

MT1.4_6 Case Studies

Case Study 1: Tech Startup Idea Evaluation

Context:

In this case study, we examine a tech startup, "InnoTech Solutions," that specializes in developing innovative software applications. The company is known for its creative approach to idea evaluation.

Scenario:

"InnoTech Solutions was faced with a challenge in determining which of two innovative app ideas to pursue for their next project. They had the option to develop either an educational app for children or a productivity app for professionals. Both ideas showed promise, but the team needed to make an informed decision."

Key Points to Highlight:

- **Idea Generation:** InnoTech Solutions encourages idea generation from all team members, fostering a culture of creativity.
- **Criteria Development:** The company has established clear criteria for idea evaluation, including feasibility, market demand, and potential impact.
- **Diversity of Perspectives:** The team involves members from various backgrounds, including educators and business professionals, to bring diverse perspectives to the evaluation process.
- **Real-World Testing:** To assess market demand, the team conducted surveys and pilot tests with target users for both app ideas.
- **Decision-Making:** After careful evaluation, they opted to proceed with the educational app, as it aligned better with their mission and had strong support from early testing results.

Learning Points:

Participants can discuss and analyze this case to understand how a tech startup utilized idea evaluation to choose between two promising ideas. They can explore the criteria, decision-making process, and the importance of testing ideas in real-world scenarios. Additionally, the case

demonstrates the value of diversity in the evaluation team and aligning chosen ideas with the company's mission and values.

Case Study 2: Corporate Innovation Challenge

Context:

This case study explores a well-established multinational corporation, "Global Innovations Inc.," that regularly holds innovation challenges to source and evaluate new ideas.

Scenario:

"Global Innovations Inc. aimed to revamp its supply chain management to enhance efficiency and reduce environmental impact. The company launched an innovation challenge, inviting employees and external partners to submit ideas. They received a wide range of proposals, from adopting sustainable sourcing practices to implementing advanced logistics technologies."

Key Points to Highlight:

- **Idea Crowdsourcing:** Global Innovations Inc. leveraged the collective intelligence of its workforce and external partners to source innovative ideas.
- **Cross-Functional Teams:** They formed cross-functional teams comprising experts from various departments, including supply chain, sustainability, and technology, to evaluate the submissions.
- **Evaluation Criteria:** The company established criteria that included environmental impact, cost-effectiveness, scalability, and alignment with corporate values.
- **Pilot Testing:** The top ideas were selected for pilot testing in different regions to assess their real-world feasibility and impact.
- **Collaborative Decision-Making:** Through collaborative evaluation and discussions, the company chose to implement a combination of ideas, including sustainable sourcing practices and advanced logistics technologies.

Learning Points:

Participants can analyze this case study to understand how a multinational corporation effectively evaluated a multitude of ideas for supply chain innovation. They can explore the advantages of idea crowdsourcing, the significance of cross-functional teams, and the importance of aligning selected

ideas with company values and goals. Additionally, the case illustrates the value of pilot testing to assess the feasibility and impact of innovative ideas.

Case Study 3: Nonprofit Project Selection

Context:

This case study focuses on a nonprofit organization called "Community United" that aims to improve the well-being of underprivileged communities through various projects.

Scenario:

"Community United received several project proposals from its members and external stakeholders. These projects ranged from educational initiatives to healthcare services. The organization needed to determine which project would have the most significant positive impact on the community."

Key Points to Highlight:

- **Community Involvement:** Community United actively engaged community members in the idea evaluation process, ensuring that the projects were aligned with the needs and aspirations of the community.
- **Impact Assessment:** The organization developed criteria to assess the potential impact of each project in terms of improving the lives of community members, with a focus on sustainability and long-term benefits.
- **Resource Allocation:** They considered the available resources, including funding and volunteers, and assessed the feasibility of each project within those constraints.
- **Decision-Making:** Through collaborative discussions and surveys involving community members, the organization selected a project that had strong community support, a clear path to implementation, and the potential for significant positive change.

Learning Points:

Attachment to MT1.4.6
Task 2.2



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Participants can examine this case study to understand how a nonprofit organization evaluated ideas for community projects. They can explore the importance of community involvement in the evaluation process, the criteria used to assess impact, and the practical considerations, such as resource allocation. The case also highlights the value of aligning selected projects with the community's needs and long-term objectives.

Case Study 4: Product Innovation in a Manufacturing Company

Context:

This case study centers on a manufacturing company, "InnoTech Manufacturing," aiming to innovate its product line.

Scenario:

"InnoTech Manufacturing sought to expand its product line by introducing a new and innovative product. The company's R&D department generated multiple product ideas, including a high-tech consumer device and an eco-friendly alternative. They needed to evaluate these ideas to determine which one to invest in."

Key Points to Highlight:

- **In-House Innovation:** InnoTech Manufacturing relied on its internal R&D team for idea generation, showcasing the significance of in-house innovation.
- **Market Potential:** The company assessed the market potential and demand for each product idea, considering factors like market trends and consumer preferences.
- **Resource Allocation:** InnoTech Manufacturing evaluated the resources required for development and production, including technology, materials, and workforce.
- **Risk Analysis:** The company conducted a risk analysis to anticipate challenges and potential setbacks associated with each idea.
- **Decision-Making:** After a comprehensive evaluation, the company opted to develop the eco-friendly alternative due to its alignment with market trends and the company's sustainability values.



Joint development, piloting and validation of entrepreneurial mindset and key skills curricula and training materials for third countries

Learning Points:

Participants can analyze this case study to understand how a manufacturing company evaluated innovative product ideas. They can explore the importance of in-house innovation, market analysis, resource allocation, and risk assessment. The case underscores the significance of aligning selected ideas with market trends and corporate values.

Attachment to MT1.4.6
Task 2.2



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.