



Report on the 2nd Online Discussion Event for Science Event Organisers

Author *Mikkel Bohm (DNF)*

Contributors: *Estrid Brandorff (DNF)*

Project Title: DESIRE

Project Number: 519113-LLP-1-2011-1-BE-KA4-KA4MP

Grant Agreement: 2011-43816/001-001



The DESIRE project has been funded with the support of the Lifelong Learning programme of the European Union. This document reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission, cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Summary | 3 |
| 2. Quantitative Description of the 2nd ODE for Organisers of Science Events | 4 |
| 3. Qualitative Description of the 2nd ODE for Organisers of Science Events | 4 |

1. Summary

Google Hangout ODE organised by Danish Science Communication (DNF) on January 28, 2013.

The event was moderated by Mr. Mikkel Bohm who is director of Danish Science Communication; a Danish NGO that targets children and young people to create excitement about science and technology.

The talk was primarily about communication strategies for EU science education projects.

Main points of the discussion:

The most common way to get information about EU science education projects is via newsletters and sessions, workshops, and talks at conferences or tips from friends/network. A comment was that if a projects sound “cool and innovative and have a twist” then people will look for more information on the project website. And if the website is interesting, they will pass on that information to others. It is also very important that the *idea* of the science education project is very specific, clear, and relevant.

The language has to be formulated to the end user – not “bureaucratic” language. There are two different ways of communicating: one set of terminology is used to communicate to EU and the bureaucratic world and another marketing-like-language is needed to communicate to the users and target groups.

Many project partners stop thinking marketing-like when the project-money from the EU is paid. Then they don’t need to sell the project anymore. Another problem is that when the funding ends, no one has the resources to keep the project websites alive.

It was also discussed how to keep the project alive after the project period. One reflexion is that you have to think ahead when you build a project; what will be the continuation of the project? Where is it going after the funding ends? Successful examples show that project experiences/conclusions can be integrated/“sold”/pushed on to local authorities having a new life in another context. There are examples - though few - where *published* conclusions have their own life after the project as well. You have to plan publications like that from the beginning of the project.

There was a proposition to have a kind of a market place where all projects are presented – like a *showroom* at different conferences. This is a good way to learn about the projects and their conclusions.

Generally, it should be made very easy to find project conclusions. You could e.g. advise future EU projects to benchmark their communication effort?

The dissemination schemes should be more specified and have more definitive goals. Who are we communicating to? It is more successful if the target group is not too big. You have to have very clear definitions on your target group. (Learn from the media- and advertising business).

It is naive to think that people will look at the websites for information by themselves. Information has to be fed to them in a well-communicated way (marketing). You have to create value for your target group.

When you propose for a project, the communication plan should be taken very seriously. You should show that you have the skills to do professional targeted communication – not just make a lot of newsletters and a website.

You need a lot of resources to make successful communication – if you do not communicate, nobody will learn about the project conclusions. Having a communication strategy - and enough resources – is very important as communication of the project conclusions is a very important part of a EU project.

2. Quantitative Description of the 2nd ODE for Organisers of Science Events

Total: 5 stakeholders were contacted directly to arrange this ODE – 4 participated, because one had technical problems and never entered the hangout.

Target type: Science event organisers from all over Europe.

Number of participants: 4 from the EUSEA network from Israel, Sweden and Denmark (The German participant was hindered due to technical problems entering the hangout).

3. Qualitative Description of the 2nd ODE for Organisers of Science Events

Problems encountered: It took some time for people to enter the hangout, because of technical confusion.

Positive aspects observed: It was a very good, face-to-face debate.

Des Spolse presence: No

Improvement required: DNF hopes to use the Google Hangout tool again, or make individual interviews with science event organisers for the next data collection.