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Executive Summary

This Discussion Paper has been prepared by Russell Jaffe (Jaffe Consulting Pty Ltd). It is based on work undertaken for the Department of Victorian Communities (DVC) in a short term contract.

The project for the DVC had the following objectives:

- To undertake a review of the current literature on social entrepreneurship.
- To consider progress on social entrepreneurship initiatives nationally and internationally.
- To identify the level of corporate engagement, and the extent to which the Third Sector is engaging with the corporate sector.
- To outline ways for the Department of Victorian Communities to focus on social entrepreneurship and engage in fostering this concept and associated projects.
- To undertake a summary review of the role of social entrepreneurship and the extent to which it may contribute to the Department’s Community Building focus and initiatives.

While the initial focus for the Paper was on social entrepreneurship, a review of terminology revealed a wide number of associated terms – social enterprise, corporate social responsibility, social capital, social venture capital and community capacity building/community strengthening. A number of key elements were identified as common to all terms:

- Partnerships (especially between business, community and government).
- Local ownership.
- Networking and collaboration.
- Building community assets.
- Innovation.
- Longer term prevention.
- Community capacity.
- Social capital, capacity and responsibility.
- Leadership and passion.

The Paper then provides a wide ranging review of case studies in Victoria, Australia and internationally. These case studies demonstrate the plethora of activity currently pushing the boundaries of this field.

The following section explores both the potential and the limitations inherent to social entrepreneurship. The key elements of Best Practice were identified as:

- Leadership.
- Accountability and transparency - effective governance.
- Combining a business approach with social goals.
- A business approach to planning and marketing.
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- Adherence to community ownership principles.
- Genuine networking, collaboration and partnering.
- Ability to change focus and role.
- Understanding of time.
- Focus on evaluation and learning.
- Recognition of outstanding entrepreneurs.

A number of key limitations were then explored:

- Fears of the authenticity of entrepreneurs.
- Poor governance and accountability structures in the community sector.
- Overcoming mindsets, suspicions and vested interests.
- Government funding structures.
- The departmental mandate across government.

The Paper concludes with an outline of five key areas as possible future pathways for the Victorian Government:

1. Providing leadership – developing conceptual thinking.
2. Promoting an evidence-based approach.
4. Provision of venture capital.
5. Government and public sector culture - creating a new environment.

Further, a number of additional opportunities exist for structuring a more supportive environment for social entrepreneurship, although many of them may require Commonwealth rather than State intervention and action:

- **Socially focused enterprises**: Consideration of a structure for socially focused enterprises, similar to the Community Interest Companies concept in the UK.
- **Microcredit**: Support for microcredit initiatives as originally established by the Grameen Bank.
- **Independent Body**: Support for an independent body/unit specifically charged with the role of stimulating and supporting social entrepreneurship.
- **Matched Savings Schemes**: Exploring Matched Savings Schemes for low income families.
- **Networking Structure**: Re-establishment of a networking structure and process for social entrepreneurs in Victoria.
- **Recognition**: Consideration of establishing processes for rewarding successful social entrepreneurial projects.
1. Introduction

This Discussion Paper has been prepared by Russell Jaffe (Jaffe Consulting Pty Ltd). It is based on work undertaken for the Department of Victorian Communities (DVC) in a short term contract. The research for this project has opened up enormous possibilities in this field, as there appears to be an explosion of interest and activity in the whole field of social entrepreneurship, social capital, community capacity building and corporate social responsibility. While the initial focus for this project was social entrepreneurship, it has not been possible to limit it to this focus, nor, in the opinion of the writer, would that be appropriate.

The drivers towards this new approach to dealing with social problems and development are many and varied:

- A sense that the solving of social problems requires new and innovative ways of approach, based on an awareness of how hard it is to make a difference simply by applying extra money and services.
- A shift in government roles, away from direct service provision, to partnership and facilitation of service delivery (‘steering the boat rather than rowing’).
- A realisation that knowledge is the new ‘limiting resource’ and that we need to think how to equip our populations with the knowledge that they need to handle modern society.
- The world wide move from rural to urban living.
- The effects of globalisation, especially the immediacy of communication through the Internet and other information technology.
- The push for ‘community’, this time in a more realistic and sophisticated form than the idealised views of the early second half of the last century.
- The understanding of large corporate businesses that social and environment goals can support and enhance their financial bottom line.
- The initiatives undertaken by the Blair Government in the UK.

These and other key factors are driving the world to find innovative ways of solving the major social problems of modern society. It represents a historic shift of focus and energy with great potential for the emergence of a new paradigm of thinking.

Interestingly, although this is seemingly a new movement, many of those interviewed stated that they felt that social entrepreneurship had always been around and that innovative individuals had always taken enterprising approaches to social problems. What seems to be different now is that the concept has been ‘packaged’, has been picked and (to some degree) recognised by government) and is attracting publicity and interest. The test now is to establish its credentials and work out effective ways of supporting and encouraging these developments.

On the other side, a key factor to consider in this debate is an aversion to the term ‘entrepreneur’, fuelled by the excesses of business entrepreneurs in the 1980’s. However, to attempt to use any other term than social entrepreneurship would create greater
confusion and uncertainty. Section four therefore will consider the key Best Practice elements which make for effective social entrepreneurs.
1.1 Project Objectives

The project for the DVC had the following objectives:

- To undertake a review of the current literature on social entrepreneurship.
- To consider progress on social entrepreneurship initiatives nationally and internationally.
- To identify the level of corporate engagement, and the extent to which the Third Sector is engaging with the corporate sector.
- To outline ways for the Department of Victorian Communities to focus on social entrepreneurship and engage in fostering this concept and associated projects.
- To undertake a summary review of the role of social entrepreneurship and the extent to which it may contribute to the Department’s Community Building focus and initiatives.

The project proposal also identified a number of issues which needed to be taken into consideration:

- The current funding environment for the Third Sector.
- The scepticism within the Third Sector, who tend to regard social entrepreneurship as a ‘copout’ by government in relation to their funding responsibilities.
- The current views of the corporate sector in relation to philanthropy and business-community partnerships.
- An appreciation of the different funding environment in the United States, as well as the different approach to enterprise and corporate links.
- The current state of volunteering and how this impacts on social entrepreneurship.
- The mandate for the Department and its role (current and potential) as a catalyst for community initiatives and projects.

1.2 Discussion Paper Outline

The Paper initially reviews the maze of terminology in this field. It then reviews the myriad of developments and examples in social entrepreneurship and allied fields, in Victoria, the rest of Australia, and worldwide, with particular emphasis on developments in the UK. Then follows a consideration of the potential and the limitations of social entrepreneurship and principles of Best Practice. There is then a focus on the government’s community strengthening agenda and how this applies to social entrepreneurship, followed by a focus on specific options and strategies for the Victorian government.

This Paper is the result of a short-term, limited review of the social entrepreneurship and allied fields and should be read with this in mind.
2. Defining the Key Terms

1. Social Entrepreneurship

Interestingly, nearly all definitions of social entrepreneurship focus on the capabilities and characteristics of social entrepreneurs. Dees (1998, p1) has however said of social entrepreneurship that 'it combines the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and determination commonly associated with...the high-tech pioneers of Silicon Valley.' He goes on to state that, for social entrepreneurs, the social mission is explicit and central and affects how they perceive and assess opportunities. (Dees, 1998, p3). Sherill Johnson (2000, p1) states that ‘social entrepreneurship is emerging as an innovative approach for dealing with complex social needs. With its emphasis on problem solving and social innovation, socially entrepreneurial activities blur the traditional boundaries between the public, private and non-profit sectors, and emphasise hybrid models of for-profit and non-profit activities.’

In a simple sense, social entrepreneurship is highlighted by a number of key words:

- Leadership (see section 4 for more on this concept).
- Passion.
- Vision.
- Drive.
- Innovation.
- Governance.
- Prevention.
- Sustainability.
- Independence/self-determination.

These last three concepts are crucial. Social Entrepreneurs are consumed by the desire to prevent social problems, to create sustainable communities, employment and forms of income, and from this to establish independence and self determination for individuals and the communities in which they live. Noel Pearson’s passionate work in Cape York is a clear example of this shift from ‘passive welfare’ to ‘sustainable communities’.

Dees has outlined five key elements for social entrepreneurship. He states that:

‘Social entrepreneurs play the role of change agents in the social sector, by:

- Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value).
- Recognising and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission.
- Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning.
- Exhibiting a heightened sense of accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.’ (Dees, p4).
The Ashoka organisation has provided an excellent definition of social entrepreneurs, as follows:

‘The job of a social entrepreneur is to recognize when a part of society is stuck and to provide new ways to get it unstuck. He or she finds what is not working and solves the problem by changing the system, spreading the solution and persuading entire societies to take new leaps. Social entrepreneurs are not content just to give a fish or teach how to fish. They will not rest until they have revolutionized the fishing industry. Identifying and solving large-scale social problems requires a social entrepreneur because only the entrepreneur has the committed vision and inexhaustible determination to persist until they have transformed an entire system. The scholar comes to rest when he expresses an idea. The professional succeeds when she solves a client’s problem. The manager calls it quits when he has enabled his organization to succeed. Social entrepreneurs go beyond the immediate problem to fundamentally change communities, societies, the world.’ (Ashoka, 2001).

Section four will take this issue in considering Best Practice elements of social entrepreneurship.

2. Social Enterprise

In undertaking interviews for this project, some interesting definitions of social enterprise were expressed:

- ‘A financially sustainable business that has a social objective as its prime purpose.’ (Steve Lawrence).
- ‘Sustainable market based ventures to achieve social aims.’ (Peter Tregilgas).
- ‘Financially viable and sustainable businesses that trade in the market to fulfil social aims.’ (Sharon Živkovic).

These definitions give an indication of a language and orientation very different to that usually encountered in the community sector. Tregilgas has gone on further to define three common characteristics of social enterprises:

- They are enterprise oriented, directly involved in the production of goods and services, acting as viable trading concerns.
- They have explicit social aims (job creation, provision of local services), are based on ethical values, are committed to community capacity building, and are accountable for their social, environmental and economic impact.
- They have a form of social ownership, with a governance structure based on participation by stakeholder groups, with profits being distributed as profit sharing to stakeholders or used for the benefit of the community. (Tregilgas, 2001, p1).

A final useful definition has been provided by G Zappala (as quoted in Gray et al 2003, p142): ‘Social enterprise is a means for non-profit agencies to maximise their mission-related performance through the development of new ventures or by reorganising activities to improve operational efficiency.’
3. **Corporate Social Responsibility/ Triple Bottom Line**

The global organisation ‘Business for Social Responsibility’, defines corporate social responsibility (CSR) as ‘achieving commercial success in ways that honour ethical values and respect people, communities and the natural environment.’ CSR relates to the way that businesses do business and how they relate to their local communities and environments as they operate. Linked with this is the growing emphasis on ‘Triple Bottom Line’ reporting, whereby the term ‘bottom line’, originally taken to indicate success of financial performance, has now been broadened to include economic, social and environmental performance. Indeed, there is now talk of the “quadruple bottom line”, whereby corporate governance has been added as a key indicator of performance and a further requiring transparent reporting.

A number of key factors appear to be driving these developments:

- Increased stakeholder activism and more sophisticated engagement.
- Greater demands for accountability and transparent reporting.
- Major corporate collapses over recent years.
- Convergence of CSR and government interest.
- Advances in information technology.
- Pressure to ensure a CSR ‘Return on Investment’.
- Growing examples of how CSR is actually good for the financial bottom line.

In an interview with the Corporate Public Relations Manager of Bristol Myer Squibb, a major pharmaceutical company in partnership with the Inspire Foundation (an innovative organisation focusing on youth suicide – see next section), the interviewee stated that one of the main drivers for the company was to be seen as an ‘employer of choice’ by its employees – he stated that since their employees began their involvement with the Inspire Foundation, absenteeism and staff turnover have significantly reduced.

This momentum towards CSR has partly emerged from a trend away from corporate philanthropy, which on many occasions seemed to benefit the donor rather than the recipient. Further, corporate philanthropy, primarily involving the writing of a cheque by a company, has become less than attractive to companies who are wanting to involve their employees in the process and aim to have a greater impact in their local communities. Thus, the term ‘partnership’ has developed increasing popularity, highlighted by the Commonwealth Government’s Community-Business Partnerships Initiative. Although this is regarded more as encouraging corporate philanthropy than CSR, it is nevertheless an indication of the trend towards a new set of relationships between historically diverse sectors (government, community, business), whereby business money is being used to build community capacity.
4. **Social Capital**

The concept of social capital has engendered significant interest in recent years. The World Health Organisation in 1998 described social capital as ‘the degree of social cohesion that exists in communities’. The World Bank, also in 1998, as outlined in a recent monograph put out by the Productivity Commission, was quoted as stating (p1): ‘The social capital of a society includes the institutions, the relationships, the attitudes and values that govern interactions among people and contribute to economic and social development. Social capital, however, is not simply the sum of institutions which underpin society, it is also the glue that holds them together.’ Norms, networks and trust are key elements of social capital, the monograph explains. Robert Putnam, along these lines has described social capital as having ‘…..features of social organisation such as trust, norms and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating co-ordinated actions.’ (Productivity Commission, 2003, p8).

5. **Social Venture Capital**

Mark Latham, Deputy Leader of the Opposition, discussed social venture capital in an occasional paper for the Institute of Public Administration in April 2001 (‘The Myths of the Welfare State’), described how Brian Munane, from the Western Sydney suburb of Claymore (see next section), made a presentation to the Social Policy Committee of the Federal Labour Caucus. He described how the suburb had been transformed over a number of years, and went on to explain the next phase of the project: the purchase of the local shopping centre. He went on to state that he did not want a government handout, rather was seeking a low-interest loan as venture capital. Latham states how this was unique – someone coming along, not wanting a handout, instead talking about paying money back to government with a return on investment (Latham, 2001, p9).

Latham went on (p10) to describe a very typical process of government funding:

‘In the past, governments have provided a huge amount of funding to community development projects but with little success. These programs have followed a familiar pattern of failure: the formation of local co-ordinating committees; the involvement of residents enthusiastic about a new approach; some capital works and physical changes; scepticism and resistance from central government agencies; a gradual loss of effort and enthusiasm at local level; demands for further government funding; and ultimately the collapse of the program.’

Latham goes on to recommend the establishment of ten Social Venture Capital Funds, each of $200m. The issue here is not so much the political processes through which he is working, but the concept of a government, usually extremely risk averse in its approach to funding, being willing to utilise public funds for social ventures. In the business world, investors invest in either a brilliant mind or a brilliant concept, and preferably both. The difficulty in the community and public sector is that a) it is much harder to discern the brilliant concept (who decides?); and b) there is a clear tendency not to reward brilliant minds, either because of the ‘tall poppy syndrome’, or the democratic demands of government bureaucracy.

A number of people however pointed out that social entrepreneurship cannot be supported through the normal government, bureaucratic, ‘level playing field/opportunities for all’ process - to do so is simply to reward mediocrity and not take
advantage of competence and success endeavours. The backing of winners was regarded as a crucial government approach in enhancing the field of social entrepreneurship through utilisation of social venture capital.

6. **Community Capacity Building/Community Strengthening**

The DVC website has numerous examples and descriptions of community building and associated terminology. It states that ‘community building places particular emphasis on the role of social capital and partnerships. It seeks to strengthen relationships within communities and between communities and government.’ It goes on to state that community building:

- Engages local people in a shared vision for revitalising their communities.
- Develops a range of community initiatives and projects to achieve long term positive change.
- Builds local skills and knowledge to increase participation in government programs.
- Increases opportunities for positive social interaction within communities.
- Encourages and celebrates social and cultural diversity.

This process is being supported by a range of demonstration projects funded through the Department.

The Commonwealth Government has developed a ‘Strengthening Families and Communities’ Strategy. Its website states that the Strategy is ‘about community involvement and giving communities the chance to think about their own local issues and what solutions they can put in place to deal with them. It’s about promoting a ‘can do’ community spirit and helping families and communities develop support networks and the skills and resources they need to deal with their own issues, including volunteering.’

These concepts again are not entirely new. The term ‘community development’ has long been favoured by the community sector, as an indicator of a stronger preventative approach and a focus on local self determination rather than a paternalistic provision of services. A key frustration of community development was its inability to show strong evidence of results, as well as its near total ignoring of the business sector.

7. **Summary**

This review of concepts has pointed to a number of key elements which are evident no matter what term is used:

- Partnerships (especially between business, community and government).
- Local ownership.
- Networking and collaboration.
- Building community assets.
- Innovation.
- Longer term prevention.
- Community capacity.
These elements, none of which on their own are brand new or recently invented, have now come together into a movement and a force which is creating unprecedented opportunities for local communities, but which are now also placing significant demands on governments to respond. It is likely that community capacity building and community strengthening are needed at least simultaneously, if not ahead of, social entrepreneurial projects.

The examples set by the Blair Government in the UK have been a strong driver in this regard. This is not to say that Victoria should blindly follow the UK (or American) examples. However, there is much to learn from both local, national and international examples – it is to these that we now turn.

3. State, National and International Examples of Social Entrepreneurship and Associated Developments

A. VICTORIA

1. Brotherhood of St Laurence – Innovation Hub

The following is taken from a promotional document put out by the Brotherhood of St Laurence (BSL):

Launched in June 2003, the Brotherhood of St Laurence established the Innovation Hub to provide financial and other resources to support:

- BSL staff to incorporate innovation into their activities and programs;
- a culture of innovation, advocacy and sustainability within BSL programs;
- the development of sustainable social enterprise; and
- the development of partnerships between BSL, business, government and other non-government organisations.

Thanks to a major donation, the Brotherhood has made $1 million available through the Innovation Hub, to invest in innovative ideas and support them to a point where they are self-sustaining. The process for accessing funding is based on a peer review process, with a focus on support rather than criticism. Senior Management play no part in decision making during the early stages.

Financial Support

The Hub facilitates funding and/or support to get ideas/projects ‘off the ground’. Financial support (of up to $15,000) can be applied for in a three stage process. The only criteria are that ideas need to meet at least one of the following priorities:

- Improving the efficiency and/or reach of existing BSL service delivery.
- Creation of jobs for disadvantaged people.
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- Development of sustainable social enterprises.

**In Stage 1**, up to $1,000 can be accessed to carry out work such as early research, purchasing materials or involving staff, partners and clients in project planning.

**In Stage 2**, up to $4,000 can be accessed to support pilot projects, study and further research projects, equipment purchases or cover costs of backfilling staff if they are working on Innovation Projects.

**In Stage 3**, up to $10,000 can be accessed to support project implementation. This funding may be used for hiring staff, further backfilling of existing staff, purchasing more equipment or marketing and promotion costs.

The money can be spent on time, materials, computers or any other resources necessary to move a project forward.

This development within the BSL demonstrates what is possible when ‘vision meets opportunity’. Clearly, the Brotherhood could have used the major donation to extend its current service delivery - no doubt there are countless demands for this. However, having developed an entrepreneurial mindset, led by its CEO, the organisation was prepared to take the risk with these funds and establish something new and innovative, but clearly not without risk.

The BSL document then goes on to describe the various projects being undertaken by the organisation:

- **Furniture Works**: The Furniture Works Training Centre helps unemployed people in Frankston through the delivery of personal development and training in woodwork-related skills in a ‘real’ workshop environment. Furniture Works is currently developing a new product range which will generate extra revenue streams with the aim of creating further jobs for trainees after their initial training period.

- **The Butchers Shop Production House**: Over the past 18 months a partnership has developed between BSL’s JPET program and Big hART around increased options and opportunities for behavioural change for disadvantaged young people accessing BSL services. From this partnership a concept has developed to establish a training venue (The Butchers Shop Production House) that would provide a range of pathways for young people towards real employment and education outcomes. Stage 2 funding from the Innovation Hub is currently being used to resource the conduct of a feasibility study to investigate issues of demand and sustainability. The objective is to establish a Production House which will become sustainable through the hire of equipment to local budding film/media producers, and the production of promotional film and media for BSL and other NGO/community organizations.

- **Community Quality Systems**: BSL Community Quality Systems has a suite of quality management products that it sells to community based organisations around Australia. The objective of this innovation project is to develop the CQS website so that Care Package modules can be purchased online and downloaded from the website. Whenever there are updates to modules they could be easily downloaded by clients. The Innovation Hub has provided Stage 1 & 2 funding ($5,000) to cover the costs of market research and development of a prototype website.
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- **Philip’s Gate/Pipsqueaks Feasibility Study:** Philip’s Gate, in a West Heidelberg, aims to establish a shared worship space, a gateway for a variety of welfare services and a community café. Pipsqueaks, a planned subsidiary of Philip’s Gate, will provide a soft entry point for contact visits and a range of children’s services, including HIPPY (auspiced by BSL). The complex will also provide opportunities for BSL to deliver other services including JPET traineeships through the café, and a Homework program, as well as the retail store.

- **Carrum Downs Settlement Job Creation Program:** This project involves job creation through an enterprise model, which will provide employment for local unemployed people. The BSL Carrum Downs Settlement will offer work for residents in grounds maintenance, cleaning and painting, which is currently outsourced to private contractors. The employees will undertake an intense pre-vocational course provided by Furniture Works Training Centre and then be employed by STEP on traineeships.

- **Exploring Social Enterprise Models for Asylum Seekers:** Each year, thousands of asylum seekers find themselves living in the Australian community whilst their application for refugee protection and possible settlement in Australia is processed. The nature of this process can strip asylum seekers of their right to work, leaving many at risk of becoming homeless and destitute. Innovation Hub funding has been allocated to pay for a part-time, temporary project/research officer to research possible solutions including skills exchange, bartering systems and co-operatives, as well as some non-Western approaches.

- **Hard Waste Recycling:** FM Recycling currently collects hard waste that is dumped by the public alongside the charity bins owned by Brotherhood of St Laurence, Open Family and Red Cross. BSL and FM Recycling operate a sophisticated clothes sorting facility in Thomastown which recovers approximately 6,000 tonnes each year. This innovation project will see the establishment of a recovery facility that will allow reusable products and recyclable materials from this waste stream to be recovered and diverted from landfill. The Innovation Hub has provided financial support and guidance for the development of a submission to EcoRecylce for a grant to assist in establishment costs and equipment purchase for the Hard Waste Recycle Plant.

In addition, BSL has worked with Bendigo Bank and 20 community agencies to establish a ‘Virtual Community Bank’, focusing on low interest loans, essentially a microcredit program. This project is being piloted at present Deer Park, and, if successful, will be extended to other communities. This scheme is allowing families to purchase new white goods (e.g. washing machines), whereas previously they didn’t have the finance to do so, so bought low quality second hand machines which needed constant repairs - over several years a family would therefore spend the equivalent of the money needed for a new machine, but without the upfront capital, could never afford a new one. This is a classic example of innovative thinking to address a typical problem facing low socio-economic families.

BSL’s example demonstrates what is achievable with leadership, organisational commitment and a significant initial funding coffer. It represents a significant entrepreneurial approach by a major national community agency.
2. **St Lukes, Bendigo - Long Gully Project**

St Lukes Anglicare in Bendigo has undertaken an extensive community strengthening project in the Long Gully community in Bendigo (funded by the Ian Potter Foundation). It is an example of the sustained effort needed by community agencies in working with low socio-economic communities. In itself, it may not have had the full range of entrepreneurial features described under the Best Practice section later in this report, but nevertheless represents one of the more notable community-agency relationships in Victoria over a lengthy period. It is an example of the type of community which may now be ready for an injection of funds specifically targeted at the development of entrepreneurial activities. Their Evaluation Report, completed by Fiona Gardner and Bob Jamieson in May 2000, had the following within its Executive Summary:

Changes observed in the community included:
1. Community members with a greater sense of pride and hope in their community as well as a feeling of ownership.
2. People who felt capable that they could influence change both at a personal and community level.
3. Community members who felt more able to deal constructively with conflict.
4. The development of community resources, an infrastructure of activities and committees so that people can choose how to be involved.
5. Individuals and groups who developed knowledge, skills, confidence and the capacity to work together effectively.
6. The development of strong social networks and a sense of social capital.
7. Physical resources such as the playground and barbecue area.
8. Increased feelings of safety from feeling connected to others and being able to deal with conflict.
9. Positive changes in relationships with voluntary organisations, schools and businesses involved in the community.

3. **Ourcommunity.com**

Rhonda Galbally has headed up a new organisation called Ourcommunity.com, who describe themselves as follows: "Through the Our Community Centres of Excellence, we provide the one-stop-gateway for practical resources, support and linkages between community networks and the general public, business and government - building capacity to strengthen the community in every Australian State and Territory.

This entrepreneurial approach has created an organisation in a field where none existed previously, although clearly it has met a significant need in the community. The organisation offers a range of information and resources on fundraising, networking, insurance, leadership and management, and sees itself as having a key role linking up donors and community organisations."
4. Southern Family Life

Southern Family Life (SFL), a community based organisation in Sandringham, has long been regarded as innovative in its approach to working with its local community and local businesses. It recently opened its Station Road Recycling Store, having worked with young people on a Community Jobs Program to establish the Store. Local schools are also assisting as volunteers to staff the Store. The agency has also attracted business and local donors to support job training at the Store, as well as a new community based intensive support program for high risk infants and their parents. SFL has also commenced some innovative work with men in the workplace, with a contract with Gregory’s Transport to support employees having personal or family difficulties.

SFL has a philosophy of turning ‘response into prevention’, and in this way is working with young men who have been referred to the agency, on a youth suicide prevention program. This is linked to a shift away from ‘problems’ to ‘community building’, an indicator of the way that the agency would encourage government funding to also shift.

5. Pilotlight Australia

Pilotlight Australia has been set up by Jane Tewson who was heavily involved in the organisation of the same name in the UK. Pilotlight encourages businesses to become involved in community issues and community organisations. It has only been established a short time here in Australia. In the UK, it initiated a number of key projects, including:

- **Timebank**: Timebank’s aim is to create a new generation of people who give time to their local communities. They came up with a new way of appealing to volunteers, and also brought together the media and charity worlds through the involvement of the BBC (for more information, see below, under ‘international examples’).

- **The Real Deal**: This program for the first time enables homeless and socially excluded young people to speak out to policy makers in a UK-wide consultation. The Project was a partnership between The Camelto Foundation, Centrepoint, Demos, Save the Children and 150 young people working in groups across the UK.

- **Refugee and Asylum Seekers**: Convinced that the public need to know more about the reality of refugees’ lives, in 1999 Pilotlight inspired Saatchi and Saatchi to develop a series of hard hitting advertisements for national newspapers with true life refugee stories.

Here in Australia PilotLight has been instrumental in exposing the corporate world to the realities of social issues and seeking their support for joint ventures.
B. AUSTRALIA WIDE

1. Inspire Foundation/Bristol Myer Squib Partnership

The Inspire Foundation undertakes innovative Internet-based projects with the aim of inspiring young people. The idea is that each Inspire project charts new territory so that it serves as a model or inspiration for others. Young people are the focus of all Inspire projects, and the medium we use is the Internet. The Internet offers unprecedented opportunities to reach out to young people - to connect, empower and inspire - in an environment that young people find attractive, accessible and fun.

The Foundation has established ‘Reach Out!’, an internet based service aimed at young people (averaging over 30,000 site visits per month). The goal of the Reach Out! service is to provide young people with much-needed information, assistance and referrals in a format that will appeal to them. Reach Out! offers an anonymous and stigma free way to get help, explore issues and discover how other young people have coped through difficult times.

While the overall goal is to reduce suicide and attempted suicide by young people, Reach Out! has five specific objectives:

1. To increase help seeking behaviour and coping skills by young people.
2. To increase access to mental health information that is engaging and relevant to young people from diverse backgrounds.
3. To actively engage young people in the design, development and implementation of Reach Out!.
4. To create a useful tool for service providers to use in the ongoing care and support of young people who may be at risk.
5. Increase youth friendly Internet access.

In addition, the Reach Out! Bush Network has installed 40 computers in 20 rural locations across New South Wales, providing young people with free Internet access at youth-friendly locations. Using a train-the-trainer model, the project has also provided Internet training to young people, who in turn have trained other people in their local communities.

A critical element of the Inspire Foundation has been its partnership with Bristol Myer Squibb (BMS), a multi-national pharmaceutical company, who have supported the organisation financially and also in offering staff time to support Inspire’s Youth Ambassadors Program. As stated above (in the section on CSR), this has been regarded by BMS as a major opportunity for them in supporting an innovative and entrepreneurial approach to a significant social problem (youth suicide).
2. **Social Ventures Australia - Big Boost Challenge**

Social Ventures Australia (SVA) is a not for profit organisation founded by AMP Foundation and three leading social sector organisations: the Benevolent Society, The Smith Family and Work Ventures Ltd.

SVA supports social entrepreneurs with ideas that deliver innovative solutions to solve critical social issues. These issues can range from the environment and education to employment and economic development.

SVA provides these people with resources such as educational material, workshops, business mentoring, and where possible seed funding. In 2002, SVA ran the Big Boost! - a business plan challenge for the social sector with a prize pool of $250,000 provided by AMP Foundation. Six organisations shared in the prize pool:

- **OzGreen Youth LEAD** encourages young people to take a practical leadership role in environmental issues.
- **Big hART** initiates arts projects that re-engage people on the fringes of their communities by helping them tell their story.
- **The Women's Circus** develops circus programs that empower marginalised women.
- **The Beacon Foundation** helps young people with the school-to-work transition. Pathways to Manhood inspires boys to reach their potential through mentoring, support networks and youth leadership.
- **Out of Redfern** fosters indigenous talent through fashion design and production.

3. **Work Ventures Australia**

WorkVentures exists to build a just, creative and sustainable society by providing quality employment, economic and community development services - giving special priority to unemployed and disadvantaged people. The organisation played a lead role in forming JOB futures - a national non-profit co-operative network of employment services agencies. It also operates an innovative and flexible IT training centre and Group Training Company - an innovator in a vital national industry.

WorkVentures works closely with corporations, and regards them as business partners, not donors. They have a principle of all service users making some financial contribution to these that they receive, believing that this turns them into 'customers' and creates a healthier 'business transaction', rather than the disempowering process of passive welfare.

4. **OzGreen**

Oz GREEN is short for the Global Rivers Environmental Education Network, Australia. It sees itself as being strongly committed to positive change in the environment, particularly in improving the quality of our water through community-based projects in a local, national and international context.

Its aims are social and ecological - social in connecting and empowering groups of people to act on a project and link with other sectors within their own community and ecological in promoting the adoption of ecologically sustainable ways of living. Education plays a critical role in the process. It channels community energy and
frustrations on water quality issues into practical working projects, such as water catchment protection schemes. We also assist communities who suffer from the effects of polluted water, at home and overseas.

OzGreen offers support with action based education courses which involve identifying, measuring and devising action plans to fight water pollution. For example, the Stormwater Action Project has brought different sections of the community together, namely households, schools, local businesses and government. With the backing of the State government, schoolchildren across New South Wales have been engaged in a water quality testing process and have conducted surveys with local businesses to determine the extent of the problem. Oz GREEN then conducted pollution prevention training programs which have led to the development of company environmental action plans to prevent stormwater pollution.

Receiving the Bog Boost Award from Social Ventures Australia was a highlight for them, as it provided recognition for their work and approach. Their partnership with SVA is crucial to them in terms of support and mentoring. OzGreen is a further example of a passionate entrepreneur setting out (in 1991) with a vision, a dream and plenty of passion – but no money, and ending up with 8 staff and 12 others in 3 countries.

5. **Cape York Partnerships**

Much has been written about the work being undertaken by Noel Pearson up in Cape York, his railing against the negative effects of passive welfare, and his efforts to bring in major corporate partners to establish sustainable enterprises with skilled workers. Noel Pearson has stated the following:

The social entrepreneur is somebody who manages to mobilise the under-utilised common resources in order to achieve lasting change. But the main assets the social entrepreneur are creating and working with are relationships. Unexpected relationships between members of the local communities, staff of government structures, at all levels, business people, politicians, anybody who has an interest in social development where it was thought not to be possible.

There are people who want to take on this role, and there are people in the communities who will be inspired by them. These things are beginning to happen in many countries, where the public sector faces the same challenges as in our country.

The main quality of such social entrepreneurs will be their belief in the capacity of our people. There must be absolutely no hesitation on this. They have to know our potential as a people such that they will never presume that our future lies in other people “saving” or “serving” us.

To avoid creating relationships of dependency and passivity, the social entrepreneur will have strong thinking to guide his or her role. They will face situations where they will be under pressure to do things in the ‘traditional’ way - through ‘service delivery’, rather than maximum self-service. Many social and ideological pressures will be brought to bear, but the social entrepreneur will resist returning to the old ‘saviour/servant’ model of leadership.
Pearson has, for instance, developed a trial of Family Income Management in three communities in Cape York. Family Income Management is about family-budget management – something that mainstream families do because they have the facilities and support services to do it.

It is about allowing local families to voluntarily pool and manage their income as a household, nuclear family or extended family (it's up to them to define the 'family'). The system aims to address three basic facilities that remote people in Cape York currently do not have:

- proper banking facilities to save money and pay accounts through automatic deductions and payments.
- loan facilities: we propose to establish access to joint loan facilities, where families take out joint loans, rather than just individual loans.
- access to goods and services - we are looking at on-line catalogues and establishing purchase facilities with suppliers and brokers.

The responsibility therefore falls to families to manage and make decisions about their pooled funds. They may decide to manage 50% of their income, and leave the remainder to individual members as discretionary income. But the system will ensure that those family members who are currently spending all of their money in a discretionary way while other family members are paying the bills and buying the food make a contribution. Families will have financial advisors available to them to provide advice on budgeting and planning.

Cape York is a clear example of a community moving away from reliance and dependence on government support and instead seeking business partners, to develop new ways of creating jobs, ensuring training and skill development, and handling family and community finances.

6. **Benevolent Society/Claymore Community**

Claymore, a public housing estate near Campbelltown in Sydney's West, is a classic tale of a transformation of a community from a point of extremely high unemployment, high crime rates, almost complete disregard for person and property, and an overall sense of despair and hopelessness. Led by an entrepreneurial Housing Manager from the Argyle Community Housing Association, and supported by the benevolent Society and a number of government and community agencies. The 'Claymore Integration Project' has:

- Established the ‘Claymore Community Development Co-operative’.
- Created a Community Park.
- Established a Community Laundromat.
- Established local enterprises - catering, maintenance, gardening etc.
- Initiating a low interest loan scheme (micro credit).

These plus other initiatives have demonstrated what can be achieved (similarly in Long Gully) with a sustained effort over several years, driven by a passionate entrepreneurial leader, and with the involvement and partnering of a number of community, business and government organisations.
7. **City of Onkaparinga/Adelaide Central Mission**

A Social Enterprise Manager, whose job it will be to facilitate people working together to develop social enterprises, has been appointed by Adelaide Central Mission. The project has been funded by Adelaide Central Mission, with the assistance of a generous donation from a private citizen. The City of Onkaparinga has also provided resources to assist with the project.

The key objectives of the new Social Enterprise position is to stimulate development projects that enhance the capacities of local communities. The task involves the development of Social Enterprises in partnership with relevant stakeholders which will have a range of economic, financial, social and health benefits for the community. An important initial role will be to establish networks with businesses, mutual or co-operative organisations that share Adelaide Central Mission's vision for the community, and to identify training needs or skills needed to develop social enterprises.

As an illustration of Adelaide Central Mission's commitment to community partnerships the Social Enterprise Manager will be located in the City of Onkaparinga Council offices at Colonnades. The Adelaide Central Mission and the City of Onkaparinga have agreed to work together to focus the social enterprise project in the southern region, concentrating effort, and more clearly identifying the outcomes.

8. **LUMBU Indigenous Foundation**

Lumbu is Australia's first indigenous controlled, national philanthropic organisation. Based in Brisbane, LUMBU is managed and directed by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, in partnership with business and philanthropic organisations. LUMBU is delivering a new approach to Indigenous community development, to bring about sustainable long term, positive change with Indigenous communities.

The Lumbu Indigenous Community Foundation is pioneering an innovative approach to community development that is modeled on venture capital. Lumbu believes in identifying good people with ideas and driving these through to good outcomes. The Lumbu vision is to support the development of indigenous communities and to effect long term sustainable positive change.

Lumbu’s primary objectives are to:

- Promote healthy, vibrant and prosperous Indigenous communities.
- Promote and encourage Indigenous ownership and control of assets in a manner that enhances Indigenous culture and values.
- To build partnerships that create and support models of sustainable, culturally appropriate Indigenous development.
- To celebrate and invest in Indigenous young people, especially initiatives that foster Indigenous leadership.

To achieve these objectives the Foundation seeks to build long-term relationships with it community level affiliates. A key feature in this process is the notion of Lumbu matching the efforts of the affiliate with experience, expertise, advice and specialised skills at critical stages of the development growth.
Lumbu’s approach is best characterised as venture philanthropy – a multi-year investment of time, advice and resources into individuals and ideas designed to yield sustainable, independent indigenous controlled initiatives. The Foundation is preparing for the complex, long term effort to effect positive change within Indigenous communities around Australia. Consistent with this deliberate approach Lumbu’s activities reinforce a desire to strike a new path in Indigenous community development.

9. Commonwealth Community-Business Partnerships

In late 1999, the Prime Minister convened the first meeting of the Community Business Partnership, aimed at encouraging and enhancing partnerships between the corporate and community sectors. Each year it has recognised significant achievements in both sectors with a series of Awards, and has strongly promoted the concept of corporate social responsibility. In addition, it has considered ways in which the tax system can be amended to encourage corporate philanthropy.

In addition, they have researched and sought out what they regard as some Best Practice examples of social enterprise in Australia, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australian Case Studies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mature Mates Maintenance Co-Operative</strong></td>
<td>Assists members to gain employment through the provision of home maintenance services. The intention was that the Co-op become a vehicle for its members to gain paid employment providing home maintenance services in the Bendigo district; everything from mowing lawns, painting fences, removing rubbish, landscaping, paving, cleaning spouts, doing the ironing etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eaglehawk Recovery Yard</strong></td>
<td>Run by FEO a non-profit community organisation, the yard provides an alternative to dumping unwanted goods to landfill and recovers resources. Established in 1994, it is a self-funding business which employs 12 people. It has developed a reputation for providing materials for that odd job that needs doing, unwanted furniture that needs restoring or a part for a washing machine or motor mower that will keep it going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revolve</strong></td>
<td>Revolve employs anywhere from 15 – 20 local people and is a community based non-profit organisation that operates a materials and goods salvage and recycling service at the Parkwood Road Recycling Estate (formerly known as West Belconnen Landfill) and Mugga Lane Landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One the Rails</strong></td>
<td>Provides training and employment to disadvantaged job seekers aged 15 – 21. Based in the mid-north of South Australia, the project is operating two small businesses, a restaurant in Port Pirie and a horticultural training centre in Peterborough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Port Pirie Junction Express</strong></td>
<td>The Junction Express Training restaurant is situated in old railway carriages at the Tourism and Arts Centre and provides training and employment to disadvantaged job seekers aged 15 – 21. Around 51 young people have participated in the Junction Express Training restaurant since it opened in November 2000. Of those 26 have since obtained either full time or part time employment, 11 are continuing further education/training and 11 are still working at the Junction Express. The training restaurant has been locally voted best Port Pirie Regional Tourism &amp; Hospitality Business, and also won the Chamber of Commerce 2001 Regional Business of the Year Award, independently selected by a team from the State’s Department of Trade and Industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Peterborough ‘HortiCentre’

36 young people have participated in the Peterborough Horticultural Training Centre since it unofficially opened in June 2000. The ‘HortiCentre’ gives young people opportunities for education and workplace training working in partnership with the Peterborough High School and the local TAFE to offer alternatives methods of completing years 11 and 12 and accredited courses in Land Management and Rural Operations. Unlike Junction Express, this group of young people are more stable with fewer leaving, and since the program commenced four people have attained either full time or part time employment, 13 are attending school full time at the Centre and five have undertaken a school based traineeship. Additional outcomes from the programs have been recorded such as a 65% drop in juvenile crime and a 93% drop in break and enter crime in the first 10 months of the Centre being open.

### SK8Makers

http://www.youngaustralians.org/projects/POO/POO-122.htm

SK8Makers is a community enterprise development project through which a small business is being developed in the production and sale of high quality skateboard decks. The project provides accredited training for ‘at risk’ young people, with the aim that the business will ultimately be owned and controlled by the participants. The project has been a major learning curve for the organisers and participants facing many hurdles such as the uniqueness of the training required, minimal funding, ‘sweat equity’ required by participants, and costs to the participants to be involved. The group have successfully researched and developed their skateboards and through local support and sponsorship are beginning to develop a solid client base. The project has developed a timeframe for the transition from a training and research project to an enterprise that has been extended to October 2003. The enterprise has received very favourable publicity both locally and through many national publications.

### SEECHANGE BOATWORKS


A youth job creation enterprise that provides ‘at risk’ young people with life skills, employment-skills training and 12-month accredited traineeships in boat building and repairs. The program will offer 10 traineeships per year, with a minimum of 40 traineeships over four years.

### Big Issue, Australia

http://www.bigissue.org.au/

The ‘Big Issue’ is a lifestyle magazine with a strong arts and social issues focus, sold by people living on the streets. The Australian edition costs $3.00. The vendors buy the magazines for $1.00 and sell them for $3.00. The magazine provides the selling locations, training and support with advertising and corporate sponsorship covering most of the production costs.

Currently there are about 200 vendors actively selling the magazine and the magazine provides short-term incomes. In six years there have been more than 1,000 vendors selling the magazine and in nearly all cases, vendors are able to make changes to their lives as a result of the opportunity to step back into the community, earn money, build relationships, become self reliant, self-confident and become socially involved.

### Hunter Gatherer

Brotherhood of St Laurence

Concept of Brotherhood of St Laurence – development of retail stores (currently 26) selling recycled clothing and household items that have been donated by the public. Have also expanded into manufacture of garments and their personnel includes home-workers, printers and embroiderers.

### Green Collect

Melbourne
BP Australia/Brotherhood of St Laurence

A community based recycling enterprise that creates environmental and social change by developing new strategies for reducing commercial waste within Melbourne’s CBD and creating new employment opportunities for people who face barriers to employment.
The Beechmont Community Association Inc is assisting the community to address its inadequate infrastructure and create diverse resources, services and opportunities. In 1999 they acquired the old primary school and are using the site to develop a community library, an Internet café, an art gallery, a community nursery and country markets.

In June 2000 Mission Australia opened its Community Café. The Café was converted from the old soup kitchen and caters for large numbers of homeless people. It receives support from many local businesses that donate food and beverages for sale. The Café also hosts a newly designed pre-employment program for Mission Australia clients. To date, seven people have undertaken the course, which revolves around practical hands on experience in the café – with four going on to employment or further training. The café plans to be staffed by clients who will receive hospitality training during their employment.

Formed in 1993 by a group of Tasmanians concerned about the amount of waste entering landfills and interested in creating employment. It is a worker-owned business and is a not-for-profit organisation. Profits from the organisation aim to reduce waste, educate and create employment – today, 16 people are employed by the cooperative.

The City of Onkaparinga (SA) has made economic development and employment creation a part of its core business. Local Government has formed a partnership with a welfare organisation to advance social enterprise and entrepreneurship. Key projects undertaken include a loan fund to provide disadvantaged homeowner and renters with savings on power and utility services, a main street project to develop community business, identification of new markets and business segments, utilising community centres to develop enterprises, and close association with the South Adelaide Football Club to develop value-added businesses for the club in recreational and leisure enterprises.

Employs people from disadvantaged groups including people with disabilities, long term unemployed and mature aged in the sales and repair of Information Technology equipment. This business has an annual turn over of about $13M and employs around 100 people at any one time.

10. Bank of I.D.E.A.S. Western Australia

The Bank of I.D.E.A.S assists communities to:

- stimulate economic development.
- develop employment opportunities.
- retain their young people.

It does this by:

- supporting communities in identifying and implementing actions to improve opportunities and overcome challenges.
- assisting government agencies in the development and implementation of initiatives that promote local community and economic development.
- exposing community and government representatives to new initiatives through involvement in training opportunities and study tours.
This organisation is also distinguished by the energies of one person who has initiated and driven the work – Peter Kenyon.

Two of its main programs are:

- **Business Retention and Expansion Program**: This program provides technical support, training and practical resources to local communities eager to keep businesses in town, supporting their expansion and the growth of new job opportunities. The Program is a community sponsored initiative which involves the formation of a local taskforce and use of a structured interview process by community volunteers to learn about the needs, concerns, suggestions and perceptions of local businesses. The key element of the initiative is a systematic visitation of local businesses by teams of community volunteer interviewers to gather information about business concerns, perceptions and ideas. The ideas and issues raised through this process are used for an immediate response to business concerns through local actions or by calling on the assistance of appropriate resource agencies. Information gathered is also used in the design and implementation of community economic development strategies and actions to improve the local business environment and opportunities for job creation.

- **C.R.E.A.T.E. (Creating Rural Entrepreneurial Attitudes Through Education)**: This program has the following goals:
  1. To identify and develop entrepreneurial attitudes and talent among rural young women and men.
  2. To contribute to the development of an enterprise culture and to stimulate new entrepreneurial activity within rural Australia.
  3. To support young women and men respond to changing economic and employment circumstances in rural Australia by encouraging self initiative and enterprise.

It specific objective is to assist rural students to explore and possibly enter the self employment option through:

- learning about the local and regional community and economy;
- enhancing self-awareness and confidence;
- developing critical thinking and enterprising life skills;
- generating and analysing new ideas and possibilities;
- acquiring persuasive communication skills;
- gaining business knowledge, skills and experiences; and
- undertaking business planning.
Its key features include:

- Concentration on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education within a rural context.
- Focusing on helping young people develop the inclination and ability to see and seize opportunities, rather than just being prepared to start and operate effectively within enterprises.
- Being based on the highly acknowledged and successful REAL Enterprises Program in the USA, and other youth entrepreneurial programs in the USA, Canada and Ireland.
- Providing high quality entrepreneurship strategies, curriculum, tools and resources which are age appropriate, flexible, empowering and engaging.
- Using experiential learning methodologies that ensure ‘hands on’ experiences support entrepreneurial thinking and habits.
- Enabling access to the national network of schools and individuals committed to the C.R.E.A.T.E. concepts, as well as annual facilitation/teacher training events.

13. **Westpac**

Westpac Bank has been widely recognised for the breadth of their corporate social/community programs, which include:

- **Matching Gifts Program**: Whenever a Westpac staff member makes a donation to a community organisation, Westpac matches that donation dollar for dollar ($5.2m donated since 1999 to over 600 charities).
- **Skills Development**: Community organisations have been invited to attend Westpac’s Financial Skills Development Programs. Organisations have also attended ‘Onsite Analysis Workshops’, to assist them to review their business practices, service provision and fundraising.
- **Indigenous Enterprise Partnerships**: This program has supported Indigenous communities in Cape York to build financial independence by a ‘Family Income Management Scheme’, and the development of ‘Indigenous Business Hubs’. Westpac have provided a full time project manager and 150 staff volunteers.
- **Smith Family’s Learning for Life Program**: The Smith Family’s Learning for Life Program, aimed at breaking inter-generational illiteracy, has been supported by Westpac to the tune of $1.6m. The program provides financial scholarships for disadvantaged children and dedicated workers and mentors to assist and guide them.
C. INTERNATIONAL

1. Community Interest Companies (CIC)

CICs, currently being set up in the UK, will be a new type of company, designed for social enterprises who want to use their profits and assets for the public good. CICs will be easy to set up, with all the flexibility and certainty of the company form, but with some special features to ensure they are working for the benefit of the community. CICs will report to an independent regulator on how they are delivering for the community and how they are involving their stakeholders in their activities.

The CIC UK website has also outlined how they view social enterprises:

A social enterprise is a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximise profit for shareholders and owners. Social enterprises tackle a wide range of social and environmental issues and operate in all parts of the economy. By using business solutions to achieve public good, the Government believes that social enterprises have a distinct and valuable role to play in helping create a strong, sustainable and socially inclusive economy.

The CICs are part of the UK government’s social enterprise agenda, aiming to establish new structures and frameworks for community initiatives. The CIC concept was established in recognition of the gap in the range of options available to social enterprises that wished to incorporate as companies. Standard companies and current company law were seen as causing problems for social entrepreneurs who want their companies to run on a not-for-profit basis, as there was no simple and transparent way to lock profits into a company.

CICs will use their assets and profits for the benefit of the community or the wider public. They will report to an independent regulator on how they are delivering on that commitment, and on how they are involving their stakeholders in their activities.

The CIC website has a host of further background material – but sufficient to note for the moment that this development is one of the British initiatives aimed at creating the best possible environment for social entrepreneurs to operate. Further structural examples from the UK can be found further on in this section.

2. Grameen Bank, Bangladesh

The origin of Grameen Bank can be traced back to 1976 when Professor Muhammad Yunus, Head of the Rural Economics Program at the University of Chittagong, launched an action research project to examine the possibility of designing a credit delivery system to provide banking services targeted at the rural poor. The Grameen Bank Project (Grameen means "rural" or "village" in Bangla language) came into operation with the following objectives:

- extend banking facilities to poor men and women;
- eliminate the exploitation of the poor by money lenders;
- create opportunities for self-employment for the vast multitude of unemployed people in rural Bangladesh;
• bring the disadvantaged, mostly the women from the poorest households, within the fold of an organizational format which they can understand and manage by themselves; and
• reverse the age-old vicious circle of “low income, low saving & low investment”, into virtuous circle of “low income, injection of credit, investment, more income, more savings, more investment, more income.

The Grameen Bank is based on the voluntary formation of small groups of five people to provide mutual, morally binding group guarantees in lieu of the collateral required by conventional banks. At first only two members of a group are allowed to apply for a loan. Depending on their performance in repayment the next two borrowers can then apply and, subsequently, the fifth member as well.

The assumption is that if individual borrowers are given access to credit, they will be able to identify and engage in viable income-generating activities - simple processing such as paddy husking, lime-making, manufacturing such as pottery, weaving, and garment sewing, storage and marketing and transport services. Women were initially given equal access to the schemes, and proved not only reliable borrowers but astute entrepreneurs.

As a result, they have raised their status, lessened their dependency on their husbands and improved their homes and the nutritional standards of their children. Today over 90 percent of borrowers are women.

The success of the Grameen Bank has demonstrated the power of micro-credit to deal with poverty, and has attacked a number of ‘poverty myths’:

• It was thought that poor borrowers would not be able to find remunerative occupations.
• It was thought that the poor would not be able to repay loans.
• It was thought that poor rural women were not ‘bankable’.
• It was thought that the poor cannot save.
• It was thought that the Bank would fail.

Not only have these myths been shattered, but the Bank has expanded and prospered – from 15,000 in 1980, to 1128 branches in 1998, with 2.34 million members in 38,957 villages, with group savings of over US$150m. Overall, an extraordinary development.

3. Community Action Network (CAN) UK

CAN is a mutual learning and support network for social entrepreneurs. Its aims are:
• to strengthen communities and attack deprivation in the UK;
• to increase the number of social entrepreneurs, raise their profile and to help improve the quality of their work;
• to train social entrepreneurs to use state of the art network communications;
• to learn from and support each other;
• to help social entrepreneurs develop partnerships in the public, private and third sectors.

CAN’s essential function is to link its members via an electronic network, supported by other forms of communication, including face-to-face meetings. CAN’s web site is developing easy to use (“hot”) links to other relevant sites and its extranet (communications network) is based upon e-mail, electronic conferences and notice boards.

It is interesting again to observe how an organisation was initiated by passionate entrepreneurs with a history of success in the field (as described on the CAN website):

At Bromley-by-Bow in East London, Andrew Mawson inherited a derelict United Reformed Church and has transformed it during the last 15 years into a remarkable integrated community project. This brings together art and craft studios, a nursery, community care, youth and enterprise activities, fitness facilities, a cafe, a Bengali language program, a three-acre park, sheltered housing and a full range of health services. It is the first community-owned healthy living centre in the UK. The centre has a partnership agreement with a local £200m housing and community regeneration scheme

At Kingston-upon-Thames, in south-west London, Adele Blakebrough was Director of the Kaleidoscope Project. Kaleidoscope also took and transformed a run-down church site - in this case the John Bunyan Baptist Church - rebuilding the church, community facilities and a hostel alongside what has become one of Britain’s largest centres for the treatment and support of opiate abusers. Over 300 heroin users a day come to Kaleidoscope for a range of medical, educational, arts and residential services. Kaleidoscope has won worldwide acclaim for its work over the last 30 years.

Helen Taylor Thompson is Founder and President of the new Mildmay Mission Hospital at Hackney in East London. Her project involved taking an unwanted NHS hospital and turning it into a pioneering, world-class hospice for AIDS patients. Mildmay has links all over the world and recently opened an AIDS village in Uganda.

4. Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurs, Geneva; Ashoka Organisation

The Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurs provides a global platform to promote social entrepreneurship as a key element to advance societies and address social problems in an innovative and effective manner. It was founded by Klaus Schwab and his wife Hilde in 1998 to highlight and encourage men, women and organizations dedicated to creating opportunities for others in directly productive ways.

Its objectives are stated as:

1. To be the foremost organization for identifying, selecting and highlighting accomplished social entrepreneurs at the regional and global levels, stimulating productive linkages between them.

2. To be the driving force that builds a global community of outstanding social entrepreneurs and others interested in promoting social entrepreneurship, leveraging successes of social entrepreneurs to achieve wider impact for the public good.
3. To be the preferred partner for companies and social investors seeking to support social entrepreneurs around the world.
4. To be the global standard bearer for excellence in social entrepreneurship and innovation for the public good.

The Foundation has also established a set of Working Standards, under the following headings:

- Organisational integrity.
- Governance.
- Vision, mission and strategy.
- Financial management.
- Human resources management.
- Quality of services.
- Public policy interaction and replication.

A similar concept has been developed by Ashoka, a global non-profit organisation established in 1980 by Bill Drayton.

Ashoka addresses social problems through social entrepreneurship, a uniquely effective approach based on a venture capital model. We identify leading social entrepreneurs, electing them as Ashoka Fellows and invest in them financially and professionally.

- Financially, we provide a living stipend typically for three years, depending on individual need and local salary standards. These stipends enable Ashoka Fellows to focus full-time on implementing their vision and new ideas.
- Professionally, we invest in leading social entrepreneurs by electing them as Ashoka Fellows to our Global Fellowship. This is the first worldwide network of leading social entrepreneurs. It fosters their collaboration nationally and internationally, and provides valuable contacts, information and opportunities to spread their innovation and build their long-term sustainability.

5. **Timebank, UK**

TimeBank is a national volunteering campaign raising the awareness of giving time through voluntary work, inspiring a whole new generation of volunteers. Its aim are to:

- Raise the profile of volunteering and help people get more out of life by making it easy for them to give time to their local community.
- Use web-based technology to match the skills, interests and availability of TimeGivers with a range of opportunities and a local TimePartner.
- Build strategic alliances to help meet the needs of TimeGivers and the voluntary sector.
- Facilitate targeted grassroots volunteer recruitment campaigns.
Timebank creates opportunities for anyone wishing to volunteer and also identifies a raft of volunteering opportunities.

The organisation’s website describes the ways that it operates:

**Web Based Technology**

Using web and database technology TimeBank provides high quality information and examples of volunteering opportunities to match people's passions, interests and skills. These examples are drawn from the National Database of Volunteering Opportunities. National Network of Local TimePartners

TimeBank works in partnership with a network of over 400 TimePartners across the country. TimePartners are Volunteer Bureaux, Councils for Voluntary Service, or Volunteer Centres and have local information to help TimeGivers find suitable volunteering opportunities.

**TimeBank in the Nations**

TimeBank works in partnership with Wales Council for Voluntary Action (WCVA) in Wales, and the Volunteer Development Agency in Northern Ireland to bring volunteering opportunities to TimeGivers through their respective networks of voluntary organisations.

**WCVA** is the lead agency for volunteering in Wales. It represents volunteering interests and works with volunteering networks and develops specific resources to support and develop good practice in volunteering.

**The Volunteer Development Agency** provides an information service on issues around volunteering in Northern Ireland, in particular involving or managing volunteers. The Volunteer Development Agency produces publications, reports and fact sheets and conducts research to keep volunteer-involving organisations fully informed on developments in the volunteering field.

**Devolving the Campaign: TimeBank Scotland**

TimeBank has now established a devolving campaign in Scotland. The Scottish Executive has funded TimeBank Scotland, and this is hosted by Volunteer Development Scotland.

**Partnership with BBC**

The BBC is TimeBank's broadcast media partner. With its support, the organisation can reach people wherever they are. Special programming produced by the BBC goes out on network television, local radio and on-line, inspiring more and more people around the UK to become TimeGivers. The BBC regularly support initiatives that are relevant to volunteering and work with TimeBank to make them a success.

6. **Furniture Resource Centre, UK**

The following description of the Furniture Resource Centre is taken from the Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship website, where Father Nic Frances’s work in establishing this initiative was outlined:
Father Nic Frances founded FRC in 1988. Back then, it collected and redistributed second-hand furniture to people living in low-cost public housing. For five years, FRC operated in a charity mode requiring donations of furniture. However, Nic had significant concerns with a model common to many such welfare approaches throughout the world where the poor are passive recipients of the largesse of the more affluent. Nic was convinced that the low quality of hand-me-downs only had a negative effect on those already feeling excluded from full social participation – an effect all too evident from rates of tenant turnover, lack of property maintenance, and frequent vandalism.

Nic had a hunch that if public housing tenants were provided with top quality furnishings, their approach to their surroundings as well as their self-image would change. So he set out to transform the traditional charity model. He began to hire long-term “unemployable” people, teaching them to make competitive quality furniture for commercial manufacture and distribution. FRC continued to supply the public housing units, and the new furniture had a dramatic effect, as Nic had suspected it would. People living in the housing units began to take care of their dwellings and surrounding areas. Housing desertion diminished. The cost associated with providing security dramatically dropped, representing significant savings for both government and landlords. FRC became a nationally renowned manufacturer of quality household furnishings. It then turned to recycling household waste products, specifically electrical items.

Within five years, FRC grew from a staff of three and a £90,000 annual turnover to a staff of 80 and a £3.5 million turnover.

7. **Delancey Street, USA**

Delancey Street (originally in San Francisco is a remarkable institution established by Dr Mimi Silbert, set up as an entirely self run organisation for those at the bottom of the socio economic scrap heap – primarily former convicts and drug addicts. It has no staff at all and is entirely run by the residents. Delancey Street has never sought nor received any government or philanthropic support- in fact it prides itself on this fact. It has developed an annual operating budget of $24m generated by more than 20 businesses (e.g. removals; renovations/construction; bistro restaurants; credit union etc) each of which doubles as a training school. It has approximately 1,500 residents if five locations across America.

Each resident is required to earn a high school equivalency degree and learn three marketable skills. One must involve physical labour; another must be accounting or secretarial or computer related; the third is in a ‘people occupation’ such as waiting tables or sales. Once they’ve experienced all three, residents are free to ‘major’ in one. Over 12,000 people have now graduated from Delancey Street – another extraordinary example of what can be achieved by the dedicated passion of a leading entrepreneur.

8. **Glasgow Alliance Project**

Glasgow Alliance, the regeneration and inclusion partnership for the city, brings together key organisations from the public, private, voluntary and community sectors to tackle issues collaboratively and strategically. The partners of the Alliance are:

- Glasgow City Council.
Scottish Enterprise, Glasgow.
Greater Glasgow Health Board.
Strathclyde Police.
Glasgow Council for the Voluntary Sector
Communities Scotland.
Scottish Executive.
Scottish Business in the Community.

Glasgow Alliance is unique in Scotland in combining a city-wide community planning partnership with local community planning through the Social Inclusion Partnerships. Glasgow Alliance manages and supports ten of the city’s social inclusion partnerships (SIPs). The SIPs encourage and co-ordinate joint working at the community level, tackling social exclusion in their geographical area or for a particular group of people. Currently the Alliance SIPs support well over 500 projects covering employment, economic development, learning, training, health and well being, housing, environment and neighbourhoods.

Glasgow Alliance assists the SIPs by providing a robust and coherent framework within which each of the SIPs operate which includes Rules of Procedure and a policy framework for conflict resolution. The Alliance also employs SIP Support Team staff, provides a range of support services and encourages the sharing of learning between the SIPs.

One of the Alliance’s guiding principles is to make Glasgow a more inclusive city. Working to integrate asylum seekers and refugees into local communities and providing a range of support services for them is part of this commitment. North Glasgow was one of the first areas of Scotland to receive asylum seekers and currently over 3000 asylum seekers and refugees from over 50 countries are resident in the area. As a result, the North Glasgow SIP is playing a lead role in asylum seekers initiatives in the local area and across the city and receives the largest proportion of the integration resources provided to the Alliance.

Glasgow Alliance has been, and continues to be, a key partner in the Healthy Living Centres initiative in the city, working with the Healthy City Partnership, Greater Glasgow NHS Board, the Primary Care Trust and the Council. Healthy Living Centres (HLC) is the name of a branch of funding available through the National Lottery’s New Opportunities Fund (NOF) for programs of health focused activities which target the most disadvantaged sectors of the population and are additional to existing services.

In order to maximise NOF funding for Glasgow, the partners worked together to look strategically at the city and determine the areas of greatest need. Then they prioritised the bids to NOF that fitted this strategic view and agreed to commit revenue funding to them. Six projects received HLC funding bringing £3.25million of new money for community health into Glasgow, with a further £2million committed to the initiative from partners. But disappointingly, five projects were not approved by NOF.

This led the partners to continue their partnership approach and seek alternative ways to support the five projects. Through working together they have identified resources
(principally from the Health Board supported by Glasgow City Council) for these five centres. The Healthy Living Centres in Greater Pollok, Greater Govan and North Glasgow as well as for the Deaf Community and for the Asylum Seeker and Refugee community in the city can now be supported for 3\(\frac{1}{2}\) years. The Alliance has also become involved in neighbourhood regeneration and anti-vandalism campaigns.

Overall, it represents a city-wide approach to development - while not specifically entrepreneurial, it is an important consideration in how a State government can look to develop and support its urban and rural communities.

9. **Create Liverpool Project**

The CREATE Liverpool developed as a result of a partnership between Thorn EMI and the Liverpool-based Furniture Resource Centre, evolving from a mutual concern for both long-term unemployment and environmental issues. CREATE Charitable Trust was established in Liverpool in October 1995 and moved to its newly refurbished premises, in Speke, in June 1996. Additional space in the building was refurbished and came into use in November 1997.

Since its establishment:

- 176 trainees have come through the organisation.
- 109 (62%) trainees have gained employment or gone into full time education on leaving.
- Over 88,000 appliances have been collected.
- More than 15,000 appliances have been sold.
- Just over 1,000 appliances have been donated through the bursary scheme.
- Approximately 4,300 tons of scrap have been sent for recycling.

CREATE has received acclaim and a high profile for its work as a pioneering Intermediate Labour Market project with several case studies written about the organisation and high profile visits from MP’s, business leaders, senior government officers and local councillors. As part of the development of the CREATE UK network the organisation changed its name to CREATE Liverpool in 1999.

CREATE units in the UK have been established (similar to CICs), as social businesses, aiming to achieve social and environmental objectives through their operations. They are companies limited by guarantee and are registered charities (unlike CICs).

10. **Other Key Initiatives in the United Kingdom**

There are a number of interesting and allied initiatives which have emerged in the United Kingdom:

**The Phoenix Fund:**

The Phoenix Fund, established in November 1999, is designed to encourage entrepreneurship in disadvantaged areas. A shortage of jobs, local services and enterprise are common features amongst the socially excluded. Encouraging
entrepreneurship was seen to help create jobs and stimulate activities in communities where crime and unemployment are high. This would help meet the basic needs of local people by providing services like shops. It would also help to develop self-confidence and determination in local people and communities which are the real drivers of regeneration in the long run.

Due to a lack of support, advice and access to finance, entrepreneurs in disadvantaged areas are regarded as experiencing even greater difficulties in launching their ideas than somebody starting a new enterprise generally faces. The Phoenix Fund was set up to help these new businesses by providing assistance to business support providers and finance to Community Development Finance Institutions.

The Phoenix Fund currently includes:

- A Development Fund to promote innovative ways of supporting enterprise in deprived areas. (England only)
- A pilot network of volunteer mentors to pre and early start-up businesses, through the Business Volunteer Mentoring Association. (England only)
- Capital, revenue and loan guarantee support for Community Development Finance Institutions (CDFIs).
- A Community Development Venture Fund (CDVF) to create a venture capital fund for SMEs in disadvantaged communities. (Parts of England only).
- City Growth Strategies (CGS) designed to encourage towns and cities to develop and implement strategies which put enterprise and business at the heart of regeneration, focusing on the competitive economic advantages of inner city areas rather than the social disadvantages. Four pilot projects are operating in Nottingham, Plymouth, St Helens and parts of London. Further information is available on this website or from Maria Kenyon, SBS Social Inclusion Unit, e-mail: maria.kenyon@SBS.gsi.gov.uk
- The Development Fund for Rural Renewal (England only). The fund aims to promote innovative ways of promoting enterprises in business communities adversely affected by Foot and Mouth. Applications close on 31 January 2002. It is expected that between 10 and 20 projects will be funded.

UnLtd Ventures

UnLtd was formed by seven leading organisations that provide a wide range of activities and support:

- Ashoka.
- Changemakers.
- CAN.
- Comic Relief.
- The Scarman Trust.
- Social Entrepreneurs Network, Scotland.
- The School for Social Entrepreneurs.
It was funded initially by a 100 million pound legacy from the British Millennium Commission. The organisation aims to support people (entrepreneurs) who have the ideas and commitment to make a positive difference to their communities. They have established a system of awards as well as individually designed packages of training and support. They have also developed a research component to evaluate the impact of social entrepreneurs, and have now embarked on ‘UnLtd Ventures’, a unit that will provide intensive support to ‘incubate’ a small number of proven entrepreneurs to help them scale or replicate their projects.

The individuals in UnLtd Ventures will have already established themselves as successful social entrepreneurs either through our level 1 and 2 awards or independently of UnLtd. What UnLtd Ventures will provide is the support and structures that will help them to grow a local initiative into a robust and sustainable project, through scaling or replicating geographically or reaching out to different groups in the community. This will include help to develop business plans, advice on accounting, IT, legal and finances as well as access to an exclusive group of industry specialists and mentors.

Social Entrepreneurs Network Scotland

The organisation’s website describes their organisation as follows:

We seek out individuals and organisations involved in social enterprise, particularly in front-line communities. We are building a database of such contacts which maps the social enterprise sector in Scotland. By the end of 2002 we expect to have registered 1000 subscribers. Through e-mail and the internet our subscribers are part of an online community which is animated by a weekly electronic bulletin. Through this, we broker contact and joint working among members. We encourage and promote face-to-face meetings among members all across Scotland. This is co-ordinated through a network of Senscot ‘agents’ - volunteers in key ‘link organisations’ who host regional meetings. We also run larger national gatherings. Through the bulletin and the internet we provide a valuable source of information and comment about social entrepreneurship/social enterprise in the UK. Through our own and other networks we try to raise the profile and appreciation of our members and their work. We work in partnership with other organisations to develop the range of services/resources available to our members and the social enterprise sector in general.

In addition, there are numerous other examples of organisations, both in the UK and the USA, dedicated to developing inner urban infrastructure and business-community alignment. Much of this is driven by one or two dedicated entrepreneurs passionate about a particular issue or problem. One senses, particularly in the UK, that there is a strong entrepreneurial climate which is encouraging the emergence of a range of different and diverse initiatives.

What is needed is an exploration of what represents Best Practice in social entrepreneurship and what limitations and challenges exist.
4. Defining the Potential and the Limitations

4.1 Potential - What Represents Best Practice?

1. Leadership

An interesting observation by one interviewee during this project was that ‘social entrepreneurship is not democratic’ - an inference that the whole movement has primarily been driven by single minded, visionary, energetic leaders, as has been clearly demonstrated in many of the case examples in the previous section.

In stating that leadership is a critical Best Practice feature of social entrepreneurship, a problem is immediately created for governments, which, bound by issues of probity, have had to be scrupulous in their funding programs, structures and guidelines. This has created funding structures which establish a ‘level playing field’ as far as possible and give all agencies and organisations an equal chance to access funding (see ‘limitations’ below).

Leadership has been essential in the entrepreneurial field, given that it tends to be a rather risky approach and seems to require individuals willing to risk everything in the pursuit of achieving a vision or dream. This is not dissimilar to business entrepreneurs, the difference being that social entrepreneurs have social goals and objectives as their driving motive.

The Schwab and Ashoka Foundations have been established to unashamedly recognise, support and encourage leaders in social entrepreneurship, acknowledging that this is a crucial component in developing the field and the opportunities available.

Interestingly again, when asked to describe the key leadership features of social entrepreneurs, many interviewees used such terms as ‘leading from behind’, ‘a facilitator’, ‘a team player’, ‘humble’, ‘willing to share’, ‘no big ego’. These are not normally terms used to describe leaders. Of course, among the range of leaders described in the case studies above, there would be a wide array of characteristics. What is clear however is that nearly all have featured a key person who has had the drive and determination to work against odds, the capacity to work at the same time on process and as well as task, and an infinite capacity for hard work and energetic support of staff.

Leadbetter (1997, as outlined in Shaw et al 2003, p12) has identified four types of individuals who can be identified as social entrepreneurs:

- They excel at spotting unmet needs and mobilising under-utilised resources to meet these needs.
- They are driven and determined, ambitious and charismatic.
- They are driven by a mission, rather than the pursuit of a profit or shareholder value.
• They are an innovator.

The Ashoka organisation (2001, as quoted in Shaw et al 2003, p 13) emphasised the ethics of the entrepreneur: ‘They ensure that public money is well used, that ideas are not corrupted by vested interests and that their full commitment is available for the project.

Finally, Shaw et al (2003 p20), identified six key personal qualities of social entrepreneurs:

1. Credibility, contacts and networking skills.
2. Focus and determination.
3. Leadership, passion and vision.
4. The ability to multitask.
5. Creativity and opportunism.
6. Interpersonal skills and people management.

In the section below (possible government actions), it is recommended that an ongoing group of these leading entrepreneurs be brought together to develop the field, share learnings and work out ways of educating and supporting entrepreneurial projects in the sector. Leadership is undoubtedly a key Best Practice factor for consideration.

2. Accountability and Transparency – Effective Governance

As previously mentioned, governance has now become the fourth plank of what has been known as ‘The Triple Bottom Line’. Effective governance has recently become a critical element for good business development as well as for the community sector – it is clearly an absolutely critical element to ensure the effectiveness of social entrepreneurial efforts.

In a sense, good governance is what established and oversees all of the next Best Practice principles, but especially the ability to combine a business approach with social goals, ensuring that the initiative is well planned and marketed. Another important governance component is the level of sector contacts that a governing Board has, particularly when partnerships are being developed with business and government. While too much involvement in this will interfere with management, these links can open doors and set up opportunities for management to follow.

The other part of good governance is absolute transparency of both how an initiative is developing and what results are achieved (or not achieved) – these outcomes include both actual service or business results and specific financial outcomes. In other words, social entrepreneurial efforts need to combine the best of business approaches in order to ensure the achievement of social outcomes.
3. **Combining a Business Approach with Social Goals**

The combining of a business approach with social goals and objectives is the critical element which distinguishes social entrepreneurial efforts. Neither of these two parts can be ignored, and must be overtly stated and followed in every stage of the initiative. In the USA, this has tended to focus on community agencies creating earned income opportunities for the organisation, more as a way of breaking government dependence (which is harder to obtain anyway in the States). In the UK, the utilisation of business skills was regarded more as the essential part of effectiveness, particularly in relation to establishing longer term initiatives around employment and skill development.

A key word in this discussion is ‘sustainability’ no matter what approach is adopted, the social entrepreneur has an eye both on the immediate need as well as the key elements required for longer term sustainability of the initiative. This means that, almost as soon as the endeavour is underway, the entrepreneur needs to be thinking as to how it will successfully function in the absence of themselves – the visionary founder. However, even when founders do remain involved over long periods of time (e.g. Mimi Silbert at Delancey Street) they establish structures which mean that the enterprise functions independently of their own input.

Overall, the key element is that the business approach is regarded as the **means to wards the end** which is the social goal - this differentiation separates social enterprises from standard businesses; separates CICs in the UK from standard companies; and is what is making the difference in this sector at the present time.

4. **A Business Approach to Planning and Marketing**

Two crucial elements form the basis of a business approach:

- The ability to prepare and utilise business and strategic plans.
- The ability to understand marketing and its implementation.

These two components were commented on time and again and continually appear in the literature.

Business and strategic planning on the surface seems a simple enough process:

- Where are we now? (What is affecting us? What factors will influence our development?).
- Where do we want to be? What is our vision?
- How will we get there? (Strategies, objectives, tasks, performance indicators, responsibilities, timelines).
- How will we monitor and review what we have set in place and keep it alive and active?
Yet this skill is one of the hardest to apply on a consistent basis, with both the business and community sectors littered with failed planning efforts.

Of interest here is the approach taken by Michael Gerber in his well known book ‘The E Myth’ (1986). Gerber examined the reasons why most small business fail. He examined the three roles necessary for an effective business:

- The Entrepreneur.
- The Manager.
- The Technician.

He identified the fact that most people starting up a business come in to it as the ‘technician’, i.e. knowing a lot about the ‘what’ of the business, but little about its management and its structural development (i.e. the entrepreneurial myth - technicians starting up businesses believing that they are entrepreneurs, when they are in fact ‘merely’ technicians). The social entrepreneur may however suffer from the reverse – a lack of technical knowledge about the business or initiative which he or she has initiated to address a social problem. This balance of skills and roles and the ability of the social entrepreneur to bring in skilled people without feeling threatened is an essential of the development of successful social enterprises.

5. **Adherence to Community Ownership Principles**

It is an old saying: ‘Those involved in the process are most likely to support the outcome’. Social and community workers trained in community development will elucidate these principles in the twinkling of an eye. At times this approach has lead to an over-emphasis on process, almost to the exclusion of any pressure to achieve results. However, the successful social entrepreneurial initiatives have been characterised by both - a strong adherence to community ownership and key stakeholder involvement while ensuring a drive towards clear results and outcomes.

It is here that the link between social enterprises and community capacity building and community strengthening can be made. As stated, successful social enterprises are grounded in their local community, draw on stakeholders from local business, community organisations, local politicians and key community agencies. This network of resources is developed as one of the main assets of a social enterprise, creating a wide base of support and linkages.

Adherence to this principle is a critical element in ensuring that the initiative remains faithful to its original social goal/s and that the intended beneficiaries indeed do see the benefits of the enterprise.
6. **Genuine Networking, Collaboration and Partnering**

Mattesich and Monsey have outlined the increasing commitment required as organisations move from co-operation towards collaboration:

**Co-operation** is characterised by informal relationships that exist without any commonly defined mission, structure or planning effort. Information is shared as needed, and authority is retained by each organisation so there is virtually no risk. Resources are separate as are rewards.

**Co-ordination** is characterised by more formal relationships and understanding of compatible missions. Some planning and division of roles are established. Authority still rests with the individual organisations, but there is some increased risk to all participants. Resources are available to participants and rewards are mutually acknowledged.

**Collaboration** is a mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organisations to achieve common goals. Collaborations bring previously separated organisations into a new structure with full commitment to a common mission. Authority is determined by the collaborative structure. Risk is much greater because each member of the collaboration contributes its own resources and reputation. (Mattesich, P, and B Monsey 1992).

Social entrepreneurs seek linkages and networks, continually looking out for partners to join them in their venture. These definitions are an indication however of the vital need for social entrepreneurs to be very clear as to the level of linkage that is being developed and the structures being set in place. Clarity is needed in several areas when collaborations or partnering is being considered:

- The goals of the enterprise.
- How effective governance will be established; the right (or otherwise) of the separate entities to veto joint decisions of the ‘Enterprise Board’.
- The decision-making structure – both major decisions and on-the-go decisions.
- Management responsibility and oversight of a manager.
- Lines of communication.
- Conflict resolution processes.

Best Practice social enterprises seek out such collaborations and partnering, but with a full understanding of what is required for sound relationships. Establishing and maintaining strong relationships is undoubtedly a hallmark of effective social entrepreneurial endeavours.
7. **Ability to Change Focus and Role**

Jonathan Nicholas, CEO of the Inspire Foundation, echoed Gerber's approach when he described the changing focus and role required of a social entrepreneur as an organisation develops. He stated that, whereas the first year or two are indeed characterised by the energy and efforts of the visionary entrepreneur, by the third year of an operation a more strategic and systematic approach is required, to bed down the developments and ensure that the enterprise becomes very clear as to its core expertise and what it is best at.

A year or two later however, a new upward is required, as the enterprise asks the question: how can we do it better?

This ability to adopt different roles is in a sense the hallmark of every successful business and community agency and thus it is no surprise that it has been identified as a Best Practice feature for successful social enterprises.

8. **Understanding of Time**

Social entrepreneurs appreciate that ‘Rome wasn’t built in a day’. Changing social practices and community attitudes takes time, as does the building of successful enterprises. In particular, getting the support of stakeholders can be a slow and at times painstaking process - 'democracy is the worst system of all...except for all the others' said Churchill. This is an indication of the sometimes frustrating, even infuriating process one has to go through to get agreement and consensus, and, of course, this at times can be sped up and sidestepped. In particular, entrepreneurs get very frustrated with mindless bureaucratic obstacles and endless community processes which seem to becomes ends in themselves.

Thus, a balance needs to be found, whereby there is sufficient attention to process and inclusion to ensure the backing of key stakeholders, but also sufficient drive to achieve results so that there is evidence that ‘things are happening’. Again we are seeing the need for the multi-skilled, multi-tasked entrepreneur.

9. **Focus on Evaluation and Learning - Auditing, not Just Reporting**

The quality improvement movement has long since established the principles of a continuous cycle: assessment→planning→implementation→evaluation. This also linked to Peter Senge’s concept of the ‘Learning Organisation’, where he applied the principles of individual learning to an organisation: how does an organisation learn? How does a Governing Board get accurate information to make informed and wise decisions? How is information quickly gathered from the right people and provided to those who can use this data? Thus, good evaluative techniques and an ability to learn from mistakes (given that most entrepreneurs have failures as part of their CV) are key hallmarks of effective social enterprises.

Part of the utilisation of learning is how social agencies can turn responses to social problems into preventative interventions - those most affected by a social problem are
often also highly motivated to ensure others are not afflicted by the same problem – and often come up with the most innovative and creative ways of dealing with the problem.

A further Best Practice feature which was raised involved the relationship with government. Nearly all those interviewed highlighted the barriers and disincentives created by the endless process of government ‘reporting’, which they claim never makes any difference whatsoever to actual service delivery and practice and is never a benefit in service improvement. However, those who had taken part in auditing processes where there was an interactive process, reviewing what went well and looking to mutually agree on improvements, stated that this was a far more productive way of reviewing a service, building better and more trusting relationships.

Similarly, social enterprises prosper in an environment of effective external review and audit and a willingness to integrate the learnings back into the business or service delivery.

10. Schwab Foundation Criteria for Outstanding Social Entrepreneurs

The criteria for selection into the Schwab Network of Social Entrepreneurs are also worth noting for this discussion of Best Practice:

- **Innovation**: The candidate has brought about social change by transforming traditional practice. The Entrepreneur is characterised by being able to come up with a pattern-changing idea and implementing it successfully.

- **Reach and Scope**: The initiative has spread beyond its initial context and has been adapted successfully to other settings.

- **Replicability**: Aspects of the initiative can be transferred to other regions and are scalable. The social entrepreneur is committed to openly sharing with others the tools and techniques necessary for such adaptation and replication.

- **Sustainability**: The entrepreneur has generated the social conditions and/or institutions needed to sustain the initiative. The organisation has some degree of financial self-sustainability, with economic incentives being embraced. The orientation, however, towards social and environmental value creation predominates.

- **Direct Positive Social Impact**: The initiative has been implemented directly, together with poor or marginalised beneficiaries or stakeholders. Impact is manifest by quantifiable results and testimonials and is well documented.

- **Role model**: The entrepreneur is a person who can serve as a role model for future social entrepreneurs and the general public.

- **Mutual Value-added**: Candidates must demonstrate an interest in building a network of outstanding social entrepreneurs that stimulates and supports its participants to actively help one another.
4.2 Limitations

1. **Fears of the Authenticity of Entrepreneurs**

The term ‘entrepreneur’ conjures up some negative connotations in Australia, principally related to the excesses of various business entrepreneurs in the 1980s. In addition, the well-documented ‘tall poppy syndrome’ has had an effect in this field as well. Linked with this is the innately risk averse approach of Australian governments, which have not demonstrated the enterprise and innovative thinking demonstrated by the Blair Government in the UK.

Linked with this is the sense within the community sector that entrepreneurialism is simply a cover for business exploitation or government cost cutting and avoidance of responsibility. These all combine to limit the current acceptance of social entrepreneurship.

2. **Poor Governance and Accountability Structures in the Community Sector**

The community sector has long been characterised by poor governance and accountability structures, linked to a suspicion of business practices and ‘hard nosed thinking’. Although this has changed somewhat in recent years, there are still significant gaps in the ability of the sector to attract the necessary calibre of Board members to their governance structures.

This is also linked to the lack of highly competent managers in the sector and the dearth of entrepreneurial training and skill development available for these managers.

3. **Overcoming Mindsets, Suspicions and Vested Interests**

There can be no doubt that developments in the field of social entrepreneurship will be viewed suspiciously by those with certain vested interests, especially where new proposals and enterprises threaten economic profits – the reaction of the major banks to Bendigo Bank’s community Bank concept, as well as their response overseas to developments in the field of micro credit.

Here in Australia there was a classic example of this in the past few weeks. Mark Latham, Deputy Leader of the Opposition, floated the idea of ‘matched savings schemes’ for low income families. Such schemes have become widespread in the United States. Whether one agrees or not with his proposals, the reaction of the Unions was fascinating – essentially bitterly attacking his suggestions, especially his notion that low income revise their budgets and cut out ‘wasteful spending’. The responses essentially stated that the poor would always be poor and they should be allowed their small pleasures of life to ease their misery! (The Age, 23.9.03).

People in the sector are also suspicious that any government support for social entrepreneurship will come at the expense of direct service delivery.

A further suspicion lies in the perception of how business is approaching CSR. Some believe that there is more talk and less action in this area, and that businesses are not really serious about their social responsibilities.
These suspicions and doubts are natural reactions at this stage of the development of social entrepreneurship and will only be overcome through dialogue, workshops and conferences, research and the showcasing of Best Practice case studies (see next section).

4. Government Funding Structures

Many of those consulted stated that the ‘one size fits all’ approach to government funding, allied with the multiple reporting requirements, are a major disincentive to adopting entrepreneurial approaches within the sector. In particular, the multiplicity of funding sources, across various government departments and different jurisdictions, can mean that a significant amount of time is spent by community sector managers in preparing funding submissions, gathering data, and meeting the various reporting regime requirements.

This is then linked to the lack of government funding for the very organisational elements which develop capacity:

- Research and development.
- Quality systems.
- Leadership and leadership development.
- IT systems.
- Data collection and analysis.
- Policy development.

These are seen as real and genuine costs of doing business, but without core funding for them, it becomes extremely difficult for agencies to be innovative and creative.

A further issue, directly related to social entrepreneurship, is the tendency for governments to fund ‘problems’, rather than identifying and rewarding success and enterprise. The latter approach is also linked to the great tendency to constantly establish new programs and defund or restructure ‘old’ programs - without necessarily learning from what has taken place and building on what has been achieved.

A further barrier is the proliferation of one-off, one year seed/pilot funding. The word ‘pilot’ has become rather discredited within the community sector, as funding labeled in this way is not regarded as being for genuine pilots, but rather for one-off small scale projects which often falter after the first year or two. While it is acknowledged that much of the major agency recurrent funding has moved to a three year cycle, this does not yet seem to be the case for project funding.

What is being discussed here could easily be put into the ‘too hard basket’, and indeed it represents a major shift in thinking and approach by governments. It is not for this Paper to attempt to completely overhaul government funding regimes - rather it is the job of this Paper to at least point out the barriers and limitations preventing the emergence of social entrepreneurial ventures.
5. **The Departmental Mandate across Government**

A final element in this discussion is the mandate the DVC has for influencing changes across government and government departments. What is being discussed here is a whole-of-government approach to business and community - it cannot simply be adopted by one government department.

6. **Summary**

Eleanor Shaw et al (2003 p36), in their paper on social entrepreneurship, outline the main barriers their research had identified which affected the establishment of entrepreneurial initiatives. The top six barriers were:

- Availability of finance.
- Bureaucracy.
- Premises and equipment.
- Lack of initial support for the initiative.
- Government regulations.
- Management skills.

When respondents were later asked for the main factors constraining the future development of initiatives, availability of funding and government bureaucracy overwhelmingly were highlighted. (Shaw et al, 2003 p44).

There can be no doubt that this field represents a tremendous challenge for the Victorian Government, as potentially its interventions could go against the very movement that it is trying to encourage. Nevertheless, there seem to be a number of possible roles for government, as shall now be outlined.
5. Possible Future Pathways for the Victorian Government in Encouraging Social Entrepreneurship

The following represent a range of different ways for the Victorian government to progress the field of social entrepreneurship – there is no one simple avenue, rather the approach needs to be decided by the level of commitment of the government and the priority that it allocates to this area. It is important for the government to admit that this is a somewhat ‘risky’ area of intervention and possible funding, as this is a comparatively new area and there are no certainties, not an easy situation for naturally risk averse bureaucracies and governments.

What would be optimal would be for a total package to be developed, consisting of a range of initiatives intended to stimulate the field and create the structure and framework for further social entrepreneurial activities.

5.1 Providing Leadership - Developing Conceptual Thinking

It seems crucial for the government and the bureaucracy to keep itself fully abreast of sector developments and to even offer a structure and environment for its enhancement. It could do this by, on an ongoing basis, bringing together as a ‘think tank’, the identified leaders in the field of social entrepreneurship. In bringing them together, they could then be resourced to undertake, on a short term basis, some of the work outlined in 5.6 below. This would involve their collating of material, identifying key presentations, and developing a ‘travelling roadshow’ to showcase their work and stimulate discussion. Ideally this might be linked with significant seed funding for new projects or to enhance existing initiatives.

The Thinktank group might also be resourced to have more significant evaluation of their projects and processes, or even to take their work further with the agreement to document and report on it within this ‘roadshow’ concept.

The simplest form of the Thinktank is for the group to act as an Advisory Body – however, by its very nature, it will not fit in easily into the standard ‘Advisory Body’ structure, which tends not to encourage innovative and creative thinking. The more ‘free-wheeling’ Thinktank concept is therefore likely to be more appropriate.

In addition, this group could establish a mentoring scheme, whereby they provide direct support and backup to budding entrepreneurs or to organisations struggling to maintain or expand their current enterprise. This role as mentors would provide invaluable information for them as a group, to feed in to their Thinktank discussions as well as providing further rich material for their presentations and workshops.

They could also take on the role of promoting social entrepreneurship to the business community and exploring possible significant community:business partnerships. The group would engender a sense of excitement and energy as their combined passion came to the fore.
5.2 Promoting an Evidence-based Approach

The concept of a Clearinghouse has now been well established in Australia, with Clearinghouses in the fields of alcohol and drugs (Australian Drug Foundation) and domestic and family violence (Centre for Gender Related Studies, University of NSW). These Clearinghouses are a rich source of material in their field, offering a database for anyone seeking information, research, good practice examples and key contacts in the particular field. They represent major resources for the field and act as a catalyst for research, evaluation and stimulation of ideas.

A similar opportunity exists in the field of social entrepreneurship. This is particularly so given that there is still significant divergence of understanding and perception of terminology and actual implementation and as yet a paucity of in-depth Australian research. Whether a full blown Clearinghouse is required or possible at this time, some type of centralised body supporting and encouraging developments in the field seems appropriate. To this extent, it seems surprising and disappointing (for whatever reasons) that SEN (the Social Entrepreneurs Network, is apparently unable to continue its operations here in Victoria and is likely to move interstate. This Network, similar to such networks in the UK, had been providing a useful function for the field and brought together key players in conferences and workshops.

Promotion of good practice could also involve a system of Awards, although the field is becoming a little crowded in this area with the Commonwealth Awards and Social Venture Australia’s Big Boost Challenge.

As mentioned a number of times in this Paper, research and evaluation are key components in developing the field. It is crucial that some process of increasing knowledge, capturing learnings, pulling out good practice case studies, identifying Best Practice principles and processes, and recognising champions in the field, be developed. Whether the suggested Clearinghouse could fulfil this role, or whether the Department in its current structure can oversee this is a matter of debate. The key words here are ‘momentum’ and ‘energy’ – the field is looking for support and facilitation from government, but will resist control and over-intervention. In particular this could build on the successful initiatives funded through the Community Support Fund for community capacity building and community strengthening, especially to consider the extent that additional funding could encourage the establishment of social entrepreneurial activities and ventures. In particular this could build on the successful initiatives funded through the Community Support Fund for community capacity building and community strengthening, especially to consider the extent that additional funding could encourage the establishment of social entrepreneurial activities and ventures.

5.3 Supporting Practice Development in the Community, Public and Business Sectors

Linked with many of the ideas already out forward would be establishing education, training and networking opportunities for the various sectors. There is no doubt that a shift in thinking is required for both the community and business sectors in terms of how they address social issues and work collaboratively. The government could play an extremely useful facilitative role in bringing together the key parties, conducting workshops and conferences, promoting new ideas, good practice and opportunities for collaborative
and partnering processes. The government may also explore ways to support the newly emerging Departments of Entrepreneurship at RMIT and Swinburne Universities.

5.4 Provision of Venture Capital

In section two, reference was made to Mark Latham’s suggestion for a Social Venture Capital Fund of $2 billion, divided into ten smaller funds each of $200m. Latham stated: ‘This is a new way of thinking about public policy: actively bypassing the formal institutions of government. Traditionally, welfare has only been of use to people as long as they remain poor. Social Venture Capital aims to tap into the wealth that lies beyond the welfare state.’ (Latham, 2001 p11).

This then represents a major proposal by a leading national political figure. Could such a concept work on a smaller scale in Victoria? Should Victoria be pushing COAG for a national approach in this matter?

What is important here are the principles under which seed money/social venture capital might operate:

- Small, one-off grants with no possibility of extension or expansion seem to be of limited value.
- The corporate sector should be heavily involved in the development of any capital fund.
- Longer term financial support rather than, for example, just one year, needs to be considered.
- In order to minimise failure, a structure for the availability of mentors and support personnel would need to be created.
- Existing successful projects should be just eligible for funding as new ventures.
- Funding should be accompanied by processes for ensuring documentation, evaluation and the dissemination of good practice examples.
- The government would need to acknowledge certain levels of risk in such funding, which is why this last point is particularly poignant, to minimise these risks.

It may well be that the Victorian Government needs to commission a feasibility study specifically to look more closely at the possibilities and parameters of social venture capital. Alternatively, it may choose to put its energies into wider structural projects or programs, as described in 5.7 below.

5.5 Government and Public Sector Culture – Creating a New Environment

As mentioned above, significant barriers to encouraging social entrepreneurship exist in the thinking and funding structures within government. It may well be that this is too large a project for the DVC to take on, and instead it looks to at least establish itself as a model of flexible funding and responsiveness to community needs and entrepreneurial success. It would indeed be a major project to examine government funding structures and identify exactly what and who is being rewarded, what is limiting innovation and initiative and how this can be overcome.
A particularly difficult area of challenge would be to consider the government’s internal processes, which tend to be laborious and unwieldy. The author’s experience over 11 years of dealings with the State government is that the State bureaucracy rarely understands its own internal processes and is therefore struggles to meet its own stated deadlines and commitments. This tends to also be the experience of the community sector. This makes it extremely difficult for the government to ‘partner’ with the community or business sectors – a critical element of partnering is the making and **honouring** of agreements in a timely manner – it is the author’s contention that this would be a hard goal for the government to achieve.

Further, a number of additional opportunities exist for structuring a more supportive environment for social entrepreneurship, although many of them may require Commonwealth rather than State intervention and action:

- **Socially focused enterprises:** Consideration of a structure for socially focused enterprises, similar to the Community Interest Companies concept in the UK.
- **Microcredit:** Support for microcredit initiatives such as initiated by BSL and the Bendigo Bank, and, originally, by the Grameen Bank.
- **Independent Body:** Support for an independent body/unit specifically charged with the role of stimulating and supporting social entrepreneurship (this could also have funding/venture capital attached).
- **Matched Savings Schemes:** Entering into discussions with the Commonwealth Government in relation to Matched Savings Schemes for low income families, possibly linked to the availability of microcredit loans for the initiation of small businesses.
- **Networking Structure:** Re-establishment of a networking structure and process for social entrepreneurs in Victoria, with a different focus and structure to that of the original Social Entrepreneurs Network.
- **Recognition:** Consideration of establishing processes for rewarding successful social entrepreneurial projects, assisting their long term sustainability and replicability, and independence of funding.

### 6. Summary and Conclusions

This Paper has deliberately broadened out from the concept of social entrepreneurship and taken a wider look at the entire field of community and business innovation and development. It does however represent only a broad sweep approach, indicating the need for government to examine this area in even more depth, especially in relation to possible interventions and projects.

It will require a difficult balance act for government, as the community sector will continue, in the short term, to pressure it for funds to expand existing service delivery to meet the myriad of existing problems which undoubtedly need support. The challenge is to consider the possibility of a whole of government approach which would require a far more indepth consideration than has been possible in this short term examination. What is undoubtedly clear is that there are numerous initiatives under way, many competent practitioners and entrepreneurs and a wealth of energy, passion and vision. What is
needed is a harnessing of these energies and skills in a way which will benefit all of those involved and address many of the pressing social issues in our contemporary society.
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