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WHY TO STUDY HEALTH ENHANCING PHYSICAL ACTIVITY POLICIES?

• Growing sedentarism and health challenges

• Use of both scientific knowledge and practical know-how to make evidence informed decisions for cross sectoral health enhancing physical activity (HEPA) policies

• Timely discussion on the use of research evidence in policy making in Finland, EU countries and globally

• Finland:
  – Working group at the Ministry of Education and Sport on access to sport and physical activity information
  – renewal of the Sport Law
  – making of health enhancing physical activity policy and
  – structural reform of public sector (recentralisation)
REsearch into POlicy to Enhance Physical Activity - REPOPA

- Integrate scientific research evidence, expert know-how & policy making process to increase synergy & sustainability in promoting health and preventing disease
- The aims were reached by
  - Building on research evidence & experiences on policy making processes
  - Studying innovative ways of collaboration between researchers, policymakers and other stakeholder
  - Establishing structures, such as virtual platform and exchanges of good practices for future health promotion through enhanced physical activity
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REPOPA – Results
Role of evidence in policy making

- Countries involved Denmark, Finland, Italy, Netherlands, Romania and England
- 21 policy documents by content analysis of policies
- 86 stakeholders interviewed

Main results:
- Few systematic and explicit use of research evidence + mixed types of evidence used

Main facilitators: administrative support, orientation of organizations towards use of research evidence, relevant and easily available information and knowledge, role of media

Main barriers: traditions, political interests, capacity
Design of REPOPA

First phase: Use of research and other type of evidence in policy making: document analysis and stakeholder interviews
THL - WP leader, all partners

Second phase: Policy game interventions on cross-sector decision making
Tranzo/Netherlands - WP leader, Denmark, Romania

Second phase: Locally tailored interventions on evidence-informed policy making
SDU/Denmark - WP leader, Italy, Netherlands

Third phase: Implementation and guideline development (Delphi)
CNR/Italy - WP leader, all partners

Process and outcome evaluation
Uottawa/Canada - WP leader, all partners

Dissemination, country-specific platforms for evidence-informed policy making
UBB/Romania - WP leader, all partners
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REPOPA Results
Increasing use of research evidence – policy game

- Countries involved Denmark, the Netherlands and Romania
- Three policy games applied at local level; 57 participants
- **Systems analysis** of the context of physical activity policy making; **Questionnaires** to participants in the beginning, right after and 6 months after the game to look at the use of research evidence in policy making

Main results:

- Increased understanding of the local HEPA policy processes
- Increased insights for collaboration in policy making
- Changes in attitudes towards the use of knowledge and research evidence in policy making
- Positive experience in using of policy game in policy making
REPOPA Results
Increasing use of research evidence – Stewardship interventions

- Countries involved Denmark, Italy and the Netherlands
- Six local, needs-based policy interventions of 6-12 months
- Pre, post and 12 months follow ups, with common and context-specific measures

Main results:
- Increased used of evidence from research; not always influential on policymaking; not always sustainable up to 12 months
- Awareness raising for use of research evidence; to keep sustainability for the use of research evidence political request and organizational processes need to be in place
- Politicians got more interested in research knowledge and cooperation of research organizations and stakeholders
- In Denmark a spring-off study to enhance PA among elderly; in Italy longer local intervention
REPOPA Results

eDelphi study to develop indicators for evidence informed policy making (EIPM)

- Countries involved Denmark, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands and Romania + international consultation
- eDelphi process to test and validate indicators for EIPM
- Two eDelphi rounds; 82 panelists
- Validation of EIPM indicators:
  - Generic list of 25 measurable indicators
  - national consensus conferences
  - Indicators included
    - human resources: competences & networking;
    - communication & participation;
    - documentation;
    - monitoring & evaluation;
    - commitment & statements of intents and complex indicators
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Linked projects and video

- **SITLESS** - Reducing sedentary behaviour among older adults – The SITLESS Project
- **PASTA project** - Physical Activity Through Sustainable Transport Approaches
- **Credits for Health C4H** - aimed at finding out and testing a system effective in engaging, nurturing and keeping people committed in the adoption of personalised wellness paths and healthy life-styles
- **EUROFIT** - engage men through their connection with their clubs to make sustainable improvements in their diet, activity, and physical fitness
- **REPOPA** - REsearch into POlicy to Enhance Physical Activity
- **VIDEO:**
  - [https://www.dropbox.com/sh/fni4vmraekvja9l/AABKT9z5bfpzWtm2t0aNRvwia?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/fni4vmraekvja9l/AABKT9z5bfpzWtm2t0aNRvwia?dl=0)
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