

## JUNE 2014 NEWSLETTER

Welcome to the ninth edition of the TEPSIE newsletter.

Our newsletter updates you regularly on our most important findings and updates you on what is happening in the Tepsie project. During the course of the project we decided to enrich the newsletter and to allow each partner to design a newsletter edition. This newsletter focusses on the state of social innovation in Central & Eastern Europe.

One could not summarize our intentions better than with the mission statement of our partner organizations at our recent international social innovation conference we co-organized in Lodz, Poland:

*The Unit for Social Innovation and Research – Shipyard is a new organization but it was created as a result of attempts of persons connected with the Polish non-governmental sector for many years. It was created with the aim of critical and reliable description of challenges of social life in Poland and searching and promoting effective, innovative methods of reacting to them based on civic participation. It also sets itself a target of formation and intellectual development of persons from different environments, ready to engage in public affairs in a way going beyond individual interests.*

*What is especially important in actions run by the Shipyard is reinforcement of co-operation between two environments: researchers-scientists and civil activists working also in non-governmental organizations.*

*Actions taken by the Shipyard will concentrate on three key issues: development of local communities, social innovations and civic participation. The Shipyard wants to be helpful in building and supplementing knowledge on social dimensions of local activity and local development. It also wants to be a place of discussion on the importance,*

*nature and conditions favourable for development of social innovations. Its ambition is also to become one of the initiators of wider reflection on the essence and methods of civic participation.*

From <http://stocznia.org.pl/about-us/>

This newsletter contains a report on our recent Tepsie conference which aimed to increase the understanding of issues and policy options in Central & Eastern Europe of social innovation at both local and regional levels.

As usual we also report back from events attended and point you to the highlight of entries on our portal – [www.siresearch.eu](http://www.siresearch.eu). Don't miss the section "what to expect in the near future".

**Be the change!**

Happy reading.



Gwendolyn Carpenter  
Senior European Policy Advisor, DTI  
Director of Dissemination, Tepsie

## SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE STATE OF SOCIAL INNOVATION IN POLAND



*Przemyslaw Leszek, PhD student (doctoral) affiliated to Institute of Economic Sciences, University of Wrocław*

### How innovative is Poland in terms of social innovation?

To quantify the amount of socially innovative activity in Poland – or rather how advanced the Polish system of social innovation is – is rather a difficult task. However, Poland is definitely not a leader in this field.

Determining the degree of effectiveness of the Polish social innovation system is associated with a general issue which relates to methods of measuring innovation in the social sphere, and which still hasn't been satisfactorily resolved.

It is rather clear that the measurement of innovation cannot be made using any direct method. With reference to the traditional understanding of innovation (in science and technology) indirect approaches are used to assess innovation, for example setting summary innovation indexes.

They are syntheses of a number of diverse partial indicators that relate to, for example, public or industry expenditure on R&D, the share of venture capital in GDP, the amount of engineering graduates, employment in high-technology sectors, the number of patents, etc.

Due to the nature of their components, these indicators are not suitable for the measurement of social innovation. In this context it is worth mentioning that in TEPSIE we are working on identifying alternatives, which will allow us to measure social innovation more effectively.

Although such a method has not yet been developed or tested, there are still some reasons why Poland is not among the most innovative countries in Europe:

1. most Polish examples of "social innovation" are in fact implementations of foreign solutions, better or worse adapted to the Polish reality;
2. there is an undeveloped infrastructure to support social innovation (hubs, centres of research and analysis, intermediaries, networks, etc.);
3. both the academic sector and the public are not especially interested in the subject of social innovation, although this is rapidly changing;
4. approaching the issue more analytically, one can take a look at indicators that must be logically related to the condition of the social innovation system, like the number of actors in the social economy in the country, the number of start-ups in the social entrepreneurship sector, the level of employment in the social economy, public budgets for the social economy, the amount of volunteers, the level of participation/civic engagement (for example participation in elections), etc. In this respect, Poland is usually at the tail end of Europe.



Wall tattoo in Lodz, Poland – Source: Gwendolyn Carpenter



Participants at the International Social Innovation Conference, 17. June 2014, in Lodz, Poland – Source: Gwendolyn Carpenter

### The main barrier for social innovation?

Among the many barriers to social innovation in Poland, one is highly specific to the country, and at the same time very difficult to overcome: the immaturity of Polish civil society and a relative lack of 'social capital' in Poland.

In more 'mature' democracies many examples of social innovation are grassroots initiatives, arising from citizens and social activists who often closely cooperate with local authorities, institutions, philanthropists, social entrepreneurs, innovators, etc. These people not only know the ins and outs of local problems, but often experience them themselves, and, most importantly, have a strong motivation to seek solutions.

The problem is that an average Pole is not especially interested and involved in the life of local communities (it is clearly visible during elections, both at a local and national level, when very low voter turnouts are observed; also during meetings of housing associations, in the philanthropic activity level, etc.). On the contrary, Poles are rather characterized by their lack of initiative in the social domain, passivity and lack of confidence.

Probably the lack of this kind of socio-civic maturity has been, and will be, one of the most important brakes on the progress and development of social innovation in Poland. It is a serious barrier, all the more alarming as it is almost impossible to eliminate in a short time, requiring a dramatic change in social attitudes.

### A possible way forward

A good starting point to strengthen social innovation in Poland seems to be a systematic analysis of cases from abroad, especially from the U.S. and the countries of the 'old' EU. In this respect foreign literature and experiences are far richer than Polish ones. There are many European institutes and centres that have been involved for a long time in social innovation and publish reports, surveys and case studies (NESTA, Young Foundation, and networks of social innovators like the Social Innovation Exchange, Ashoka, etc.).

Bearing in mind the above, it could be a good idea to set up a research institute in Poland – dedicated to and specializing in the field of social innovation – which would gather the competences of social scientists (searching for and reporting what works, analysing the possibility of implementing specific solutions, assisting in their implementation), NGOs and social activists (assessment of the desirability and usefulness of selected solutions in specific local conditions, proposals of alterations, implementation), local government (implementation of specific solutions in the public sector) and business (implementation of a business model to ensure greater potential for replication).

It may seem an unoriginal idea, especially for someone who lives in the 'old' EU. The thing is that currently in Poland there is no such institute or organization specializing in social innovation.

## PUBLIC AWARENESS OF SOCIAL INNOVATION IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC



*Marek Vyskočil, Centre for Nonprofit Sector Research, Masaryk University*

Social innovation is a relatively new topic in the Czech Republic. Although awareness has increased in the last few years, it is not surprising that public support of social innovation is still in the early stages.

Social innovation became a popular topic for academics due to European funding and important research projects like TEPSIE and ITSSOIN. More small-scale social innovation research projects started in universities or were proposed to grant agencies. Awareness of social innovation research connected to social economics was spread to other academics and social economists through conferences and workshops.

The non-profit sector and social service sector have long been aware of the importance of social innovations. This is evidenced by the Institute of Social Innovation, established in 2002, a research institute which promotes social innovations.

Other examples include the SozialMarie awards and support from the RESPEKT Institute. SozialMarie awards have been granted since 2005 by Unruhe Privatstiftung, encouraging social innovation projects that can then serve as examples or models for other interested parties. The RESPEKT Institute also provides financial support for social innovation projects. Sometimes social innovations are supported by grants such as those from the T-Mobile foundation and by donors supporting innovative ideas, social economics, and public benefit programs without a specific focus on social innovation as the key aim.

With the increased awareness of the topic, some grantors have changed their programs to be more oriented toward social innovation. The non-profit sector and researchers are now focused on social innovation, but the government has largely ignored this topic, even though social innovation could offer potential solutions for many problems that should be covered by public policies. A "Social innovation" call from The Operational Program Human Resources and Employment (OP HRE) of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic (MoLSA), which supports social innovation, was the first important acknowledgment of social innovation and support by the government. This program is the first direct government support of social innovation in the Czech Republic.

MoLSA announced the call for OP HRE in 2013. As an academic call, it could be a breakthrough for social innovators. Hopefully, it will mean a new support system for social innovation in the Czech Republic. The Center for Innovation Studies (CIS) declared that the call from the Ministry was helpful and innovative, playing a truly important role in the process of social innovation in order to reach intended goals. CIS stated that it is necessary to appreciate the courage of MoLSA for initiating the call, as well as for the readiness and options of the program. Without the proper conditions and the knowledge for assessing social innovations, the call would be useless, according to CIS.

The first call, in 2013, was answered by eleven applicants with projects totalling approximately 72 million CZK from a total of 150 million CZK allocated (approximately 5.5 million euro). Only three applicants were successful, with 12 million granted. In the second call, in 2014, 66 applicants asked for 366 million CZK; eleven were successful with 109 million CZK granted.

We can find some positive views of the call for social innovations that mainly highlight the call as a new source of financing for social economic projects and non-profits. According to the program, the call should help applicants with innovative solutions to problems of unemployment, professional education, integration of excluded minorities, ineffectiveness in public administration, and international cooperation. However, the call still has its limits.

The call tries to offer applicants a high level of freedom that is however restricted by the framework of structural funds of the EU. It is not well oriented to innovation, which is a problem of all EU program financing. It is too rule-based, rigid, and bureaucratic for some social innovators. Some criticisms are that the call is too difficult for smaller social innovators to apply for and that the criteria are not optimal for social innovation. For example, the program seems confused between social innovation and technical innovation.



Visiting local social innovation art incubator in Lodz, Poland – Source: Gwendolyn Carpenter



For example, there is an emphasis on start-up expenses and coming up with ideas (similar to financing of research) more than sustainability and results. One evaluation of the program states that it is insufficiently evidence based, and that in any case the ability of applicants to advocate for their cause in order to obtain resources is more important than evidence. Employees of the Ministry have commented that there could be problems in assessing the financed projects and their impact in the future.

The call may have some problems and may not be well adjusted. It is still a great effort towards direct support of social innovation, unseen in the Czech Republic or many other countries. We can foresee that the call will evolve and hopefully it will have a positive impact on the amount and quality of social innovation.

Another example of acknowledging social innovations by public bodies (albeit not as important as the call of MoLSA) is the Regional Innovative Strategy of the Capital City Prague. This strategy, regularly compiled since 2004, emphasizes innovation; in 2013, it acknowledged social innovation and established a goal for future years to map possibilities of supporting social innovations in order to solve social problems in the Prague region. The 2014 version of this regional strategy only states the goal of mapping needs of social innovators without further elaboration.

The support of social innovation in the strategy for Prague thus probably remains unused, but at least it was noticed and incorporated. I have illustrated the present situation and the recent evolution in the Czech Republic in the field of social innovation. Social innovation awareness is growing mainly in the fields of social economics and non-profits, then the academic sphere, and finally it has started to appear in government documents.

I highlighted what I consider to be most pro-active access, the call for support of social innovations from European funds that could produce a big change in the government approach towards social innovations in the future. This brief look at the Czech Republic should offer the foreign reader insight into Czech conditions and material for comparison.

## SOCIAL INNOVATION IN ACTION: A CASE STUDY FROM POLAND



*Dawid Cieřlik, architect and founder of <http://cohousing.pl/>*

Cohousing (Community Housing) refers to a highly integrated housing community which retains a balance between intimate private living space and open access to common facilities. It is composed of individual houses and common spaces open to all inhabitants. Every apartment is efficiently connected with common space, such as a kitchen and dining area or playrooms for children – which are the most important feature of the idea. The development also has some typical leisure facilities, for example a swimming pool, sport fields, gardens, playgrounds and others.

Cohousing is characterised by grassroots organization with the active participation of all the inhabitants as opposed to one central managing body. The key feature of this kind of a housing project is a free selection of elements. Both the construction mode and building types as well as the design of the common spaces will depend on the inhabitants themselves.

Recent months in Poland have seen some energetic activity in this space. There has been the emergence of the first groups interested in setting up cohousing communities and creating their own perfect living spaces in order to raise their children, provide comfortable retirement for themselves as well as ensure considerable savings. The cohousing development as part of the Active Senior Foundation's activity is managed by an architect Dawid Cieřlik and the foundation's chairman Marek Ferenc. Since 2006, he has been involved in scientific research into modern living solutions.

Dawid Cieřlik is also the first cohousing activist in Poland and represents Polish cohousing projects on an international level. He manages the web portal: Modern Communities. Together with the Active Senior Foundation they lead the project under the Grundtvig program. The aim of the project is to organize knowledge about senior communities around Europe. It is very important for Poland, because the topic is absolutely innovative.



Source: Gwendolyn Carpenter

The Active Senior Foundation and Modern Communities have found a place in the business model of cohousing for the principles of sustainable development. In many ways they seek to ensure that people in the second half of life have a more comfortable living place. Construction of the development is supervised by a diverse team of experts who make sure that modern planning, architectural, social and business solutions are properly applied. Paradoxically, this innovative approach to designing housing projects is rooted in the once utopian ideas and projects created decades ago.

However, it is only now that modern advanced technology has been able to overcome the barriers of the construction market and set new trends for the future. Each building has been devised with a digital operating system which guarantees more cost-efficient energy management. It controls lighting, appliances, blinds, alarm system and heating via indoors control panels (such as computers) as well as remote devices (a mobile phone or a tablet). The system follows the latest trends in efficient energy use and enhanced comfort of living. It is simple and intuitive, so there is no need to read long manuals in order to use it. The dream of managing one's home from any remote location in the world now comes true and access to cutting-edge technology becomes a part of everyday life.

The aim of the Foundation and Modern Communities were initiated with one major goal in mind: to widen the knowledge base which indicates how to create as healthy and balanced a living space as possible by means of commonly kept vegetable gardens and various facilities dedicated to personal development for both children and

adults. Strengthening neighbourly relations could be achieved by creating a network of support through the exchange of goods and services as well as fostering good neighbour practices.

Selected facilities are dedicated to workshops and seminars led by experts in various crafts which help develop manual skills and artistic sensitivity. Children can learn and play together in designated areas supervised by adults. Spending time together in leisure zones and sport facilities improve interpersonal relations and the ability to work as part of a team as well as helping to make life-long friendships. Therefore, solutions proposed by the Active Senior Foundation and Modern Communities enable combining the privacy of one's home with sociable forms of spending time in a community as well as neighbourly support.

Both in terms of design and getting knowledge as well as management, Active Senior Foundation's strategy is marked by innovation. We cannot stress enough the revolutionary change in management: from the once centrally controlled to grassroots decision-making and participation of all inhabitants.

## HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE SIRESEARCH.EU PORTAL



*Rachel Schon, The Young Foundation (UK)*

As part of our research work on social innovation, Tepsie aimed to innovate also how European research projects work, and has created a European portal dedicated to social innovation: [www.Siresearch.eu](http://www.Siresearch.eu). Here are some of the highlights:

**Rachel Schon** writes about the Teach For All Network, in the context of research that The Young Foundation has been doing into the way that individual innovations spread. Teach For All is an umbrella organisation that exists to spread a particular model of training young people to create systemic change within their national education systems. Rachel explains that the Teach For All Network has reached thirty-four countries in six years, yet has had to make many adaptations in order to make sense within diverse contexts. She considers that the success of the Teach For All network highlights key issues around the trade-offs between control and flexibility for innovations that are replicated in new contexts.

**Greg Winfield** writes about the Transition programme for incubating social innovations. He explains that while the social innovation community can sometimes feel insufficiently diverse, the innovators with whom he has been working on Transition are not 'the usual suspects' and that this creates marvellous opportunities for collaboration, shared learning and truly disruptive social innovation. In particular, Greg is excited about the Transnational Startup Lab, which will take the most promising concepts and put them through an intensive training process in another European country. This will hopefully result in expansion into new markets, further enriching the social innovation community.

**Anton Shelupanov** writes about the potential for social innovation within the criminal justice system. He explains that criminal justice has not traditionally been seen as a fertile ground for social innovation, yet this is changing. Together with his colleagues at the Centre for Justice Innovation, he has written a book, 'Streetcraft', based on interviews with almost thirty pioneering criminal justice practitioners.



Source: Gwendolyn Carpenter

The book details a wealth of promising grassroots innovation within the sector, yet finds that there is a worrying gap in support structures for innovation within some of the larger governmental and non-governmental institutions. He details a variety of reasons why this might be the case, and explains the importance of supporting emerging criminal justice innovators early on.

**John René Keller Lauritzen** writes about a new book he has written, 'Creating Welfare Together: Better Solutions with Social Innovation'. He believes that now is the time to begin developing specific tools and guidelines on how social innovation can be promoted and how social value can be maximised. The book introduces the reader to the concept of social innovation and how it can be spread through scaling and diffusion. In particular, the book praises Denmark as having unique potential to be a global hotbed for social innovation, given the strong social ties between people and the flexibility of Danish public sector institutions.

## EVENTS UPDATE



*Gwendolyn Carpenter, Danish Technological Institute (DK)*

We both organize and attend key events on social innovation globally. Here are the events we would like to highlight. An emerging key theme in social innovation is social investment and social policy innovation. Jeremy Millard was a key speaker at a conference on this in Brussels. We co-organized a conference on international social innovation with a specific focus on Eastern & Central Europe in Lodz, Poland.

### **Conference on Mobilising Social Policy Innovation, 19-20 May 2014, Brussels, Belgium**



*Jeremy Millard, Danish Technological Institute (DK)*

On 19-20 May 2014, the European Commission's DG Research and DG Employment organized a potentially ground-breaking conference on "social policy innovation". A mixed audience of over 400 policy-makers, academics, and practitioners from public, private and civil sectors debated, discussed and exchanged experiences on this important topic. Social innovation was a major theme underpinning the realization that good policy-making and implementation needs to work with social innovators at all levels, as well as draw on their practical insights.

The purpose of the conference was "to contribute to a new focus and better understanding among public authorities and stakeholders on how social policy innovation catalyses structural reforms based on a social investment perspective, as described in the Social Investment Package and the new programme for Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI). By doing so, the Conference was designed to help Member States and other actors reach the targets of the Europe 2020 Strategy."

Amongst many relevant topics, the role of evidence-based research and knowledge-sharing for implementing innovative social policy reforms was considered by examining traditional as well as newer measurement tools and instruments. These included good practices, peer reviews and learning, dialogue, workshops and debate, as well as more rigorous and 'scientific' methods like randomised control trials (RCTs) and statistical matching. Existing European frameworks, like that deployed by the European Alliance of Families which focuses on the three main parameters of effectiveness, transferability and sustainability, were examined.

### **Series of meetings to draft the declaration „Soziale Innovationen für Deutschland“ (Social Innovations for Germany)**



*Gunnar Glänzel, Centre for Social Investment, University of Heidelberg (DE)*

The declaration „Soziale Innovationen für Deutschland“ (Social Innovations for Germany) has been drafted in Dortmund on June 6. The kick-off was attended by a very diverse audience from academia and think tanks, civil society, the private sector, policy as well as numerous practitioners and promoters of social innovation. Initiated by the European Business Oestrich-Winkel and the World Vision Institute, the declaration will be signed in Oestrich-Winkel on June 27 and presented to the public in following events.

The declaration builds on the insight that the potential of social innovation to provide solutions for complex societal challenges has so far not been recognized well enough, neither by policy-makers nor by society as a whole. Therefore, the need is increasingly visible for political, institutional, educational, cultural and societal change which harnesses social innovation for more people, organisations and society. Consequently, the topic and practice have to be promoted through the commitment of at least two groups of actors: The signers of the declaration who commit themselves to undertake a number of concrete measures, and those in charge of making key decisions in policy and in the private sector.



The TEPSIE team and the Centre for Social Investment (CSI) of Heidelberg University were represented by the author to inject TEPSIE findings into the draft. In particular, we felt it was important to bring in what we have learned about the nature of social innovation: Its practical dimension, the importance of newness, impact and dissemination, as well as its orientation towards social needs. A short discussion of associated definitional issues made clear that the audience appreciated our view on what social innovation is and what is distinct about it.

In the course of the conference, it became clear that four different target groups have to be addressed with concrete recommendations: Policy, business, research and education, and civil society. Taskforces for each of the four areas were quickly set up to develop the initial ideas gathered during the kick-off into a single draft document. In the next step, the full draft will be discussed and after that the declaration will be signed by a limited number of original signatories, the CSI being among them.

We will write up more information about the vision, content and impact we expect from this declaration on our blog – [www.siresearch.eu](http://www.siresearch.eu).

**Tepsi's International Social Innovation Conference, 17. June 2014, Lodz, Poland**



*Witold Kwasnicki, Professor of Economics, University of Wrocław*

The Social Innovation Conference was organized together by TEPSIE and the Lodz University of Technology on the 17th of June, 2014, in Lodz, Poland. The Unit for Social Innovation and Research Stocznia (The Shipyard, <http://stocznia.org.pl/www/>) was the Conference partner. Stocznia is one of the leading Polish organizations focused on social innovation application and scaling. An integral Part of the Conference was the TEPSIE Policy Workshop on Scaling, Digital Social Innovation and Measuring Impact.

The Conference started with a plenary session on Social Innovation – Challenges and barriers. The first Lecture, titled 'Where do social innovations come from and how to foster them?' was given by Kuba Wygnanski (President of the Board, Unit for Social Innovation and Research Shipyard). He spoke on the growing importance

of social innovation grassroots activities in Poland. His speech was followed by a presentation of the social innovation activities of the National Research and Development Centre in Poland ('Social innovation from the perspective of the National Research and Development Centre'). Joanna Makocka and Adam Kazmierczak (Coordinators of the Social Innovation Research Programme) from the National Centre described the goals and results of the two competitions for grants (in 2013 and 2014) on social innovations: 'a programme to support the scientific sector and the economic environment within the scope of taking up and executing innovative operations and social initiatives'.

Representatives of local government described public programs supporting the development of the social economy and social innovation in the Lodz region. Łukasz Prykowski, Lodz Mayor's Representative of Cooperation with Non-governmental Organisations, spoke on the standards of cooperation of Lodz with voluntary sector, information policy for NGO creation, and supports given by the Social Innovations Fund in Lodz.

Next, Barbara Sidor-Pietras from the Regional Center for Social Policy in Lodz outlined the activities and tasks of the Provincial Government of Lodz which are focused on the alignment of life chances for people requiring support and at risk of exclusion. She presented short description of works carried out with other units of the Provincial Government, local government units, government administration, churches and religious organizations, associations, foundations, institutions of health, education and culture, scientific research units and individuals.

The practical aspect of social innovation activity was the subject of two other talks. Małgorzata Barosiak from The Lodz Centre of Excellence for Teacher Training and Practical Training (The Office of the Marshal of Lodz), in her lecture 'Implementation of educational innovation based on a project realised by the City of Lodz' described an implementation of educational innovation called Innovative Training Program Vocational Guidance.

In the last speech Aleksandra Krolak from the Medical Electronics Division, Lodz University of Technology spoke on 'Alternative methods of Human-Computer Interaction' and presented her own research focused on The b-Link computer programme dedicated for disabled people. This programme gives the opportunity to control a computer just by blinking.



International workshop participants in Lodz, Poland Source: Gwendolyn Carpenter

After that session, John Lauritzen, Danish Technological Institute, Project Manager for TEPSIE, led the TEPSIE Policy Workshop on Scaling, Digital Social Innovation, Measuring Impact. Julie Simon presented 'Growing what works – Key issues in scaling social innovation'. This was followed by Tricia Hackett 'Insight into Realising Ambition programme' and Kostas Modikos who gave a presentation on 'Knowing what works - Measuring Impact'. Gwendolyn Carpenter presented why digital social innovation was a key enabler for emergence, scaling and growth of social innovation and Peter Baeck, Leader of Digital Social innovation Project, Nesta, presented 'Insights into Mapping Digital Social Innovation'.

After lunch, two hours were spent on workshop sessions prepared by the Shipyard; 'How to boost social innovation?' Maciej Pilaszek and Zofia Komorowska (with cooperation of Agata Stafi ej-Bartosik from Ashoka) were moderators of the workshop session. All participants were divided into groups. To each group a specific social innovation (case study) was assigned and each group was asked to 'discuss whether this social innovation is a success and what does that mean' and to answer (on flipcharts) three questions: 'What enabled this social innovation's success?', 'What made it difficult or impossible for this innovation to succeed?', and 'What else could have driven this innovation's success?'. Leaders of these groups presented results of their discussions. At the end of the session Kuba Wygnanski made a summary of the workshop session.

Finally, a 'Panel discussion on learning from today: feedback from workshops' was given by John Lauritzen, Elżbieta Jędrych, Kuba Wygnanski and Witold Kwasnicki. Short remarks about key policy areas to support and scale social innovation in Central and Eastern Europe were given by experts from those countries. Tetyana Shtanko and Victor Shtanko (Ivan Franko National University of Lviv) talked about the current state of social innovation activities in the Ukraine, Oleg Oberemko (Department for Methods of Collection and Analysis of Sociological Information in Higher School of Economics, Moscow) gave insights into what is going on in Russia, and Jakub Pejcal together with Marek Vyskočil (Masaryk University, Brno), reported on the state of social innovation in the Czech Republic.

The final part of the conference was led by Joanna Roczek and Katarzyna Kędzierska (Lodz European Institute). Their presentation, 'Introducing learning from local SI – Keep calm and do social innovation', gave a general picture of the numerous social economy activities in Lodz. At the end of the day the participants were invited to an almost three hours 'tour of Social Innovation initiatives in Lodz'. Participants of the conference were able to see the grassroots activities of young Poles in practical issues of social innovation as well as being able to observe how local government supports development of social economy and social innovation scaling.

## WHAT'S NEXT



*Gwendolyn Carpenter and Jeremy Millard, Danish Technological Institute (DK)*

Here is an overview of what will be happening in the near future:

### Upcoming Events

- 6th International Social Innovation research Conference (ISIRC), early September, hosted at the University of Northampton
- Social Innovation Summit 2014: Business innovation meets Social Innovation, 19-20th November, San Francisco Bay Area
- Social Innovation Festival and Tepsie Final Conference, 12th-14th November, Lisbon

### Look out for the following publications:

- June 2014 – Appraisal template for social innovation programmes/ projects (D6.2)
- June 2014 – A set of case studies on spreading social innovation (D7.2)
- August 2014 – Scientific paper on frameworks conceptualizing barriers to SI (D3.3)
- September 2014 – Current practices in assessing the impact of social innovation projects/ programmes aiming to tackle unemployment (D6.3)
- September 2014 – Policy Paper Measurement (D6.4)
- September 2014 - Policy Paper Scaling (D7.4)
- September 2014 – In-depth case studies of online tools supporting social innovation (D8.3)
- October 2014 – Gap analysis of policies and practices in digital social innovation (D8.4), Policy Report digital social innovation(D8.5)
- December 2014 – Final report(s) (D.1.4)

## TEPSIE CONTACT DETAILS

Jeremy Millard and John Rene Keller Lauritzen  
Project Management

Gwendolyn Carpenter,  
Director of Dissemination & Communications  
Senior European Policy Advisor

Danish Technological Institute  
Teknologiparken  
Kongsvang Allé 29  
DK-8000 Aarhus C  
Denmark

Tel: +45 7220 1869

E: [jrm@dti.dk](mailto:jrm@dti.dk) (Jeremy) [jrla@dti.dk](mailto:jrla@dti.dk) (John)

[gwc@dti.dk](mailto:gwc@dti.dk) (Gwendolyn)

You can also follow us via [Twitter@TEPSIE\\_EU](https://twitter.com/TEPSIE_EU)

