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A. Introduction

Note on document structure

The document is structured in 4 sections: A, B, C, and D.

Section A (Introduction) provides for the scope of the pilot workshops undertaken in the UK, Spain, Greece, and Finland, as implemented along the lines of the guidelines developed to test and evaluate the online Design Thinking Field Guide of the EU co-funded project SocialUP- Design Thinking for Social Entrepreneurs (Erasmus+ programme of the European Union).

Section B (Pilot workshops profile and flow) provides an overview of the main data of the pilot workshops (dates, duration, no. of participants, implementing project partner, venue); the overall participants’ profile (total number and professional status); the flow of the workshops per country, indicating the social challenges selected to apply assorted DT Guide tools, the activities during the workshops in each country, and indicative pictures from workshops.

Section C (Workshops results summary) presents the integrated evaluation results as collected by evaluation questionnaires for the participants (across piloting countries).

Section D (Conclusion – insights for further optimization) offers a follow-up discussion engulfing the main findings from the workshops’ evaluation and suggestions for improvement either already implemented within the scope of the project, or suggested for further uses of the DT Guide.

The objective of the pilot workshops undertaken in Spain, Finland, Greece and the UK (2 pilot workshops) was to bring end-users in direct contact with the SocialUP Design Thinking Field Guide as developed by the project partners and made available online. The Design Thinking Field Guide and all its assorted tools was translated to the respective languages (ES, FI, EL), so in each piloting country, pilot testers could work around by using content and tools in own language to address social challenges as prospect subjects of social enterprises interventions.

Pilot Workshop Guidelines have been discussed and agreed, prior to the implementation of the workshops. The guidelines addressed:

The suggested preparation activities (i.e. prospect participants, participants’ profile and number, needed material and infrastructure) and:

- A workshop walk-through addressing duration, content and flow for a one-day and a two-days’ workshop in terms of sessions;
- The main objective of each session – responding to the design thinking phases of Inspiration-Ideation-Implementation – complemented by suggested DT Guide tools for use;
An evaluation questionnaire to acquire feedback from the participants across the following aspects:
- The level of usefulness and effectiveness of the training provision
- The clarity and level of direct application of tools and practices in real-life social needs, challenges and social enterprise responding readiness
- The pedagogical appropriateness of the material (language used, format, structure, logical sequence etc.)

B. Pilot workshops profile and flow

a) Overview of pilot workshops (main data)

The table below provides and overview of the main data of all pilot workshops. The workshops took place in the period between 4/7/2018 to 22/8/2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UK 1</th>
<th>UK 2</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Finland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>4-6/7/2018</td>
<td>11/7/2018</td>
<td>26-27/7/2018</td>
<td>26/7/2018</td>
<td>22/8/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>2 days (change in duration)</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of participants</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementing project partner</strong></td>
<td>Design thinkers UK</td>
<td>Social Enterprise Mark CIC</td>
<td>ITC</td>
<td>Militos</td>
<td>VAMK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venue</strong></td>
<td>Loughborough University London Innovation Campus, Queen Elizabeth Park</td>
<td>Bristol (at a Social Enterprise Organisation called BS3 Community Development)</td>
<td>Estepona Salón de Actos Polideportivo El Carmen; Avda. Huerta Nueva (Málaga)</td>
<td>Militos Consulting SA Athens (own premises)</td>
<td>Design Centre Muova facilitated by Vaasa University of Applied Sciences (Vaasa, Finland)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Participants’ profiles in all workshops

The total number of participants was 33. Their profiles were as follows:

UK workshops
- International student social entrepreneurs
- Mature ‘Masters in Design Thinking’ graduates as coaches/facilitators
- Part-time attendance by Loughborough University staff
- Social entrepreneurs
- Managers of established social enterprises
- Business Advisors

Spain workshops
- Aspiring Social entrepreneurs
- Experts in entrepreneurship interested in Design Thinking.

Greece workshops
- Social entrepreneur
- Development programs expert
- Research executive in entrepreneurship
- Civil society actors

Finland workshops
- CEO of social enterprise
- Head of higher education, expert in entrepreneurship and business interested in Design Thinking.
- Development manager and expert in Design Thinking
- Interior architect interested in social business
- Students in Design and Service design

c) Workshops flow

Methodologically, the workshops in all cases followed a similar flow according to the pilot workshops guidelines, but as decided among the partnership, the
implementation of each workshop should allow for different approaches, especially in terms of co-creation and co-design among participants, as well as in utilization of respective tools as made available online across the three phases of DT (Inspiration-Ideation-Implementation). This proved as an effective practice, since different mixes of participants and social challenges would benefit from such flexibility, which would serve best the social challenge at hand each time. Furthermore, the duration of each workshop varied, again, in terms of participants’ mix and perceived goal of each workshop. In total there have been directly utilized 14 tools in the developed format, as they are downloadable from the online DT Guide, following the explanatory description and the material online within each different tool.

All workshops have been facilitated by representatives of project partners, while in one case (UK London workshop), DT ‘graduates’ supported the session in terms of facilitation. Before delving into the DT Guide toolkit, the participants have been briefed on the SocialUP project objectives and the philosophy of the toolkit along the phases of design thinking. They have been informed on what is expected from them during the workshop, and how they would collaborate with each other and the facilitator(s).

Below follows a summary account of the pilot workshops flow as implemented in the UK, Spain, Greece, and Finland. UK pilot workshops (1) and (2) implemented a different evaluation method and instead of circulating the evaluation questionnaire as developed, participants were prompt to evaluate their experience with in-board post-it note as shown in the evaluation pictures included here. All other pilot workshops utilized the evaluation questionnaire. The overall results of the evaluation are presented in section
UK workshop, London (1) 4-6/7/2018

This 3 Day pilot workshop in the UK took place on 4/5/6 July 2018 in London (at Loughborough University London Innovation Campus, Queen Elizabeth Park). The workshop had 6 participants. This workshop was designed to allow testing of the key tools within the SocialUP toolkit and examine their use in a facilitated training workshop environment that goes through the complete SocialUP design thinking process. The venue chosen was a modern innovation centre with innovation workshop facilities. The workshop challenge selected by the participants was Stress and pressures on universities students and addressing this to decrease suicidal rates among students.

- **Duration**: 3 days – originally 3 x 6.5 hours but this had to be adjusted/changed due to travel difficulties and late arrivals – subsequently on half-day and two extended full days of 7.5 hours. (this shows need for flexibility in facilitation)

**Overall flow**

**Day 1.** Welcome and discussion including facilitator and participants presenting themselves; discussion about design thinking; discussion about social enterprise; mutual redesign of remaining workshop time to cater for late arrivals.

**Day 2.** Intro to Design Thinking; Inspiration - Design Challenge selection; Design Research; Ideation – First Burst

**Coupled with**

**Day 3.** Ideation continued – Concept Selection; Implementation – Storyboarding; Social Business Canvas; Prototyping; Pitching ideas; Final Q&A / Reflection for participants

**Tools utilised:**

These tools were used in group co-creation and co-design activity. We worked in one large group of 6 until concept selection, then two smaller
groups chose two concepts to prototype and pitch as their solution. This worked very effectively in practice.

- Challenge Cards
- Challenge Framework Map
- Stakeholder Map
- Context Map
- Persona Map
- Customer Journey Map (1&2)
- Ideation First Burst
- Affinity Map
- Vision Mapping Cards
- Idea Cards
- Concept Priority Map
- Storboard Canvas
- Prototyping Tools
- Social Business Canvas

The participants worked effectively together over 2 days, and enjoyed the overall experience. The more experienced Masters in Design graduates acted as coaches to help participants with the activities – this approach was very effective. The workshop was facilitated by utilizing a presentation to provide overall understanding of the Design Thinking methodology and practical guidelines on how to work step-by-step with the provided design thinking tools around a social challenge. Having a duration of 2 days, allowed participants to work with more tools, compared to the rest of the workshops as implemented in Spain, Greece and Finland, as well as in the second UK workshop.
Facilitator Comments after the event:

- Check everyone arrival schedule to begin on time and not have to flex the timetable
- The diversity of background and experience worked very well
- Using more experienced and mature participants added value for the less experienced participants and aided facilitation
- The reflection on use of the tools was very good.
- Timing for each tool cannot be rigid – some grasp the activity quickly whilst others need more time – the facilitator must monitor and adjust timings to stay within the overall workshop timing
- It was necessary to prepare for each workshop day based upon the lessons learned and progress from the day(s) before

Evaluation of workshop I Liked, I Learned, I Wish (photos):

Evaluation of tools (indicative pics)
UK workshop, Bristol (2) 11/7/2018

The pilot workshop (2) in the UK took place on 11/07/2018 in Bristol (at a Social Enterprise Organisation called BS3 Community Development). It has been attended by 6 participants. The selected challenge to work on by utilizing the DT guide and tools was tackling through a social intervention Obesity in children as a social issue.

Duration: 1 full day- 6.5 hours

Overall flow

1. Welcome and concise presentation of SocialUp project. Circulation of Participants’ list. Participants presenting themselves.
2. What is Design Thinking – A complete overhaul of what it is, how it works and when and why to use it.

3. Presentation of the SocialUP project and development of the online platform so far (structure, navigation, layout, logic, sequence of tools)

4. Session 1 – Inspiration
   - Explaining the meaning and the logic of the Inspiration phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Inspiration phase). Tools presented:
     - Choosing a Challenge with Challenge cards
     - Challenge Framework
     - Stakeholder Mapping
     - Customer Journey Mapping
     - Context Mapping

5. Session 2 – Ideation
   - Explaining the meaning and the logic of the Ideation phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Ideation phase). Tools presented:
     - Ideation First Burst / Affinity Mapping
     - Concept selection
6. Session 3 – Implementation

- Explaining the meaning and the logic of the Implementation phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Implementation phase). Tools presented:
  - Storyboard Canvas
  - Pitching Final Proposals

7. Open discussion and evaluation

Prompting participants to share their experiences from the workshop in an open Q&A model. Follow-up by completing the evaluation post-it note task.
Spain workshop 26/7/2018
The pilot workshop in Spain took place on 26/07/2018 in Estepona (at Salón de Actos Polideportivo El Carmen; Avda. Huerta Nueva s/n, Estepona (Málaga). Spain), facilitated by the CADE Estepona, the local entrepreneurial promotion center in close collaboration with the Estepona City hall and the Andalusia regional government. It had 10 participants.

- Duration: 2 days- 2 hours each day.

Day 1 workshop had an introductory character, while day 2 was more in-depth, experience based and hands-on experience.

Overall flow

1. Welcome and concise presentation of SocialUp project (mentioning the funding source of the project: European Commission - Erasmus+ Programme) and the partnership. Circulation of Participants’ list.

Participants presenting themselves.

2. Presentation of the overall goals of the workshop

3. Presentation of the online platform (structure, navigation, layout, logic, sequence of tools)

4. Session 1 – Inspiration

First there was an introductory session explaining the meaning and the logic of the Inspiration phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Inspiration phase).
Tools:
- Choosing a Challenge
- Stakeholder Mapping

Explanation: the participants wrote 2 challenges each in 3 minutes and afterwards they shared it with all the participants. After that they placed in the board. The facilitator then grouped the challenges and all the participants voted: Social Idea Selected: ONE STOP SHOP FOR SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS.

Then, the participants had some time to select the main stakeholders and they were shared in a group.

5. Session 2 – Ideation

Explaining the meaning and the logic of the Ideation phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Ideation phase). Tools:
- Ideation First Burst / Affinity Mapping
- Concept selection

6. Session 3 – Implementation

- Explaining the meaning and the logic of the Implementation phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Implementation phase). Tools presented:
- Storyboard Preparation
- Pitching Final Proposals

7. Open discussion and evaluation

Prompting participants to share their experiences from the workshop in an open Q&A model. Filling out evaluation questionnaire

In general the tools were useful and the participants welcomed a lot the individual and group work: particularly the selection of the challenge was considered very useful, as was the "Ideation First Burst Mapping".

Greece workshop 26/7/2018

The Greek workshop has been implemented on the 26th of July 2018 at the Militos Consulting SA premises in Athens, Greece. It hosted 5 participants.

Duration: 5 hours

Following a welcome and introduction session, the workshop flow was based on an overall presentation on SocialUP DT approach and selected tools as made available online. There was a specific interest by the participants to set up a social intervention scheme to become a social enterprise (A neighborhood-hub to support social inclusion), so to that end, a ‘master tool’ has been selected (Social business canvas) as the target objective at the end of the workshop. Towards the objective, the following tools from the Inspiration, ideation and Implementation phases have been utilized:

- Stakeholder Mapping
- Context Mapping
- Vision Mapping
- Concept Priority Mapping
- Storyboard Preparation
- Social Business Canvas (target tool)

Overall flow

1. **Welcome** and concise presentation of SocialUp project Circulation of Participants’ list. Participants presenting themselves.

2. **Presentation of the overall goals of the workshop**

3. **Presentation of the online platform** (structure, navigation, layout, logic, sequence of tools)

Adapted flow for the Greek workshop:

Following the Sessions flow as suggested in the Pilot workshop guidelines, a different approach has been adopted to follow up the presentation of the online platform. All available tools have been shortly presented, however, the aforementioned tools (see above) were the ones that participants worked hands-on. The process was highly interactive, while participants have been divided into two small virtual groups, in the roles of positively supporting the idea and the implications involved, and that of critically evaluating the steps throughout the process identifying drawback or failure aspects. This prompted a heated and constructive discussion, while it helped towards better understanding of how DT functions methodologically to overcome obstacles and better present/visualize a project idea. Pitching of the idea has been integrated in the overall discussion, especially towards the goal of involving local authorities in the process and the implementation of the idea (e.g. infrastructure, available space, funding etc.). The process was highly stimulating. Methodologically, the supporting DT tools have been utilized by keeping in mind the final Social Business Canvas and its requirements. This was deemed necessary, as participants preferred to work on an existing, real-life idea, so it was highly valued to place focus on the implementation phase, being however informed on the integrated DT phases and process. DT is not
well-known in the Greek case, so participants often mixed interchangeably DT approaches with standard, familiar methodologies for the development of a similar project. This in turn helped to identify the different development philosophy between DT and other methodologies.

Workshop pics

Finland workshop 22/8/2018

The pilot workshop in Finland took place 22/08/2018 in Vaasa at Design Centre Muova and was facilitated by Vaasa University of Applied Sciences (later VAMK), at the premises of VAMK’s participating unit Western Finland Design Centre MUOVA (later Muova) at Wollfintie 36 F 11, 65200 Vaasa, Finland.

There were 6 participants of 8 participants having expressed interest for the workshop on 22nd August. Two cancelled their participation just before the workshop. Invitations were sent in June – August 2018 directly or indirectly to over 1000 subjects, including for instance, social enterprises, organisations working with them, experts, developers and researchers.
Duration: 1 day - 6 hours

The invitees were given the option to sign up for 1, 2 or 3 days. As there were not enough participants to a 3-day event and the preference was on a 1-day event, the final duration was 1 day. As the workshop was one day workshop, it included a short introduction to Design Thinking and social entrepreneurship, and continued with hands-on design thinking activities. The chosen challenge to work on was Quality daily life of aging people. In the end of the day experiences of the training were discussed and feedback collected. Participants were also sharing their thoughts what could be possible issues to pay attention to when developing the training.

Overall flow of the DT workshop

1. Welcome, the presentation of the programme (annex 2) for the day and concise presentation of SocialUp project (mentioning the funding source of the project: European Commission - Erasmus+ Programme) and the partnership. Circulation of Participants’ list.

Participants presenting themselves.

2. Presentation of the overall goals of the workshop and short introduction to Design Thinking, e.g. what are the key features and principles in design thinking.

3. Overall presentation of the online platform (structure, navigation, layout, logic, sequence of tools).

4. Phase 1 – Inspiration
- Explaining the meaning and the logic of the Inspiration phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Inspiration phase).
- Discussing and identifying the context of design challenge based on given focus on Aging and dignified everyday life for elderly.
- Tools presented:
  - Stakeholder Mapping
  - Context mapping
  - Customer Journey mapping

5. Phase 2 – Ideation
- Explaining the meaning and the logic of the Ideation phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Ideation phase).
- Tools presented:
  - Ideation First Burst / Affinity Mapping
  - Concept Priority Mapping
6. Phase 3 – Implementation

- Explaining the meaning and the logic of the Implementation phase in Design Thinking methodology (what is involved, what is the purpose in a sequential manner, what are the expected benefits working around a challenge in the Implementation phase).

- Tools presented:
  - Storyboard Preparation
  - Business Model Canvas
7. Open discussion and evaluation

Leading participants to share their experiences from the DT workshop regarding the DT process and toolkit, facilitation of workshop and learning platform. Filling out evaluation questionnaire.

C. Workshops results summary

In this section we are providing the main results of the workshops based upon the evaluation questionnaires received from the participants as well as the open discussion and collaboration during the workshops. It should be noted, the both UK workshops have been evaluated differently (i.e. without the use of the evaluation questionnaire as decided on the spot by project leader DT UK). In particular it was advised by the Project Co-ordinator Jamse Rock of DesignThinkingUK, instead of using evaluation forms, to ask participants to evaluate the workshop in a popular ‘Design Thinking’ technique whereby participants write on post-it notes what they liked, learned and wished when reflecting on the workshop. The evaluation pictures have been included in section B.

The evaluation questionnaire was divided in 4 sections:

A. Background information (Country, gender, age, professional status, prior participation in design thinking training)

B. Workshop evaluation (information received about the SocialUP project, relevance to professional interests, level of understanding of the presented tools)

C. Training provision evaluation (relevance of the DT guide and platform to own needs and aspiration, level of confidence to apply design thinking knowledge/practices, need for more extensive coverage, considerations about aspects deemed as not necessary, suggestions for improvement)
For the needs of this results-overview section we provide the following summary of the evaluation results, drawing from results of sections B. and C. from the evaluation questionnaire and the respective evaluation aspects included in them. In addition we give the overall background data of section A. of the questionnaire as collected:

**A. Background information**

Gender of participants:

Male=11
Female=22

Age groups:

26-45 was the most frequent age group of the participant, while overall age range was 19-65.

Prior experience/training in DT:

6 participants (3 form Finland and another 3 from Spain) stated that they had prior experience with Design Thinking interventions and methodology. In this number we must add two ‘expert’ DT students having participated the IK London workshop

**B. Workshop evaluation**

I was well informed about the SocialUp project and the workshop objectives

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Spain</th>
<th>Median Greece</th>
<th>Median Finland</th>
<th>Overall median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information on the initiative and the training provision was relevant to my professional interests
Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Spain</th>
<th>Median Greece</th>
<th>Median Finland</th>
<th>Overall median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tools presented and used were easy to understand.

Scale: 1=Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Spain</th>
<th>Median Greece</th>
<th>Median Finland</th>
<th>Overall median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Training provision evaluation

Having been presented with the main structure, objectives, and content subjects of the SocialUp platform and training provision, how relevant are they for your needs and/or aspirations?

Scale: 1= Not relevant, 5=Very relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Spain</th>
<th>Median Greece</th>
<th>Median Finland</th>
<th>Overall median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How confident do you feel about applying some of the knowledge, practices, concepts and tools to Social Enterprises?

Scale: 1=Not confident, 5=Very confident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Spain</th>
<th>Median Greece</th>
<th>Median Finland</th>
<th>Overall median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to you, is there anything that would require more extensive coverage (in terms of tools provided and the desired outcome)?

Scale: Yes/No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Spain</th>
<th>Median Greece</th>
<th>Median Finland</th>
<th>Overall median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
According to you, is there anything included that you consider not so necessary?

**Scale: Yes/No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Spain</th>
<th>Median Greece</th>
<th>Median Finland</th>
<th>Overall median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes=0 No=10</td>
<td>Yes=0 No=5</td>
<td>Yes=1 No=5</td>
<td>Yes=1 No=20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any other comment in order to help us optimize the SocialUp learning platform and its content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Finland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• I am interested in MORE!</td>
<td>• A mid- to short term involvement (1-2 months) would be needed in real-life projects</td>
<td>• The outlook of the DT Platform looks nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maybe would make it even longer</td>
<td>• The methodology is new and needs intensive studying from the users</td>
<td>• The organization of the tools in the Platform in relation to sequences of the process works well and is easy to adapt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More examples and videos with what the other countries in the project have done</td>
<td>• The tools have the power to visualise challenges and project phases</td>
<td>• The definition of the phases and instructions are clear and easy to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information about running workshop is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitation of the workshop was needed to understand and apply DT tools in the process in practice. Applying DT tools without the guidance of an experienced facilitator is challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• More time would be required when applying each tool in practice (regarding the organisation of a 1-day workshop and its content).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding and implementing DT is an evolving process that takes a long time in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The process should be described in a basic level of common understanding as each person has one’s own personal strengths that may vary. What does the capability of implementing DT principles, processes and tools require from a person without previous experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All the links for material and tools were not available and did not work well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How to implement DT as a micro entrepreneur without a team?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The language used was somewhat complicated and difficult to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Availability in Greek is a plus!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitators’ observations (summary)

- The facilitator’s role is central. The facilitator should understand the processes of Design Thinking in order to be able to run workshops effectively and to modify the event for specific needs including selecting the appropriate tools.
- Overall, someone needs to keep the process together and help if people get stuck etc. and moreover, to help the participants not only to generate ideas but to select ideas, identify the good ones, as this may become a problem. A facilitator can help in identifying a good idea to develop further.
- A facilitator should also know about the creative process and creativity in general.
- There should be explanations why something is done and why something is done in a specific way.
- Challenges should be country and issue related (a great variation in Europe).
- Impact of using DT should be presented and be more evident.

D. Conclusion, discussion, and insights for further optimization

All implemented pilot workshops were positively evaluated by the participants. All participants stated that they were highly satisfied with the quality and coverage of the overall information and objectives of the SocialUP project, as well as the appropriateness of the DT guide and the assorted tools as made available online. The objective of the workshops was to bring the users in direct contact with the Design Thinking methodology at a theoretical and practical level, allowing them to directly apply the tools and practices of the DT approach to specific social challenges. It was explained that the workshops would have a clear prototyping character that would familiarize the users with the DT toolkit, and to this end all workshops have been organized following a suggested logical flow which would involve the three main phases of the DT methodology (Inspiration-Ideation-Implementation). More weight has been placed in understanding the underlying philosophy and mindset of the DT.
methodology in supporting the development of a social enterprise, and on the basis of this principal understanding, to work around a specific challenge in each case, deploying some core DT tools.

The prior knowledge of and experience in DT varied across the participants’ mix in all five workshops. So it was a prerequisite to be highly flexible in carrying out the workshops and make them attractive for people already familiar with DT, but most importantly others who actually got in touch with DT for the first time, at least within the scope of social entrepreneurship. One standard comment of many participants was of course their need for more extended workshops in terms of time; ones that would go through the whole array of tools in detail. According to the DT experts in the SocialUP partnership, this would touch the issue of the added value of the project, that is, implementing small scale pilots to gain some insights for scaling-up and further uses of the DT Guide by future interested parties and users. Following the discussions and feedback from the participants in all events, one of the main benefits for them is that the DT guide and the DT methodology are offering a development model that suits the needs of social entrepreneurs since it translates traditional methodologies for entrepreneurial development into a set of visualized, interrelated steps, which are not structured around a well-defined problem, seeking to find a solution, but on the desired end-state for a specific (social) challenge. This was the main meaningful driver for the implemented workshops as discussed among the piloting partners in the project. It seems that this has been successfully communicated in all workshops, since participants stated that they feel ready to apply some practices and tools to social enterprises, either real or imaginary in delving into one specific social challenge. In the same vein, the presented methodology and tools seemed to respond at a high extend to personal aspirations and needs of participants, as they were built around the chosen real-life or imaginary social challenges for each workshop.

Having a closer look at the various comments of the participants, we provide here some of them that methodologically can be applied in full-blown DT
Guide usage for the development of a social enterprise on the basis of a social challenge. The majority of them come from the Finnish workshop, and address mainly the overall methodological approach of the DT Guide, either with the support of a consultant/facilitator or as a self-paced process by an existing or aspiring social entrepreneur and her/his team:

The Toolkit was proved to provide a lot of useful tools to work around a business or project idea, but it was deemed necessary that at some point, users not familiarized with the methodology would surely need a facilitator, even for long-term workshops, guiding the interested party through the logic of the DT model. A facilitator/consultant would also be needed in minimizing distractions of focus – mostly in terms of lengthy discussions which distort the objective to clearly respond to each phase of the DT methodology and the respective tools at hand. One of the hardest parts of the process on behalf of the users would be to stick on the desired end-state to a given challenge, rather than coming up with supposed ‘solutions’ during an inappropriate phase of the methodology. This is one of the issues that could of course be better tested and exercised over a much longer period. This was reflected in a couple of participants’ comments, who seemed to need more elaborated guidance to understand both the underlying interconnections of the main 3 phases of the methodology, as well as the exact role of the tools within each one. For example, applying research in the ideation phase involves challenging rather than justifying an idea, which in turn makes DT suitable for social challenges, since the open character of ideas burst in DT allows for a wide array of even the most unlikely ideas that could respond to a social challenge, whereas ‘solutions’-focused methodologies often lack this flexibility as they lose contact with the desired end-state and change. During the Greek workshop a simple example has been used to highlight this. It is like having to jump over an obstacle placed right in front of the exit door of a house, where one could work towards acquiring physical skills to jump over the obstacle in a gradually easier way, while another could focus on the end-state, focusing on the nature of the
challenge and why the obstacle is placed there in the first place. So, for example, the role of research in the ideation phase as questioned by a participant would involve the clear definition of the challenge and what it is to be really achieved towards the desired end-state (as explained), rather than the definition of a ‘solution to a problem’.

Further comments stressed the issue of deploying the DT guide as a sole aspiring or existing social entrepreneur – one that has no established co-working team or colleagues. DT methodology works for sure better in team environments. Moreover, setting up an enterprise involves sooner or later the collaboration between more than one actor. This option can be covered by the Toolkit, since even at the level of ideation, certain tools are prompting the interested party as a sole actor to at least consider complementary, co-working and collaborating roles that are needed.

The chosen social challenges across all workshops helped participants to better understand what can be accomplished with the DT tools towards a specific challenge. Some participants stated that of course the knowledge of the challenge at hand can vary. Some of the participants might be well informed on the issue, while others not. However, this situation works positively within the DT methodology, since ideas thrown in should indeed cover the ground of all possible (even non-appropriate), unlikely and seemingly ‘out-of-context’ aspects.

Taking into consideration the assorted participants’ comments, as well as their overall evaluation as provided by the respective questionnaires, we can conclude that first, the workshop objective to present the benefits of design thinking as a mindset and a set of practical methods and tools for social enterprises has been met; second, that the developed tools, after having been tried and tested in practice using specific social challenges, are considered to a large extent as ready to be applied directly by prospect users; third, that based on the model of small-scale, short-duration workshops as done, scaled-up, medium- to long-term sessions can provide a valid methodology for social
entrepreneurs, consultants, design-thinking experts to come up with innovative social interventions and social enterprises to tackle diverse social challenges. The availability of all material in four languages is furthermore highly facilitating this opportunity.
## E. ANNEXES

Annex A – Participants signature lists

---

**UK1 workshop London (DT)**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Clark</td>
<td><a href="mailto:James_Tuck@design-group.com">James_Tuck@design-group.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKHANDA 2025</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ukhanda2025@gmail.com">ukhanda2025@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahmat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rahmat.hope@gmail.com">rahmat.hope@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Shen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:li.shen15@gmail.com">li.shen15@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie@example.com">stephanie@example.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicke Miyua</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bicke.miyua@bmi.edu">bicke.miyua@bmi.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Shen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:67308906@gmail.com">67308906@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autia Demi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:autia.demi@gmail.com">autia.demi@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.
### UK 2 workshop Bristol (SEMCIC)

**SocialUp Bristol Pilot Workshop**

**Wednesday 11th July 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Lockhart</td>
<td>Head of Communications</td>
<td>BS3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dawn.lockhart@hsfccommunity.org.uk">dawn.lockhart@hsfccommunity.org.uk</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>⚫️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Dawkins</td>
<td>Self-reliant Groups Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Purple Shoots</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martin@purpleshoots.co.uk">martin@purpleshoots.co.uk</a></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>⚫️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic</td>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>WEOL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dominic.elison@weol.co.uk">dominic.elison@weol.co.uk</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>⚫️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta</td>
<td>Sherwin</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>University of Bath</td>
<td><a href="mailto:h.sherwin@bath.ac.uk">h.sherwin@bath.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>⚫️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Head of New Project Development</td>
<td>Genesis Trust (Bath)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle.williams@genesistrust.org.uk">michelle.williams@genesistrust.org.uk</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>Strategic Advisor</td>
<td>Genesis Trust (Bath)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmpalmer4@btinternet.com">jmpalmer4@btinternet.com</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia</td>
<td>Konis</td>
<td>Business Mentor</td>
<td>Natalie Konis</td>
<td><a href="mailto:natalia@iamsplicable.co.uk">natalia@iamsplicable.co.uk</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Samuels</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachelsamuels@gmail.com">rachelsamuels@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Fell</td>
<td>Business Development Manager</td>
<td>SEMcic</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachelf@socialenterprisemark.org.uk">rachelf@socialenterprisemark.org.uk</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Rack</td>
<td>Design Thinkers</td>
<td>Design Thinkers UK</td>
<td><a href="mailto:james.rack@designthinkersgroup.com">james.rack@designthinkersgroup.com</a></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mark Gate

ebdonfarm@yahoo.com ✔️

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the opinions which reflects the views only of the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.
**Spanish workshop (ITC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the participant/NOMBRE</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Organisation name and address/ENTIDAD</th>
<th>Signature/FIRMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paco Acosta Garces (ITC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pacoacostagarces@gmail.com">pacoacostagarces@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA, AEPPA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia García García (ITC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:soniagarcia@uniofuturo.com">soniagarcia@uniofuturo.com</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA, AEPPA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Hotschke</td>
<td>KAA 72106, adelcon, LIRE Evaluación de Riesgos</td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Melián</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jame.melian@cae.es">jame.melian@cae.es</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March Sáez López</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mar@insigmar.com">mar@insigmar.com</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari Sol Duarte Arbe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:masol.duarte@gmail.com">masol.duarte@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Gómez Rivas Torres</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rivas@torres.com">rivas@torres.com</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Rincón Sánchez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cristina.rincon.sanchez@gmail.com">cristina.rincon.sanchez@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Moreno Pérez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vmp@cae.es">vmp@cae.es</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuela Palacios</td>
<td><a href="mailto:manuela.palacios@gmail.com">manuela.palacios@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>CADE ESTEPONA</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Greek workshop (Militos)**

---

### Participants List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name of the participant</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>Organisation name and address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Participant 1</em></td>
<td><em>Email 1</em></td>
<td><em>Organisation 1</em></td>
<td><em>Signature 1</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Participant 2</em></td>
<td><em>Email 2</em></td>
<td><em>Organisation 2</em></td>
<td><em>Signature 2</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the content which reflects the views only of the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.
Finnish workshop (VAMK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name of the participant</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>Organisation name and address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Wartermann</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Marianne.wartermann@vamm.fl">Marianne.wartermann@vamm.fl</a></td>
<td>Vaasan ammatikorkeakoulu VAMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Uskaure</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Heidi@psien-idea.fl">Heidi@psien-idea.fl</a></td>
<td>Ideaabutiki Pietila Lahdenkatu 16 E 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ani-Pekka Saarela</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anisaarela@annanpur.fi">anisaarela@annanpur.fi</a></td>
<td>Annanpura Oy Marianniemiet 74, 00830 HKI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maija Väätäis-Palo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maija.waita-palo@lohet.fi">maija.waita-palo@lohet.fi</a></td>
<td>Österbottens hantverk rf Hägghagen 29, Vaasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marika Niemelä</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marita.niemela@outlook.com">marita.niemela@outlook.com</a></td>
<td>Voisan yksityisko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.
Annex B Evaluation questionnaire (English)

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Background information:

1. Country

- UK
- Greece
- Finland
- Spain

2. Gender

- Male
- Female

3. Age

- 18-25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 66+

4. Professional status: Which of the following categories describes you best? (Choose one)

- Social entrepreneur
- Social enterprise consultant/adviser
- Design thinking adviser
- Other: ___________________________
5. Have you taken part in any kind of training on design thinking methodology (especially in supporting social enterprises)?

Yes □  No □  If yes, what kind of training (short explanation):

B. Workshop evaluation:

6. Circle your response for each item

(1=Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree)

6.1 I was well informed about the SocialUp project and the workshop objectives.
1 2 3 4 5

6.2 The information on the initiative and the training provision was relevant to my professional interests.
1 2 3 4 5

6.3 The tools presented and used were easy to understand (in terms of leading to tangible results).
1 2 3 4 5

C. Training provision evaluation

7. Having been presented with the main structure, objectives, and content subjects of the Social Up platform and training provision, how relevant are they for your needs and/or aspirations? (1= Not relevant, 5= Very relevant)
1 2 3 4 5

8. According to your first impression of this initiative, how confident do you feel about applying some of the knowledge, practices, concepts and tools to Social Enterprises?
(1=Not confident, 5=Very confident)
1 2 3 4 5

9. According to you, is there anything that would require more extensive coverage (in terms of tools provided and the desired outcome)?

Yes □  No □

If yes, which one?

36
10. According to you, is there anything included that you consider not so necessary?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, which one?

11. Please provide any other comment in order to help us optimize the SocialUp learning platform and its content.


Annex C Assorted presentations from workshops (in EN, EL, FI) as used
### Design Thinking for Social Enterprises

#### Nature of Complex Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Problems</th>
<th>Wicked Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What is “Design Thinking”?**

*Design Thinking is a human-centered approach to innovation.*

#### What is “Design Thinking”?**

- Desirability
- Viability
- Feasibility

#### The Double Diamond Model

- Empathy
- Define
- Ideate
- Prototype

#### What is “Design Thinking”?**

- Design Change

#### Design Thinking For Sustainable Social Enterprises

A Previous Example

#### What is a “Social Enterprise”?

A Revised Model.....

#### Principles of Creative Collaboration

1. Seek out diversity of thought.
1. Seek out diversity of thought.
2. Make room for everyone.
3. Everybody gets to be right . . . partially.
4. Get comfortable with ‘creative abrasion.’

“Write with the door closed. Rewrite with the door open.”
Stephen King

Preparing to Work Differently

Barriers to Innovation

Fear Frames Focus on Efficiency
Fear Frames Focus on Efficiency

Fear of being wrong
Fear of failure
Fear of rejection

Do Schools Kill Creativity?
TEDTalk 2006
Sir Ken Robinson

“If you’re not prepared to be wrong, you’ll never create anything original.”
Sir Ken Robinson

What can we do differently?
Team Formation ...

The Design Challenge

Exercise 1.
- Take the pack of Challenge Cards and as a Team share the 6 different Social Design Challenges
- Choose a scenario that you would like to work on together
- You have 15 minutes for this

Exercise 2.
- Take a Stakeholder Map
- Individually brainstorm who you think the wider stakeholders will be for this challenge
- Share your ideas by posting, discussing and grouping them on the stakeholder map – most important in the centre – less important further out in the circle
- You have 15 minutes for this

The Design Challenge

Exercise 3.
- Take a Challenge Framework Map
- Using the SMV’s technique flesh out more about the challenge
- Complete the Challenge Statement
- Name your Challenge
- You have 30 minutes for this

The Design Challenge

Exercise 9 – Idea Cards
- Take 5 Idea Cards
- Choose one team’s best 5 ideas and complete an idea card for each
- Image the idea in action, describe it, maybe sketch it, bring it to life
- Identify the 3 key stakeholders it will impact and describe how the idea might impact the
- You have 20 minutes for this

The Design Challenge

Exercise 10 – Concept Priority Mapping
- Tape a Concept Priority Map on the wall
- Take your 5 best Idea Cards and as a group post them on the concept priority map, agreeing where they should be positioned on the impact and difficulty matrix
- As a group confirm that you are happy with the relative positions...
- You have 10 minutes for this

The Design Challenge

Exercise 11 – Concept Selection
- From your 5 best Idea Cards on the concept priority map use the voting to individually vote for which 3 of those ideas are your chosen favourites
- As a team identify which 2 of the best 3 ideas are the groups selected winners
- Take the 2 best idea cards and place them on the floor in a clear space in the room
- Use ‘vote with your feet’ technique to go and stand next to the idea you would most like to support – try to create equal number for both ideas
- You have 10 minutes for this

The Design Challenge

Exercise 12 – Storyboard Preparation
- Tape a Storyboard canvas on the wall
- Create a storyboard that explains how your new idea will work – a new headline/journey that will help the user
- First use post-it notes to identify a sequence of 8 scenes
- Sketch on the canvas or use sheets of blank paper to illustrate each scene as you woulda a comic book – write speech bubbles and description boxes to help explain
- Work in parallel – split up the task amongst the team to save speed
- You have 45 minutes for this

The Design Challenge

Exercise 13 – Prototyping
- Use the rough concept models already developed to provide guidance on the process of the model you will construct together
- Gather prototyping materials (e.g. coloured card, paper, cardboard, scissors, pens, tapes, felt-tips, marker pens, etc) that you will use to construct the models
- Make sure the importance matrix will be sufficient to make the entire customer journey. These ideas are debating and more or less:
- Think about what you will use the model for, and how you will use little bit the story to your advantage
- When complete run through the concept with your team and identify possible improvements
- You have 60 minutes for this

The Design Challenge

Exercise 14 – Social Business Canvas
- Complete the Social Business Canvas. What is it that motivates you in this social enterprise? What do you have to do/produce/deliver to make it work, and how does it work?
- Join together and pitch your models teams to work on completing the other sections of the Social Business Canvas. It is the later time to share and discuss the outcomes of each section with the wider team for improvement and further ideas and comments.
- Write down any questions or discussion points as you go and... use your own voice!
- You have 60 minutes for this

Design Research Guide

Reflections / Q&A

- Liked?
- Learned?
- What?
Ymmärtämisvaiheen työkalut

- Käyttäjäpersonot
- Kontesteikko
- Tiedepankin opas
- Pilskupko
- Samankaltaisuuskavio

Käyttämisvaiheen työkalut

- Samankaltaisuuskavio
- Kuinka voikemme välttämättä
- Tavoitekortit

Kehittämisvaiheen työkalut

- Ideakartta
- Vuokrakuorit-ojattelu
- Akomaatikkoku
- Sisäisyysmäärä arvokartta
- Ideakortti
- Arvoinen ja prioritointi

Toteuttamisvaiheen työkalut

- Kuvakeskijärjestelmä
- Prototyö
- Tietokanto
- Yhteiskunnallinen yrityksen
  ilkeäkorintavainteli
- Konseptikanssi

Yhdekkäyttäminen käytännössä

- Klean esittely

Pohdinta ja palautte

- Mitä täällä?
- Mitä opin?
- Mitä toivoin?