

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY STAGE I

This evaluation study was created as part of the public contract *Kvalitativní šetření inovačních projektů PO 3 OPZ (Qualitative survey of innovation projects PO 3 OPZ)* and offers the first series of evaluations concerning nine selected social innovation projects supported in OPZ (Operational Programme Employment) based mainly on interviews with representatives of the project teams, project evaluators and stakeholders.

During this "(self) evaluation", all the projects were described as rather successful, successful, or very successful. However, from an independent point of view, not all the results and conclusions were found to be so definite once the findings obtained in this study were assessed, with each project varying specifically in terms of their potential for sustainability and replication.

What all the projects have in common is the fact that their assessments do not reflect any broader, more general, or systemic perception of the impacts of these social innovations as they focus "only" on the impacts concerning individuals or specific organizations.

In general, with very few exceptions (the evaluators), participants preferred soft metrics as a tool for the assessment of their project's impact. Many respondents explicitly expressed their "distaste" for evaluations using quantitative indicators such as numbers, money, etc., often not only for reasons related to social innovation or the social sphere in general, but also (or above all) because they were not familiar with such practices or simply didn't "like" such approach.

The systemic change in solving more complex topics, which were the subject of the individual projects, was only perceived in a significant minority of the cases. With only one or two exceptions, there was not even a theoretical reflection on comparing the output or impact of the project in relation to the specific amount of ESF financial support in any project.

For B2B projects, the respondents had obvious difficulties while attempting to formulate the fulfillment of the essence of "social innovation" in the project.

In addition, for almost all projects, there was a strong tendency (often justified) to avoid evaluating the project "here and now" and, on the contrary, the respondents would prefer the option of letting the project run its course for one, two, five or ten years until the impact is truly visible. Only then would they deliver "verdict" about its real impacts, results and the extent of systemic changes achieved. However, none of the projects had a planned deadline for their own retrospective evaluation.

If we wanted to evaluate the success, impact and effect of individual projects as the respondents did themselves, we would come to very subjective, emotional, qualitative and often vague conclusions which, also due to the different nature of each project, don't allow us to make any direct and simple comparisons between them.

A certain unifying element of the evaluations and conclusions for these social innovation projects is their potential sustainability and / or their replication in another period of time or in another region / city / locality.

From this point of view, "the most prepared" and also the most compelling seems to be the project **Cochemský model v ČR (Cochem model in the Czech Republic)** (p. 98) and project **Inovace v SPOD pro ohrožené děti (Innovation in SPOD for endangered children)** (p. 166). The project **Systém sociálně-zdravotní péče o osoby 50+ s využitím inovativního modelu (The system of socio-health care for people aged 50+ using the innovative model)** (p. 81) and the project **Zvyšování interkulturní propustnosti institucí ve městě Brně (Increasing the intercultural permeability of institutions in the city of Brno)** (p. 58) come close behind.

The project **Sociální klinika (Social Clinic)** (p. 12) has a limited ability to provide wider support in the development of regions (more regions, greater intensity - volume of clients, bigger support in existing regions, or greater autonomy of the regions) and, in contradiction with its original intention, it took a "step back" in a way once the project was over, cancelling the positions of regional coordinators while reinforcing its headquarters in the capital city and weakening the competencies of the regions acquired for the project.

The overall evaluation of projects **Edison** (p. 132) and **Impact Academy** (p. 149) is very difficult as the effects of these projects are mediated in a significant way and their manifestation is traceable only in a long-term horizon of several years, which, however, makes it impossible to directly prove the unique effects of these programs on the changes that will occur in the participating organizations, respectively in their activities or in their work. At least the successful gradual increase of awareness about the need to monitor the impact, systemic changes and the suitability or possibility of acceleration, scaling, etc. in the non-profit sector can be considered a positive contribution of these projects.

Projects **R-ITAREPS** (p. 34) and **Inovujeme s telekomunikačními daty! (Innovating with telecommunication data!)** (p. 114) are evaluated as the most problematic. The main weakness of the R-ITAREPS project is in particular the absence of an appropriate contractual relationship (a license agreement) with NUDZ (National Institute of Mental Health) who is the holder of the ITAREPS application license. Fundamentally different approaches towards the project and the application together with serious technical defects in the technology used (the application) were mentioned as other difficulties of the project.

The results and usefulness of the project **Inovujeme s telekomunikačními daty! (Innovating with telecommunication Data!)** could not have been assessed since the fulfillment of its goals and the impact of the project could not have been practically traced. During the interviews for this project, no specific real-life user of the output was identified (big data of the mobile operator for monitoring migration on the labor market) and both the goals of the project (or rather the real possibilities of their fulfillment) and the relevance of the target group for which the outputs were primarily intended (public / state sector - authorities) were seriously put into question.

Each chapter of Part D. FINDINGS BASED ON THE EVALUATION FOR INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS of this study deals in detail with each project and with all the essentials mentioned in the interviews related to the given intervention. At the beginning of each chapter, the main findings of the project are described in a brief summary. The final part E. of this study then aims to answer the evaluation questions for Stage I of this public contract (see the list of questions on page 10) across all projects.

This report will be followed by a Stage II study in the first half of 2021, in which further interviews will be conducted and the longer-term sustainability of the project will be analyzed.