

**FEEDBACK REQUEST:**  
**Implementation Plan for Innovation Barometer**  
**Tranche 2**  
**Creative HQ + NZTE (G2G)**  
***Digital Government Leadership Group***

Based on the feedback from the Panel in December 2019, we have prepared the following implementation plan for the development of the NZ Innovation Barometer.

Information is organised as follows:

1. Value of the Innovation Barometer for the public sector
2. Outline of professional and academic partners
3. Roadmap of the data development and collection plan
4. Government stakeholder map
5. Appendix A: Draft survey categories
6. Attachment: Digital Government Partnership Innovation Fund Lean Canvas

## **1. Value of the Innovation Barometer for the public sector**

Building trust, promoting transparency, and reducing risk is the value of innovation in the public sector. Senior leaders need data to legitimise the need for innovation and to identify actions to take. The Innovation Barometer will do this through the collection of data against five key 'Innovation Inputs' each with a number of sub-categories and key 'Innovation Outputs'. This will create insights that can be clearly articulated to senior leaders showing them the areas within their organisations where they could take action and give examples of how this is best to happen.

This deeper level of visibility, understanding and action will enable senior leaders to deliver innovative public value, which will build trust, promote transparency, and reduce risk.

## **2. Outline of professional and academic partners**

### **Victoria School of Business and Government**

Partnering with a well regarded university with intellectual rigour is vital to the credibility of the research. Creative HQ has a working relationship with the Victoria School of Business and Government, in particular the innovation research team led by Stephen Cummings, Professor of Strategy and Innovation, and Director of the Atom Innovation Space.

For this Innovation Barometer data collection, we would establish a formal partnership with the Victoria School of Business and Government, through a research grant. Ian Williamson, Pro-Vice-Chancellor & Dean of Commerce, and Girol Karacaoglu, Head of the School of Government are in full support of this partnership. The cost for their expertise is yet to be confirmed, however, it is signaled to be \$55-80k.

### **The Innovation Research Team**

Below is a brief outline of each team members expertise

- Stephen Cummings, PhD - data visualisation and innovation
- Dr Jesse Pirini - data visualisation and multimedia presentation
- Dr Ben Walker - survey design and alignment to international best practice
- Ruth Fischer-Smith, PhD - government lens as a current LINZ manager
- Dr Flavia Donadelli - public policy and innovation

### **Denmark National Centre for Public Sector Innovation (COI)**

The Innovation Barometer team has formed a strong relationship with the Denmark COI who created the first official statistics on public sector innovation in 2015. Sally Hett, the Creative HQ lead for the Innovation Barometer, met with the team in Copenhagen in January 2020. They shared details about their data collection method and content, as well as suggesting questions for us to consider when developing the study. They have agreed to continue to support us as needed.

### **Copenhagen Manual**

Sally Hett has been invited to represent New Zealand in the co-creation of the Copenhagen Manual - new international guidelines for measuring and developing public sector innovation. We are one of 19 countries involved in this work, see [Press Release to learn more](#). The Manual is led by the Copenhagen COI. While the scope of different countries Innovation Barometers vary, there is such value in learning from each other about what works, what doesn't and recommended improvements. Formed in November 2019, the group will develop six themes over the next 9 months.

### **AskYourTeam**

We have had foundational discussions with AskYourTeam, a company that specialises in employee feedback to gain organisational insights. AskYourTeam has vast experience working with Government delivering highly relevant, globally researched and independently validated performance measurement frameworks, as well as automated analytics and reporting. The cost for their expertise for a public sector employee survey is yet to be confirmed, however, it is signaled to be \$35-40k.

### 3. Roadmap of the data development and collection process

#### Workshop 1: Introduction

The first workshop will bring together the advisory board for the first time. The advisory board will draw from the government stakeholder map below and include the VUW innovation research team. The aim of this workshop is to share the background of the project to ensure everyone is aligned and supportive of the objectives and scope of the barometer.

#### Workshop 2: Determine data requirements (Advisory Board)

- Innovative inputs and outputs (see Appendix A)
- Quantitative and qualitative
- How do we reflect and integrate Te Ao Māori and other forms of cultural and social diversity?
- Who is the audience?
- The number of people to be surveyed
- Confidentiality requirements

#### Identify existing data sources

Much of the data underpinning the innovative inputs are already being monitored by government agencies. Once we have determined the data requirements, we can identify existing data sources that align with these data requirements to ensure no/reduced duplication of work. Here's a non-exhaustive list of sources that might provide relevant data.

- SSC's Public Sector Workforce Survey.<sup>1</sup>
- DIA's *Strategy for a Digital Public Service's* focus on "new ways of working"<sup>2</sup>
- Stats NZ have a Data Leadership Dashboard,<sup>3</sup> and Indicators Aotearoa.
- Treasury dashboard of Living Standards data.<sup>4</sup> It may also be possible to analyse Budget material and compile some data around the funding granted to "innovative" projects.
- Academic surveys; for example the Public Service Association (PSA) commissioned VUW to survey their members in 2013 and again in 2016.<sup>5</sup> VUW also created the ANZSOG 2019 survey.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> SSC, Workforce Data ([link](#)); Public Service Workforce information: Human Resource Capability (HRC) data collection ([link](#)); see *Our People: Public Service Workforce Data 2018* ([link](#)), page 19, for an explanation of aggregating Staff Engagement data.

<sup>2</sup> Digital.govt.nz (2019) *Strategy for a Digital Public Service* ([link](#)).

<sup>3</sup> Stats NZ, Data Leadership Dashboard ([link](#)).

<sup>4</sup> Treasury, Living Standards Dashboard ([link](#)).

<sup>5</sup> PSA (2013) *Workplace dynamics in New Zealand public services* ([link](#)); (2016) *Workplace dynamics in New Zealand public services* ([link](#)).

<sup>6</sup> ANZSOG (2019) *Today's Problems, Yesterday's Toolkit* ([link](#)).

### **Survey Design (VUW research team + AskYourTeam)**

We will draw from other countries innovation research as well as international best practice to ensure robust, comprehensive, coherent, comparable with other countries. For example, we can learn from the following surveys:

- MEPIN survey from Nordic countries<sup>7</sup>
- NESTA pilot survey in the UK<sup>8</sup>
- EU Innobarometer<sup>9</sup>
- Australian Public Sector Innovation Indicators (APSII)<sup>10</sup>
- Canadian Public Service Employee Survey<sup>11</sup>

The survey will be tested with a sample audience and iterated as needed to ensure it fulfils the objectives and requirements above.

### **Workshop 3: Data collection methodology (Advisory Board)**

Informed by the objectives and data requirements, we will develop the most appropriate nonprobability sampling method for disseminating the survey. Research is to be done on the best/innovative way to execute and communicate our survey. For example, the snowball sampling method will be further explored.

### **Stakeholder management**

For the barometer to be a success we need strong management buy in, particularly at executive leadership level to ensure the gravitas of the survey. Given initial support, we propose utilising the DGLG to endorse the survey. This will be done by involving agency representatives in the survey design through the Advisory Board as well as ongoing meetings with senior leaders to explain the value of this work. Part of the additional funding will cover the cost of relationship management.

### **Pilot barometer**

- Launch pilot survey with partner agencies. Targeted agencies include:
  - MOH
  - SIA
  - NZTE
  - DoC
  - MFAT
- Communications needed to follow up survey (reminders)
- Gather existing data

---

<sup>7</sup> Norden (2011) *Measuring Public Innovation in the Nordic Countries (MEPIN)* ([link](#)).

<sup>8</sup> NESTA (2011) *Innovation in Public Sector Organisations: A pilot survey for measuring innovation across the public sector* ([link](#)).

<sup>9</sup> European Commission (2011) *Innobarometer 2010: Analytical Report: Innovation in Public Administration* ([link](#)).

<sup>10</sup> Australian Government (2013) *Wrapping Up the Australian Public Sector Innovation Indicators (APSII) Project* ([link](#)).

<sup>11</sup> Canadian Government (2019) *Public Service Employee Survey* ([link](#)).

### **Pilot analysis and reporting**

- Analyse data
- Data visualisation
- Compile case studies
- Actionable steps
- Publish findings. (Access to this information is yet to be determined.)

It's important to recognise that this will be an iterative journey. Much like the Treasury's Wellbeing Budget, we're unlikely to get everything right with the first attempt, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't be trying to move the government in this direction. The end result - articulating, measuring, and promoting "good" public sector innovation - is our North Star.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Digital.govt.nz (2019) *What Does 'Good' Look Like? Innovation in Public Service Design* ([link](#)).

## 4. Government stakeholder map

### A: Confirmed interest in being involved

David Downs (NZTE)  
Elena Higgison (DIA)  
Dani Lucas (SIA)  
Grant Carpenter (Service Innovation Lab)  
Rachel Clements (ex-MPI)  
Melita Glasgow (DPMC)  
Matt Frost (MOE)  
Paul Stone (StatsNZ)

### B: Agencies involved in the creation of the Innovation Barometer prototype

- MOH
- Treasury
- MPI
- MBIE
- DIA
- NZ Police
- MfE
- OT
- DOC
- DPMC
- StatsNZ
- MoJ
- MoE
- SIL
- WellingtonNZ
- MSD
- FENZ
- GWRC
- SIA
- MFAT

# Appendix A: Draft survey categories

Here is a first draft of the possible categories for each Innovation Stock under which questions will need to be developed at the workshops. The 'Example data and survey questions' illustrate the research we've done of surveys that gather similar data in New Zealand, whose approach we could learn from.

## ***Innovative Inputs***

### **1. Innovative Intent**

Sub-category	Example data and survey questions
Belief that Innovation by Method adds value	[ ]
Interest in learning Innovation by Method skills	Interest in Learning Skills (Figures 4.1-4.3, ANZSOG survey 2019)
Motivation to serve the public	Motivation (Table 5.1, 5.2, PSA survey 2016)
Willingness and capacity to change and try new things	Employee resilience (Table 5.3, PSA survey 2016)

### **2. Innovative Skills and Capability<sup>13</sup>**

Sub-category	Example data and survey questions
Innovation by Method know-how and understanding	Skills (Figures 3.1-4.3, ANZSOG survey 2019)
Access to / capability with tools (including digital tools)	Skills (Figures 3.1-4.3, ANZSOG survey 2019)
Training and development	Formal training (Figures 2.1-2.4, ANZSOG survey 2019)
Workload and capacity	Working overtime (Table 6.1, PSA survey 2016)

### **3. Ease of Collaboration**

Sub-category	Example data and survey questions
--------------	-----------------------------------

<sup>13</sup> It is important to distinguish (a) Skills and Capability from (b) Innovative Intent. As highlighted in the ANZSOG survey 2019, many people in the public sector *want* to innovate and apply new problem solving methods (or are at least open to doing so), but don't have the skills to use these methods.

Horizontal collaboration (across teams and agencies)	Collaboration (Table 12.3, PSA survey 2016)
Vertical collaboration (hierarchical)	Information (Table 10.3, PSA survey 2016)
External collaboration (with non-government partners)	Policy input from stakeholders (Table 12.1, PSA survey 2016)
Data sharing and technology compatibility	Open Data Leadership Dashboard (Stats NZ)
Access to innovation experts and/or innovation hubs	[ ]

#### 4. Innovative Culture

Sub-category	Example data and survey questions
Leadership culture	Leadership (Tables 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.7, PSA survey 2016)
Risk culture	Risk and Innovation (Chap 3, Australian State of the Service Report 2017-2018)
Autonomy and incentives	Role clarity and rewards (Tables 10.1,10.4, PSA survey 2016)
Workplace safety	Bullying and support (Tables 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 10.6, 10.7, PSA survey 2016)
Organisational culture	Staff engagement (SSC et al); Goal clarity and performance (Tables 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, PSA survey 2016)
Anticipatory focus and long-term thinking	Forward-thinking (Table 11.5, PSA survey 2016)

#### 5. Institutional Environment<sup>14</sup>

Sub-category	Example data and survey questions
Resourcing and budget	Access to budget (Table 9.8, PSA survey 2016)
Procedural flexibility	[ ]
Retention and diffusion of institutional knowledge	[ ]

<sup>14</sup> It is also important to differentiate (a) Innovative Culture from (b) Institutional Environment. The former describes the incentives and sense of purpose necessary for people to feel safe and supported to try new things. The latter is about the settings and processes that enable/obstruct new ideas or methods from being successfully implemented in a practical sense. Ease of Collaboration overlaps with both Innovative Culture and Institutional Environment, but is significant enough to merit its own category (capturing the incentives and practical settings relating to collaboration).



Evaluation, monitoring and feedback loops	Innovation and Learning Culture (Tables 11.3, 11.4, PSA survey 2016)
[Restructuring]	[ ]

### ***Innovative Outputs***

The approach for measuring the Innovative Outputs is to be further developed. For example, whether we follow the hybrid approach recommended by Arundel et al (2019),<sup>15</sup> which involves asking questions about multiple innovations and a single innovation. Here is a first draft of the possible categories the output-based part of the survey could aim to collect.

- Types of innovations (e.g. services, products, policy, processes or methods of organisation, methods of communicating with external parties)
- Novelty of the innovation (incremental vs transformational).
- Impact/value of the innovation (e.g. quality, efficiency, procurement, citizen involvement, employee satisfaction)
- Inputs necessary to realise the innovation (e.g. Innovative Intent, Innovative Skills and Capabilities, Innovative Culture, Ease of Collaboration, Institutional Environment, studies about noteworthy successes and failures.)
- Case studies about noteworthy successes and failures.

---

<sup>15</sup> Arundel, A; Bloch, C; Ferguson, B (2019) *Advancing innovation in the public sector: Aligning innovation measurement with policy goals* ([link](#))