Introduction

This document is an annex to the Trainers' Manual prepared in Work Package 3. It describes methodological aspects and contains questions proposed to be used during the practical exercises foreseen within Modules 1 and 2 of the training to be held under the same work package., thus:

- Module 1: Activity - Ice-break and identification of expectations (Slide no. 6),
- Module 2: Activity - Quadruple helix cooperation: Roles and potential benefits for RIS3 stakeholders - value proposition for quadruple helix partners from RIS3 perspective (Slide no. 31).

The exercises are built in a way to:

- Fit into the thematic of the modules and proposed course structure,
- Be in line with the aims of the project, by putting accent on enhancing triple/quadruple helix cooperation linked to the smart specialisation process, at the same time reinforcing the key role of HEIs in the regional innovation (eco-)system.

In addition to that, the two exercises should be seen in a complementary manner. The first exercise is at the beginning of the training, before participants become familiar with RIS3 and quadruple helix related concepts. It is intended to shed light on participants' familiarity with regional smart specialisation processes as well as on regional stakeholder cooperation dynamics, helping the trainers to further tailor training content (by putting more or less accent on different content/themes). The second exercise has the objective to assess how and to what extent the information shared during the training has changed participants perceptions about quadruple helix cooperation in general and cooperation with HEIs in particular in light of RIS3.

Finally, another aim of the exercises is to gather information about the specific bottlenecks and problems linked to triple/quadruple helix cooperation on the level of participating regions. This information can be then additionally used as qualitative information to prepare documents and events under WP2 and WP3 (for example, HEIs action plans, HEIs meetings with other stakeholders, etc.).

Partners are free to select from or add to the questions proposed, based on the specificity of the regional (eco-)system. Responsible trainers and facilitators should be prepared to put additional questions or modify questions based on the dynamic of trainees.

Methodological aspects

There are two main methodological options partners and trainers can choose from for both exercises. Both are designed for an online environment. A combination of the two approaches can also be used. The recommendation is for Option 1 for the first exercise and Option 2 for the second exercise.

Option 1: Structured discussions within smaller groups of participants conducted by a facilitator using Jam Board

In this case, the trainer or a person responsible for technical support will generate three smaller groups of participants and allocate them in separate breakout rooms along with one facilitator: a) representatives of public administration and RIS3 responsible organisations, b) business representatives, and c) civil society. Participants of each group can be previously identified by

analysing the responses in the registration forms that participants should complete before the course (see proposed registration forms in the Training Manual, Chapter 3.3 Support tools and forms).

The three smaller groups will work together in the same room, or in a dedicated online breakout rooms each in which they will discuss along the questions proposed with the support of a facilitator. At the beginning, the facilitator will explain to the participants what their role is and what they have to do in this practical session. The tool that is proposed to be used is Google Jam Board (https://jamboard.google.com/d/1Gni_ilriYUA7KjJaCvzcCsSu-jNkqru3N7KKDEyvs90/viewer?f=0). The trainer, together with facilitators will prepare a slide with empty post-its for each of the three categories/groups of participating stakeholders. Summary of answers given will be written down on the post-its previously prepared and will form the basis of reporting back on the conclusions to the whole group at the end of the exercise.

Depending on if the training session is held online or face-to-face, this exercise can be implemented as follows:

1. Online: If possible (e.g. if the organizers have Zoom accounts), groups will be in online breakout rooms to facilitate separate discussions. This approach is suitable to encourage discussions but is not mandatory if the organizers do not have the required online tools. Alternatively, participants can be in one room and work in the specific Google Jamboard Slide.

2. Face-to-face: participants can work/discuss in separate rooms and complete the Jamboard slide with the conclusions.

Option 2: Structured open discussions with all participants in the training session

All participants are free to discuss jointly by answering the questions proposed. Discussions are moderated by the trainer with the support of a facilitator. There is one person dedicated to take notes, based on which conclusions and summary of discussions (debriefing) can be presented at the end of the exercise to the whole group.

Time frames proposed:

- 5 minutes overview of the activity – by facilitators within each smaller group in case of Option 1 and by the trainer at the beginning of the exercise in case of Option 2,

- 15 - 25 minutes of structured discussions in breakout rooms or in a full format depending on the number of participants and their openness for the exercises,

- 5 minutes final conclusions, debriefing - in case of option 2 and 3 x 2 minutes of final conclusions in case of option 1.

Questions

Note: *It is not mandatory to ask all the questions suggested below. Organizers/trainers can choose the relevant questions for their context considering the options of questions given.*

Module 1. - Activity - Icebreak and identification of expectations (Slide no. 6)

1. **Experience of cooperation with others: Describe experiences of collaboration you had with other organisations, their context and results. How do you feel about this collaboration in general? More specifically:**

   - Have you ever formally or informally collaborated with other types of organisations from the regional innovation ecosystem (*in case of Option 1 please explicitly refer to the categories of actors that are different from the ones in the smaller group; in case of Option 2 please specify for each type of actor that they should think in terms of other types of organisations from the quadruple helix)*? What kind of organisations have you cooperated with and what was the context of cooperation?

   - What was your experience linked to the cooperation mentioned? What were the achievements and the added value? What were the main problems and difficulties you have encountered? What were the key elements that facilitated the collaboration with the other partners?

2. **Expectations – reaching the others: Who are the institutions you would like to work with and what hinders this cooperation? More specifically:**

   - Are there any institutions, organisations in the region with whom you wanted to cooperate, but never succeeded? What was the objective of that cooperation and what were the bottlenecks?

   - Which regional partners would you like to work with in the future and why?

3. **My organization and RIS3**

   - Have you ever participated in an event linked to the design and implementation of RIS3 in your region? If yes, what is your experience linked to interaction with other types of actors? (*in case of Option 1 please explicitly refer to the categories of actors that are different from the ones in the smaller group; in case of Option 2 please specify for each type of actor that they should think in terms of other types of organisations from the quadruple helix)*

   - What do you think the role of your organization should be in the process of regional innovation and smart specialization?

Module 2 - Quadruple helix cooperation: Roles and potential benefits for RIS3 stakeholders

1. How do you think that participation in RIS3 could contribute to the development of the organization / stakeholder category you represent?

2. What is the value proposed by the organization / stakeholder category you are part of in the RIS3 design and implementation processes?

3. What should be the roles of HEIs in RIS3 from your organizations' perspective? What would be the areas in which you would consider cooperating with an HEI?

4. What could be the benefits of collaborating with other RIS3 stakeholders?

5. What is needed to foster collaboration between RIS3 stakeholders?

6. What do you think would be the main barriers you could encounter in RIS3 collaboration?