



## **Innovation Mainstreaming CoP October 2008 Report**

**Eudaimonia, Unipessoal Lda**

[www.eudaimonia.pt](http://www.eudaimonia.pt)

Overview	3
Steering Group meeting - 6th October 2008	3
EU Open Days - 7th October 2008	3
The Lisbon workshop	3
Social Reporting	4
Activity on the site	4
Reflections and next steps	5
<i>EU workshop</i>	5
<i>Website and its organisation</i>	5
<i>Social Reporting</i>	6
Annex 1	8
Annex 2	8
Annex 3	8

## Overview

October saw two major events - the EU Open Day workshop and the Lisbon workshop. There was also a Steering Group meeting for preparing recommendations for ESF decision-makers.

## Steering Group meeting - 6th October 2008

- A Steering Group meeting was held in the EC office the day before the EU Open Days. There were some reflective discussions about the factors that stimulate social innovation for improving the recommendations to decision-makers. A more interesting title than “Recommendations” was discussed as well as the need for more context.
- Preparations for the EU workshop to take place on the following day were also made at the meeting.
- An account of this can be found on the site here: <http://innovation.esflive.eu/node/730>

## EU Open Days - 7th October 2008

- A report on the workshop was submitted to the European Commission and is attached in **Annex 1**. Participants were invited to give their comments, suggestions and questions on post-it notes during the workshop and these have been transcribed in **Annex 2**. They also appear as a comment on the event in the CoPIM website (<http://innovation.esflive.eu/node/580#comment-118>)

## The Lisbon workshop

The Lisbon workshop took place on the 27th October. David Wilcox, UK also supported the facilitation and social reporting. Lucy Pepper, a illustrator based in Portugal, made informal drawings of people at the event which can be found in [a slideshow on YouTube](#) and embedded in the CoPIM site.

An account of the event, including the slideshows, the informal videos and text about the event can be found here: <http://innovation.esflive.eu/node/644>

Further videos of the event can also be found in blip.tv here: <http://copim.blip.tv>. These videos were taken by participants at the event.

## Social Reporting

The rough draft of a social reporting toolbox is being created in a wiki here:<http://srtoolbox.wikispaces.com/>. The idea is to create a comprehensive, but also emergent toolbox that is accumulating the experience of social reporting events that can inform other people who want to do social reporting. Documenting and reflecting about “what happened” at different events is informing the final toolbox, which will be written for the EQUAL event “Powering a new future”. This “final” event will be a snapshot from the wiki which will continue into the future.

In the spirit of mainstreaming and scaling up the wiki was also used to inform the social reporting of a Portuguese local event for Anim@Te (<http://animate08.wordpress.com/>) and adapted and the toolbox is being adapted and translated into Portuguese (<http://animatesr.wikispaces.com/>)

## Activity on the site

### Three new members

- Milos Gáfrik, Bratislava, Slovakia - Project Manager for the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic
- Carlos Ribeiro, Portugal - Anop
- Luisa Moar, Venice Mestre - Technical Assistance to ESF Programme

The number of spammers who register on the site is now very high. There can be up to fifteen spammers a day (although not on all days). Sometimes it is easy to see what is spam and what is not spam. Other times it is not so easy because people choose user names such as “marinescum” and “gouda777”. That means I have to check each new user and spammer’s profile in order to verify if they are a genuine user or not. While there are advantages to making registration easy, there are also disadvantages in terms of managing spam.

### No new tools

- There were no new resources in October.

### Site statistics

According to Google Analytics (**see annex 1**) there were 380 visits to the site in October and 2,256 pageviews. The average number of pages visited is 5.9 and the bounce rate went down to 49%. Visitors to the site spent around five and a half minutes on the site with 43% of visits were from new or first-time visitors. Except for new visitors (the number of which fell) the site statistics are considerably higher than the previous month reflecting the two events in October.

The most frequently visited page after the homepage is the report on the Lisbon Workshop (<http://innovation.esflive.eu/node/644>) followed by the power point presentation by Ana Vale about the

CoP on Innovation and Mainstreaming. The next most frequently viewed page is the page about “What is (or isn’t) social innovation?” (<http://innovation.esflive.eu/node/662>)

Most of the visits to the site (66%) come directly, suggesting that people mostly click into the site from an email. 25% of visits to the site came from a google search on these expressions: “key stages of innovation”. “community of practice of social innovation”, “maria nunes”, “powering a new future” and “jose manuel lacleta”.

## Reflections and next steps

There was a lot of work carried out in October, both in terms of organising and facilitating the events, and also on reporting the events and in preparing the toolbox. I learned some significant lessons from social reporting that also surface questions about the nature of this community of practice and about the online tools for the community. What follows is some of the learning plus a recommendation for future similar situations.

### EU workshop

As with the process of preparing the workshop last year, much of the learning happened in the steering group in the process of preparing the content and activities. I think that the workshop itself, while of some value to the audience, was very context specific.

**Recommendation:** in future workshops I would keep the structure of the workshop simpler, bearing in mind that the audience were not very familiar with EQUAL. The post-it notes for comments and suggestions was very interesting and could have been used as a start of conversations online.

### Website and its organisation

The life-cycle of this community of practice is drawing to a close, and there is little value in making any major investment in changing the website. However, it is worth noting that the value of a Drupal site being used as a blogging tool has not been fully taken advantage of at any time. For example, the social reporting of the event was carried out on a page inside the “Event reports” rather than as tagged blogposts on the front page. The expectations of people who use this site is that it is more a publishing or broadcasting tool rather than as a co-created space for inviting people into the community or of carrying conversations one step further. I am the only person who is able to use the space, which should count as a weaknesses in the CoP’s activities.

**Recommendation:** Given the level of online activity and interest of steering group members in online tools, the platform is probably rather ambitious. There needs to be a team of people doing the work of the facilitation and site maintenance, including dealing with the smap.

## Social Reporting

The Lisbon workshop was a good opportunity to continue refining the social reporting toolbox. Here are some of the lessons from about social reporting from this event:

**What is social reporting?** Social reporting is a way of deepening conversations and is not a way of producing accurate reports of “what happened”. This is a different approach to the traditional idea of broadcasting results of an event and is not always apparent when people are first introduced to it. Some people whose conversational videos appeared on the website were concerned that their conversation was not appropriate and even asked for a Power Point presentation to substitute the video. Part of the reason for this is that the final outcome of the social reporting was to be published on the official CoPIM website. This meant that on the one hand people were being told that this was informal and conversational. On the other hand, their conversations were published on an official site, which gave the idea that they should be producing the official line.

**Recommendation:** have a separate online space for particular events, which are linked to from the main site, but which are not part of the official site.

**Time.** Social reporting takes much more time than I ever anticipated. Filming, recording and interviewing are the least time-consuming activities in the social reporting process. I greatly underestimated the time it takes for post-production work, including:

Uploading files

compressing files to make them more easily uploadable and downloadable;

preparing captions for the videos and audio files, with text that puts it into context;

Editing videos;

Embedding code into the site;

Bringing closure to the conversations started by the social reporting.

**Recommendation:** plan and budget (people) resources for doing these tasks.

**Roles: facilitation and social reporting.** It was very helpful dividing the roles between facilitation and social reporting, allowing both David and I share in the planning and follow-up of each task but focusing on the activities of just one during the event.

**Recommendation:** pay attention to the different roles of people involved in the social reporting process.

**Dissemination and voluntary social reporters.**

The participation of voluntary social reporters was a very satisfactory element of the process. They were keen to learn what to do in order that they could use it in their own practice. Since the Lisbon workshop two voluntary social reporters have talked with me how they have used the concept and activities in carrying out their own event. It could have been more productive and interesting for them if we had organised more preparation for the social reporters, involving them in some of the pre-and post-event activities.

**Recommendation:** if possible have a skype conversation or meeting with social reporters before the event to engage them in the process at an earlier stage in the process.

## **Annex 1 - EU Open Day workshop report**

(see attachment)

## **Annex 2 - EU workshop comments and suggestions**

- As many speakers mentioned "amending" the validation methodology to make this relevant and acceptable for their countries. Is there a danger the validation process and therefore the outcome could be diluted?
- What have been the major successes of this transnational network and what are your priorities for change during 2007-13 programme?
- I expected to discuss successful projects (as failed ones...) but it was not the case.
- What are the worst practices of social reform?
- What are the elements of success of social innovations and reforms?
- In what ways did you involve residents in the programme and what influence did they have in what stage of the project?
- I find interesting the subject.
- What do innovative actions mean in terms of modern public management? What are the prerequisites of a more effective system?
- Role of the public administration in the innovation process?
- I am interested in learning the exact practices of how to support reforms.
- Next to ESF/EQUAL so want to learn some best practice based on experience regarding reform and organisational change and how to implement this effectively e.g. what worked, what didn't and why.
- Why CoP? Do CoPs are better when it comes to mainstreaming innovation than other "bodies" i.e. working groups?
- How to identify innovation?
- Change in processes and structure are more easy than changes in mental models. But all three are important. How can we reach all three types of change?

## **Annex 3 - Google analytics, October 2008**

(see attachment)