishing. Drawing from group discussions and interviews, this qualitative investigation “explores the perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of researchers toward open access (OA) publishing... Overall, the results show that whilst most researchers support the idea of making scientific knowledge freely accessible to everyone, they are hesitant about actually living this practice by choosing OA journals to publish their own work.”

Second, if you're looking to promote open science through policy, you might want to revisit this article on [how](#) the European Commission has “sought to advance open science policy” to make science more “efficient, reliable, and responsive to societal challenges.” The authors outline the European Commission's holistic and integrated actions to make science accessible with a “forward-looking perspective on the challenges laying ahead, in particular the necessary change of the rewards and incentives system for researchers,” while considering the role of artificial intelligence in how knowledge is produced.

Beyond open science, scientific journals must confront another chief issue in publishing: while many scientific journals are proclaiming commitment to racial equity, they aren't collecting the race and ethnicity data to show for it. Interviewees in this New York Times [article](#) contend that scientific publishing is not the meritocratic process that

people imagine it to be, and criteria for publication are subjective and unstandardized. Ambika Kamath, an evolutionary biologist at the University of California, Berkeley, asks of scientific journals, “What does it mean to say ‘I’m in favor of diversity’ when you haven’t even reckoned with what the state of diversity is in your own institution?”

Elsewhere, Alison Mudditt, the CEO of PLoS, writes about the [role](#) of scientific publishing in perpetuating racial inequity, and that systemic change for racial equity must be a fundamental, strategic goal of scientific journals. While she’s a believer that open access research is an important tool in addressing the challenge of inequity, she pushes readers and other scientific publishers to “examine more deeply in the ways in which we - inadvertently or otherwise - perpetuate this dynamic [of inequality].”



## On Science Communication...

Below are two compilations of articles on communication: the first tackles misinformation, while the second outlines the ways communication can be leveraged to influence public policy.

The latest edition of Scientific American centers the theme of misinformation and how to protect society from fear, lies and division. The issue includes five [articles](#) on misinformation, including the roots of vaccine mistrust, an analysis of what the 1990s Internet protest movements share with today’s disinformation campaigns, and COVID-19 misinformation that won’t go away.

This recently updated [compilation](#) of thirteen Stanford Social Innovation Review articles provides practical advice and insightful perspectives on influencing public policy. Many of the articles are older, but they affirm the [importance](#) of storytelling to make social change and the [science](#) of what makes people care.



## On Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in HSR...

In last month’s newsletter, we included an awareness campaign produced by the Sociology and Anthropology Department of Lehigh University, in which students and staff have been asked to share stories of racism at their own institution. This awareness campaign is similar to the storytelling component of a Design Team’s idea that aims to address underrepresentation in the health services research workforce with an experience that sparks a fundamental shift in perspective. The Sociology and Anthropology Department posted a video every week for seven weeks. Find the final video [here](#), and scroll down this [Twitter page](#) to find the videos for weeks 2-6.



## On Community Engagement in Research...

The merged Design Team group is beginning to test and refine their storyboard prototype of a new funding model that shifts the locus of control from researchers and “traditional” partners to patients and communities. Meanwhile, here is an example of patient engagement in research to supplement the discussion.

A self-organized group of “Long Covid” patients, who also happen to be researchers in relevant fields, such as “participatory design, neuroscience, public policy, data collection and analysis, and human-centered design,” works on patient-led research on the “Long Covid” experience. Find out more about this patient-led research [here](#).

Finally, we’d like to remind all Learning Community members that you are invited to participate in testing conversations with any of the five Design Teams that are currently engaged in this process. If you are interested, please reach out to [caitlin.otter@academyhealth.org](mailto:caitlin.otter@academyhealth.org) so that she may match you to a Design Team and schedule a testing conversation with you.

AcademyHealth  
1666 K Street NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20006