FB 2

Empowering implementation scientists: Exploring needs and opportunities

Marie-Therese Schultes[1], Monika Sztankay[2], Tina Quasdorf[3], Monika Finsterwald[1,4], Leah Bührmann[5], Julia Klug[6]

[1]*University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland*
[2]*Medical University Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria*
[3]*Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Winterthur, Switzerland*
[4]*Karl Landsteiner University of Health Sciences, Krems, Austria*
[5]*Northumbria University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, United Kingdom*
[6]*Salzburg University of Education Stefan Zweig, Salzburg, Austria*

Introduction
In this idea jam hosted by the German-speaking implementation network INFo-P, we invite colleagues from Europe and beyond to discuss implementation researchers' needs regarding networking, education, and funding opportunities. We will explore potential international differences in infrastructural conditions for conducting implementation science and deduct ways in which researchers from different countries can learn from and support each other.

Our Fishbowl – a World Café
As part of a survey study within the "Promote ImpSci" project, we assessed the current implementation research infrastructure in German-speaking countries. In this study, implementation researchers from Germany, Austria, and Switzerland gave insight into their networking, education, and funding needs. We found that formal networks are highly relevant, especially for early career researchers. Regarding education, respondents wished for a better integration of implementation science in formal educational structures and courses geared to different levels of competence. In terms of funding, there was a desire for more lobbying for implementation science within academic and funding bodies so that implementation science aspects are integrated and considered in existing funding structures.

We will explore these topics with a wider international audience. We will host a **world café**, which allows a large group of participants to engage. Depending on the number of participants, we will discuss at least three main questions around three to six tables. Each table will be hosted by a facilitator, who poses the question to the table's audience/discussants. Comments are collected on sticky notes on a flipchart. After 15 minutes, discussants from the audience move on to another table. The facilitator presents the results of previous discussions and encourages the new discussants to add their comments. After three rounds, the facilitators present the main results to the audience.

Key questions
The key question leading our symposium is, "What are the key challenges and support factors for conducting implementation research?". Participants will discuss the three main questions: "What are implementation scientists' needs with regard to (1) networks, (2) education, and (3) funding?"

Key highlights
We will take on a meta-perspective of the conditions that can make implementation research successful. Discussion questions will focus on the infrastructure needed for conducting scientifically sound implementation research while using existing resources pragmatically.

Implications for research and practice
Context factors are important not only for implementing evidence-informed practice but also for developing implementation science as an academic discipline. A number of barriers and enablers influence the possibility of conducting implementation research. In this symposium, we want to explore these with regard to networking, education, and funding.