**Supplementary Material**

**SM 1. Notes on Data Collection**

*SM1.1 Data on BI Projects*

We coded each project using the Policy/Comparative Policy Agendas codebook. We started by reading each project description and identifying its primary goal. We then assigned each project a single policy topic code based on that goal. For example, one project involved sending Ontario Works clients to free tax clinics. The primary outcome measure is technically tax filing, which could fall under Government Operations. However, this project was run through social services and the project description clearly connects it to Social Welfare. By helping Ontario Works clients file taxes, the BIU sought to help people access other tax-related benefits, like Old Age Security, the Canada Child Benefit, or the Worker’s Benefit. We therefore coded this project as Social Welfare.

*SM1.2 Data on BI Projects*

We collected data from the Government of Canada’s Government Electronic Directory Service (GEDS). For 2022, we used the federal government’s Open Government portal. For 2016-2021, we used the Internet Archive’s Wayback Machine. Specifically, we navigated to the Wayback Machine and searched for the relevant Open Government portal website.

GEDS is appropriate for our purposes and is consistent with prior research estimating the number of ministerial staff and communications staff in government (Glenn 2014, Wilson 2015). However, GEDS is an imperfect representation of who works in the federal government. Some departments are not listed (e.g. certain sections of Canada’s cryptologic security agency, the Communications Security Establishment). Other employees may also be missing, such as those on leave. Nonetheless, the data is rich, and includes name, job title, and work unit for over 200,000 federal employees. Our initial search process involved two data filters: employees whose job title included the word “behaviour” or employees who worked in the IIU (known as the Central Innovation Hub prior to 2017). This yielded 412 observations. We then manually reviewed each employee to determine whether or not they worked in BI. For example, we included federal employees who worked as “Behavioural Researchers” in the Service Insights and Experimentation Division at Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada because this team is a well-known BI unit. However, we excluded employees who worked as “Behavioural Counsellor,” as these individuals worked in a clinical capacity for Correctional Services Canada. Similarly, we excluded IIU staff who worked on non-BI files, such as the “Deep Space Food Challenge.” This resulted in a final dataset of 161 observations over seven time points.

Finally, we note that the number of employees listed in GEDS is not the same as the number of Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs). For example, GEDS shows that 11 employees worked in the IIU in 2018. However, a recent audit shows the number of FTEs at that time was slightly lower at 8.5 (Institute on Governance 2020).

*SM1.3 Growth of BI relative to overall growth of Canada’s federal public service*

In the main analysis, we report an average growth rate in BI staff of about 48% every year. This rate of growth is much faster than the overall rate of growth of the federal public service, which rose from 262,696 employees in 2017 to 319,601 by the end of 2021—an average annual growth rate of approximately 4% (Canada 2017, page 20 and Canada 2022, page 28). The increase is also faster than the growth among policy analysts, which Henderson & Craft (2021, 465) report rose from approximately 14,000 in 2017 to 21,000 in 2021—an average growth of around 8% every year.

**SM2. Estimated federal spending on BI personnel**

It is difficult to estimate annual spending on BI in Canada, as precise budgetary data is unavailable. However, we can use publicly available information to estimate a range of potential salary costs. In 2018-19, the Parliamentary Budget Officer estimated average compensation per Full-Time Equivalent in the federal public service of $115,000 per year (Canada 2019). Also in 2018, an evaluation of the federal government’s Impact and Innovation Unit (called the “Innovation Hub” at the time) showed annual salary expenditures of $1.33M with 8.5 Full-Time Equivalents (FTE), or an average per-FTE cost per BI employee just over $150,000 (Institute on Governance 2018). Given that most BI staff start at the level of a mid-career policy analyst, this amount sounds plausible. Using these two figures, along with our estimated number of BI staff in 2022 (i.e. 63), we believe it is plausible that the Government of Canada currently spends between $7-10M per year on BI staff. This amount does not include operations and other costs, nor does it include spending by provincial or municipal governments.

**SM3. Increasing collaboration between Political Scientists and BI in Canada**

We recognize collaboration is not always easy — researchers may not have contacts in government or know how to begin a conversation about improving a government service. Fortunately, BI units exist within government precisely to encourage these collaborations. These units offer political scientists an on-the-ground focus, including a professional network that spans government departments. Such collaborations are especially important given the impressive research on policy design and implementation by political scientists during COVID-19. Examples includes the optimal way to measure behaviour and communicate with the public (e.g. Armstrong et al., 2020; Daoust et al., 2021; Poirier et al., 2020; Sevi et al., 2020; Sheluchin et al., 2020), gauge public support when designing policy responses (e.g. Rheault & Musulan, 2021), and increase vaccine uptake (e.g. Merkley & Loewen, 2021). In our experience, BI practitioners are eager to collaborate, and political scientists are keen to generate policy impact.

Below, we offer contact information for BI teams across Canada. We invite readers to start a conversation or engage with the work of BI units through reading online reports of previous projects.

*Public Sector & Post-Secondary*

* Government of Ontario
  + Treasury Board: Behavioural Insights Unit (BIU.TBS@ontario.ca)
* Government of British Columbia
  + Public Service Agency: Behavioural Insights Group (big@gov.bc.ca)
* Government of Canada
  + Privy Council Office: Impact and Innovation Unit (iiu-uii@pco-bcp.gc.ca)
  + Employment and Social Development: Innovation Lab (NC-LAB-GD@hrsdc-rhdcc.gc.ca)
  + Public Health Agency: Office of Behavioural Science (bescio-bsc@phac-aspc.gc.ca)
  + Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada: Client Experience Branch (https://secure.cic.gc.ca/enquiries-renseignements/canada-case-cas-eng.aspx)
  + Global Affairs Canada: Evaluation and Results Bureau (experimentation@international.gc.ca)
* City of Vancouver
  + CityStudio (https://citystudiovancouver.com/contact/)
* City of Toronto
  + Customer Experience and Innovation Program (Twitter: @cxitoronto)
* University of Toronto
  + Behavioural Economics in Action at Rotman (bear@rotman.utoronto.ca)
* University of British Columbia
  + Decision Insights for Business and Society (dibs@sauder.ubc.ca)
  + Behavioural Public Policy Lab (vince.hopkins@ubc.ca)

*Social Purpose & Private Sector*

* Behavioural Insights Team (https://www.bi.team/get-in-touch-2/)
* BEworks (info@BEworks.com)
* Bethink Solutions (info@bethinksolutions.com)
* Fresh Squeezed Ideas (info@freshsqueezedideas.com)
* PwC (https://www.pwc.com/ca/en/global/forms/contactUsNew.html?parentPagePath=/content/pwc/ca/en&style)
* The Decision Lab (info@thedecisionlab.com)
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