

Selling tools is fraught with similar difficulties. I can sell you the baking tins. But that won't help you figure out what to fill the baking tins with. And you can easily put the baking tins to a different usage. That's not necessarily a problem - if you're able to make something yummy using the tins. But if I'm trying to prompt *intentional*/social change, then peddling the implements, probably won't get me to coherent implementation. And it definitely won't get me towards fidelity. When we do one-off workshops and create methods card sets, we're really in the tool business.

Then there's the baking school experience. So in-context project based learning. With the right instruction in baking chemistry, exposure to different baking methods, guidance and a lot of feedback, you could learn to be a pretty competent cupcake baker. But this is time intensive. How much learning do you need to be competent, versus be good? And how do we actually design our processes in such a way that more and more people can be immersed in the doing? So that it's not just tight project teams - from social labs - doing all the work? Plus, how do we find and up-skill the instructors? The key to teaching baking is actually having made a lot of cupcakes yourself, and being able to extrapolate transferrable concepts. But who in our field has actually *made* a lot of what we're talking about? The rhetoric often feels ahead of the practice.

Finally, there's what I'll call the Jamie Oliver approach. Developing a mix of inspirational and learning content - so a TV show which exposes you to new kinds of cupcakes and to *somebody else's tacit knowledge*. Along with a magazine with stories, and embedded recipes. As well as product partnerships - so 'quality approved' tools to use in your home contexts.

How could we create a similar mix of content to bring more and more people into our processes? Indeed, what's so compelling about Jamie Oliver is that he's managed to build a movement alongside a set of products. And he operates at differing levels of fidelity. Go to his restaurants, and get the full Jamie Oliver quality-approved experience. Use his books and tools, get a taste of the Jamie Oliver experience, and add your own spin. Of course, whether you go to his restaurant or do-it-yourself at home, key to a good experience is a shared idea of what constitutes a good outcome: is it taste, health, speed, value, novelty, or some combination?

## Jesper's Response:

The ability to spread the process rather than the product is key in much government planning. Notions of 'blueprint', 'manual' or 'best practice' have done much damage in mismanaging the expectations to what could actually be expected of the 'solutions' that are supposed to create change in public systems and services. A common and reoccurring question amongst decision makers and civil servants is: why are there so few solutions that actually scale?

This is seen as a huge problem - mainly when seen in economic terms. But also in relation to the role of the public sector more generally. Many civil servants see their role as one of standardization and replication. "We can't let 1000 flowers blossom" is a common phrase. Instead, there is a desire to find the 'best practice,' to analyse every aspect of it, and then to scale it - as a product that is able to change its contextual environment. In practice, this logic is reversed when dealing with social change.

Sarah is pointing our attention to the notion of 'tacit knowledge.' This is important. In particular when working in contexts where the dominant epistemological position is based on one of its counterparts: rationalized, stable knowledge.

In [MindLab](#), we are currently assisting the Ministry of Employment to implement some ambitious reforms focusing on, among many other things, reinventing the role of social worker. The Ministry