Summary

This report describes the Citispyce pilot project in Malmö, a project called “Multisectoral cooperation for social sustainability”. The project has been a preparatory project financed by the European Social Fund (ESF), run by Save the Children. The prefix preparatory denotes that this has been a project that has been granted funds from the ESF in order to plan and prepare a full-scale action project, also funded from the ESF. The project started in January 2014 and ended formally in March 2015. The process of writing a proposal to the ESF for a full-scale action project based on the results of the preparatory project is however continuing until autumn 2015.

The project has been based on multisectoral cooperation between representatives from different sectors (NGO, public, private, academia) and has been divided into three parts, of which the first part, “Test bed for penta-helix”, has been connected to the Citispyce project and is thus described in this pilot project report. The purpose with this part of the project has been “identifying and creating cross-sector collaboration to address the underlying structural causes of individual’s unemployment”. An overlying aim has also been to plan and prepare the full-scale action project proposal to the ESF.

The collaboration in the multisectoral cooperation project has strived to create a common understanding of problems and solutions connected to social exclusion by discussions between actors from different sectors, but also by involving young people. The project has consisted of workshops of various kinds in two tracks. Firstly, between the involved actors in a “Development group” and secondly in a “Youth involvement process”, where eleven young people have been involved. This second track has been added to the original project plan as a result of integrating the project with Citispyce. In this track, a number of workshops were arranged where young people from different parts of Malmö have been discussing the problems connected to social inequalities, but also possible solutions.

This report describes the processes in the pilot project, taking an on-going research perspective. The report builds on interviews and workshops with the participants of the network, including young people, conducted by Mikael Stigendal and/or myself during the project 2014 and 2015. The report also builds on results from the ongoing research report of the preparatory project, written in Swedish by Mikael Stigendal.

1. Understanding the task

When discussing the task of WP6 and writing this report, the difference between Work Package 6 and Work Package 7 has been a matter of consideration for the Malmö team. What should we write in each report? In what ways should the reports differ from each other, beside from the length of the report?

As we have understood the differences between the reports, judging from templates and instructions, the WP6 report should be an intermediate report, describing the current state of the project and to a large extent focus on quantitative aspects of the project’s fulfilment of aims. The template for this
report asks us for example how many young people has participated, what the response rate have been and how many dropouts there have been. But also if success indicators have been reached, why they have been reached or why they have not been reached. And as we have interpreted the instructions for WP7, that report should be formed as an evaluation report of the project as a whole, presenting further evidence of the final results and being more extensive and theoretically grounded than WP6.

This division between WP6 and WP7 could be said to build on a traditional ex-post view on evaluation, where conclusions are drawn on basis of the results of project, examined in hindsight or by mid-term. Another, – to a great deal contrasting – view on evaluation is the on-going evaluation. This way of evaluating is centred on the researcher’s/evaluator’s active participation during the whole project process. On-going evaluation has been advocated by the European Union, for example in the previous Structural programme period (2007-2013), and is defined by the Commission (DG Regio/Evalsed) in the following way:

*Evaluation which extends throughout the period of implementation of an intervention. This form of evaluation accompanies the monitoring of outputs and results (…) The advantage of on-going evaluation is that it allows for effective collaboration between the evaluator and programme managers, which in turn favours a better appropriation of conclusions and recommendations. On-going evaluation may be seen as a series of in-depth studies, comprising successive analyses of evaluative questions which have appeared during the implementation (…) (European Commission, 2013:107).*

According to this approach, the evaluation of projects and programmes must rest on a view of results as something else than just reaching goals or fulfilling success criteria. As argued by Brulin et al. (2013), project goals and aims can’t be regarded as specific and unambiguous, not full of conflict or contradictions. Projects and programmes can’t be regarded as having stable surroundings and a predictable future. Results can’t be assumed to be capable of transfer irrespective of situation. And processes can’t be disregarded as important for project results. Instead, Brulin et al. claim that development, especially with a focus on innovations, is something that takes place in open and dynamic systems, where development is difficult to predict and surprises and crises are normal recurring elements.

This view on evaluation has been the point of departure of our commitment in the ESF-funded Preparatory project Multisectoral cooperation for social sustainability. In order to be able to draw conclusions on what results have been achieved in the project, on-going evaluation with a focus on the processes have, in our view, been necessary. The template for this report urges us to answer the questions “Does the pilot go according to plan? Are there any significant changes in the implementation phase? If yes, what caused these?” It is our firm belief that projects like this should indeed be open for changes to the original plan, and that potential changes built on the voices of participants (especially young people, who may have very different opinions than adult partners) should be regarded as something important. Thus, our point of departure has been that the processes must be extensively described and analysed.

It could be argued that the proposed division between WP6 and WP7, as it pre-supposes that the project first should be carried out then evaluated, makes it harder to fulfil such a commitment of ongoing-research, for example in the way the project is written about in reports. We have, therefore, agreed on a division between the Malmö WP6 and WP7 reports where they both are evaluation reports, but have different focal points. According to our view on evaluation, it is not possible to draw conclusions before analysing the processes. This report will therefore put emphasis on the background of the project, the original purpose and aims and – most importantly – describing the processes of the project. Thus, no conclusions regarding the results will be drawn in this report. The results of the project will instead be extensively described and analysed in the WP7 report.

**2. The project**

In 2013, the NGO Save the Children in Malmö submitted a proposal for a so-called preparatory project to the European Social Fund (ESF). The project proposal was based on an idea of arranging
multisectoral collaboration in order to solve societal problems in innovative ways. The proposal of the project describes how new societal challenges demand new solutions:

The society of today is facing challenges that cannot be resolved within the current welfare system. We need to find new solutions in order to make tomorrow’s society sustainable. One possible tool for this is multisectoral collaboration, but improved operative models are needed. The aim of this project is therefore to create better conditions for multisectoral collaboration in order to prevent exclusion and to promote a socially sustainable society (Project proposal (my translation)).

The purpose of the project was in the proposal described as “Identifying and creating cross-sector collaboration to address the underlying structural causes of individual’s unemployment”. A main expectation of the preparatory project has been that it should result in a proposal for a larger ESF-project. Thus, the project can be considered as a planning project, aiming to prepare a full-scale action project. The main purpose and the aim of preparing a full-scale project could be identified as the formal success criteria of the project. With regards to the purpose, it should be noted that the original proposal did not focus on young people in particular, and was also pinpointing unemployment as the main problem, although addressing the underlying causes of it. Using another word, the preparatory project could be described as an effort of building what the Commission for a socially sustainable Malmö (Stigendal and Östergren, 2013) refers to as knowledge alliances – equal collaborations between different actors with different competences, background and occupations.

As the proposal was granted by the ESF, a “Development group”, consisting of representatives from Non-Governmental Organisations, public administration (local and regional), private sector and academia (see list below) was set up to start the activities in January 2014. Mikael Stigendal from Malmö University was appointed as a representative from the academia, but more importantly came to take a role as an on-going researcher in the project. The project was set up in three parallel parts: “Test bed for penta-helix”, ”The knowledge journey ” and ”The civil society 3.0”. This report is delimited to the first part, “test bed for penta helix”, as it is this part of the project that became connected to Citispyce.

During the initial months of the preparatory project in spring 2014, the Citispyce project was in the phase of identifying innovative practices to be presented in the WP5 “Fiche of innovative practices”. During one of the meetings in the preparatory project, Mikael Stigendal suggested that the preparatory project should be linked to Citispyce by becoming the selected pilot project in Malmö for Work Package 6 and 7. There was a lot to gain by merging the two projects and this seemed as a perfect match as the preparatory project had an objective similar to Citispyce, but was in need of an innovative twist to be able to be eligible as a Citispyce pilot. The innovative twist became including young people in the preparatory study, something that was not planned in the original proposal. By
including young people in this early stage, the project created increased possibilities for including relevant and important input in the proposal to the ESF for a full-scale project. It could also become a possibility to connect the causes of social inequalities, explored in WP2-4, with innovative solutions in Malmö. The participants in the project welcomed the suggestion with enthusiasm.

Thus, the knowledge alliance set up in this preparatory project also came to include young people in order to create a potential contribution of a multitude of perspectives regarding causes and solutions to the societal problem of social exclusion. In this way, it was possible to connect the preparatory project to two of the prospects of social innovation from the WP2 comparative baseline report; democracy and approach.

Connecting the project to the prospects for social innovation from WP2

Reminiscing the seven prospects for social innovation in the WP2 report (Stigendal, 2013), the sixth prospect deals with young people’s influence. Young people’s influence should be regarded as key prospect for socially innovative measures. Influence is, however, a broad concept. As stated in the WP2 comparative report, young people’s voices should be lifted into a context where they could have real influence. When young people are included and their rights are being strengthened, it is too often in areas where young people don’t count. As young people are normally not involved at the planning stage (or allowed to have an influence at all) involving them here became a key for the connection to Citispynce of the preparatory project. By taking part in the preparatory project young people were offered influence in an arena where their voices and competences actually mattered. Competences are also central in the seventh prospect for social innovation in WP2; approach. The seventh prospect deals with the potential-oriented approach, meaning that social innovations that take advantage of, support and actualise young people’s positive potential should be encouraged. By involving young people in the planning of the full-scale action project, their different knowledge could be part of forming the ideas of the causes and solutions to problems with social exclusion.

Actors involved

The template for this report asks us to specify the target group of the project. The notion of target group brings in minds a selective approach, common in liberal welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990). In the liberal welfare regime, policies and actions are directed at certain groups, most often on a needs-tested basis. The Nordic, or Social Democratic welfare regime, as defined by Esping-Andersen, is characterized by a universal approach, where policies are more often directed at the general public. This project has been taking the universal approach as a point of departure, why there hasn’t been a specific target group of disadvantaged young people. Of course, the ambition in the long run is to change the situation for young people who lead lives characterized by social exclusion by setting up a full-scale action project funded by the ESF, and to use that project to change societal structures and discourses. But the means of achieving this has not in the preparatory project primarily been connected to empowering or motivating young people facing social exclusion, but rather to include and to discuss with them causes and solutions to social exclusion.

Thus, the point of departure for this multisectoral cooperation project has rather been a universal approach, inviting and involving a number of actors – including young people – to discuss the causes of and solutions to social exclusion. The involved actors have been:

- Save the Children (NGO)
- Centre for Public Entrepreneurship (Centrum för Publilt Entreprensörskap) (NGO)
- Sustainable Development in Skåne (Hållbar utveckling i Skåne) (NGO)
- The Social Economy Network in Skåne (NÄTVERKET- Social ekonomi i Skåne) (NGO)
- PWC (Private)
- City of Malmö (Public – municipality)
- Malmö University (Academia)
- The Region of Skåne (Public – region)
- The County Administrative Board of Skåne (public – county)
In addition to this list of partners, eleven young people, six girls and five boys in the ages 16-25 with different background and living in different parts of Malmö, have been part of the project.

3. The process

The activities in the part of the project entitled “Testbed for penta-helix” have been done within two tracks; within the “Development group” and within the “Youth involvement process”. The core of each track has been a number of workshops on different themes.

The Development group

The first workshop in the Development group was held in February 2014. In total 11 workshops or meetings with the involved partners have been held during the project period. The first workshop started with a discussion about the expectations on the project, and the last workshop in December focused on the discussion of a draft of Mikael Stigendal’s research report about the project. After the last workshop, a follow-up meeting dealing with the continued work with the proposal for a full-scale project has been held.

Around half of the workshops have started with one of the partners doing a so called “spaning” (approx. “observation”), a well prepared presentation on a specific subject connected to the purpose of the project, which then was discussed by the workshop participants. The different themes brought up by the participants in these observations have in different ways been connected to the social and economical development of society, the problems that emerge for groups of people (for example barriers that are hindering people from being included and the demands on specific competences), but also solutions (the role of NGO’s, cooperation between private business and the public sector etc.). One of the workshops has been centred on the view of knowledge, where Mikael Stigendal held a lecture that was followed by discussions. As it has turned out to be, the causes and symptoms of social inequality have been actualised during most of the observations and discussions. Two workshops were specifically focusing on the underlying causes of social exclusion in order to create a joint understanding of the relation between causes and effects of social exclusion. One workshop was about collaboration as general tool, where the concept of multi-sectoral collaboration was discussed. The tenth workshop was arranged as a live-in seminar where the experiences of the previous workshops were discussed and ideas for the proposal for a full-scale project were lifted.

Although young people were not pointed out specifically in the project description, much of the discussions in the Development group have had a focal point on social exclusion affecting in particular young people. Much discussion has been about the school, and the view on knowledge that reigns not only in school but also in the societal structures in general. During one of the workshops, the participants discussed how the living conditions for children and young people in school are unequal, that the school is increasing its focus on quantitative results at the cost of relation-building and that the view on knowledge that is reigning in societal structures implies that informal knowledge is improperly assessed and taken care of. One of the participants argued that measurement is the only thing that is being done in school and that school is no longer dealing with social issues. “Who in the community is working with social upbringing if you do not have parents who can do it?” he asked rhetorically at the workshop.

In the research report describing the results of the ongoing research, Mikael Stigendal discusses some of the difficulties with the process in the workshops of the Development group. It has been problematic to maintain focus on the causes of social exclusion, partly because different phenomena can appear as both a symptom of and a cause to a problem. Another difficulty has been to focus on multisectoral collaboration in regard to solving the problems of social exclusion, not just multisectoral collaboration in general. Nevertheless, the research report concludes with a suggestion for a theme of the proposal for a full-scale project, which we will return to in the WP7 report.

The Youth involvement process

In parallel to the workshops in the Development group, a Youth involvement process has been running. The Youth involvement process was not part of the original proposal, but was incorporated in
the project during the preparations for the Citispycce WP5 conference in Krakow. The Youth involvement process was thus a direct result of making the preparatory project the Citispycce pilot, and could be seen as an innovative twist of the preparatory project. The Youth involvement process had the task to involve young people in the process of discussing inequality and exclusion, but also solutions, in relation to the situation for young people of Malmö. As described earlier, the involvement of young people could be connected to two of the prospects for social innovation in WP2. By giving young people a voice and having a potential-orientated approach valuing their knowledge, the idea was to create a proposal for a full-scale action project that was imbued by the young people’s ideas on the causes and solutions to social exclusion.

Eleven young people, five girls and six boys, in the ages 16-25 with different backgrounds and living in different parts of Malmö were engaged in the group, participating on voluntary basis. The young people were mainly recruited through Save the Children’s existing network. The original plan was to have six workshops during six weeks, but it turned out to become more than that. Two employees from Save the children, Lina Gustafsson and Alison Mendez Vargas, have led the youth involvement process, assisted by Johanna Lindén from Malmö university who also has been taking notes. At one workshop, Mario Dri from Save the Children attended. Mikael Stigendal participated in two of the workshops and Jonas Alwall in one. Mikael and myself also attended one of the meetings after the planned six workshops, which I will return to.

The six workshops have had different themes, prearranged by the group leaders from Save the Children. According to the leaders, it was however crucial for Save the Children that the young people would be able to manage and redirect the process and content if they were not satisfied with the proceedings. “We have tried not to be egoistic about the proposed outcome, instead we wanted to be flexible”, said one of the leaders. The first meeting was about getting to know each other and inform about the purpose of the workshops. Mikael Stigendal participated at this meeting and told about the connection to Citispycce. The second meeting had the theme of young people’s dreams and future. During this workshop, problems emerged. The situation become too much like a classroom, where the leaders became teachers and young people the students.

The young people were mostly performers of a task we steered entirely and we felt that they were being unaccustomed to think aloud and speak about thoughts of their future (Lina Gustafsson, leader of the Youth involvement process, Save the Children).

The third workshop had Malmö as a theme. In different exercises, the young people described Malmö and the areas they live in. Together the group discussed similarities and differences between and in areas in Malmö. The leaders describe the outcome of this meeting as fruitful, but they found that it was hard to talk about social exclusion and social inclusion. They felt that the workshop still were “to much steered, which we felt was not optimal in relation to the feeing of participation and openness that we wanted”. Some of the young people were quieter, and the leaders felt that “the agreement about how it is not having the same life opportunities as other young people was at the expense of some individuals in the group”. In the interviews, the leaders tell that they were not aware of how steering they were in their roles. They mean that this is a lesson learned in the project: “There was too much focus on the outcomes, we wanted results, and I think that was wrong”, one of them says. The leaders are also reflecting about their previous experience and culture when talking with young people on specific subjects; “We are not used to talk about social exclusion and causes to problems, we are used to look forward and try to accomplish change”. I would argue that this is an interesting reason of why solutions to social problems so often become disconnected from an understanding of the problems.

This insight about steering had a direct impact in the process. The fourth workshop had a more open agenda, where discussion was focused on Malmö as a future dream city for young people. This open outline was also evident in the fifth workshop, which focused on a general discussion about young people's conditions and opportunities in society. At the sixth meeting, the focus was on recommendations and ideas to the proposal for the full-scale project. The young people discussed what barriers young people experience, what the reasons are for these barriers existence and how they would like to solve the problems. The meeting was at Hilton hotel in Malmö, as one of the wishes from the young people in the group was to have meetings at different places of the City.
A lot of focus during the discussions on the last three workshops came to centre around on two problem areas: problems connected to housing and problems connected to school. Regarding housing, many of the young people lifted the lack of affordable rental apartments in the city. Several of them are living involuntarily with their parents, and meant that designated apartments for students – also at upper secondary level – could be a solution to problems related to the transition to adulthood, but more importantly related to school and education. Cramped apartments means lesser possibility to concentrate at homework. Regarding school, the young people told how they are in need of other knowledge than what is being thought in school. They told how they are in need of knowledge of managing the transition to adulthood. There is a need for a place where young people can talk about life, get advice and get seriously listened to, and where all their knowledge could be valuable. The school is not such a place. Questions about life, adulthood and the societal demands that come with this are, for many young people, left in a vacuum between school and family.

Although only six meetings were planned, the young people wanted to continue meeting after the workshops. The group was still running in spring 2015. In February, Mikael Stigendal and me participated in one of these extra meetings with the group. We wanted to hear from the young people how they had experienced the process and what they wanted to have included in the proposal for a full-scale action project. After Mikael had asked a substantial number of question, which the young people answered, the leaders from Save the Children (who also participated), interrupted the discussion, asking the young people if they felt uncomfortable and tried to steer the discussion in another way. According to what the leaders said afterwards, they had felt that the young people in the room did not like the number of questions and the way we asked them. After Mikael and me had left, some of the young people had described the situation as “a police interrogation”. We did not sense this vibe during the workshop. Instead, we felt that we had a very interesting discussion going on. This could be understood from a number of aspects. Firstly, Save the Children had during the previous meetings grown a certain climate for discussion in the group; built on a very high degree of letting the young people set the agenda and speak freely, not so much answering questions. Secondly, relationships and trust takes time to build, and the young people perhaps felt that we had not been part of the process in order to gain their trust. Thirdly, this says something about what young people are used to. They are not used to being asked about their opinion, they are used being asked what they have learnt. This could be linked to a specific view on knowledge, which we will return to in the WP7 report.

Just as the journey in the Development group, the journey in the Youth involvement process could be said to have had difficulties and has been going down a windy road. However, the experiences of involving young people in an early stage like this could be very valuable. Both the experiences regarding the process itself and the outcomes regarding causes of, effects of and solutions to social exclusion are expected to be an important input to the proposal for a full-scale action project.

The Krakow conference

As a consequence of making the preparatory project the Citispyce pilot project, three members of the project (Alexandra Frizon and Lina Gustafsson from Save the Children and Mattias Larsson from the The County Administrative Board of Skåne) participated in the Krakow conference, together with Pia Hellberg-Lannerheim from the city of Malmö, Mikael Stigendal, Jonas Alwall and Johanna Lindén from Malmö University.

The expectations on the conference were high. The group were hoping to get inspired and to see examples of innovative solutions that combat social inequalities. But the opinion of the group is that these high expectations weren’t fulfilled. The projects and actions presented at the conference were not considered by the group to have any connection to urban problems connected with social exclusion. Rather, they were – in many cases praiseworthy – examples of actions that are disconnected from societal problems. At the workshop in the Development group following the Krakow conference, the participants from Malmö expressed how they had become both surprised and disappointed. The reason for them to go to the conference was not to import an existing project from another city but to get inspired and learn by approaches, methods and elements in projects and actions from the other partner cities. Unfortunately, the team went home without such inspiration.
Staff and resources

The preparatory project has been funded by the ESF and with each partner in the Development group co-financing in kind through the work carried out in the project. This was considered as a benefit of choosing the preparatory project as the Citispyce pilot project, as there were limited resources in Citispyce. The young people in the Youth involvement process have participated voluntarily, however they were rewarded with a diploma and a gift card after the first 6 meetings. There have been no signals that financial resources haven’t been sufficient. Support from partners in Citispyce has, unfortunately, been non-existing. We also feel that our project has been regarded with some scepticism from the other partners, at least until the Rotterdam conference.

The activities have been evaluated by the on-going research conducted by Mikael Stigendal. Regarding the youth involvement process, Save the Children has been evaluating the meetings continuously with help from Johanna Linden from Malmö University.

4. Looking ahead to WP7

When writing this report, the work with developing a proposal to the ESF for a full-scale action project is in progress. This proposal is planned to be sent in during autumn 2015, and will be based on the most important results of the preparatory project. These results have, however, not been discussed in detail here. This report has focused on the process. And as I have described, the processes in both the tracks of the project have been full of interesting twists and turns. As we will come back to in the WP7 report when discussing results, the processes of a project like this can be seen as a very important – perhaps the most important – result. Swedish poet Karin Boye once wrote. “Yes, there is goal and meaning in our path – but it's the way that is the labour's worth”. The poem, entitled “In motion”, may be worn out, but in this project it very well describes the value of the process during the workshops. While the results of the workshops might become very useful in proceeding for a full-scale action project, the learning from the process in itself might be equally important. It shows the weight of being adaptive, not the least when including young people, in order to build relations built on mutual trust. This is indeed one of the great advantages with knowledge alliances – the possibility to mutually reflect over the ongoing process from a multitude of perspectives and not seeing plans as carved in stone.
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