



Erasmus+



August 2019

Innovation Skills Development Program for Innovation with Multi Challenged Families – Intellectual Output 3

The LIFE project partners:

APCC, Coimbra, Portugal

Comune di Cervia, Italy

Ljubljana University, Slovenia

NTNU, Trondheim, Norway

Municipality of Linköping, R & D Centre, Sweden

1. Introduction

The innovation skills development program (Intellectual Output 3) is based on Competency framework (Intellectual Output 1) and Knowledge triangle (Intellectual Output 2). Those three intellectual outputs were tested through a pilot training program which was implemented over a 12 month period, January – December 2018. One central element in the training program is the focus upon practical innovations in social work with families with multiple challenges. The participants are chosen because their everyday work include tasks related to such families. The explicit aim of the training program is to devise new ways of organizing social work that can offer improvements for children and parents. This text describes the innovation skills development program within the LIFE project but also gives general recommendations to organizations interested in developing similar initiatives.

The framework for development of the Innovation skills development program within the LIFE project:

- Two international meetings in which participants from all the five partner countries will work together. These meetings will take place in Ljubljana, Slovenia at the end of January 2018, and in Coimbra, Portugal in November 2018.
- A local training programme for each national participator group in each country 2018 in between the TN meetings.

2. General Approach – pedagogical framework and starting points

The innovation training program sets out to provide participants with a “free space” within which they can discuss and develop practical approaches to problems that they encounter in their everyday practice with multi-challenged families. It is to be based on *abductive reasoning and learning*. This contrasts with the two more common learning approaches termed *deductive* and *inductive*.

Deductive approaches emphasise structured presentation that starts with basic concepts and then uses examples that demonstrate these. They are as such teacher or instructor-centred. Training in methods or procedures that are systematic and manual-based uses a deductive approach. This can be both effective and efficient provided that the instructor or trainer knows what has to be done, and the aims for the methods being taught are sufficiently clear.

Inductive approaches are based on a different premise. It is assumed that knowledge is mainly built on a basis of learners’ experience and their interaction with phenomena. So learners are encouraged to discuss examples of the concepts to be assimilated and applied, and to discuss these. The instructor or trainer provides guidance. Inductive learning can be appropriate in many contexts. Learners have a more active role, and take part in “constructing” the concepts to be learned by referring to their own experience and perceptions.

In the LIFE project we are at or probably beyond the limits of what can be learned using deductive or inductive approaches. Innovation requires actual changes in practice, primarily designed to provide better, more appropriate help for families. Practice is complex, and heavily influenced by a whole series of pressures, and takes place within an arena (an enclave) in which practitioners have to make judgments and decisions in a constant flux. Work with families may be conducted in bureaucratic settings that set out to enforce set procedure and predictability, but there may be a considerable tension between this mode of organization and the demands imposed by maintaining readiness and rapid response, as for example in child protection. Practice is often regulated to secure measurable

and preferred outcomes and this regulation may restrict the freedom to reflect or attempt new strategies. In the LIFE project we think that organizations and structures affect the ways in which practitioners perceive and think. This may make innovation at local level quite difficult to achieve.

Abductive reasoning and learning has become popular in various applied contexts of late, for example in work with artificial intelligence (AI). But its roots go a long way back, to the natural philosophy of the ancient world and late medieval/renaissance epochs, before the emergence of modern empirical and experimental science. The simplest way of explaining the concept is that inference from observation and experience is an essential step in developing new ideas and hypotheses, *without undue reliance upon or reference to* prevailing doctrines and theories. Inference in this connection means a summarization and weighing of observation and experience to find likely or plausible explanations for a phenomenon or problem. *Educated guesswork* is the everyday English expression that comes closest. But abductive learning involves more than this, rather a process in which inferences are challenged, and their practical applications discussed in terms of feasibility, and ultimately tested out by using new approaches and devices based upon them in practice. Abductive reasoning may lead to incorrect inferences, but it is still creative and productive in that a range of avenues toward better practice can be opened.

A question that arises is whether abductive reasoning and learning and *critical reflection* as practiced in social work (and many other professional settings) are in effect much the same. Brookfield (1990) explains that critical reflection involves three phases:

1. Identifying the assumptions (“those taken-for-granted ideas, commonsense beliefs, and self-evident rules of thumb”) that underlie our thoughts and actions;
2. Assessing and scrutinizing the validity of these assumptions in terms of how they relate to our ‘real-life’ experiences and our present context(s);
3. Transforming these assumptions to become more inclusive and integrative, and using this newly-formed knowledge to more appropriately inform our future actions and practices.

It is obvious that there are some strong similarities between critical reflection and an abductive learning approach, but our focus in the LIFE innovation skills training program is upon setting up a learning environment for the participant groups. On the whole, it seems that much use of critical reflection is directed at *individual* awareness. In the LIFE program, we want to encourage participants to look at the aims, approaches, and constraints agencies of various kinds apply in helping multi-challenged families *in the light of* families’ needs. In effect a somewhat “cooler” approach that devotes less attention to the individual social workers’ relations with families. It has to be admitted that this distinction cannot be very hard and fast, and perhaps only is to be regarded as a nuance. And it would be undesirable to prohibit use of a critical reflection approach if course leaders have substantial experience of using it. The limitations of time available will restrict very thorough use of critical reflection as an approach in the LIFE innovation skills training program.

3. Skills in social work with multi-challenged families

When we use the term *skill*, we refer to what we must be able to do to work toward a goal or support a task. Skills are not abstract, intellectual entities that organizational psychologists have dreamt up. Skills are operational, what one needs to be able to do the job. Some tasks require several skills from their executor, to be deployed simultaneously or in rapid flux, which is obviously complicated. Skills are usually thought of as individual capabilities and this most often seems reasonable. Even when working with others on a complex task, there will usually be some skill requirements that individuals have to satisfy.

Competencies are essentially jobs described in terms of the skills required as well as the professional background and theoretical knowledge deemed most appropriate. Many social workers, like other professional employees, are expected to be adaptable and in large measure self-regulating, and these two requirements are part of what are defined as competencies.

In the LIFE project the starting point has to be different. *Our organization and ways of doing things are often part of the problem multi-challenged families have to deal with.* When a target group with complex and complex problems encounters a complex system of action, tensions and problems arise that are partly the focus of this project.

In Swedish research, Per Grell in his dissertation (Complex Needs or Complex Organizations? Consequences of Specialized Individual and Family Care from a Client Perspective, 2016, Umeå University) used complexity theory to understand the interplay between social service and, in particular, clients with complex and complex needs. The conclusions of Grell's research show that organizational specialization has negative consequences for this category of clients. In short, the specialization involves fragmentation and fragmentation when it comes to responsibilities and tasks that are difficult to handle for clients with complex and complex needs. This can be expressed in (Grell, 2016, p. 46);

- Difficulties in understanding and orienting themselves in the organization and thereby finding or getting the help you need.
- Confusing and time-consuming parallel contacts.
- Unclear division of responsibilities between different units and professionals in the contribution system.
- The paradox that both overlaps and gaps in the help that is offered occur at the same time.
- The need for a balancing act with the intention of sometimes managing intricately interconnected interventions from various actors within IFO, where the nature of each unit's intervention ranges from purely voluntary to interventions of a more compelling nature.
- Difficulties in establishing close, helping relationships with any individual social worker in the crowd.

Grell also points out that these conclusions can be found in other Swedish and international studies.

In the LIFE project we want to develop *innovation skills*. To accomplish this, we have to be prepared to redefine tasks so that they relate better to a family's needs, and we have to be critical about the assumptions built into prevailing practices that do not help us to deal with the needs and difficulties a family experiences. This may require *reframing*, that is revising the assumptions involved in assessing the problems that affect a family and the ways in which we set out to help them.

Innovation skills are practically the types of skills that allow individuals to become innovative in what they do. These are usually a combination of cognitive skills (e.g. the ability to think creatively and critically), behavioral skills (e.g. the ability to solve problems, to manage risk), functional skills (e.g. basic skills such as writing, reading and numeracy), and technical skills (such as research or organizing and analyzing information).

The question that arises from this is whether there are generic innovation skills that can be identified when partners drawn from very different professional settings, in different national contexts with pronounced cultural differences, work to define aims and the skills required to deal with varying legal systems and levels of resource constraint. The LIFE project is obviously set up to enable a severe test of what might be domain-specific, and what could be seen as generic. So this will be one of the questions relevant to the content of the toolkit.

A social innovation is new solution or an approach to a social problem. This can mean changes in patterns in a field at micro, national, or global level, making use of the self-organizing power in society and how to use this power of individuals and communities. E.g. social work with multi challenged families, education, health, etc. The European Commission describe social innovation as “about new ideas that work to address unmet needs”. We simply describe it as innovations that are both social in their ends and in their means.

We have emphasized that our focus in the LIFE project is upon low-level innovations that will improve help for families, good ideas that can be realized using available resources. The discipline this requires is to be able to think beyond what each agency sets out to provide, and this can of course be demanding.

Looking back to the pre-project stage in which we set up the outline for the LIFE project, there was an emphasis on avoiding top-down innovation strategies that at any rate in our Scandinavian experience have been unsuccessful in reducing the burdens, privations and discrimination suffered by multi-challenged families. Nor were we convinced that methods or models often taught in social work education would be effective. (Some of these however, are probably relevant if nowadays unfashionable or partly forgotten, such as task-centered social work.) What we were concerned about was the necessity of re-thinking work with the families. This involved a fresh approach to learning in which the traditional didactic models based upon deductive and inductive strategies would have to be abandoned. Instead we wanted to focus on abductive learning that would draw on the experience of group participants and the dialogue.

Learning goals was formulated for the pilot training program:

(1) Skills

- Initiating and carrying through innovation processes
- Meeting standards for argument and presentation
- Cooperation with partners in innovation processes
- Identifying areas of work where innovation is needed
- Understanding preconditions for inter-professional cooperation and communication

(2) Knowledge

- Knowledge of innovation and innovation processes
- Understanding of what can promote or hinder innovation
- Better understanding of child welfare work with families in difficulty
- Innovation as a perspective in child welfare
- Innovation in learning organizations
- Knowledge of different types of innovation strategy
- Learning to see own practice and experience in the light of theory and societal issues

(3) General Competencies

- To be able to reflect upon users' situation and needs
- To reflect on the interplay of organization, structure and culture influencing what help users can obtain

- To acquire an inter-professional and interagency mentality
- To acquire ethical insight and standards for practice.

4. Purpose and knowledge content of the Innovation Training Program

The content of the training program is related to the knowledge base and approach outlined in the baseline study, knowledge base papers, and the Competency Framework and the Knowledge triangle, Intellectual Outputs 1 and 2. Participants are expected to develop innovative approaches and devices in their work with *the individual families*. Partner organisations and field agencies have given their consent to participant's following the training program, but they will not have direct influence on any of the working methods and approaches proposed by participants. It should be noted that the focus in the LIFE project is upon low-level innovations that can benefit particular families; our intention is not to work toward sweeping changes and reorganisations, though changes and organisational issues will inevitably be part of the discussions that emerge. Working toward low-level innovations that are useful for families involves a realignment in which the following the principles presented in the Competency Framework.

- The understanding and skills required to implement a holistic approach to working with the family. This means that from the point of professionals undertaking an initial assessment of the family's needs and throughout the period of intervention, the totality of the issues and problems facing the family should be considered, analyzed, and continually reviewed, together with the relationship of these issues to each other. The project has developed an assessment tool as an additional output to support this.
- The capacity to identify areas with a potential for change in the family situation and to prioritize interventions accordingly. Current work with multi challenged families is often characterized by a reactive response to individual crises rather than a proactive approach which can effect real impact, change and improvement in the family's situation.
- Understanding innovation in social work in a family environment. This will include an understanding of 'abductive learning' through practice based knowledge and experience, incorporating the experiences, understanding and perceptions of the users of the services i.e. the families themselves.
- Co-creation of solutions with the family, valuing their perceptions. This contrasts with much current practice which tends to assume the families are fundamentally dysfunctional and that their perceptions are therefore of little value. A greater focus on co creation can empower the family, enable it to achieve greater ownership of agreed solutions and courses of action, and ultimately greater independence with a reduced need for the support of social work and related services.
- The ability to work in a multi-disciplinary environment and to address the often fragmented nature of multiple professional interventions. Current practice is often characterized by a range of professional services intervening relatively independently of each other with only a limited attempt at assessing the relative impact of these interventions, or planning and prioritizing them. For the families concerned, dealing with the range of services involved can become a major weekly task.
- Case Management skills involving the ability to jointly assess and plan interventions with professionals from other disciplines who are working with the family and to manage the implementation of these interventions. This can represent a challenge to management hierarchies both within the professional's own discipline and those of related professionals, so competence in negotiating roles and responsibilities with these will be a critical part of this.

5. Preparation and activities for the Innovation skills development programme

In order to get things right from the beginning there are some important choices to be made about preparation, content and other practical matters to a training program leadership and specific contributions.

In the LIFE project each partner recruited 5-7 participants. The important point is that all participants should have their everyday work with multi-challenged families. In practice most participants will be social workers but it can be relevant to include personnel from other occupational groups. There need to be agreements with both the employers and individual participants regarding their availability and commitment to complete the program. Employers need to commit to replace participants if they drop out in the early stages.

Each participant shall be given a pre-course introduction so that they are clear on the objectives and requirements of the programme. The pre course introduction will focus on a) at an overall level understanding the purpose, context and activities with the Innovation training programme. b) Understanding the objectives and the pedagogical framework for the Innovations training programme. c) Understanding the role as participator in the innovation training programme. Key words is active participation, sharing experiences and be a “co-creator” of the training programme and in the knowledge development process.

The time is an important part of the structure of the programme in two aspects. Partly the time span should not be less than 100 hours, of which 50 hours are in seminar / workshop form and 50 hours of self-study. The program should also extend over a sufficient period of time to create time to both test new ways of working and reflect on these tests. The recommendation is about 10 - 12 months. It is suggested that the participators could meet regularly at least once per month to ensure that they do not lose contact with the programme.

In the work in the national groups the participants have to reflect upon work with particular families, including analysis of needs, shortcomings of services that have been offered, seeing the families as a whole, and looking at information and viewpoints of family members themselves. Not all the families that each group has selected can easily be dealt with fully, though there may be common needs and issues affecting several families. The focus must be firmly upon change first and foremost. The major components in the training program are the activities in the transnational meetings combined with the work in the participant groups, about 160 hours in all.

It is valuable to make a rapid transition to a situation in which the participants make decisions and judgements about their own process. The abductive learning approach we want to use requires that participants “own” their learning process and pursue it without input from authority within their own agency/institution. The idea is to recruit a variety of resource persons who can contribute, both at transnational meetings and in the interim national part of the program.

The training program leads to a written presentation from each participant that should concentrate on one or two innovations. These have to be described clearly and their relation to the agency setting made explicit. It is desirable, but not mandatory, that these be tried out in the training program. Each participant's presentation should outline issues relating to implementation of the chosen innovation(s). The written presentation is not an examination or written test: its purpose is to enable participants to work out their innovation ideas and to allow us to monitor the products of the training program. Presentations will be written in participants own language and we will have to consider how these can be translated for monitoring purposes.

A leader role is necessary to help participants “move along” and identify knowledge areas and approaches that can be explored. The proposition is that one specific person gets the task of being the overall leader and facilitator of the training program. That is necessary at both national and transnational level of the programme. In the LIFE Partnership we decided to leave each partner free to define the leader role in the national part of the training program. A role that is feasible and “right” for their particular situation. Local circumstances and resources will have to be taken into account. Any other contributors to the training program are at the discretion of partners, whether these have supporting or advisory roles or actually take part in the training program meetings and presentations.

It is of course very important that the actual organisation of the training program runs smoothly with proper information about meeting times, agendas for each meeting, reading requirements etc. being made available for participants. Detailed program, learning materials and tools must be available for circulation to participants prior to the start of the program. The groups should be set up as networks with Email addresses being distributed and participants should be encouraged to communicate with one another, and identify common issues/problems. If you are including a transnational part in the Innovation training programme at least one participant from each partner should be a fluent English speaker.

6. Basic Components in the Training Program

The training program consists of four different main components:

1. An introduction to innovation theory and practice (Learning, Learning organizations, Knowledge production, expertise and reflection, the relation between scientific/ knowledge based structuring and reflection, social workers background and competence lifeworld, citizens voice and monitoring practices).
2. Reflection by individual learners and groups of learners.
3. Individual work with practice-based innovations in their own context.
3. A written presentation from each participant/country group describing the individual learning process and developed innovations (see template as attachment).

The training program is organized in two transnational weeks and national training activities and covers a total of 160 hours of work for each participant.

Transnational training sessions in the Innovation skills development programme:

- January/February 2018 In Ljubljana, Slovenia
- November 2018 in Coimbra, Portugal
- For complete program, see attachment

Each partner organized introductory meetings before the first transnational meeting in Ljubljana and collected information and viewpoints from participators and to give some tuition relating to innovation theory.

First transnational training week, early 2018 , Project teams and participators from the different countries	
Introduction	Practical arrangements, presentation, introduction
Themes	<p>Theme: Innovating with multi-challenged families</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the practice experiences/actual challenges of multi-challenged families' situation in the partner countries/organizations? • What does research tell us about the situation for families with multiple challenges? The importance of an everyday life perspective, what do we mean by this? • National groups discuss the challenges families face. Do existing approaches and methods help? What are the gaps in knowledge and in services for the families about? <p>Theme: Innovating with multi-challenged families</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovation: what competence and skills are required for work with multi-challenged families? What do we mean by innovation? • Practice knowledge and Research knowledge in work with multi-challenged families. <p>Theme: Innovation approaches and challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovation research and challenges in partner countries. <p>Theme: Evaluation and Research</p>
Activities	<p>Lectures</p> <p>Group work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups discuss the challenges families face. • Do existing approaches and methods help? • What are the gaps in knowledge about, and gaps in services for the families? • National groups discuss need for new approaches to multi-challenged families. <p>Round table discussions</p> <p>Presentations</p>
Materials	Presentations based on templates from participating partners. Articles, power point presentations etc.

Final transnational training week, November, 2018 , Project teams and participators from the different countries	
Introduction	Practical arrangements, presentation, introduction
Themes	<p><u>Themes focusing on experiences from the national training programs and micro innovations in social work with MCF</u></p> <p><i>National training programs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organization of the training program • theoretical input and study materials • meetings and exchange with others • support • supervision • learning and outcomes <p><i>Social work with MCF</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenges in social work with MCF • Competencies and skills needed <p><i>Micro innovations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to identify micro innovations to work with • Challenges to work with micro innovations • The role of social worker in relation to work with MCF and micro innovations <p><u>Themes focusing on the conditions for working with micro innovations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factors that facilitate and hinder the work with micro innovations. • What support and skills is needed in the work with MCF and micro innovations? • Work with micro innovations in relation to organizational policies and practices • Implications for training and education.
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports by the individual partners on national training programs, learning and micro innovations in social work with MCF based on the participators reports (template). • Round table presentations and discussions focusing on experiences from the national training programs and learning. Mixed seminary groups from participating countries. • In group sum up from round table discussions focusing on experiences from the national training programs, learning and micro innovations in social work with MCF. Mixed seminary groups from participating countries. • Round table presentations and discussions focusing on skills, training, organizational factors and policy in social work with MCF. Small mixed groups from participating countries. • Conclusions in the light of the theoretical starting points: MCF, innovation, the knowledge triangle and abductive learning etc. • Reflections and evaluation of the training program.
Materials	Presentations based on templates from participating partners, list of learning material, PowerPoints from lectures and theoretical input

National parts of the training programs – February to October 2018

	Italy	Norway	Portugal	Slovenia	Sweden
Local curriculum aims/goals	Acquire tools (Triangle, Ecomaps, micro-planning grid) and methodologies able to support work with MCF.	Develop family centered innovations for child protection users	Improve working model centered on the clients/family through intervention in multidisciplinary teams, to involve, strengthen and empower MCF.	Support SWs who collaborate with MCF for reflexive use and development of knowledge and self-confidence. Implement innovations for SWs working with MCF.	Develop skills for innovations in social work with MCF.
Content / themes	Methods and tools to analyze and design interventions with families. Theoretical and methodological tools connect to the Italian national program P.I.P.P.I.	Protection. The quality of SW. SW and the approach to the families is the key issue. Re-framing. How to communicate with and involve families and to design help for them.	Innovation theory and practice. Theory of resilience, communication, literacy in inter professional practice, action-research, and co-construction. Relational skills, the attitude of the intervener.	Support, reflection and implementation of innovative SW with MCF. Working relationship of co-creation. Solution focused approach with families/children in community/at home. Narrative approach. Gestalt approach in working with children.	Research on SW with MCF, Learning and innovations in working life, case management, systemic perspective. Interpretation of collected material. Implications and applications.
Course design: lectures, group exercises, discussion, reflection	Lecture on tools for innovation. Discussions. Monitoring and reflection on work with MCF. Exercises. Preparation for TN meeting.	Reflection in group, support from project staff, ongoing support from two dedicated staff	Meetings with project team. Feedback. Sessions with Stakeholders and professors from Universities. Supervision.	Short lectures, discussions, experiential workshops, reflections about each project SWs projects. Homework after each meeting.	Lectures, group discussions, presentations and reflection on application of tasks in work with innovations. Work with TN report.
Participation of teachers, facilitators and supervisors	1 researcher from Padua University, project team.	Support from project team, stakeholders and guest lecturers.	Reflection Group, Social Workers, MCF.	2 researchers from Faculty of Social Work, project team.	1 professor from Linköping University, project team.
Number of meetings	7 days meetings.	2 events, 3-day sessions.	5 Sessions with Stakeholders. 36 meetings with SW.	10 half-day meetings.	7 half-day meetings.
Instructions and tasks for participants	How to use tools with clients. Analysis of situations, resources, needs and to define objectives and actions.	Group developed own dialogue, interchange and infrastructure.	Learning through reflection on practices with MCF, peers and stakeholders, abductive thinking, reflexivity, innovation in daily work.	Homework after each meeting, reading texts and recording meetings with families with pre-prepared forms.	Instructions for tasks, homework and critical reflection for each theme in the local training program.
Learning materials and tools	Selection of chapters in the handbook of the P.I.P.P.I. program.	Intellectual products, background study and selected literature	Articles, theses. Evaluation tools, template report.	Articles, book, power point presentations, demonstrations of new approaches.	Texts, power point presentations.
Abductive learning and work with micro innovations	Tools were used for inference from observation and experience during the interaction with families in creation of meaning and understanding of situations.	Strict abductive approach, minimal input from project staff. Encourage contact and dialogue with users-	Micro innovations, holistic, understanding of complex systems. Cooperating with stakeholders, building alliances and networks. Putting the family in the center for long term solutions.	Reflexive learning as starting point for the training program and each meeting.	Participants defined their own cases for innovation. Application of theory for learning, innovation and social work. Analysis of factors for change.
Feedback to participants e.g. regarding tasks and individual templates	Periodically researchers and participants met in order to discuss, reflect and support the innovations and the relation between practice and theories.	Periodically researchers and participants met in order to discuss, reflect and support the innovations and the relation between practice and theories.	Templates to help participants to work and (re)think. Important to invest in training concepts and reference theories before the development of micro innovations.	Continuous support from project team. Professors from FSW read and gave written feedback for participants. Feedback on each meeting and final assignments.	Written feedback on texts/templates from project team, discussions in group.

Each partner organized introductory meetings before the first transnational meeting in Ljubljana and collected information and viewpoints from participants and gave some tuition relating to innovation theory. It was decided that each partner could choose how to best organize the activities in the interim period in the light of their own circumstances and local conditions.

Summary of main components in national training programmes

- **Local, curriculum, aims/goals**
Develop skills for innovation, acquire tools and methodologies able to support work with MCF
- **Content / themes**
Learning and innovations in working life, co-creation, case management, communication, reframing
- **Course design**
Lectures, group exercises, discussion, reflection
Sessions with stakeholders, discussions, monitoring and reflection, exercises
- **Participation of teachers, facilitators and supervisors**
Support from project team, stakeholders, researchers
- **Number of meetings**
Different approach; half-day meetings (7-36) or fewer but longer sessions
- **Instructions and tasks for participants**
Homework after meetings, critical reflection on practices with MCF, analysis of situations, resources and needs of MCF
- **Learning materials and tools**
Articles, power point presentations, evaluation tools, template report
- **Abductive learning and work with micro innovations**
Encourage contact and dialogue with users, understanding of complex systems, analysis of factors for change
- **Feedback to participants e.g. regarding tasks and individual templates**
Support from project team, discussions with researchers and participants, written feedback on texts/templates

6. Concluding Remarks and recommendations

In view of the above, the ambition is to design and test an Innovation training program that will include a curriculum focusing on practice based innovation skills, knowledge and competencies required to enable professionals working with families to develop a holistic, flexible and constructively critical approach in social work with multi-challenged families. The program will be interactive, linking families with researchers, educators and practitioners and will be designed on a modular basis for delivery on a standalone basis or to complement existing professional development programs.

Furthermore, the program will be transferable on a transnational basis with core competencies and content which can be customized to national requirements and specific target groups.

Guidelines for organizers of training program for social workers working with families facing multiple challenges:

- Program must be based on a survey of participants' needs, done before the beginning of the training (e.g. about contents, methods of learning)
- Program must include topics about specifics of social work with families facing multiple challenges, innovations in social work, use of knowledge in practice and knowledge production
- The structure of the program must follow the guidelines of knowledge triangle (in connection with contents and trainers) (e.g. interaction between practice based knowledge, knowledge in training and education, and research-based knowledge)
- Enough time in the program for discussions in multicultural groups
- Consider the language barriers at the international weeks and find way to enable all to participate
- It is crucial for trainers who will lead national trainings and continuously support social workers during one year of national training to participate at the international weeks
- National trainings should have broad common frame (e.g. common and clear goals, basic structure) for all countries, but enough possibilities to adjust the programme to national needs

- Continuous support for social workers included in the program during national training is needed (e.g. reflection of practice experiences, experiential learning at the meetings, themes of meetings are planned based on actual needs of participants)
- It is crucial to regularly evaluate the training and adjust the program based on the evaluation results

Appendix

The Innovation skills training programme

Reference list of literature and learning materials

Multi challenged families and social work

Davidsson, B. (2017). *The Family Pilot – An evaluation of a project to develop working methods in social work with families with complex social needs (summary)*. R & D Centre in Care and Social Work. Linköping, Sweden.

LIFE (2017). *Summary of the baseline study – Social work in five countries for families with multiple challenges*. Erasmus + LIFE project.

LIFE (2017). *Intellectual Output 1: Competency Framework for the LIFE project*. Erasmus+ LIFE project.

Mešl, N. et.al. (2012). *The role of contemporary social work concepts in dealing with learned helplessness of children with learning difficulties*. Scientific paper. Faculty of social work, University of Ljubljana.

Mešl, N. and Kodele, T. (2016). *Co-creating processes of help: Collaboration with families in the community*. Faculty of social work, University of Ljubljana.

Mešl, N. and Kodele, T. (2016). Co-creating desired outcomes and strengthening the resilience of multi-challenged families. *C.E.P.S. Journal*, vol. 6, nr. 4.

Social innovation and social work

Bahar, O. S. (2017). "A Promising Partnership: Uncovering the Middle Ground Between Social Innovation and Social Work: Response to Dr. Marilyn L. Flynn's Remarks." *Research on Social Work Practice* **27**(2): 131-133.

Edwards-Schachter, M. and Wallace M. L. (2017). "'Shaken, but not stirred': Sixty years of defining social innovation." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **119**: 64-79.

Halvorsen, C. J. (2017). "Bridging Social Innovation and Social Work: Balancing Science, Values, and Speed." *Research on Social Work Practice* **27**(2): 129-130.

Nordic Council of Ministers (2015). *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation: Initiatives to Promote Social Entrepreneurship and Social Innovation in the Nordic Countries*. Copenhagen, Nordic Council of Ministers.

Phills, J. A., et al. (2008). Rediscovering Social Innovation. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Stanford, Stanford Social Innovation Review, Stanford University. **6**: 34-43.

Tracey, P. and Stott, N. (2017). "Social innovation: a window on alternative ways of organizing and innovating." *Innovation: Organization & Management* **19** (1): 51-60.

Turker, D. and Altuntas Vural, C. (2017). "Embedding social innovation process into the institutional context: Voids or supports." *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **119**: 98-113

Attachment - Complete Transnational Training Program

Ljubljana University 29 January – 1 February, 2018

Venue: Ljubljana University, Faculty of Social Work, Topniška 31, Ljubljana.

Schedule

Dates and time	Title/content	Responsible/ resource persons	Comments
Monday 29 January	Theme: Innovating with multi-challenged families		
09.00	Welcome, practical arrangements and introduction to the programme	Nina Mešl, Tadeja Kodele, Ljubljana University, Mats Eriksson, R & D Centre Linköping, Mari Nordstrand, NTNU Trondheim	
09.30	What is the practice experiences/actual challenges of multi challenged families' situation in the partner countries/organizations?	National groups gives presentations. Led by Mari Nordstrand.	Presentations with power points and hand outs
11.30	Lunch		
13.00	What does research tell us about the situation for families with multiple challenges? The importance of an everyday life perspective, what do we mean by this?	Graham Clifford, NTNU, Trondheim	The New Child Welfare, Families in social services, Ljubljana study, LIFE Baseline study
14.00	National groups discuss the challenges families face. Do existing approaches and methods help? What are the gaps in knowledge about, and gaps in services for the families? Summary in a round table presentation.	Round table led by Mari Nordstrand and Nina Mešl.	Each national group make a documentation from the reflection
15.50	Round table summary of the day	Mari Nordstrand, Nina Mešl	
16.00	Closing of the day		

Dates and time	Title/content	Responsible/ resource persons	Comments
Tuesday 30 January	Theme: Innovating with multi-challenged families		
09.00	Innovation: what competence and skill are required for work with multi challenged families? What do we mean by innovation?	Skender Redzovic, NTNU, Trondheim + expert from the partners about the competency framework.	Based on LIFE Competency Framework
10.00	National groups discuss need for new approaches to multi challenged families. Summary in a round table presentation.	Round table led by Mari Nordstrand and Nina Mešl.	Each national group make a documentation from the reflection
11.30	Lunch		
13.00	Plenum session with reports from national groups.	Skender Redzovic	
15.00	Practice knowledge and Research knowledge in work with multi challenged families	Edgar Marthinsen, NTNU, Trondheim	In plenum based on the LIFE knowledge triangle
15.50	Round table summary of the day	Mari Nordstrand, Nina Mešl	
16.00	Closing of the day		
19.00	Dinner for participators and project teams		Paid by each person

Dates and time	Title/content	Responsible/ resource persons	Comments
Wednesday 31 January	Theme: Innovation approaches and challenges		
09.00	How can the national groups approach their task?	Led by Graham Clifford, Edgar Marthinsen with contribution from the partner teams	
10.00	Innovation research and challenges in Slovenia and Italy	Input from research and practice Nina Mešl, Tadeja Kodele, person from Italy	In plenum. E.g. based on Co-creation, Family by Family
11.30	Lunch		
13.00	Innovation research and challenges in Sweden, Portugal and Norway	Input from research and practice	In plenum. E.g. Family Pilot
15.00	Round table summary of the day	Mari Nordstrand, Nina Mešl	
15.15	Sightseeing in Ljubljana		

Dates and time	Title/content	Responsible/ resource persons	Comments
Thursday 1 February	Theme: Evaluation and Research		
09.00	Research Components in the LIFE project	Graham Clifford and others from the partners	
10.30	Conclusions and next step	All and led by Mari Nordstrand, Nina Mešl	
11.00	Closing of the week		

Attachment

LIFE - Transnational Innovation Training Program in Coimbra, Portugal

Dates: Monday – Thursday, 26-29 November, 2018

Meeting venue: APCC, Coimbra – Rua Garcia de Orta - Vale das Flores

The agenda is organized to cover different themes, namely: the training program and work with MCF, micro innovations and organizational factors and policy in social work with MCF. In addition the program concludes by linking to the theoretical starting points: MCF, innovation, the knowledge triangle and abductive learning. The ambition is also to get a good balance between presentations from partners and discussions.

Time	Monday 26 November, 18.00 – 20.00	Comments
18.00-20.00	Welcome from the host, practical information.	Graça Gonçalves, Mats Eriksson

Time	Tuesday 27 November, 09.00 – 16.30	Comments
9.00-9.15	Welcome from the host, practical information, agenda for the meeting.	Graça Gonçalves, Mats Eriksson
9.15-10.15	Feedback from the national partners on national training programs. 15-20 minutes each.	PowerPoint presentation from each project team focusing on structure, content and results so far.
10.30-11.30	Round table discussions focusing on experiences from the national training programs. Small mixed groups from participating countries.	Mari Nordstrand and facilitators/researchers.
11.30-12.00	Sum up from discussions by facilitators.	In plenum.
13.00-12.00	Lunch	
13.00-14.30	Reports by the individual partners on learning and micro innovations in social work with MCF based on the participators reports (template). 15-20 minutes each.	PowerPoint presentation from each project team focusing on micro innovations.
15.00-16.30	Round table discussions focusing on micro innovations in social work with MCF. Mixed seminary groups from participating countries.	Mari Nordstrand and facilitators/researchers.

Time	Wednesday 28 November, 09.00 – 16.00	Comments
9.00-12.00	Cont. Round table discussions focusing on micro innovations in social work with MCF. Mixed seminary groups from participating countries.	Mari Nordstrand and facilitators/researchers.
12.00-13.00	Lunch	
13.00-14.00	Cont. Round table discussions focusing on micro innovations in social work with MCF. Mixed seminary groups from participating countries.	Mari Nordstrand and facilitators/researchers.
14.15-16.00	Sum up from discussions by facilitators. Closing of the day.	In plenum.
20.00	Project dinner	Everybody
Time	Thursday 29 November, 09.00 – 16.00	Comments
9.00-10.30	Participation from Portuguese stakeholders	Graça and colleagues
11.00-12.00	Study visit at APCC	Staff APCC
12.00-13.00	Lunch	
13.00-14.15	Round table discussions focusing on skills, training, organizational factors and policy in social work with MCF. Small mixed groups from participating countries.	Mari Nordstrand and facilitators/researchers.
14.15-15.00	Sum up from discussions by facilitators.	In plenum.
15.00-15.30	Conclusions in the light of the theoretical starting points: MCF, innovation, the knowledge triangle and abductive learning etc.	Skender Redzovic, Graham Clifford, Bo Davidsson
15.30-16.00	Reflections and evaluation of the training program.	Mats Eriksson
16.00	Thank you and goodbye. Closing of the day.	Graça Gonçalves, Mats Eriksson

Instructions to facilitators for the round table discussions

The round table discussions are to be organized in two slightly different ways:

1. **Small mixed groups.** This is the form chosen for the discussions on the training program on **Tuesday** and on skills, training, organizational factors and policy in social work with MCF on **Thursday**. These mixed groups will consist of 1-2 participants from each country, i.e. a total of 7-8 participants in each group.
2. **Mixed seminary groups.** This is the form chosen for the discussions focusing on micro innovations in social work with MCF on **Tuesday** and **Wednesday**. These groups will consist of 2 participants from each country (if possible), i.e. a total of 10 participants in each group.

For the round table discussions there will be facilitators from the project team in each group. The facilitators' task is to lead the discussion based on different themes so that each participant gets the opportunity to express her/his opinion and to encourage

discussion on the experiences in the work with MCF and micro innovations. The facilitators should also take notes and summarize the conclusions of the group discussion and, with the help of the group, present this in the sum up that concludes each round table.

Suggested themes for the facilitators to summarize the round table discussion on micro innovations with MCF:

Themes for sum up from round table discussions focusing on experiences from the national training programs

- organization of the training program
- theoretical input and study materials
- meetings and exchange with others
- support
- supervision
- learning and outcomes

Themes for sum up from round table discussions focusing on experiences from micro innovations in social work with MCF

1. Social work with MCF

- Challenges in social work with MCF
- Competencies and skills needed

2. Micro innovations

- How to identify micro innovations to work with
- Challenges to work with micro innovations
- The role of social worker in relation to work with MCF and micro innovations

Themes for sum up from round table discussions focusing on the conditions for working with micro innovations

- Factors that facilitate and hinder the work with micro innovations
- What support and skills is needed in the work with MCF and micro innovations?
- Work with micro innovations in relation to organizational policies and practices
- Implications for training and education

Round table groups

Round table 1. Tuesday 27 November, time 10.30 – 11.30

Working task: Round table discussions focusing on experiences from the national training programs.

Small mixed groups from participating countries. Main facilitator: Mari Nordstrand (No)

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Facilitator and researchers Bo Davidsson (Sw) Skender Redzovic (No) Christina Albuquerque (P)	Facilitator and researchers Sara Serbati (It) Willy Lichtwarck (No) Jorge Ferreira (P)	Facilitator and researchers Graca Goncalves (P) Björn Skoog (Sw) Graham Clifford (No)	Facilitator and researchers Lena Ulfseth (No) Mats Eriksson (Sw) Sonia Miguel Torga (P)
Social workers Valerija Ilešič (Slo) Diana Machado (P) Sofia Teixeira (P) Laura Di Stanislao (It) Therese Kratschmer (Sw)	Social workers Sanja Sitar Surič (Slo) Élia Costa (P) Sara Casadio (It) Lars Lindberg (Sw) Ida Vestin (Sw) Trine Olden Pettersen (No)	Social workers Tjaša Komac (Slo) Isabel Matos (P) Giulia Valbonetti (It) Josefin Söderstedt (Sw) Marie Persson (Sw) Pål Börmark (No) Grete Bartnes (No)	Social workers Meta Smole (Slo) Samuel Silva (P) Francesca Gnudi (It) Cecilia Cras (Sw) Claudia Manriquez Huaiquimilla (Sv)

Merete Aasheim (No) Karina Evjen (No) Cristina Duarte (P)	Hege-Cecilie Angell (No) Isabel Roseiro (P)		May-Elisabeth Lund (No) Alexandra Machado (P)
---	--	--	--

Round table 2. Tuesday 26 November, time 15.00 – 16.30

Wednesday 27 November, time 09.00 – 12.00, 13.00 – 14.00

Working task: Round table discussions focusing on micro innovations in social work with MCF.

Mixed seminary groups from participating countries. Main facilitator: Mari Nordstrand (No)

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Facilitators and researchers Bo Davidsson (Sw) Lena Ulfseth (No) Björn Skoog (Sw) Christina Albuquerque (P)	Facilitators and researchers Mats Eriksson (Sw) Skender Redzovic (No) Sonia Miguel Torga (P) Graham Clifford (No)	Facilitators and researchers Sara Serbati (It) Willy Lichtwarck (No) Jorge Ferreira (P) Graca Goncalves (P)
Social workers Tjaša Komac (Slo) Sofia Teixeira (P) Isabel Matos (P) Laura Di Stanislao (It) Giulia Valbonetti (It) Merete Aasheim (No) Karina Evjen (No) Pål Börmark (No) Josefin Söderstedt (Sw) Marie Persson (Sw)	Social workers Sanja Sitar Surič (Slo) Meta Smole (Slo) Élia Costa (P) Isabel Roseiro (P) Samuel Silva (P) Francesca Gnudi (It) Ida Vestin (Sw) Claudia Manriquez Huaiquimilla (Sv) Hege-Cecilie Angell (No) May-Elisabeth Lund (No)	Social workers Valerija Ilešič (Slo) Diana Machado (P) Cristina Duarte (P) Alexandra Machado (P) Sara Casadio (It) Trine Olden Pettersen (No) Grete Bartnes (No) Lars Lindberg (Sw) Therese Kratschmer (Sw) Cecilia Cras (Sw)

Round table 3. Thursday 29 November, time 13.00 – 14.15

Working task: Round table discussions focusing on skills, training, organizational factors and policy in social work with MCF. Main facilitator: Mari Nordstrand (No)

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Facilitator and researchers Bo Davidsson (Sw) Skender Redzovic (No) Christina Albuquerque (P)	Facilitator and researchers Sara Serbati (It) Willy Lichtwarck (No) Jorge Ferreira (P)	Facilitator and researchers Graca Goncalves (P) Björn Skoog (Sw) Graham Clifford (No)	Facilitator and researchers Lena Ulfseth (No) Mats Eriksson (Sw) Sonia Miguel Torga (P)
Social workers Valerija Ilešič (Slo) Samuel Silva (P) Sara Casadio (It) Cecilia Cras (Sw) Ida Vestin (Sw) May-Elisabeth Lund (No) Alexandra Machado (P)	Social workers Sanja Sitar Surič (Slo) Diana Machado (P) Giulia Valbonetti (It) Laura Di Stanislao (It) Marie Persson (Sw) Merete Aasheim (No) Karina Evjen (No)	Social workers Tjaša Komac (Slo) Élia Costa (P) Francesca Gnudi (It) Lars Lindberg (Sw) Claudia Manriquez Huaiquimilla (Sv) Trine Olden Pettersen (No) Hege-Cecilie Angell (No) Cristina Duarte (P)	Social workers Meta Smole (Slo) Isabel Matos (P) Sofia Teixeira (P) Josefin Söderstedt (Sw) Therese Kratschmer (Sw) Pål Börmark (No) Grete Bartnes (No) Isabel Roseiro (P)

Attachment – template for written presentations

Template for participants in The Innovation Training Program 2018

Introduction to the report/presentation

This task is part of The Innovation Training Program and has three main purposes: 1) To support project partners and training program participants to develop innovations in social work with Multi challenged families and 2) To follow-up, describe and analyze experiences, knowledge and innovations developed within the framework of the LIFE project 3) To be able to create an transnational and transferable Innovation toolkit for social work with multi challenge families.

Each participant is to complete a report to be submitted 15th October 2018. It should consist of 7 typewritten pages (see below). We would like your *own views about these issues*. We recommend you to not discuss your text with other group members before it is completed. Your text should be presented in Slovenian, Portuguese, Italian, Swedish or Norwegian.

The structure and scope of the task

1. Introduction and background (0,5 page)

Briefly describe the organization you work in and what assignment you have as a social worker.

2. Description of the innovation and learning process (4-5 pages)

Describe the innovation(s) you have worked with within the framework of The Innovation Training Program based on the following topics. Arrange your answer so that there is a good balance between the various topics.

1. *Everyday situations and needs*: your views related to being able to capturing the family's everyday situation and defining *their* needs: you are only required to relate your answer to one family who you have worked with. Was it possible to reframe your views about parents' and children's needs?
2. *Communication with family members*: were your ideas based on what the family (parents and children) wanted? Was it possible to have a useful dialogue with family members about problems they experience in their everyday life, and the kind of changes they wanted?
3. *Innovation*: was it possible to see new approaches, different methods and/or altered short- or long- term aims for working with the family?
4. *Feasibility*: To what extent were the changes you could recommend feasible in terms of the everyday working situation for you and your colleagues?

5. *Agency policy*: did your ideas about desirable innovation come into conflict with your agency's policies and/or practices? If so, explain why.

3. The Innovation, knowledge, skills and organizational factors (1 - 2 pages)

1. Describe the purpose and the key components for the innovation (s) you have worked with.
2. Describe what skills should be available to work with the selected micro innovation:
 - a) With you and your colleagues as a social workers.
 - b) In your organization and in cooperating organizations.
3. Describe factors at the organizational level that limit or support the ability for long-term and sustained work with the chosen innovation.

4. Concluding remarks (0,5 page)

Summarize the most important experiences and knowledge gained in the work with MCF.

What experience, knowledge and results from the work with MCF should be part of an Innovation toolkit for social work with MCF?

What consequences should the experiences you have made through the LIFE project be for a future social worker role in social work with MCF?