SISCIPLE CO-DESIGN FOR Society in innovation and science

Task 3.5 | Monitoring and assessing

Alessandro Deserti, Francesca Rizzo, Felicitas Schmittinger. Politecnico di Milano

Initial aims of task 3.5

- Collect and interpret data from the pilots' co-creation journeys
- Provide feedback on the results of the prototyping and testing phases to the internal, organisational and institutional contexts, as well as to the regulation and policy contexts.

Scaling up and out the initial aims of the task



Roles of partners in Task 3.5

Co-creation Labs

Provide data (filling in forms, questionnaires etc.)

Supporting partners

(IAAC, Continium, Polimi, ENoLL)

Provide support to the co-creation labs

Other partners (IAAC, Polimi, SPI, TUDO, ENoLL)

Elaborate the the framework, analyse and compare results, co-produce the deliverable

Definition of a set of indicators



Indicators for co-creation (project-specific)

MoRRI

Monitoring the Evolution and Benefits of Responsible Research and Innovation

Set of 36 RRI indicators divided in 6 dimensions.

Gender Equality (GE)

Science Literacy and Scientific Education (SLSE)

Public Engagement (PE)

Open Access (OA)

Research and Innovation Ethics (E)

Research and Innovation Governance (GOV)

Levels of aggregation

MoRRI considers different levels of analysis of the indicators, called levels of aggregation. The most relevant and developed part is the national level.

We analysed each indicator to identify the **possibility to interpret and apply it at the institutional and project level.**



Analysis of the MoRRI indicators (example)

Public Engagement (PE)

Item	Name of indicator	Relevant conceptual dimension at project level	Rationale for SISCODE	Notes
PE1	Models of public involvement in S&T decision making	 Degree of formalized structures / mechanisms for involving citizens in decisions around science and technology. Degree to which citizens are de facto involved in making decisions 	This dimension is the basis of the co- creation journeys. Previous experience of each lab is <u>considered in the lab's self-assessment</u> <u>questionnaire</u> and then monitored in the <u>Lab's journey spreadsheet</u> <u>How do we visualise the Roles of the</u> <u>actors in the journey?</u>	The national level indicator was collected by the MASIS project only once in 2012. Later developments are not known. (MoRRI, 2018, p. 48)
PE2	Policy-oriented engagement with science	Actual engagement practice among citizens	Make a survey before prototyping?	The national level indicator was collected only once by Eurobarometer on 2010. Later developments are not known. (MoRRI, 2018, p. 50)
PE5	Public engagement performance mechanisms at the level of research institutions	Public engagement mechanisms implemented by the consortium partners	Monitored for the co-creation labs within the <u>co-creation journeys in the lab's</u> journey spreadsheet. Other WP mechanisms will be described in the reports	

Analysis of the MoRRI indicators (example)

PE1- Models of public involvement in S&T decision making Analytical level of aggregation: National*

Description (MoRRI report D3.2)	Relevant conceptual dimension at project level	Data collection methods	Rationale for SISCODE
The indicator is two-dimensional. It taps into the degree of formalized structures / mechanisms at the national level for involving citizens in decisions around science and technology. Formalized structures could, e.g., be existing organizational bodies facilitating public involvement and legal frameworks mandating citizen participation in S&T decision making. Secondly, it taps into the degree to which citizens are de facto involved in making decisions. These two dimensions, each contributing to the overall democratization of science and technology decision making, are not always related in a straight-forward way. In the majority of countries, some formalized procedures for involving citizens in priority setting and assessment related to science and technology can be identified, but in some of these countries, the actual degree of public involvement is in fact considered to be low. Opportunity does not always imply action, and, in addition, different opportunity structures are not equally effective in creating a fertile context for citizen participation. On the basis of these two dimensions, countries can be grouped into four main categories.	 Degree of formalized structures / mechanisms for involving citizens in decisions around science and technology. Degree to which citizens are de facto involved in making decisions 	Desk research and validation interviews	This dimension is the basis of the co-creation journeys. Previous experience of each lab is <u>considered in the lab's self-</u> <u>assessment questionnaire</u> and then 1) and 2) are monitored in the <u>Lab's journey spreadsheet</u> . How do we visualise the Roles of the actors in the journey?

Rationale of the SISCODE assessment framework



SISCODE'S MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Logic framework: outcomes

At the level of Outcomes we defined:



Tools to monitor and assess



Tools to monitor and assess



Self assessment questionnaire

• Provides an overview of the actual state of the different labs while stimulating them to reflect on their actual situation

• Change in this self-perception can be measured at different points throughout the process

Structure of the questionnaire - Thematical areas



SISCODE'S MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT TOOLS



SISCODE'S MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Development and management of the tool



Timeline



SISCODE'S MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Results - Baseline - December 2019

FAMILIARITY WITH PRACTICES -Strategies for actor engagement



FAMILIARITY WITH PRACTICES – Evaluation of CO-creation methodologies & tools





RESULTS SELF-POSITIONING



Positioning from 1-5 (5=perfect scenario)

SPECIFIC QUESTION -FREQUENCY OF APPLICATION OF CO-CREATION TOOLS



SELF POSITIONING - EXAMPLE (FabLab BCN)



SELF POSITIONING - EXAMPLE (KTP)



INSIGHTS

"[There's a] specific unit dealing with dissemination activities or conduction of dissemination activities inside the projects by academic publications or policy reports and guidelines" [living lab]

> "Assessment of co-creation happens with the core team as weekly meetings..." [fab lab]

"There were very unstructured pathways for actors to give feedback on cocreation activities"

[science centers & museums]

FIRST INSIGHTS

A lot of activities for **stakeholder engagement** have already been in action but lacking structured processes and engagement throughout all phases

Gap between labs applying **co-creation** already at a medium level and those not applying it at all

When applied, **co-creation** often lacks evaluation procedures regarding its effectiveness

Dissemination through media is widely used while the provision of open access, especially to more scientific material, has been considered less

TO BE EXPLORED

...the already applied co-creation techniques becoming more diffused and structured

...the involvement of stakeholders eventually becoming more an overall than just a partial engagement

...new dissemination channels and strategies emerging

...direct benefits of the tools and methodologies of SISCODE and their embedding in the organisation



WWW.SISCODEPROJECT.EU CONTACT@SISCODEPROJECT.EU

alessandro.deserti@polimi.it



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under grant agreement No. 788217