Teaching Social Innovation in the Age of AI

Mats Danielson[1,2]

[1] Openlab Stockholm, Valhallavägen 79, SE-114 28 Stockholm, Sweden

[2] Dept. of Computer and Systems Sciences, Stockholm University, PO Box 1073, SE-164 25 Kista, Sweden

Correspondence: Mats Danielson, Dept. of Computer and Systems Sciences, Stockholm University, PO Box 1073, SE-164 25 Kista, Sweden.

Received: November 10, 2025 Accepted: December 12, 2025 Published: December 17,2025

doi:10.65343/erd.v2i1.65 URL: https://doi.org/10.65343/erd.v2i1.65

Abstract

This paper examines how a contemporary conversational artificial intelligence performs in the concept generation phase of design thinking based social innovation education. The setting is Openlab Stockholm's interdisciplinary master course Innovations for Societal Challenges, where student teams work with real challenges from the City of Stockholm and Region Stockholm. In the study, eight project reports from recent course iterations were selected, of which six could be processed technically. For each team, a three step protocol was applied. First, the AI chatbot (ChatGPT 5.1 Pro) read only the empathise and define sections of the student report, including field insights and the team's reframed point of view, but not their own concepts. Second, the chatbot generated five solution directions, called concepts in the course, based solely on that material. Third, once the full report including the student concepts was opened by the author only, the two concept sets were compared along five criteria: social impact and relevance, innovativeness and insightfulness, feasibility and solidness as a foundation for continued work, agency and ownership including stakeholder alignment, and scalability, learning and robustness. Each set was given an indicative score on a five-point scale for every criterion and an overall average per case.

Across the six complete comparisons, the chatbot produced concept sets that were consistently competitive with the student teams, but typically scored slightly lower overall. The AI performed particularly well on tight alignment with user needs, clear conceptual structuring and proposals for modular, scalable engagement systems. The student teams, however, outperformed the AI on contextualisation in the Swedish public sector, institutional realism, stakeholder anchoring and empirically grounded feasibility, supported by prototyping, surveys and sponsor interaction. The study concludes that a current AI chatbot can match master students in creativity and user insight when given high quality research and problem framing, but cannot replace the situated, collective work of embedding concepts in real organisational, legal and political contexts. In design thinking education, its most appropriate role is that of a powerful early stage ideation partner rather than a substitute innovator.

Keywords: design thinking, social innovation, artificial intelligence, concept generation, public sector innovation, project based learning, higher education, human AI collaboration, qualitative case study, Openlab Stockholm

1. Introduction

Design thinking has over the past two decades moved from design studios and academic circles into mainstream discourses of management, public administration and social change. It is commonly presented as a human-centred and iterative approach to complex problems, combining deep engagement with users and stakeholders with cycles of framing, ideation, prototyping, and testing. Brown and Katz (2019) describe design thinking as the application of designers' ways of working to a broad range of innovation challenges in order to match human needs with what is technically feasible and organisationally viable. Instead of treating design as a late-stage aesthetic exercise, they argue that design thinking brings a particular kind of abductive reasoning, visualisation and experimentation into the earliest stages of problem exploration and opportunity creation. From this perspective, design thinking is less a codified toolkit and more a way of working in which uncertainty and ambiguity are treated as material for creative inquiry rather than as obstacles to be eliminated (Cross, 2011; Dorst, 2011).

Although popular accounts often present design thinking as a sequence of stages, viz. empathise, define, ideate, prototype, and test, or as a double diamond that alternates between divergence and convergence, evidence suggests that its practice is more heterogeneous and situated than those diagrams imply. Carlgren et al. (2016) argue that design thinking should be understood simultaneously as a concept, a practice and a discourse. In their study of organisations that adopted design thinking, they found substantial variation in what practitioners considered essential elements, in how processes were structured, and in how the label was used strategically within firms. This insight complicates any simple view of design thinking as a universal method and instead highlights the

importance of local enactment and organisational learning. Brown and Katz (2019) similarly caution against reducing design thinking to a checklist, and emphasise that its value lies in cultivating capabilities such as empathy, integrative thinking, rapid prototyping and storytelling that allow teams to reframe problems, explore alternative futures and negotiate among diverse perspectives.

The connection between design thinking and social innovation has become increasingly prominent. Social innovation refers to new ideas, practices and arrangements that aim to meet social needs more effectively or more justly than existing solutions and that often reshape the roles of public institutions, civil society and citizens. Manzini (2015) characterises design for social innovation as work that supports and amplifies initiatives emerging from communities and social movements, especially in areas such as ageing, care, environmental sustainability and urban living. Designers in this field do not primarily produce finished artefacts but contribute to the configuration of collaborative platforms, service ecologies and networks of actors. In his view, design thinking offers tools and languages for making such often fragile initiatives more visible, legible and robust, and for connecting them with institutional actors without erasing their situated character. Brown and Katz (2019) likewise argue that design thinking is well-suited to the so-called wicked problems of contemporary society because it combines attention to individual experiences with system-level mapping and experimentation.

Public sector organisations have adopted design thinking as one response to the challenges of fragmented responsibilities, risk aversion and weak citizen involvement that often hinder social innovation. Bason (2017) documents how public managers in several countries have used design approaches to bring citizens and frontline staff into policy processes, to map complex service systems and to prototype new forms of interaction between state and society. Design is portrayed here as a catalyst for human-centred governance, shifting the focus from internal procedures and programme compliance toward outcomes as experienced by people in their everyday lives. Manzini (2015) notes that when public bodies work in this way, they can act as enablers of distributed social creativity rather than as sole problem solvers, which is crucial in fields where durable solutions depend on sustained collective effort. In practice, this often means using design thinking not only to generate ideas, but also to create shared artefacts, stories and prototypes that help diverse stakeholders explore and negotiate possible futures together.

In parallel, design thinking has been taken up in education at different levels as both subject matter and pedagogical approach. Advocates argue that design thinking can support the development of creativity, collaboration, problem-solving, and empathy, sometimes summarised as 21st-century competences. Lor (2017), in a critical review of design thinking in education, describes it as an innovation-oriented and learner-centred process in which multidisciplinary teams tackle open-ended challenges and move iteratively between research, ideation and prototyping. She also warns that if design thinking is imported as a fashionable method without serious attention to context, it can remain superficial and fail to engage with deeper structural issues in schooling. Panke (2019) synthesises work across school and higher education and concludes that design thinking can provide a productive framework for project-based learning, especially when students collaborate with external partners on authentic problems, but that it requires careful scaffolding and reflection in order to avoid becoming a set of ritualised activities.

In higher education, design thinking has been integrated into management, engineering and social science programmes where students are expected to engage with real-world complexity. Courses often involve partnerships with companies, municipalities or civil society organisations and ask student teams to work through empathic inquiry, problem reframing and concept development for live briefs. Brown and Katz (2019) explicitly present design thinking as a general innovation literacy that managers, civil servants and professionals outside design need to acquire in order to navigate uncertain environments. Manzini (2015) similarly sees design for social innovation as a promising domain for educating future professionals and citizens who will need to collaborate across institutional boundaries. Bason (2017) suggests that public administrators require not only analytical skills but also design capabilities if they are to lead human-centred change in complex governance systems. Social innovation education that uses design thinking thus occupies a specific niche in which students learn to move between user perspectives and system constraints, to generate and compare alternative concept directions and to negotiate with public sector and community stakeholders. The present study situates itself within this niche by treating a design thinking-based social innovation course as a testbed for comparing human and artificial intelligence in early-stage concept generation, and by asking how a contemporary conversational artificial intelligence fares relative to teams of master students when working within a structured design thinking process.

2. Background

Openlab Stockholm was established in 2013 as a joint initiative of the City of Stockholm, Region Stockholm, the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm University, Karolinska Institutet and Södertörn University College. It was conceived as a creative centre for societal innovation in the Stockholm region, tasked with mobilising and coordinating innovation capacity across these institutions in order to address complex public challenges. Openlab's

mission is framed in terms of challenge-driven innovation for a sustainable society, with a particular emphasis on improving quality of life for residents through collaboration, design methods and early testing of ideas (Openlab, 2025a; Openlab, 2025b). Over time it has evolved into a community and physical hub that combines education, innovation support and co working infrastructure, positioning itself as an expert resource for public sector innovation in the region.

From the outset, Openlab has been organised around transdisciplinary education for social and public innovation. Danielson and Björkman (2025) describe it as a challenge-driven innovation arena providing courses for master and doctoral students as well as professionals, together with co-creation spaces and process support for innovation projects. The flagship master level course, titled Innovations for Societal Challenges, is an interdisciplinary project course in which students from the four partner universities work in mixed teams on real challenges submitted by the City of Stockholm and Region Stockholm. The course is explicitly grounded in design thinking and project-based learning, requiring students to understand complex societal problems, construct their own point of view, and develop and test concept-level solutions on behalf of public sector clients (Openlab, 2025b).

The master course has played a central role in defining Openlab's pedagogical profile. It combines intensive teamwork, stakeholder interaction and iterative design workshops over a full semester, and has been analysed as a case of transformation driving education that links challenge-driven learning with regional development agendas (Rosén et al., 2022). This research highlights how Openlab's course design intertwines cognitive, social and emotional dimensions of learning through the use of interdisciplinary teams, real stakeholder missions and design thinking processes. At the same time, Openlab has developed a portfolio of professional courses for civil servants and other practitioners. These range from introductory design thinking workshops to continuation courses that deepen skills in insight-driven innovation and reframing of challenges, all structured around concrete cases from public organisations (Openlab, 2025a). The professional courses mirror the academic ones in their emphasis on interdisciplinary teamwork, user-centred inquiry and hands-on experimentation, but have shorter duration.

In parallel with its educational activities, Openlab has built a substantial innovation support function. It offers facilitated processes for partners and external actors who seek help with innovation leadership, needs analysis, formulation and reframing of challenges, and development of new services, products or work methods in the public sector (Openlab, 2025a). These services are supported by co-creation spaces, workshop rooms and digital platforms that accommodate collaborative work across organisational boundaries. The innovation support and educational programmes are closely intertwined: student projects often seed longer term innovation initiatives, and alumni as well as public servants trained in Openlab's professional courses feed back into the community as collaborators and challenge givers. This reciprocal structure reinforces Openlab's role as a regional hub where design thinking, social innovation and public administration meet, and where academic learning, professional development and concrete innovation projects are deliberately integrated.

3. Methodology

The study was designed as an exploratory multiple case comparison in which an artificial intelligence chatbot (the newly released ChatGPT 5.1 Pro) and student teams worked independently (in space and time) on the concept generation phase of a design thinking process. Each case involved a project team in a master's-level course at Openlab Stockholm, working on a real-world public-sector challenge. Eight project reports (from 2023 to 2025) were selected for this study, Teams 1−8, but for Teams 2 and 3, the chatbot was not able to open and read the project report PDF files. For the six remaining teams, the students' design reports and the chatbot's independently generated concepts were treated as embedded units of analysis within a single educational and organisational setting, which aligns with Yin's notion of embedded case study designs where multiple units are examined within a bounded system (Yin, 2018). The aim was not statistical generalisation, but analytic investigation into broader questions about the respective strengths of human teams and generative artificial intelligence in early-stage social innovation work.

The empirical material consisted of the project reports produced by the student teams and the concept sets generated by the chatbot. Each team report followed the structure of the Openlab master course and included an empathise phase (fieldwork, stakeholder interviews, and secondary data), a define phase (problem framing and point of view) and an ideate phase (generation and selection of solution directions called "concepts"). For each of the six teams, the research procedure followed a fixed three-step protocol. In step A, the chatbot was given access to the empathise and define sections of each team's report. It read these sections, including the original challenge, insights from user research and the reformulated problem statement (a so-called point of view in design thinking terminology), but did not have access to any of the students' subsequent ideation or prototyping phases. This corresponds to a form of qualitative content analysis in which textual material is first understood within its communicative context before any coding or comparison is attempted (Mayring, 2014).

In step B, based solely on the understanding gained in step A, the chatbot suggested five solution directions, here referred to as concepts, for the team's challenge. These concepts were required to be coherent with the team's

point of view and user insights, to be creative and innovative, and to represent feasible directions for further development within the second half (10 weeks remaining) of the course. The procedure mirrors emerging work on human–AI collaboration in design where generative models are used as partners in ideation and concept development while being constrained by prior research and framing (Chang & Tung, 2025; Lyu, Hao, & Yi, 2023). Importantly, the chatbot produced its five concepts without access to the students' own ideation outcomes, thereby approximating the same informational conditions as those under which the student teams had worked.

In step C, the author compared each student team's innovation suggestions in the project report to the chatbot's. For each case, the author, who has been supervising each of the project teams during the courses, compared the bot's five concepts with the team's five using a predefined analytic framework. The framework consisted of five criteria: social impact and relevance, innovativeness and insightfulness, feasibility and solidness as a foundation for continued work, agency and ownership including stakeholder alignment, and scalability, learning and robustness. These criteria had been decided on in advance by the author to reflect both design thinking ideals and the specific course context. See below for a more detailed discussion of the criteria. The comparison combined qualitative content analysis of the concept descriptions with rubric-based scoring (Mayring, 2014; Yin, 2018). For each criterion, the author made a narrative comparison and assigned an indicative score from one to five (with one decimal) for the AI set and the student set respectively, followed by an overall average score per set in each case. This is admittedly subjective, but serves as a starting point for discussing the impact of AI chatbots in innovation education. The author has had no contact with any of the student teams after they submitted their reports for the final grading examination.

The use of an explicit rubric with rating scales is in line with established practice in performance assessment in education, where rubrics are employed to support structured judgement of complex outputs and to enhance reliability and transparency (Andrade, 2005; Jonsson & Svingby, 2007). In this study, the rubric was not used for high stakes grading but as an analytic device to make comparisons across cases more systematic and to facilitate cross-case pattern recognition. The numerical scores are therefore best understood as descriptive indicators that complement the qualitative comparisons rather than as precise measurements.

Across the six cases, the analysis proceeded as a form of cross-case synthesis (Yin, 2018). For each team, the narrative comparisons and scores were examined to identify where and how the chatbot's concepts outperformed, matched or underperformed relative to the student concepts along the five criteria. Recurrent patterns, such as the chatbot's tendency to propose more system-oriented and scalable engagement mechanisms and the students' stronger anchoring in organisational realities and stakeholder structures, were noted and interpreted in light of current discussions about generative AI as a co-creative design partner rather than substitute for human designers (Chang & Tung, 2025; Lyu et al., 2023). The resulting tendencies informed the discussion of the relative strengths and limitations of AI-supported concept generation in social innovation education.

4. Assessment Criteria

These are the five criteria selected for assessing social innovation in this study and which can be used consistently for both sets of concepts.

1). Social impact and relevance

Does the concept address the core social challenge in a meaningful way, for the specific users and stakeholders in the case? Indicators: a) Clear theory of change from activities to outcomes; b) Relevance to the defined problem and target group; and c) Potential depth and breadth of positive social impact. This indicates how well the concept addresses the core social challenge for the defined users and stakeholders, and whether there is a plausible path to meaningful social outcomes.

2). Innovativeness and insightfulness

How original and insight-based is the concept, given the context and what is already common practice? Indicators: a) Builds on surprising or non-obvious insights from the case material; b) Moves beyond standard solutions or generic digital platforms; and c) Reframes part of the problem or creates a new value proposition. This indicates how original the concept is and how strongly it is rooted in non-trivial insights from the context, users and system, rather than generic solutions.

3). Feasibility and solidness as a foundation

How well does the concept function as a robust foundation for later detailed solution design? Indicators: a) Internally coherent and not hand-waving; b) Clear how one could break it down into services, processes or interventions later; and c) Uses resources and capacities that are plausible in the context.

4). Agency, ownership and stakeholder alignment

Is it clear who does what, who owns the initiative and how different actors can actually exercise agency? Indicators: a) Named primary owner or lead organisation or community actor; b) Concrete roles for key stakeholders, not just abstract mentions; and c) Incentives aligned so that actors have reasons to participate and sustain the solution. This indicates how clearly the concept specifies who leads, who participates and why they would be willing to act, including incentives and roles.

5). Scalability, learning and robustness

Can the concept grow, adapt and survive in the real institutional and political environment? Indicators: a) Built in feedback loops, learning or experimentation; b) Possibility to adapt to other contexts or scale up if it works; and c) Some robustness to policy changes, funding shifts or staff turnover. This indicates how well the concept invites experimentation, learning and adaptation over time, and whether it has the potential to scale or transfer and survive real-world constraints.

5. The Projects

The course runs every semester, for the entire semester (20 weeks) at half pace, requiring 20 hours of coursework per week. Eight project reports were selected from the four latest completed semesters. For the complete reports, see (Openlab, 2025b). Of the 12 available reports, the eight that had the most detailed background descriptions were chosen, in order to give the AI chatbot a fair chance of generating five solution concepts, the same number that the students are asked to do for the midterm presentation. For each team report in turn, the steps A to C in the methods section were carried out. Below is a presentation of the student team's five solution concepts (one team had seven) followed by the AI chatbot's five. Thereafter, the two sets of concepts are compared using the five criteria described above and a score is given to each set. The intended way to read this article is to look up the original reports (Openlab, 2025b), read them one by one, and for each compare them to the AI chatbot's suggested concepts in Appendix A. After the comparison, read the criteria assessments below and the final score.

6. Challenge 1 - Report Name: FROM

Team 1 concept set (seven in total)

1. Door 2 Door: multimodal first and last kilometre services combining public transport, shared cars, bikes and scooters.
2. Tra-fika: recurring networking and community events at sports environments to build trust and culture that supports ride sharing.
3. Carbon Conscience: awareness and behaviour campaigns, including SL app messages, social media and gamified carbon information.
4. Green Hubs: hubs at natural gathering places (for example sports facilities) where multiple services are co-located to reduce the need for separate car trips.
5. Mobility Lab: a shared data and collaboration environment across administrations, research and companies.
6. Idrottsbuss: a dedicated activity bus concept making it easier for families to reach sports and leisure activities.
7. Responsible ride-sharing app (FROM): a local app anchored at sports halls and clubs that organises ride-sharing among parents.

ChatGPT 5.1 Pro set

1. A dedicated sports shuttle service aligned with training and match schedules, tightly integrated with SL planning so parents and clubs can rely on predictable, safe trips instead of ad hoc car use.
2. Neighbourhood sports pods near schools and housing, with secure bike parking, gear lockers and mini club space, to make walking and biking to sports the default.
3. A parent mobility time bank where families earn credits for car-free travel and shared rides that can be redeemed for club fees or local services.
4. A safe routes mentor programme where older youths or vetted adults accompany groups of children on public transport or bikes along mapped safe corridors to and from sports venues.
5. A sports journey planner that connects club calendars with SL (the public transport authority) data and local ride sharing options, giving parents one-click alternatives to driving for each practice or match.

6.1 Comparison by Criterion

6.1.1 Fit With User Needs and Insights

Team set: Several concepts are strongly anchored in parents and sports: Door 2 Door, Idrottsbuss and the ride-sharing app FROM. Tra-fika also arises from real field insights about community and trust. Carbon Conscience, Green Hubs and Mobility Lab lean more toward system-level and administrative needs, which reflect macro and meso insights, but they are somewhat more distant from the lived daily pain of individual parents.

AI set: All five concepts are directly anchored in the narrow user group and context: parents and children in relation to sports activities and trips to IPs. They respond clearly to expressed needs around safety, time stress, logistics and desire for children to gain independence. They also resonate with the specific PoV about multi-location trips and constraints of the existing public transport system.

Indicative scores: Team 4.0 / 5, AI bot 4.5 / 5. Slight advantage to the AI set on tight alignment with the chosen user and PoV.

6.1.2 Innovativeness and Insightfulness

Team set: Some concepts are standard patterns in this domain: awareness campaigns, a ride-sharing app, multimodal first-last kilometre services and data labs are well-known solution types. Green Hubs and Tra-fika apply these patterns creatively in the sports and leisure context and are insight-driven, but conceptually they resemble existing ideas like community hubs and stakeholder forums. Idrottsbuss as repurposing existing buses for sports is clever but not radically new.

AI set: The time bank for mobility and the youth mentor safe routes programme push into less conventional territory and combine social and mobility innovation. The sports pods and combined journey planner are more incremental but still show a clear reframing of how sports logistics and infrastructure could be organised. Overall, there is a mix of incremental and more speculative ideas, all still grounded.

Indicative scores: Team 3.5 / 5, AI bot 4.0 / 5. Clear advantage to the AI set for conceptual freshness.

6.1.3 Feasibility and Strength as a Foundation for Solutions

Team set: Team 1 explicitly recognises feasibility differences. Door 2 Door, Idrottsbuss and the ride-sharing app are realistic within current institutional structures. Green Hubs and Mobility Lab are clearly more demanding and the report itself flags their implementation issues, which is helpful but also shows that some of their portfolio is quite heavy for a near term concept. Tra-fika and Carbon Conscience are relatively easy to pilot and scale gradually. Overall, their set contains both light and heavy concepts, and they already start reflecting on feasibility trade-offs, which is exactly the bridge toward the course's second half.

AI set: The shuttle, pods, time bank, mentor programme and journey planner are all conceptually implementable, but several would require new organisational structures and actors that are not yet clearly identified. The time bank and mentor programme in particular need careful institutional anchoring and governance design for the second half of the course. As a foundation, these concepts are coherent but would still require substantial elaboration on ownership, funding and regulation before detailed solutions can be built.

Indicative scores: Team 3.5 / 5, AI bot 3.5 / 5. Roughly a tie. Both sets mix easier and harder concepts; the team earns points for explicit feasibility reflection, while the AI set avoids infrastructurally heavy ideas.

6.1.4 Agency, Ownership and Stakeholder Alignment

Team set: Here they clearly shine. Mobility Lab and Tra-fika are direct responses to collaboration and knowledge barriers between departments. Green Hubs and Carbon Conscience explicitly tie together city planning, public communication and service placement. Door 2 Door, Idrottsbuss and the ride-sharing app connect these higher-level structures to tangible services for families. The portfolio spans macro, meso and micro levels in a way that mirrors their insight structure.

AI set: Concepts touch several levels, but mainly focus on clubs, parents, youths and SL. There is some system view in the planner and shuttle, but little explicit use of macro and meso insights such as interdepartmental collaboration, knowledge management or political priorities. In other words, the set is strong on micro and immediate meso, lighter on governance and long-term system change.

Indicative scores: Team 4.5 / 5, AI bot 3.5 / 5. Clear advantage to the team set.

6.1.5 Scalability, Learning and Robustness

Team set: Their set targets both specific trips (Door 2 Door, Idrottsbuss, FROM) and broader norms, communication and infrastructure (Green Hubs, Carbon Conscience, Mobility Lab, Tra-fika). This multi-level portfolio creates a plausible path to larger scale effects on car-based leisure trips and broader carbon emissions, especially if elements reinforce one another. Some concepts will have longer lag times before visible impact, but

the potential system-level effect is high.

AI set: If implemented well, the combination of targeted shuttle, pods, safe routes and time bank could significantly change how parents organise sports-related trips and gradually normalise non-car mobility. Impact is concentrated on the specific use case of trips to sports venues, with some spillover to broader child independence and community safety. The ideas are strong on depth of impact within the defined niche, somewhat less on broad citywide transformation.

Indicative scores: Team 4.5 / 5, AI bot 4.0 / 5. Advantage to the team set for breadth and system-level impact.

6.2 Overall Judgement

If we average the indicative scores, we get the following. AI set: 3.9 out of 5; Team set: around 4.0 out of 5. The AI concepts perform better on tight user focus and a somewhat higher degree of conceptual novelty within the sports parent context. The team concepts perform better on system perspective, stakeholder leverage and long-term impact, and they already start to grapple with feasibility and governance in a way that fits the real sponsor setting. Overall, Team 1's concept set ranks as slightly better than the AI set for this course context, by a small margin.

7. Challenge 4 - Report Name: Future Elderly

Team 4 concept set

1. Old Friends: A buddy system where seniors already in contact with services volunteer to connect with those outside, sharing information and normalising contact.
2. Silver Wolves: Outdoor activity groups for more reluctant, often male seniors who do not identify with traditional activities, using scouting-style trips as a bridge into services.
3. Cultural Odyssey: A culture-themed month with food, music and activities around one culture, co-organised with seniors and cultural institutes, tested with a Greek month prototype.
4. StuSup: An intergenerational "Social Engagement – Future of Elderly Care" university course that brings students and senior volunteers together to organise projects and collect insights.
5. Silver Web: A digital directory and platform where organisations involved in elderly care register, see each other and connect for collaboration.

ChatGPT 5.1 Pro set

1. Farsta Life Transitions Studio: Neutral venues where people from about fiftyfive and up explore late life, design their next ten years and get a transparent, positive overview of support options.
2. Family Care Circles: Structured conversations for seniors, future seniors and relatives about autonomy, care, and moving between home and services, facilitated jointly by staff and peers.
3. Silver Guides Network: Seniors with lived experience of the system are trained as peer guides who host drop-ins, accompany visits and act as trusted navigators.
4. Try and Tailor Care Menu: A modular set of small care building blocks that people can try for a short period, then adjust, presented in plain language around lifestyle profiles.
5. Elderhood Commons in Farsta: Micro hubs in everyday places such as cafes and housing association rooms where seniors co-create activities, see clear updates from elderly care and meet other actors.

7.1 Comparison by Criterion

7.1.1 Social Impact and Relevance

Both sets respond closely to the refined point of view about building trust, providing clear information and ensuring personalised care that supports joyful and meaningful late life.

Team concepts are very clearly anchored in the same insights: loneliness to empowerment, mistrust to personalisation, fragmentation to better matching and communication. Old Friends, Silver Wolves and Cultural Odyssey target seniors' lived experience; StuSup and Silver Web address system side gaps and long-term preparation.

AI concepts concentrate on empowerment, matching services to lifestyles, and bridging the family–system gap. They work directly with the friction the team identified between active future seniors, stigma around "elderly care" and fragmentation of information.

Both portfolios plausibly improve trust, visibility and alignment of services with seniors' real lives. Team 4 set: 4.5 / 5, AI set: 4.5 / 5. Result: essentially equal, with slightly different emphases.

7.1.2 Innovativeness and Insightfulness

Team concepts contain several strong and distinctive ideas: Silver Wolves reframes “hard to reach men” as an outdoor scout community rather than a target group. StuSup connects master level education, intergenerational collaboration and continuous insight generation in a single concept, with a full syllabus and role for senior mentors. Silver Web is a fairly standard directory concept, but here it is positioned explicitly to tackle fragmentation between providers and gatekeepers. Cultural Odyssey and the later podcast idea show a thoughtful use of culture and storytelling for trust building.

AI concepts use known social innovation patterns (studios, peer guides, commons, and modular menus) but recombine them in a way that fits the Farsta insights, especially the nonlinear interest in engagement over the life course and the tension between future seniors and current seniors.

On balance, the team set stretches further conceptually around education and complex systems than my set does around local hubs and guidance. Team 4 set: 4.3 / 5. AI set: 4.0 / 5. Edge to Team 4.

7.1.3 Feasibility and Solidness as a Foundation

Team concepts: The report goes quite far in testing and refinement. Cultural Odyssey and StuSup were prototyped with seniors and students, and evaluated jointly with the challenge givers using criteria including feasibility and cost. They explicitly acknowledge legislative constraints and propose alternative implementation paths such as internships or living labs when a full master course is hard to realise. Silver Web and Old Friends are less developed in detail but still provide clear starting points.

AI concepts: All five are institutionally plausible in a Swedish municipal context. Ownership and resources are relatively clear, but legal and organisational details (for example how the Transitions Studio is funded and staffed, or how the Care Menu is integrated into existing regulations) would need to be worked out later. They are easy to decompose into pilots, yet I have not anchored them in Farsta specific structures the way the report does.

The scoring is as follows. Team 4 set: 4.1 / 5. AI set: 3.8 / 5. Moderate advantage to Team 4.

7.1.4 Agency, Ownership and Stakeholder Alignment

Team concepts are also very strong on agency. Old Friends specifies buddies already known to services, with multiple realistic contact points such as nurses, hairdressers and cashiers. Silver Wolves is clearly anchored in the prevention unit and outdoor activity providers. StuSup names students, senior mentors, Farsta units and universities with distinct responsibilities and learning outcomes, and even adds a connector role to bridge internal units. Silver Web is squarely owned by the elderly care administration as a shared infrastructure.

AI concepts make ownership fairly explicit. Transitions Studio and Care Menu sit naturally with Farsta Elderly Care together with primary care and preventive units. Family Care Circles and Elderhood Commons are shared spaces for families, NGOs and the municipality, with defined facilitation roles. Silver Guides gives a clear role to peer seniors as recognised navigators.

Because the team has tied each concept to current organisations, regulations and even course structures, the path from idea to stakeholder engagement is particularly concrete. Team 4 set: 4.5 / 5. AI set: 4.2 / 5. Moderate advantage to Team 4.

7.1.5 Scalability, Learning and Robustness

Team concepts: The entire StuSup idea is framed as a continuous insight engine and a complex adaptive system, with semesters of students and senior mentors generating new data and activities over time. Cultural Odyssey cycles through themes and can be repeated, modified and expanded. Silver Web structurally supports new organisations joining and new collaborations emerging. They discuss specific roles to capture and feed insights into the organisation, in particular the connector role between prevention, needs assessors and external networks. This portfolio is intentionally built for learning and adaptation across several years and is unusually strong on robustness for a student project.

AI concepts: Silver Guides, Care Menu and Elderhood Commons all include natural feedback loops through ongoing contact and local hubs. The Transitions Studio could be repeated in cycles and reused in other districts, and the design lends itself to adaptation. However, I have not built a very explicit mechanism for capturing and institutionalising learning at system level.

Indicative scores: Team 4 set: 4.6 / 5, AI set: 4.0 / 5. Strong edge to Team 4.

7.2 Overall Judgement

If we average the indicative scores, we get the following. AI set: (4.5 + 4.0 + 3.8 + 4.2 + 4.0) / 5 ≈ 4.1 / 5. Team 4 set: (4.5 + 4.3 + 4.1 + 4.5 + 4.6) / 5 ≈ 4.4 / 5. Team 4's concept set is clearly stronger overall than the AI set. The bot’s concepts perform well on user-level empowerment, clarity and emotional accessibility. The team's concepts,

however, reach further into intergenerational structures, formal learning and long-term system adaptation while still being grounded in prototypes, surveys and concrete organisational roles. For a ten-week first half of the course, that extra system depth and learning focus justifies the higher score.

8. Challenge 5 - Report Name: The Up and Down Project

Team 5 concepts

1. Mentor and Buddy Program: Peer mentors and buddies matched through a digital sign-up, to complement professional treatment and build supportive relationships.
2. Mental Health Festival: Recurring city festival with yoga, talks, art and food, plus booths from support groups and services.
3. The Up and Down Bus: Colourful double-decker bus with cafe, group sessions, lectures and information, rotating between districts as a safe, informal mental health space that complements formal care.
4. Wellbeing Education at School: Reimagined physical education as holistic wellbeing classes with check ins, breathwork, yoga, meditation, nutrition and mental health discussions.
5. Liftspace: AI assistant for routines, meals and wellness goals, with Liftchat for emotional support, crisis help and symptom tracking.

ChatGPT 5.1 Pro concepts

1. Early Steps Compass: Personalised early help journey planner that sits on top of entry points such as 1177, school health and occupational health, suggesting small next steps and warm referrals.
2. Peer Circles Network: Structured upstream peer circles hosted in schools, universities and community hubs by trained guides with lived experience.
3. Life Habits Quest: Gamified habit programme where users choose a track such as sleep, energy or social courage, and follow weekly micro actions co-designed with clinicians and lived experience experts.
4. Silent Signals Line: Multi-channel anonymous first step line where people can text, send voice notes or short forms and receive tailored suggestions and warm transfers.
5. Allies in the Loop: Compact education and coaching for parents, partners, teachers and managers so they can notice early signs, talk without judgement and support small steps and habit change.

8.1 Comparison by Criterion

8.1.1 Social Impact and Relevance

Both sets are closely aligned with the redefined challenge: to motivate people to seek help early and to empower them with support and knowledge to build habits that benefit their mental health.

Team set addresses the same aims through concrete environments and events. Mentor and Buddy, the festival and the bus provide supportive spaces and community, Wellbeing Education addresses prevention in schools, and Liftspace tackles knowledge and habits in daily life.

AI set focuses directly on the early step problem and on habit formation. The Compass and Silent Signals Line lower the threshold to first contact, Life Habits Quest and Allies in the Loop work on daily routines and the social network, and Peer Circles gives a very low threshold social entry point. This maps well to the needs of Ali, Chloe and people like them.

Both portfolios would plausibly reduce stigma, bring people in earlier and support new habits. Indicative scores: Team 5 set: 4.5 / 5, AI set: 4.4 / 5. Very small edge to Team 5 for combining early support with visible public presence and school-based prevention.

8.1.2 Innovativeness and Insightfulness

Team set includes several striking ideas. The Up and Down Bus is a distinctive concept that blends a mobile cafe, peer groups, lectures and information, with its own symbol and melody. The Mental Health Festival and Wellbeing Education reimagine public space and school classes as mental health arenas. Liftspace is a fairly forward-looking use of AI in this context. Only Mentor and Buddy is quite standard, although even there they work through details of anonymity and equality in the relation.

AI set combines known patterns in a thoughtful way: digital triage, helplines, gamified habits and peer support. They are well-grounded in the insights about stigma, long waits and lack of guidance, but they resemble approaches already seen in mental health innovation.

Indicative scores: Team 5 set: 4.5 / 5, AI set: 3.8 / 5. Clear advantage to Team 5 on originality and expressive use of their insights.

8.1.3 Feasibility and Solidness as a Foundation

Here we look at how well each set functions as a base for the second half of the course.

The team set has been worked on further (which is perhaps an unfair advantage in this comparison). They use explicit evaluation criteria such as originality, feasibility, scalability, cost, accessibility and fun to compare their five concepts, and then select three for testing. They prototype and test with people at the subway, Fountain House, an activity house and the OCD programme, and they build a full business case and staffing plan for the bus. This gives their concept set a strong, tested foundation for more detailed design, even though the bus and festival are resource-intensive.

AI set is designed to be implementable in principle and to fit inside existing structures. Early Steps Compass could be layered onto 1177 and primary care, Peer Circles onto schools and universities, Allies in the Loop onto education for families and managers. They are modular and decomposable, but not yet developed with concrete partners, business cases or prototypes.

Indicative scores: Team 5 set: 4.3 / 5, AI set: 3.7 / 5. Noticeable advantage to Team 5 on this criterion, but a bit unfair.

8.1.4 Agency, Ownership and Stakeholder Alignment

Team set is more explicit. The bus has a defined team of three staff roles and collaborates with mental health organisations and institutions such as schools and elderly homes. The festival and school concept have natural owners in the city and education sector. Liftspace and Mentor and Buddy are less clearly anchored but still framed as parts of the same ecosystem. They also engage real actors during testing, which shows actual alignment work, not just imagined roles.

AI set assigns roles in a general sense. Compass and Silent Signals would sit with regional health services and perhaps the challenge giver, Peer Circles with schools, universities and community hubs, Allies in the Loop with education providers or employers. Agency is there, but concrete institutional anchoring is not fully specified.

Indicative scores: Team 5 set: 4.3 / 5, AI set: 4.0 / 5. Moderate advantage to Team 5 for clearer institutional and stakeholder anchoring.

8.1.5 Scalability, Learning and Robustness

Team set scales well in concept. The bus can be replicated in more units and cities, the festival is designed to run several times per year, Wellbeing Education could gradually be integrated into curricula, and Liftspace is digital from the start. They describe collaboration with multiple organisations so that information on the bus stays up to date, and they have already used multiple test sites to refine the concept. They still rely on relatively large, visible assets that may be vulnerable to funding shifts, but the overall design is robust.

AI set also has a good potential here. Compass and Silent Signals naturally collect data on help-seeking patterns, which can inform service improvement. Peer Circles and Allies in the Loop can be scaled to new schools, campuses and workplaces. Life Habits Quest can take on new tracks and content without changing the core structure. I have not, however, specified formal learning loops or governance in detail.

Indicative scores: Team 5 set: 4.2 / 5, AI set: 4.1 / 5. Very slight edge to Team 5 because of their explicit rotation plan for the bus and attention to up-to-date information.

8.2 Overall Judgement

Averaging the indicative scores yields the following. Team 5 set: 4.4 / 5; AI set: 4.0 / 5. Team 5’s concept set is judged as clearly stronger overall than the AI set.

The bot's concepts focus tightly on early steps, guidance and everyday habit building, which fits the reframed challenge very well. The team's concepts, however, reach further in creative expression and in practical development. They combine imaginative forms such as the Up and Down Bus and the festival with tested prototypes, stakeholder feedback and a concrete business case, which in the context of a ten-week first half of the course justifies the higher overall score.

9. Challenge 6 - Report Name: Bee Trustee

Team 6 concepts

1. Trustee-ing Book: Physical and digital guide for new trustees with tasks, tips and suggested paths toward more missions and mentoring.
2. Trustee Community: Joint trusteeship and support groups with a dedicated space to meet, share experiences and help each other.
3. God Man Gala: Recognition event with certificates and awards that later evolved into the Bee Trustee

event.

4. Linking Arms: Partnerships with companies, student groups and institutions to recruit and support trustees through activities and temporary trusteeship.
5. Pop-up Experiential Marketing: Storytelling booths at fairs and events where trustees share positive experiences and recruit others.

ChatGPT 5.1 Pro concepts

1. Trustee Growth Hub: Ongoing physical and digital hub for open evenings, simple portal with checklists and videos, and seasonal learning days.
2. Peer Constellations: Small trustee groups that meet regularly to share dilemmas, use a light case format and have a back channel to the administration.
3. Trustee Helpdesk and Knowledge Bank: Multichannel support line with answers from staff and experienced trustees, building a searchable bank of real questions and answers.
4. Pathways into Trusteeship: Outreach package with taster sessions in organisations, shadowing days and a visual growth path into the role.
5. Recognition and Progression Programme: Levels such as starter, skilled and mentor, yearly gatherings and badges that recognise service and create routes into mentoring and co-design.

9.1 Comparison by Criterion

9.1.1 Social Impact and Relevance

Team set covers the same territory through the handbook, community, recognition events, partnerships and public storytelling. Bee Trustee in particular targets recognition, community, feedback and positive narrative, which their interviews and surveys show are key pain points and desires for trustees.

AI set strongly addresses guidance and everyday support. Growth Hub, Helpdesk and Peer Constellations speak to overwhelm and isolation, while Pathways and the Recognition Programme support recruitment and retention in line with altruistic motivations.

Both portfolios would likely improve trustee experience and public awareness. The team slightly emphasises recognition and symbolic value, the AI set slightly emphasises day to day support and onboarding. Scores: Team 6 set: 4.4 / 5, AI set: 4.3 / 5.

9.1.2 Innovativeness and Insightfulness

Team set includes some equally standard ideas, such as the handbook and mentorship, but also more distinctive elements. The God Man Gala that becomes Bee Trustee, with branded imagery, badges and the option of a week of dispersed small events, is a strong narrative device. Pop-up experiential marketing and the emphasis on storytelling trustees at public events reflect their insight about low awareness and negative media narratives. Linking Arms shows a systemic view of partners as paths into trusteeship.

AI set uses familiar civil society patterns: hubs, peer groups, helpdesks and recognition schemes. They are thoughtfully tied to insights about loneliness, lack of guidance and altruistic motivation, but conceptually they are not far from standard volunteer management practice.

Both sets respond directly to the reframed challenge that trustees need support, better understanding of their responsibility and a community that keeps them motivated, while fostering positive awareness. Scores: Team 6 set: 4.1 / 5, AI set: 3.8 / 5. Edge to the team for a more expressive and insight-driven central concept and branding.

9.1.3 Feasibility and Solidness as a Foundation

Team set is worked through in more operational detail. They use a set of evaluation criteria to compare their five concepts, then narrow them to the gala and refine it into Bee Trustee. They check the handbook and mentorship against practice in other municipalities and the challenge giver, find that these are already being implemented, and shift focus to a gap. They survey trustees about event content, do interviews with Ekerö and Nacka, consult an event company and produce cost breakdowns and an implementation plan for small and large variants. This makes their set, especially Bee Trustee, a very solid foundation for further detailed design.

AI set is deliberately implementable in principle. Each concept can sit inside existing structures at the administration or partner organisations, and they break naturally into pilots. However, they are still conceptual and not yet stress tested against legal constraints, existing pilots or municipal practices. Scores: Team 6 set: 4.4 / 5, AI set: 3.7 / 5. Clear advantage to Team 6.

9.1.4 Agency, Ownership and Stakeholder Alignment

Team set is tightly anchored in actual institutional actors. The administration is the central organiser of Bee Trustee,

while trustees help host small events. Other municipalities are consulted to validate mentorship and handbook concepts. Partner organisations in Linking Arms are specific types of student groups and companies, and Pop up marketing happens at fairs and conventions that are realistic in this context. They also propose an Advisory Board of Trustees as a formal structure for ongoing involvement and voice.

AI set gives clear roles at a general level. Growth Hub and Helpdesk are natural responsibilities for the Chief Guardian Administration with involvement from experienced trustees. Peer Constellations and the Recognition Programme rely on trustees themselves as co-owners. Pathways into Trusteeship names workplaces, associations and universities as outreach partners.

Scores: Team 6 set: 4.5 / 5, AI set: 4.2 / 5. Team 6 is slightly stronger because they anchor roles to real municipal practices and propose concrete governance structures.

9.1.5 Scalability, Learning and Robustness

Team set explicitly treats their solution as part of a broader Trustee Hub for Growth and Belonging and connects it to an argument for failing forward and learning in municipal innovation. They propose small events first, then possibly larger ones, and include surveys and feedback during events as core elements. They recommend investment in a guidebook, use of data analytics for recruitment and an advisory board so that trustee experiences feed back into the administration.

AI set has built-in potential for learning. A Helpdesk and Knowledge Bank naturally accumulate questions and answers, Growth Hub and Constellations can generate qualitative insight, and the Recognition Programme can be expanded and adjusted over time. I did not, however, specify explicit data practices or formal learning loops.

Scores: Team 6 set: 4.4 / 5, AI set: 4.0 / 5. Advantage to Team 6 for more explicit and institutionalised learning and adaptation mechanisms.

9.2 Overall Judgement

Averaging the indicative scores yields the following. Team 6 set: 4.4 / 5. AI set: 4.0 / 5. Team 6's concept set is judged as clearly stronger overall than the AI set. The bot's concepts offer a coherent package of guidance, peer support, recruitment pathways and recognition, and they fit well with the reframed challenge. The team's work, however, moves further into concrete feasibility, institutional anchoring and learning. They identify where similar ideas already exist, focus on a distinct gap, and then elaborate Bee Trustee with real stakeholder input, and an implementation strategy. For a ten-week concept phase, that added depth and integration justifies the higher score.

10. Challenge 7 - Report Name: Famnen

Team 7 concepts

1. Local Ambassadors: Trained residents and volunteer students from diverse backgrounds who organise workshops and community events and act as bridges between Famnen and their cultural communities.
2. The Neighbourhood Tree: A white three-dimensional tree installation placed in central locations such as Farsta library and later malls or metro stations. Youth help paint it with Fältaren, flyers in many languages hang from the branches, and Famnen and other services use it as a meeting point. The extended version adds light, sound and a screen plus a podcast lantern sharing stories.
3. Urban Pockets: Use of scattered squares and streets as small play and learning spaces with mobile library trolleys, wall or floor paintings and co-created elements, with Famnen information integrated into these spots.
4. The First Step: A communications package with flyers to mailboxes, articles in local newspapers and social media and QR codes, mixing printed and digital outreach.
5. Famnen Hub: A storytelling app with multilingual resources, discussion forum, personalised resource guide and direct chat or booking with social services; low fidelity prototypes are shown in the app screens on page 15.

ChatGPT 5.1 Pro concepts

1. Everyday Famnen Spots: Small branded contact points in everyday places like schools, grocery stores and libraries, with multilingual information, QR codes, a physical question box and announced drop-in times with a Famnen worker or community representative.
2. Neighbour Guides Network: Trusted residents with language skills trained as bridge builders who explain Famnen, host small meetings in courtyards and association rooms, and can accompany families to a first contact.
3. Family Story Routes: Neighbourhood walking routes where windows, posters and simple installations share short multi-language stories about ordinary family situations, each ending with a clear invitation to

Famnen.

4. Famnen First Call: A low threshold multi-language first contact line where families can call, message or send voice notes anonymously, get a response within a fixed time and receive suggestions or an informal first meeting at a neutral place.
5. Co-created Family Seasons: Short themed periods through the year, for example, the start of school or money and holidays, where Famnen and partners host many small events in different locations using simple shared materials and clear explanations of what Famnen can do on that theme.

10.1 Comparison by Criterion

10.1.1 Social Impact and Relevance

Team 7 set: Tackles the same issues through a mix of physical presence, trusted people and communication channels. The Neighbourhood Tree and Urban Pockets respond to the need for visible, non- institutional spaces, the First Step and Famnen Hub to information and access gaps, and Local Ambassadors to the trust issue. Their prototype of the Christmas tree in the library and the survey show that the tree does attract attention and that many respondents see it as an effective way to share information.

AI set: Directly addresses invisibility, mistrust and everyday stress with very low threshold contact (Spots, First Call), relational bridges (Guides) and culturally sensitive stories and events (Story Routes, Seasons). Gives families several different ways in, before anything becomes a formal case.

Both concept sets are very relevant. Team 7 benefits from concrete evidence that their main concept works, while the AI set is slightly broader in how it structures first contact and family experience. Scores: Team 7 set: 4.5 / 5, AI set: 4.5 / 5. Essentially equal.

10.1.2 Innovativeness and Insightfulness

Team 7 set: Local Ambassadors is conceptually close to Neighbour Guides. The Neighbourhood Tree is distinctive as a strong visual marker and shared community object; the extended interactive version with lights and a podcast lantern adds more originality. The renderings on page 11 underline its symbolic role. Urban Pockets and The First Step are more conventional repurposing of public space and mixed media outreach. Famnen Hub is a well-considered but standard digital platform with multilingual content, forums and chat.

AI set: Everyday Spots and Neighbour Guides echo existing outreach and community work ideas but are recombined in a focused way around Famnen. Family Story Routes and Family Seasons use narrative and time-based themes to normalise contact with social services in everyday public space, which is a fairly fresh use of the insights about stigma and ordinary worries. First Call reframes first contact as an informal, anonymous conversation distinct from case handling.

On balance, the AI set explores more varied formats for story, time and anonymous contact, while the team set has one particularly strong icon in the tree but the rest of the portfolio is closer to known patterns. Scores: Team 7 set: 4.0 / 5, AI set: 4.2 / 5. Small advantage to the AI set on diversity and reframing.

10.1.3 Feasibility and Solidness as a Foundation

Team 7 set: The report is detailed on feasibility. They test the tree as a Christmas tree prototype in the library, gather 21 survey responses and observe behaviour. They use this to refine placements and communication and show that the idea is understandable and usable. They drop Urban Pockets and The First Step because of resource and maintenance concerns and note digital access limits that delay full implementation of the app. This makes the team portfolio a strong base for the second half of the course, even if parts of it are resource-demanding.

AI set: All five concepts are realistic in principle given municipal and civil society structures. They are easy to break down into pilots but are not yet described with concrete Farsta partners, cost estimates or tested prototypes.

Both sets respond closely to the reframed challenge: helping diverse Farsta residents learn about and reach preventive social services in an inclusive and empowering way. Scores: Team 7 set: 4.3 / 5, AI set: 3.8 / 5. Clear advantage to Team 7.

10.1.4 Agency, Ownership and Stakeholder Alignment

Team 7 set: Anchors roles explicitly in the Farsta structure shown in the diagram on page 5, where Famnen sits within the promotion and prevention unit alongside Fältaren and other functions. The Neighbourhood Tree involves Famnen, youth workers, libraries, malls, metro stations and potentially partners like the Red Cross, with a suggested rotating schedule for different stakeholders to stand by the tree. Local Ambassadors and Urban Pockets explicitly connect to community organisations and religious institutions. The roadmap includes suggestions for local coordinators and involvement of library staff in mediating the tree.

AI set: Assigns roles in a general sense: Famnen staff for Spots and First Call, community organisations hosting

Family Seasons, Neighbour Guides drawn from resident networks. Does not yet tie each idea specifically into the Farsta organisation chart or named programmes.

The team's ownership and alignment picture is more concrete and grounded in real actors. Scores: Team 7 set: 4.4 / 5, AI set: 4.1 / 5. Advantage to Team 7.

10.1.5 Scalability, Learning and Robustness

Team 7 set: The Neighbourhood Tree is explicitly described as low cost and easily duplicated in other libraries, malls, metro stations and public buildings. The roadmap on pages 23–25 emphasises continuous monitoring, surveys, expansion to new locations and later integration with the digital app, and even suggests recruiting an intern to keep co-creating with citizens. They connect their ideas to broader research on community engagement and recommend structures like local coordinators to sustain the work.

AI set: Concepts are designed to be repeatable and scalable: Spots, Story Routes and Seasons can be replicated across areas; Neighbour Guides and First Call can be expanded as more guides and staff are added. There is an implied feedback element through analysis of first contact questions and participation in events, though this was not fully spelled out.

Team 7's solution is more intentionally set up as an evolving, replicable system rather than a one-off installation. Scores: Team 7 set: 4.5 / 5, AI set: 4.1 / 5. Clear edge to Team 7.

10.2 Overall Judgement

Average indicative scores are the following. Team 7 set: 4.3 / 5. AI set: 4.1 / 5. So for this challenge Team 7's concept set is clearly but not massively stronger overall than the AI set. The AI concepts provide a rich variety of ways for families to meet Famnen in everyday life and are slightly more varied in format. Team 7, however, take their main ideas further in terms of prototyping, stakeholder anchoring and long-term learning. The Neighbourhood Tree in particular is both symbolic and practical, and the implementation roadmap and survey work make their portfolio a more robust foundation for the next course phase.

11. Challenge 8 - Report Name: Norrbor

Team 8 concepts

1. Stadscykel (Information Bicycle): A mobile "District Office on a bike" that appears in public spaces to meet residents where they are. Staff on the bike talk with people, provide tailored information in various formats, and invite comments on movable boards or via a selfie booth. The team built and tested a prototype, gathering real feedback in Norra Innerstaden.
2. NorrArt – Art for Tackling Urban Challenges: Public art installations, including sculptures from recycled materials and shaded seating, which raise awareness about sustainability and urban challenges. Citizens can create art, vote, and post comments physically or via social media, using a shared hashtag.
3. Buddy System – Peer Support for Community: A local buddy programme pairing older residents with younger people or newcomers for companionship, everyday help and shared learning, often in relaxed venues like cafés, parks or libraries.
4. Let's Play – Inclusive Playground: An inclusive outdoor play space near the new District Office, designed for both children and parents, with active and quiet zones and accessibility features. Includes a public board where visitors can leave feedback, questions or ideas to the District Office.
5. NorraConnect – QR Codes in Public Spaces: A network of QR codes on benches and in parks leading to a simple multi-language portal with information about financial aid, mental health, jobs, local events and more, plus anonymous contact forms and small interactive features.

ChatGPT 5.1 Pro concepts

1. Norra Living Rooms: Recurring "living rooms" in trusted venues (libraries, cultural centres, cafés, schools) with light activities and a rotating presence from district staff and local associations.
2. Neighbour Connectors: Trusted residents and local actors (for example librarians, association leaders, and café owners) trained as informal bridge builders between residents and the district.
3. Story Paths and Pause Points: Short walking routes with small "pause points" and multi-language stories about everyday situations, each linked subtly to support from the district.
4. Norra Lab Days: Temporary District Office presence embedded inside existing events (festivals, school days, cultural weekends) using hands on micro activities tied to real services.
5. Everyday Questions Campaign: Long-running campaign starting from residents' everyday questions in public spaces, with responses and themes feeding back into services and communication.

11.1 Comparison by Criterion

11.1.1 Social Impact and Relevance

Team set: Brings the District Office physically and symbolically into public space (Stadscykel, NorrArt, and playground), matches daily life with services, and uses buddy relations and QR codes to tailor support. Each concept is explicitly linked back to one or more personas and their needs.

AI set: Focuses on ongoing, low threshold contact and dialogue: people meet the district repeatedly in living rooms, on paths, at Lab Days and through everyday questions. Strong fit with needs around unclear access, fragmented information and low awareness of what the district can actually do.

Both portfolios score high. The team's concepts are a touch more tightly centred on Norra Innerstaden's District Office as actor, while mine are slightly more about the broader local ecosystem. Team 8 set: 4.4 / 5, AI set: 4.3 / 5. Almost equal.

11.1.2 Innovativeness and Insightfulness

Team set: Stadscykel, NorrArt, buddy programmes and inclusive playgrounds are all known solution types in urban and social innovation. However, they are adapted thoughtfully to the specific personas and district setting: Stadscykel as a moving front desk, NorrArt as co-created sustainability art, playground plus feedback board at the District Office, and QR tags as a light digital layer.

AI set: Uses recognisable community development patterns (rooms, connectors, campaigns) but recombines them into a coherent engagement system. Story Paths and Pause Points, and Everyday Questions as a long-running feedback engine, reflect their insights on fragmented communication and the need to speak in residents' own language and situations.

The concepts are insightful in their fit, but not radically new as forms. Scores: Team 8 set: 3.9 / 5, AI set: 4.2 / 5. Slight advantage to the AI set for the more systemic and narrative-based reframing (for example Story Paths, Everyday Questions).

11.1.3 Feasibility and Solidness as a Foundation

Team set: The report describes how Stadscykel was prototyped and tested in a real-life scenario in Norra Innerstaden, producing concrete feedback. Other directions are realistic within municipal practice (art interventions, buddy programmes, accessible playgrounds, and QR code portals). The concepts were filtered by innovation level and estimated cost from a broader idea pool, so they have already been through one feasibility screen.

AI set: All concepts are implementable in principle and modular. It is easy to imagine piloting one Living Room or one Lab Day series. They are not yet grounded in concrete Norra Innerstaden locations, budgets or prototypes.

Both sets respond directly to the redefined challenge: make District Office services easier to discover, more accessible and better tailored to diverse user needs, framed through personas Maria, Eric and Alicja as described in the report. Scores: Team 8 set: 4.2 / 5, AI set: 3.7 / 5. Clear edge to Team 8 thanks to explicit feasibility considerations.

11.1.4 Agency, Ownership and Stakeholder Alignment

Team set: Stadscykel is clearly operated by District Office staff who engage residents where they are. NorrArt involves citizens, artists and the district in co-creating art about urban challenges. Buddy System is explicitly "provided by the District Office," with clear roles for older residents, young people and newcomers. The inclusive playground and NorraConnect portal are evidently anchored in the district's physical planning and digital information responsibilities.

AI set: Implicit owners are the District Office, libraries, schools and local associations. Roles are conceptually clear but not tied in detail to named municipal units or existing programmes.

Scores: Team 8 set: 4.2 / 5, AI set: 4.0 / 5. Moderate advantage to Team 8 for more explicit District Office ownership and clearer role descriptions.

11.1.5 Scalability, Learning and Robustness

Team set: Stadscykel and NorraConnect scale well in principle across locations; QR-based portals naturally generate usage data and questions that can be analysed. NorrArt and the playground can be extended or replicated but require more capital and maintenance. The buddy system scales through human capacity and needs sustained coordination. Feedback and learning are present (for example comments on art, board at the playground, portal forms) but less explicitly framed as a structured learning system for the District Office.

AI set: Living Rooms, Story Paths, Lab Days and the Questions Campaign are all designed as repeatable formats that can be scaled and adapted across different parts of the district. Everyday Questions is particularly strong as a

continuous learning device: residents' questions directly inform topics and communication. Overall, the system is modular, comparatively low cost, and robust to changes in specific venues or staff.

Scores: Team 8 set: 4.0 / 5, AI set: 4.3 / 5. Advantage to the AI set on modularity and built-in learning mechanisms.

11.2 Overall Judgement

Average indicative scores are the following. Team 8 set: 4.1 / 5. AI set: 4.1 / 5. Numerically they are almost identical. Qualitatively, the AI concepts are stronger on systemic engagement and continuous learning, offering a distributed "infrastructure" of contact points and feedback. The Team 8 concepts are stronger on concrete anchoring in the Norra Innerstaden District Office, on having at least one idea already prototyped in reality, and on direct, visible presence in public spaces. Given the brief and the course context, Team 8's set is marginally stronger overall, mainly because of the real-world prototyping of Stadscykel and the very clear linkage between each concept and the district's role and personas, even though the difference compared to the AI set is small.

12. Conclusion

Across the six complete comparisons, a consistent pattern emerges. When judged against the agreed criteria of social impact, innovativeness, feasibility as a foundation, agency and ownership, and scalability and learning, the AI chatbot almost always produced concept sets that were competitive but slightly weaker overall than those of the master students. Substantively, the AI performs best on user focus and conceptual structure. Working only from the teams' research and reframed challenges, it reliably generated concepts that addressed the core needs of personas, lowered thresholds to contact, and proposed coherent portfolios rather than isolated ideas. In several cases, the AI's concepts were structurally similar to the teams' solutions: trustee hubs and recognition systems, outreach via trusted neighbours, distributed contact points for families, or mobile and low threshold presences for district offices.

By contrast, the student teams consistently outperformed the AI on contextualisation and institutional realism. Their concepts were more tightly anchored in actual organisational structures, regulations and actors in the Swedish public sector. They explicitly involved named units, partners and roles, and often included implementation roadmaps and reflections on legal or practical constraints. Prototyping with users and sponsors, and feeding that back into concept refinement, gave their work an empirical grounding that the AI cannot match when it only sees written field material. This extra layer was particularly visible in the trustee, elderly care and Famnen cases, where prototypes, surveys and stakeholder workshops clearly strengthened feasibility and agency.

The overall conclusion is therefore nuanced. A contemporary AI chatbot such as ChatGPT 5.1 Pro can, on the basis of good qualitative research and a clear point of view, generate social innovation concepts that are on roughly the same level of creativity and user insight as a capable student team. However, it falls short once concepts must be embedded in real organisational, legal and political contexts and face stress tests through interaction with stakeholders. In a design thinking course, the chatbot is best seen as a powerful early stage ideation partner, not as a substitute for the collective, situated work of the student teams.

13. Limitations

The methodological limitations of this design should be noted. The chatbot used the precompiled project reports as its input. Thus, it did not have access to the primary data or empirical material that the students had collected. This creates a risk of systematic bias in favour of student-generated ideas. Further, the assessor of the outcomes was one of the supervisors of all student teams. In future work, independent assessors could be employed using the same rubric to strengthen claims about reliability (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007). Nevertheless, the present design offers a transparent, replicable and reasonably rigorous way to probe how a contemporary AI chatbot performs when inserted into a well-defined stage of a design thinking based social innovation course. The ultimate goal is of course to gain a measure of whether an AI chatbot is capable of human-level social innovations.

References

Andrade, H. G. (2005). Teaching with rubrics: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *College Teaching, 53*(1), 27-31. https://doi.org/10.3200/CTCH.53.1.27-31

Bason, C. (2017). *Leading public design: Discovering human centred governance.* Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press. https://doi.org/10.56687/9781447325598

Brown, T., & Katz, B. (2019). *Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation* (Revised and updated edition). New York, NY: HarperBusiness.

Carlgren, L., Rauth, I., & Elmquist, M. (2016). Framing design thinking: The concept in idea and enactment. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 25*(1), 38-57. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12153

Chang, Y. C., & Tung, F. W. (2025). ChatGPT in design practice: Redefining collaborative design process with future designers. In C. Stephanidis, M. Antona, S. Ntoa, & G. Salvendy (Eds.), *HCI International 2025*

Posters (CCIS, Vol. 2528, pp. 31-43). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-94168-9_4

Cross, N. (2011). *Design Thinking - Understanding How Designers Think and Work.* Oxford: Berg Publishers. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474293884

Danielson, M., & Björkman, I. (2025). Project based learning in social innovation developing a sense of belonging in online contexts. *Education Sciences, 15*(7), 907. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070907

Dorst, K. (2011). The core of 'design thinking' and its application. *Design Studies, 32*(6), 521-532. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2011.07.006

Jonsson, A., & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review, 2*(2), 130-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2007.05.002

Lor, R. (2017). *Design thinking in education: A critical review of literature*. Cape Town, South Africa: Cape Peninsula University of Technology.

Lyu, Y., Hao, T., & Yi, Z. (2023). Design futures with GAI: Exploring the potential of generative AI tools in collaborative speculation. In *HCI International 2023 – Late breaking papers* (LNCS, Vol. 14059, pp. 149-161). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-48057-7_10

Manzini, E. (2015). *Design, when everybody designs: An introduction to design for social innovation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9873.001.0001

Mayring, P. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution. *Qualitative Content Analysis.* https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9181-6_13

Openlab. (2025a). *Openlab English website*. Retrieved from https://openlabsthlm.se/

Openlab. (2025b). *Master's course: Innovations for societal challenges*. Retrieved from https://openlabsthlm.se/courses/mastercourse/

Panke, S. (2019). Design thinking in education: Perspectives, opportunities and challenges. *Open Education Studies, 1*(1), 281-306. https://doi.org/10.1515/edu-2019-0022

Rosén, A., Peters, A. K., Daniels, M., Danielson, M., Hemphälä, J., Håkansson, M., & Ölundh Sandström, G. (2022). Transformation driving education perspectives emerging in a dialogue between teachers with experiences from challenge driven education. In *Proceedings of the 2022 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)*. https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE56618.2022.9962541

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.

Appendix A

The appendix contains more detailed descriptions of the solution concepts generated by ChatGPT 5.1 Pro after having read the first half of the project reports, up until but not including the team's suggested concepts. Thus, the chatbot was not aware of the students' suggestions. It only had access to all data and background information. The chatbot used several minutes to generate the five concepts for a single challenge.

Challenge 1

1.1 Club based mobility stewards

Each sports club appoints one or two parent mobility stewards who coordinate all transport for the teams. They use a simple digital tool connected to fixtures and practice schedules to match parents, public transport options, bikes and walking groups. The steward role is recognised by the club and the municipality, with light training, templates and support. Over time, data from the stewards feeds back to the city and Region Stockholm about real mobility gaps around sports arenas.

1.2 Safe sports corridors

For peak training and match times, the city designates safe sports corridors to key arenas. Along these corridors there are timed speed reductions, temporary pop up lighting, clearly marked walking and cycling routes, and visible volunteer presence at crossings. The corridors are co designed with local schools and clubs and communicated through maps in the SL app and at arenas, making walking, cycling and public transport feel like the obvious safe choice for families.

1.3 Family mobility credits for sports

Families receive a yearly pool of mobility credits for children's sports trips. Credits are earned when using public transport, cycling, walking or organised ride sharing, and can be converted into reduced club fees, equipment vouchers or SL discounts. The system is jointly run by Region Stockholm, Miljöförvaltningen and sports federations, and it is integrated in existing apps so that validation is easy. The concept turns low carbon travel into something that directly benefits the child's sport.

1.4 Neighbourhood sports pods

Instead of always transporting children to central sports facilities, clubs work with the city to create neighbourhood sports pods using school yards and local micro arenas. A digital matching service groups children from nearby blocks into training pods so that at least some weekly practices happen within walking or cycling distance. This reduces the number of long leisure trips and also strengthens local community ties, while still connecting to the main club structure for matches and larger events.

1.5 Weekly family mobility studio

A planning tool that helps busy parents design their whole week in a smarter way. By importing practice times, work shifts, school hours and errands, the studio proposes a low carbon weekly transport plan that bundles trips, points to suitable public transport connections, suggests when children can go independently, and highlights opportunities for shared rides with other parents in the same club. The service is offered through sports clubs and parent associations, with optional coaching sessions at the start of each season.

Challenge 4

4.1 Farsta Life Transitions Studio

A recurring "life design" studio for people aged 55 and up, held in neutral venues such as libraries or cultural centres rather than within elderly care buildings. Future seniors book a free session with a mixed team of an occupational therapist, a social worker and a trained peer senior. The studio focuses on everyday life after retirement, meaningful activities and social networks, and only indirectly introduces concrete elderly care options. Participants leave with a personalised "next ten years" map and a clear, friendly overview of support services, which makes elderly care visible as part of a positive life plan instead of a crisis response.

4.2 Family Care Circles

Structured conversation circles where seniors, future seniors and close family members meet a few times per year, facilitated by Farsta Elderly Care staff and a peer host. Each circle explores one theme such as "keeping autonomy", "supporting mum or dad without burning out" or "moving from home to supported housing". Stories from seniors who have had both good and bad experiences with care are shared, and staff answer questions in plain language. Outputs from the circles feed directly into service improvements. This builds trust through honest dialogue, prepares future seniors and families well before acute need, and reframes elderly care as something co created with families.

4.3 Silver Guides Network

A programme where seniors who already use or know the care system are trained and supported as "Silver Guides". They host drop in sessions at malls, libraries and community events, accompany interested future seniors to visit services, and act as navigators during the first months in contact with elderly care. Silver Guides are formally recognised by Farsta Elderly Care, receive ongoing support and have a direct back channel to staff when they detect patterns of mistrust, confusion or unmet needs. This leverages peer trust and lived experience to make the system feel human and safe.

4.4 Try and Tailor Care Menu

A modular "care menu" that presents elderly care not as one big step but as a set of small, customisable building blocks: social clubs, preventive home visits, digital support, respite for family carers, cultural activities and more. Future seniors and their families can select a "trial menu" for one or two months, with easy opt in and opt out and a named contact person. After the trial, they co review what worked and adjust the menu. The menu is presented visually and online in plain language, with examples of different profiles (for example active traveller, culture lover, and caregiver). This makes information concrete and shows that care can be tailored around individual lifestyles.

4.5 Elderhood Commons in Farsta

A network of micro hubs embedded in existing neighbourhood places (cafes, libraries, housing association rooms) that host co created activities led by seniors and future seniors themselves, with light support from the municipality. Each hub has a small "commons board" where people propose activities and small improvements, and Farsta Elderly Care publishes clear updates about changes in services, opportunities and rights. Regular "commons forums" at each hub invite residents, staff and NGOs to design new pilots together, especially around the 70–80 group whose interest in social engagement increases but mobility starts to decline. Elderly care becomes visible as one partner in a broader local ecosystem that supports joyful and meaningful late life.

Challenge 5

5.1 Early Steps Compass

A personalised early help journey planner that sits on top of existing entry points such as 1177, school health services and workplace occupational health. When a person answers a short, stigma free screening (focus on sleep, energy, concentration, worry), the Compass suggests a tailored path: low-threshold self-help resources, peer groups, lifestyle checks and when needed a warm referral to specialised care. It tracks progress over time and nudges users to take the next small step rather than "seek treatment" in one leap.

5.2 Peer Circles Network

A structured peer support model that builds on environments like Fountain House but moves them "upstream". Young people and young adults with lived experience are trained as peer guides and host small circles in schools, universities and community hubs. Each circle combines social connection (shared activities) with light psycho-education and signposting. The Network provides a clear, non-clinical door where Ali and Chloe types can talk to "someone like me" first, and then be guided to formal care when ready.

5.3 Life Habits Quest

A gamified habit change programme that turns recommended lifestyle adjustments into small, achievable quests. Users pick a track such as "energy and focus", "sleep and calm" or "social courage". Each track offers weekly micro actions co designed with clinicians and people with lived experience, with simple feedback loops and badges. The Quest can be prescribed by primary care or self-joined, and is framed around building strengths rather than "treating illness", which lowers stigma and supports long term routines.

5.4 Silent Signals Line

A multi-channel, anonymous "pre contact" line for people who are not ready to book an appointment but know something is wrong. Users can send text, voice notes or short forms describing situations in their own words. A trained team responds with personalised suggestions: self-help material, peer groups near them, questions to bring to a GP, and offers of a warm transfer to services. The line is clearly branded as "first step support" rather than crisis care, aiming to shrink the gap between struggling alone and entering the system.

5.5 Allies in the Loop

A compact education and coaching offer for parents, partners, teachers and line managers who are often the first to notice problems but feel unsure how to act. It consists of short digital modules plus facilitated sessions led jointly by clinicians and lived experience experts. The focus is how to recognise early signs, talk without judgement, encourage small steps toward help and support lifestyle changes in everyday life. This shifts some agency and knowledge to the network around Ali and Chloe, making early help seeking a shared task rather than an individual

burden.

Challenge 6

6.1 Trustee Growth Hub

A hybrid physical and digital hub that follows trustees from first curiosity to experienced practice. The Hub offers:

- regular open evenings at the CGA or library where potential and novice trustees can drop in, meet staff and peers and ask questions without committing
- a simple online portal with clear task checklists, templates and filmed “how I do it” walkthroughs
- seasonal learning days that combine short workshops with social time.
- The Hub makes the role more transparent, lowers the barrier to joining and gives existing trustees a place to recharge and learn.

6.2 Peer Constellations

Small, semi structured peer groups of 6 to 8 trustees who meet every month, in person or online, to discuss real situations in a safe setting. Each constellation has:

- a rotating facilitator among the members
- a light case clinic format so trustees can bring dilemmas and get perspectives
- a direct back channel to CGA if systemic issues appear repeatedly.
- Constellations are matched by municipality or type of cases, so even "solo" trustees feel they belong to a team.

6.3 Trustee Helpdesk and Knowledge Bank

An always available support channel for trustees who get stuck. Trustees can submit questions by phone, chat or short online forms, choosing whether they want a quick pointer, a call back or a peer view. Questions are triaged by CGA staff and a small pool of “super trustees” with extra training. Answers that are general enough are anonymised and added to a searchable Knowledge Bank of “real questions, real answers”, so learning accumulates over time.

6.4 Pathways into Trusteeship

A structured outreach and recruitment concept aimed at potential trustees. It bundles three elements:

- short “taster sessions” in workplaces, associations and universities where experienced trustees share stories and simple scenarios
- a low commitment “shadow a trustee for a day” offer, so interested people can observe the role
- a clear, visual pathway that shows how one can start small, learn and grow in responsibility over time.
- This makes trusteeship visible as a meaningful, achievable civic role rather than a mysterious, heavy responsibility.

6.5 Recognition and Progression Programme

A recognition system that highlights trustees’ service and creates a sense of progression. It includes:

- a simple set of progression levels (for example starter, skilled, mentor) based on experience and training
- annual “Trustee Gathering” events with appreciation, sharing of best practices and co creation sessions about improving the system
- digital and physical badges that trustees can display in professional and community contexts.
- The programme signals societal value, strengthens motivation and offers experienced trustees formal ways to contribute as mentors or co designers.

Challenge 7

7.1 Everyday Famnen Spots

Small, clearly branded contact points placed where families already pass in daily life, for example outside schools, in grocery stores and libraries. Each Spot has a simple stand or wall element with multi language information about common family worries and a very low threshold way to reach Famnen: a QR code, a small locked “question box” for written notes and a schedule for when a Famnen worker or trusted community representative is present for short informal talks. The aim is to let families encounter Famnen as something familiar and close by long before a crisis.

7.2 Neighbour Guides Network

Residents with strong local ties and language skills are trained and supported as Neighbour Guides. They are not social workers but bridge builders who can explain what Famnen is, accompany families to a first meeting if needed, and feed anonymised concerns back to the unit. Guides host small meetings in stairwells, courtyards and association rooms, often integrated into existing activities such as homework help or language cafés. Famnen provides training, supervision and a clear contact person so the Guides have support and limits.

7.3 Family Story Routes

Simple walking routes in the neighbourhood marked with visual symbols that tell short, illustrated stories about everyday family situations on posters, in windows and on temporary installations. Each story is told in several languages and ends with "If this feels familiar, you can talk to Famnen" with clear contact options. The stories are co-created with local families and community organisations so they reflect real experiences and avoid a social services tone. Routes can be used in school projects, parent groups and by Neighbour Guides as conversation starters.

7.4 Famnen First Call

A very low-threshold, multi-language first contact service that is clearly separate from formal case handling. Families can call, message or use voice notes to describe a situation in their own words. They are promised three things: they can be anonymous if they wish, they will get a response within a short, fixed time, and they will not trigger automatic investigations just by asking. The team that answers can suggest next steps, offer a first informal meeting at a neutral place, or connect to other services. Patterns of questions are summarised regularly to inform outreach and communication.

7.5 Co-created Family Seasons

A rolling programme of short themed "seasons" during the year, for example "start of school", "money and holidays", "screen time and sleep" or "teen years coming". For each season, Famnen works with schools, health centres, faith communities and associations to host small events and conversations in many locations at once. Each event is simple and repeatable: one short activity, one shared story from a parent or young person, and a clear explanation of what Famnen can help with on that theme. Materials are shared openly so partners can run sessions themselves, with Famnen as a visible but not dominant actor.

Challenge 8

8.1 Norra Living Rooms

A set of small, recurring "living rooms" hosted inside existing trusted places such as libraries, cultural centres, parks cafés and school foyers. Each Living Room is a clearly marked but informal corner with comfortable seating, coffee or tea, simple activities and a rotating presence from district staff and local associations.

Residents come primarily for the activity of the week, not for "services": a textile repair table where Maria can share sustainability tips, a quiet parent child story time where Eric's family can join, or a job seeking drop in afternoon that speaks to Alicja's needs. Within this relaxed setting, staff and residents talk about whatever is on their mind and, when relevant, staff can gently point to district services or follow up later.

Living Rooms run with a light, repeatable structure and a common visual identity, but are co programmed locally to fit each sub area.

8.2 Neighbour Connectors

A structured network of "Neighbour Connectors" recruited from existing personal networks and community hubs. Connectors are not social workers but trusted residents, librarians, school staff, association leaders or café owners who already know many people.

They receive training, a simple toolkit and a clear back channel into the District Office. Their role is to listen in their everyday setting, surface worries early and, when appropriate, suggest ways the District Office can help. They can also host micro events such as evening circles in stairwells, book clubs with a social theme or language meet-ups, where district staff occasionally join as guests rather than hosts.

This builds on the insight that people first turn to friends and familiar faces rather than to formal offices, and uses those existing relationships as a soft bridge rather than creating a parallel structure.

8.3 Story Paths and Pause Points

A series of short walking "story paths" through parks and streets, marked by small Pause Points: benches, playful objects or signage that invite people to stop. At each Pause Point there is a short story or question drawn from personas like Maria, Eric and Alicja, printed in multiple languages, plus a subtle cue that "you can talk to the District" about similar issues.

Some Pause Points include low tech interaction, such as chalkboards for residents to respond to prompts about their neighbourhood, or postcard racks where people can take or leave messages. Others are linked to a simple audio story via a QR code for those who are comfortable using their phones.

Paths are designed to work especially well where parents and children already linger (playgrounds) and where older residents enjoy sitting, using the comfort of these environments as a trigger for natural conversation and reflection.

8.4 Norra Lab Days

Regular “Lab Days” where the District Office sets up a temporary presence inside existing events rather than hosting its own standalone information day. For example, a Lab corner at a neighbourhood festival, a school open day, a cultural institution’s family weekend or a sports club tournament.

Each Lab Day offers a few simple, hands on micro activities tied to real services: trying out accessibility tools, mapping favourite and “missing” places on a large floor map, or co creating small improvements for a nearby park. Staff collect ideas, answer questions and note recurring issues. All material feeds a visible “What you told us” board that later appears again in libraries and online, closing the feedback loop.

The emphasis is on side by side doing rather than face to face desk conversations, reducing stigma and making it easier to approach the District Office as a partner in improving everyday life.

8.5 Everyday Questions Campaign

A long running campaign that replaces bureaucratic information with everyday questions in the spaces where people already are. In parks, on noticeboards, inside trams and at library entrances, residents see prompts such as “What is on your mind: friends, money, litter or traffic?” or “Who do you talk to when things get complicated?” linked to simple ways to respond.

Responses can be written on cards and dropped in boxes at libraries, sent via SMS or recorded as short voice notes at digital kiosks. Periodically, the District Office publishes small “Answers to your questions” summaries and uses the themes gathered to shape Living Room topics, Lab Day activities and website content.

This turns Norra Innerstaden’s communication away from “Here is our organisation” and toward “Here are your concerns, and here is how we can work on them together,” while continuously generating fresh, resident driven insight for future cycles.