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Introduction

In 2005, social enterprise (SE) operators and investors in British Columbia began an in-depth process to investigate the issues, interest levels, and form of a project to develop a framework for measuring the social impact of the activities of nonprofits funded by social investment organizations and institutions. The idea for this project emerged from many groups including Partners for Economic and Community Help, The Potluck Café Society, VanCity Community Foundation and Enterprising Nonprofits.

A national advisory group was developed to guide the process and a lead investigator, Kerry Armstrong, was retained to guide the development phase. The objective of this phase was to determine whether or not the development of a social enterprise impact assessment (SEIA) framework for social enterprise in a Canadian context was warranted and, if so, to provide guidance in developing a proposal for a pilot project. Key components of this phase included a Literature Review followed by stakeholder interviews. This report describes the findings of these interviews.

Literature Review Summary

The literature review showed that, in Canada, government funding to the non-profit sector has significantly decreased since the 1990s and that social purpose organizations have had to adjust funding strategies. While demand for their services has been growing, these organizations are also dealing with an increasingly competitive funding environment and greater controls by funders - a lack of funding for core operations, an over reliance on project funding, the need to modify programs in order to receive funding, and problems with funder reporting requirements.

In addition to being a means to financial stability, social enterprise is also seen as an innovative program delivery mechanism and a means to deliver goods and services that would not otherwise be provided by the marketplace. However, discussion about SE also includes its potential disadvantages: concerns about the scope, risks, and pitfalls of SE, and concerns about the commercialization of the public sector. Organizations can be overly optimistic about a venture's potential financial returns, lack business skills, or have an unrealistic view of the challenges of operating a business. Social objectives may also create conflicting priorities that undermine the possibility of business success. Where the goal is reliance on indirect customers to subsidize target population services, organizations may lack the necessary understanding of market customers.

Some observers are concerned about the social implications of SE and the commercialization of the social sector. Others question the advisability of the entire sector moving in this direction because venture activities can be detrimental to the values and principles of the sector.

From the social investor point of view there is increasing interest in connecting social return measurement with traditional financial accounting. Both government and private investors are seen to be ensuring effective use of resources through various mechanisms: targeting funding to organizations that meet their priorities, reducing support for administration in order to increase support for programming and services, requiring demonstration of achieved results, reduced duplication through investee collaboration, and avoiding long-term commitments in order to retain flexibility.

There is increasing interest in understanding the social sector as a marketplace with a view to improving its ability to create social value. Inefficiency is primarily seen as a
consequence of the focus on transactions (outputs), rather than by long-term value created subsequent to transactions.

In the Canadian social sector, evaluation and performance measurement is generally common and becoming more routine. Increasingly, investors want more evaluation information and particularly evaluation of outcomes rather than outputs. However, it appears that investee organizations don’t clearly understand what this involves. They nonetheless identify problems related to conducting evaluations: internal capacity (i.e. staff time, money), unclear evaluation expectations and direction from investors, and lack of skill and knowledge in conducting evaluations. Investors tend to perceive investee-conducted evaluations as less than satisfactory. It is also the case that investees believe evaluations are for investor administrative purposes only, and, in fact, investors tend to not make effective use of the evaluation information they do receive, often due to a lack of capacity.

Increased reporting expectations in Canada generally do not include funds for doing the evaluations - less than half of investors provide funding for evaluation or allow project funds to be used for evaluations. Some do provide non-financial support, such as evaluation advice, tools and resources, or training. Investors want more financial resources and consistency among investors in use of terminology. Investees want investors to ask for similar evaluation information where there are multiple investors, more financial resources, and consistent use of terminology.

The challenge is to create a comprehensive vocabulary and analytic framework in order to understand combined value creation. Investors and investees must develop and promote new management information and tracking systems, and new metrics in order to assess progress, and maximize social and economic value.

From a professional accounting and reporting point of view, quality performance measurement is both essential and difficult to produce. Moreover, all performance measures have limitations and should be treated as guides to decision-making, not a substitute for judgment. Because, for mission-lead organizations, earnings are not the primary measure of success, accounting must include financial and non-financial objectives, targets, and outcomes, however, it is difficult to fully define social goals in terms of useful measures of outputs or outcomes, or to determine to what extent goals are measurable and to find ways to measure results in practice.

Although promoted as a move toward more objective evaluation standards, the realities of determining outcomes by measurable indicators often raise questions because of methodological disputes, data limitations, or value conflicts. Performance criteria can be ambiguous, complex missions are technically difficult to measure, and designing measurement systems that satisfy all stakeholders can be politically problematic. Political concerns also include fears of the punitive use of outcomes assessments and unrealistic or rigid outcomes expectations.

The lack of common practice around social impact assessment and reporting means that many SEs are judged in financial terms, even if their social goals are their primary motivator. Outcomes assessment is now seen as essential to initiatives to strengthen accountability in public spending and for disciplined decision-making.

Developing trusting relationships may be as valuable to SE because investors respond favourably to clear proposals, organizational sustainability, and financial audits. The feasibility of producing outcomes evaluations also requires investor flexibility in rigour by
broadening demands for what might serve as valid outcomes indicators. The risk, however, in that too much flexibility can undermine the credibility of indicators.

There is also a risk that results-based measurement that is initially embraced is abandoned when difficulties arise or when they are assumed to be a panacea. Abandonment is higher when measurement is externally demanded and not helpful to operators, or when unrealistic scientific rigour is expected. Outcomes measurement is successful when organizations articulate and prove contributions to community outcomes and when investors collaborate to identify and prioritize measurable goals and create incentives to direct projects to these goals. Leadership is also needed to create and sustain processes for targeting outcomes, developing data, and reflecting on results among collaborative partners.
Defining Terms

For the purposes of this research, a social enterprise (SE) was taken to be any revenue-generating venture structured either as a division within an organization or as a separate legal entity - nonprofit or for-profit. SE was further defined by the interdependence of social impact and business success; the enterprise is created in order to contribute to a social cause and operates according to the methods, discipline, and innovation associated with a for-profit business.

Other critical terms were also defined in order to ensure consistency of their meanings: ‘outcomes’ are the ultimate changes that are the intent of a particular activity; ‘impact’ is the portion of the total outcome that happened as a result of the activity, beyond what would have happened anyway, ‘social impact assessment’ is the use of social science, program evaluation, or business practice tools to establish the social outputs, outcomes, or impact of an activity, or organization, and a ‘method’ is a process established by a social investor or enterprise to assess social outcomes or impact.

Although these definitions were intended to fix meanings of key terms, it was apparent during the interviews that there is a marked tendency to conflate some meanings, particularly among ‘outputs,’ ‘outcomes,’ and ‘impacts.’

Stakeholders, for interview research purposes, were either SE operators - the organizations that manage the enterprise – or investors - entities external to the enterprise and its operators, and that support the enterprise through financial products, technical assistance, or advice. Although SE operators often consider themselves as investors in their ventures, the above distinction was maintained for this research.
Method
This paper is based on in-depth interviews conducted in 2005 with 17 representatives from 16 organizations operating social enterprises and with 10 representatives from 9 organizations that provide direct or indirect support to social enterprise. (See appendix for a complete list.) It should be noted that this paper does not attempt to provide a comprehensive review of investor and practitioner practices and attitudes. Rather, it seeks to synthesize key elements of practitioner and investor experience, and to provide guidance for the development of a pilot project involving collaboration among investors and practitioners to develop an evaluation framework.

Operators. The enterprise operator interviewees were selected from a list of SE investor-identified social enterprises in BC. Collectively, SE operator interviewees were intended to be diverse with respect to several variables: organization size, age, mission focus, location of the enterprise, and enterprise business sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise Operator Organization Mission Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social service</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training/employment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social justice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The social missions of the SE operator organizations interviewed are often multi-faceted: in 5 cases the mission is a statement about a single purpose; while, in other cases, the mission refers to 2 or 3 distinct areas of focus. They also represent a wide range of social mission interest areas that can be categorized as environmental (5), social service (4), training/employment (2), health (2), social justice (2) and business support (1).

Investors. Investor organizations selected for interviews were those in BC generally known to be interested to some degree in social enterprise investing, and two out-of-province investors that hold SE-specific investment portfolios. Of the 9 social investor organizations interviewed, 6 are in British Columbia, 2 in Ontario, and one is a federal government agency. Four provide exclusive support to social enterprise, and of these 4, 2 exclusively support the employment model of social enterprise; the remaining two support various social enterprise models, one supports the planning phase only, the other supports from startup phase onward.

Questions. A set of questions was developed for each of the two groups, operators and investors. The questions were open-ended in order to allow for a wide range of responses. They were sent to interviewees in advance, along with the definitions of key terms. (See appendix for the sets of questions.) The one-hour interviews were conducted in person (some by telephone) and an honorarium of seventy-five dollars was paid in recognition of the time involved. Interviewees were also promised that they would not be identified with their particular responses. This level of anonymity was offered in order to encourage candid responses.

The interviews were intended to provide at a clearer understanding of SE social impact assessment with respect to: current knowledge and practices, the potential for undertaking a pilot project and to suggest directions to take and barriers to expect. Investors were asked about their historic interest in supporting SE and how they foresee that support changing. They were also asked about their knowledge of social impact
assessment and their interest in pursuing development of a collaborative SE assessment framework. Questions also focused on evaluation practices with respect to the organization itself and with respect to the SEs they support. SE operators were asked about the relationship between the purpose of their organization and that of their enterprise. They were also asked about their evaluation practices, both for the organization and for the enterprise, with additional focus on challenges and issues with assessment and reporting. Other questions focused on their knowledge of social impact assessment and their interest in pursuing development of a collaborative assessment framework.

Of note is that all the organizations that were selected as interviewees for this research agreed to participate, often despite time constraints and other priorities. Clearly, the issues raised here are important. All were keen to ensure the clarity and completeness of their responses; that their point of view was heard and articulated.
Findings

*Evaluation and Reporting – Current Practices*

**Defining Success**

**Investors.** Social investors define organizational success in various ways. Most often success is based on the self-reported achievements of individual project goals, which may be accompanied by some indication of the sustainability of the initiative and its reported impact on the community or organizational culture. In one case, success is based on outputs - the number of grants given and the type of grant given. In one instance, a definition of success is just being developed.

There are cases where success is more specifically described. In one instance, although not a numerical definition, success is related to SE business double-bottom line – business viability (how much revenue from sales covers business costs; business costs versus social costs) and the achievement of social goals (i.e. longer employment, individual self-esteem, etc.). In another case, success is when investments break even or better over a 3 to 5 year timeframe and SE’s maintain a majority of employees from their target populations. In a further case, although traditional business measures are used along with some social and environmental measures, success is defined differently for each SE and depends also on the development level of the particular SE.

**Operators.** Among SE organizations, there is generally a well-defined relationship between mission and descriptions of success. Most often there are multiple definitions: for 3 organizations, 1 definition; for 4 organizations, 2; for 5 or ganizations, 3; two had four definitions and one had 5.

Success is defined over a range of interests that can be categorized as financial performance, social performance, and programming performance. In some cases, particular success categories are even further detailed. It is usually also the case that, in addition to multiple meanings of success, organizations also designate levels of success. On average, there are three levels of success, which tend to be some combination of individual, community, ecological, economic, or organizational. Even for those with a single mission focus, success is usually defined on multiple levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Definitions of Success</th>
<th>Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Definition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Definitions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Definitions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Definitions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Definitions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enterprises. For the enterprise itself, most describe success by at least two measures - only 2 report that the enterprise in question has only one purpose. Six enterprises have 2 purposes, 4 have 3; others have 4 or 5. Most frequent is the combination of enterprise financial viability or sustainability, along with a mission-related measure, for example, the number of employees from target populations, the amount of public education achieved; etc. In some cases the enterprise is the vehicle for only one aspect of the organization’s social mission, while in other cases, it is the vehicle for all aspects. Generally, it is the meeting of both financial and social objectives that represent success for the enterprise.

### Measuring success

**Investors.** As with definitions of success, the methods used to measure investment success vary widely. In one case, traditional financial methods (monitoring investments, sales, and/or business planning strategies) are used in conjunction with a Social Return on Investment (SROI)\(^1\) reporting system. Investments and co-investments are calculated and financial performance is measured against social performance with respect to target employees before, during, and after intervention. In this case, the limitation is said to be the inability to say what a good social return on investment is because a comparison framework doesn’t exist.

In another case, from 2001-03, participants were sampled and evaluated using an individual asset format. Statistical and narrative information is now collected from investees on a semi-annual basis. One organization uses the scoring criteria from its refunding process in conjunction with funding partners’ participation in an organized review process that measures success. In other cases, anecdotal reporting from investee groups is often used in organizational reports, as well as reports on the progress or achievement of individual project goals, for which a scoring procedure may be in place.

The real measure of organizational success most often is some combination of the dollar amount of funds granted, the number of organizations supported, the number of grants given, or the geographical diversity of grants.

**Operators.** There is also a wide range in the amount and sophistication in the measurement of SE organizational success. The most common and straightforward measurement is for financial viability, using standard accounting methods. Beyond that, other measures are sometimes for outputs: the number of participants, number of members, the number of presentations done, etc. Outcomes-based measurements may include client satisfaction surveys, that a plan was created and followed, or involve methods to track, measure, and evaluate individuals, groups, or programs. In some cases, rigourous, third party statistical information is incorporated into methods (this seems to be more the case with environmental statistics). In some cases, organizational success can be measured using accounting methods, such as for return on financial investments. Otherwise, measurement methods are sometimes anecdotal or non-existent, especially with respect to areas such as ‘independence of individuals’, ‘changes in people’s lives’, or ‘community development’.

\(^1\) Roberts Enterprise Development Foundation
Enterprises. When asked about current enterprise assessment practices, including required reporting, most often mentioned are those related to the financial objectives of the enterprise, probably because revenue generation is a social enterprise purpose and because financial reporting is the most straightforward to conduct. Second, and related to the first, are those concerning business operations, such as business costs analysis, client satisfaction, sales reports, and sales analysis. Less often mentioned are social mission-related reporting and data collection. Other reporting and assessment is for investors (funders or lenders) and for internal reports to the board. It is not the case that an enterprise does no reporting or assessing, since even in a planning phase, reports will be prepared for funders or other participants.

Investor and Operator Interaction

Investor view. Social investors support social enterprise in various ways. Direct support is given in the form of grants, loans, technical assistance and advice. Where support for SE is explicitly defined, it is more likely that support is tracked and quantified. In organizations that do not explicitly support SE, it is less likely that the amount of support given, even for grants and loans, can be established, especially in larger organizations and where SE investment is part of larger investment strategies. In these cases, other, non-financial forms of support are even less likely to be quantified. Indirect SE support is given when funds are distributed to intermediary organizations, in which case support specific to SE is also not tracked. Less often acknowledged or measured is indirect support given through activities such as participation on boards, advisory committees, etc. In summary, it is currently impossible to know the total value of investment in social enterprise for these organizations.

For half of the interviewed SI organizations, closeness of the working relationship with investees is either limited to the assessment process, or depends on the motivation of the investee to request closer involvement, which can occur indirectly, such as participation on advisory committees or making links to other funding. In other cases, the investor more actively determines engagement. Here, the level of involvement can depend on the motivation of the investee to request closer involvement, which can occur indirectly, such as participation on advisory committees or making links to other funding. In other cases, the investor more actively determines engagement. Here, the level of involvement can depend on the motivation of the investee to request closer involvement, which can occur indirectly, such as participation on advisory committees or making links to other funding. In other cases, the investor more actively determines engagement. Here, the level of involvement can depend on the motivation of the investee to request closer involvement, which can occur indirectly, such as participation on advisory committees or making links to other funding. In other cases, the investor more actively determines engagement. Here, the level of involvement can depend on the motivation of the investee to request closer involvement, which can occur indirectly, such as participation on advisory committees or making links to other funding.}

For some investors, the length of necessary engagement in order to be effective varies depending on the purpose of the engagement and the situation. For example, for planning work, engagement is short-term. Most suggest that long-term engagement timeframes need to be from 3 to 5 years, and possibly as high as 10 years. Investors acknowledge there is investee demand for their involvement beyond dollars and that this is important for investment success - a commitment of time and other resources is necessary for ethical SE investment. The length of engagement needed can also depend on what ‘effective’ means. A longer timeframe is generally seen as necessary to decrease dependence on a single investor, to encourage a business focus, sustainability, and the continuation of social impact assessment practices.

With respect to exit strategies, in one case, an exit hasn’t happened yet, and the organization assumes it will either be a long-term investor or will move investees to more appropriate investors. Otherwise, for this organization, exits have been for unsuccessful
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programs. In 4 cases investment is through grants, so, exit is by default. In two cases, exit strategy policies are yet to be determined, and in two cases, exits are determined on an individual, case-by-case basis.

Operator view. From the SE point of view, reporting or assessment is equally divided between internal and external purposes. Internally, it is for the organization's board or for an advisory committee, and is primarily with respect to financial objectives. The second most reported purpose for internal enterprise reporting is to provide feedback in order to improve performance related to business or social objectives. External reports and assessments are predominantly those required by investors (funders or lenders) or, in some cases, are aimed at external stakeholders for communication or promotional purposes.

In smaller SE organizations, reporting and assessment is more burdensome strictly because of limited staff resources. In larger organizations, tasks can be spread among staff and the enterprise can rely on existing infrastructure, for example, accounting services, administrative staff, or, in some cases, volunteers. Reporting and assessment is also less burdensome when it is aligned with business-related operations and systems. For example, if social outcome measurement relies on sales data, these data are already available and managed.

When asked about 'challenges' related to enterprise assessments or reporting - what they are unable but would like to assess and report - most operators express difficulties with being able to report and assess the scope of their activities: how to measure social outcomes and impact; what data to collect, what methods to use to interpret data. Business and systems-related issues are with staff time constraints, lack of staff skills or interest, and a limited ability to manage and analyze existing data. The ability to analyze data for marketing purposes and to undertake market research in general are additional challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Enterprise Reporting Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Feedback for Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SE interviewees were also asked about ‘issues’ related to enterprise assessments or reporting – what they dislike about current practices. This question evoked lively responses regarding experiences with investors in general, not strictly SE investors. Most raised issues related to investor reporting, not surprising since most external enterprise reporting is for investors. Two enterprise operators that no longer rely on external investment issues the way they want and of the ability

Investor reporting complaints include a lack of dialogue with investors, the lack of feedback and interaction (especially on project reports), the non-integration of reporting with other and internal reporting, that it is too restrictive, complex, and onerous. Investor reporting is ‘an enormous waste of resources when it moves into the micro-management level of reporting.’ Some don’t have protocol for reports; some have precise reporting requirements that aren’t necessarily informative to the organization. Other issues are the frequency and variety of reporting requirements and that they are wanted at different times of the year.

Reporting can be duplication or triplication, and if it’s in addition to what the organization needs, investors often assume that the SE operator will cover the costs. Organizations can be caught in a bind: as entities with social missions, they are seen to have an obligation to report or provide services regardless of their capacity. When social purpose organizations engage in enterprise activities as a means to attain financial sustainability, they risk alienating stakeholders with a more traditional notion of what a ‘charity’ is. For example, donors are confused as to whether they are giving money to a business or a charity. Operators mention investor resistance to applying funds to administrative or infrastructure costs and the time delay in learning whether or not funding has been approved. Internal issues are the lack of board participation or narrow focus. Ultimately, without impact measurement tools, reports and assessments are admittedly often just good guesses.

Process – Assessing, Reporting, & Data
Investors. For eight social investors SE investing is not new. In most of these cases (6), this means that SE investing was part of the investment strategy (explicitly or implicitly) when the organization started or SE investing has been occurring, but has not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Enterprise Reporting Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unable to report scope of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How to measure social outcomes and impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What data to collect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What methods to use to interpret data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff skills and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How to analyze data for marketing purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Enterprise Reporting Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of dialogue with investors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-integration of investor reporting with internal reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investor reporting restrictive, complex, onerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of standardized investor reporting protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investor reporting requirements irrelevant to the enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple investor reporting dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investor resistance to applying funds to administrative or infrastructure costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time delay to find out if funding is coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of board participation or narrow focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specifically been identified as such. Where SE investing is new, all funding is new, but social enterprise investment could be ‘the best way to meet community needs; it is entrepreneurs that define the services needed but they can’t find the financial resources to become sustainable.’

Five SI organizations state that they have a process to review funding applications with respect to social impact, while four say they do not. Three organizations have a process to assess impact against funding criteria, while six do not. However, it is unclear whether all organizations are using the same meaning of ‘impact’ when reporting on these two items.

Two of the organizations that explicitly invest in social enterprise have the most rigorous reporting requirements, including specific reporting periods, statistical information, audited financial statements, social costs compared to business costs, narrative reporting, as well as informal reporting through ongoing update contacts. Otherwise, reporting can be project specific, where reporting requirements vary depending on the project and no formalized reporting requirements exist. In some cases a brief end-of-project summary may be required that refers to project successes, challenges, opportunities, next steps, etc., and may include financial statements. In one case, direct formal reporting is not required because there is close involvement of partner organizations with investees. In another case, reporting requirements are yet to be determined.

Enterprises. Two SE interviewees report that they only collect data for financial reporting, while the remainder reports that they systematically collect data for other business-related reasons. Nine report that they systematically collect data related to social outputs or impact.

Correlation between amount and types of reporting produced and the data collected.
Trends and Aspirations

SE Investing

Eight of nine investors want to increase their level of investment in social enterprise. In some cases, this means shifting current investments by giving an explicit definition to social enterprise within the organization so that it is more targeted. For one organization, SE is seen as a way to move outside the ‘charitable box,’ to diversify funds, and to promote independence within investee organizations. The achievement of increased SE investment may, however, be limited by competing priorities or the lack of overall awareness of SE in larger investor organizations. Another organization intends to keep the current dollar level but increase technical assistance and advice, to broaden support by leveraging non-financial resources to enhance SE support.

Evaluation Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Investor SE Evaluation Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quantify investment outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explain and justify investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation to guide investment programs and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation to inform and educate donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To inform investor organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make business case for SE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investors. Investors want to quantify outcomes: to prove, explain, and justify investments. They want to demonstrate the quality of investing, not just the quantity: to show social costs and savings. There is also acknowledgment that the use of evaluations varies depending on who stakeholders are and that indicators are only as good as their use. Evaluations need to inform investor programs and investor goals, to inform and educate donors, to make the corporate level aware of the impact of investments, to make a business case for SE, and advocate for the work that is being done.

All investors want to measure social impact, primarily to measure return on investment - ‘to assess the impact of our dollars.’ There is also a desire to use impact assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of investment processes in order to improve outcomes. Investors also want to know that investments produce the results that investee organizations want – are enterprises doing what they are intended to do? Could
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resources be used in another, more effective way? Social impact assessment (SIA) is seen as a means to encourage investee organizations to think about impact, which will lead to better management and shared best practices.

Social impact assessment is also seen as a communication tool, both internally and externally. It is a potential advocacy tool to influence policy change, for example, policy changes related to an investee-organization’s mission or to influence government policy regarding support for social enterprise - tax, legal, etc. Internally, SIA could raise awareness of SE and influence organizational readiness and support for SE.

Social investors also hope that SIA can provide a realistic picture of what social enterprise can do and not do; to help identify the limits of social enterprise as a social strategy; to help identify the conditions in which SE can be useful and the ideal conditions for its efficacy. There is also acknowledgement that that an SIA framework must be shared in order to be credible.

Operators. Fourteen SE interviewees stated that their organizations are interested in assessing social impact. The most common reasons given were: to demonstrate the value of activities; to know the monetary value of activities; to better defend and prove the value of activities; to show to staff, the organization, the public, clients and investors that there is progress on the mandate and value in activities; to improve activities; to broaden understanding of what the impacts really are; to find out if activities are still relevant; to determine future organizational directions; to help maintain focus. The ‘maybes’ came from one interviewee concerned about the feasibility of assessing social impact and one concerned about the relevance of assessing social impact for the organization.

![Demand for SIA](image)

**Demand for SIA**

**SIA Priority**

**Investors.** The average rating for social impact assessment as an investor organization priority is 4 on a scale of 1 to 5. The highest rating of 5 was given by SE-specific organizations with SE-specific staff. One gives the highest rating of 5 on condition that impact assessment fulfill the ideal of being applicable to all investees, a framework that is transferable to all portfolios, not just social enterprise. It was also emphasized that the framework should be Canadian, locally developed among colleagues so that it will take into account local needs.
One rating of 4 was given based on the organization’s principle of transparent reporting. Within one larger organization, the lower rating of 3.5 was given because of staffing issues, although it is not clear how resource intensive SIA would be. Lower ratings of 3 were given because it reflects the current level of importance of SIA for the organization although it is becoming more important because of increasing demand for accountability, because reporting formats are still being developed, or because the board is not really thinking about it yet and may not yet see the importance of it. The lowest rating, 2.5, was given because organizationally an audit framework terminology is currently used while SIA terminology is unfamiliar.

Operators. The average rating for social impact assessment as an organizational priority for practitioners is 3.9. Where ratings were lower, it was generally because of other, more pressing priorities or caution because of a lack of information about what is involved.
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**SIA knowledge**

**Investors.** Six of nine investors claim some theoretic knowledge of social impact assessment and knowledge of some methods. Within this group, there is a general understanding of assessment theory, concepts, and principles, as well a general awareness of some frameworks for assessing outputs, outcomes, and impacts. There is also awareness of some attempts to use SIA, of some reporting frameworks, and of motivational factors.

Most familiar with SIA, not surprisingly, are those organizations that specifically identify and support SE. With a couple of exceptions, most have limited application experience, but are aware of the inability of social entrepreneurs ‘to talk about results of their social enterprises either financially or socially, and without being able to do this, they can’t demonstrate that SE conceptually is the way to go; that SE does what it claims.’

**Operators.** Half of the SE operators report having some general, conceptual understanding of SIA. Three also have knowledge of some measurement methods. Five are not at all familiar with social impact assessments.
SIA Questions & Concerns

**Investors.** Investors want to know how to ‘develop better models to measure the things that people sense,’ but most often want to know how to apply theory to practice; the implementation and application of theory, the ‘struggle with taking and adapting particular methodologies to the real world.’ For example, ‘what level of complexity is required for a method to be effective?’ How to make SIA manageable and feasible for the enterprise? Can a framework really be created that will satisfy both investor and operator interests?

Investors want consistent use of methods and metrics throughout portfolio organizations; they want social impact assessment to be used as a global measure of social enterprise, not just applied to one aspect or sector. There is concern that some sectors are excluded from discussions of SIA and social economy and that this limits the value and strength of SE to develop and to have influence.

Questions about the scope of SIA are also raised: Does social impact assessment measure impact of social enterprise on all participants? For example, the impact not just on the target population, but also on such things as organizational asset development – the capacity of operators, boards, etc. – as well as improved social enterprise infrastructure – the ability to attract more resources, leadership, and mentors. Are both sides (investors and investees) being more effective? Is philanthropy more effective and engaged? Is the environment for social enterprise improved?

There is also an aspiration that SIA consider higher order questions. Are goals being reached through social enterprise as a mechanism? What are the political motivations for investing in social enterprise? Is the intent to reduce social spending through social enterprise? The truly pragmatic question raised is who is going to pay for SIA? Will resources be available to implement it?

**Operators.** Although SE respondents are less knowledgeable about SIA, they ask similar types of important questions:

- How to determine what kinds of measurement are useful?
- What tools to use? How to use them?
- How is measurement designed, structured, and data collected?
- How to make SIA specific for each particular type of organization?
- How to use existing information to measure social impact?
- How to know what causes impact?
- How to measure impact on communities, not just on individuals?
- How are others using SIA?
- What are the implications of using SIA? Is there too much focus on measuring rather than capacity building? What prevents investors from doing damage by doing too much meddling? Are investors willing to stick with the organizations they fund, no matter what the results are?
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**Perspectives on a Shared Framework**

**Interest**

Investors. All investors support the idea of having a standardized social impact assessment framework that entrepreneurs and investors would use. There is, however, some skepticism that it can be done. Is it possible for one framework to meet everyone’s needs? One that will allow for measuring collective impact instead of individual organizational impact and that is flexible enough for all to use? A base framework with common elements is needed that can be customized, a standard that is easy to use for operators and investors, and that can be scaled up and used for comparison purposes among organizations. Can a framework be operationalized beyond a small group of investors in SE to a larger group that has critical mass, cohesion, and collegiality? Can an assessment framework account for situations where SE is a subset of investment, policies, procedures, and reporting mechanisms?

There is acknowledgement that SIA will have to come out of the organizational goals of both enterprise operators and investors - both need to demonstrate investment impact. A shared framework would make investee reporting easier and, ideally, it could also be used for social investments beyond social enterprise.

Some caution expressed that while a standardized methodology is necessary, there is a risk that apples are compared with oranges; there is a risk in comparing, for example, different SE models, different target populations, etc. A framework must be multi-dimensional in order to reflect variations and to distinguish outcomes in one situation from those in another. These sorts of comparisons need to be undertaken with care and must reflect the original goals of the SE organizations.

Finally, what does ‘framework’ mean? Is it a set of questions, software…?

Operators. Most SEs (14) think that having a standardized social impact assessment framework is a good idea because it would demonstrate social impact, explain activities to the larger community, or show that some non-profits shouldn’t be run as a business. An impact assessment framework could also encourage partnerships across sectors, have promotional value, and streamline reporting.

Reservations are mostly expressed about the ability to develop a framework flexible enough to allow for adjusting or adapting programs to ensure outcomes are achieved, one that functions as a guide for operational decision making, meets different organizational needs, and that accounts for differences between enterprises. There is also concern about the effect of the activity of measurement on the target population.
A further concern is that there needs to be a convergence with investors about what is of value and should therefore be measured. Is there a risk of investor or ideology-driven measures rather than what organizations want and need? Differences among enterprises are subtle and it may be unfair to compare them without weighted comparisons. Is SIA therefore better for helping achieve internal organizational goals?

One operator is interested only if there is a major shift in the language used by the non-profit sector, which is seen as being ‘miles behind the corporate sector in sustainability reporting.’ ‘Look at the triple bottom line, not just double bottom line; change from calling it “social enterprise” to “sustainable enterprise.”’ Another operator, uncertain about this question, feels isolated locally because social enterprise is strongly led by CED (Community Economic Development) and is too service-enterprise focused.

**Collaboration**

All investor organizations are interested in collaborating with SE organizations and other investors to develop a standardized social impact assessment framework, even where collaboration means funding a project rather than being directly involved in the development. The only reservation expressed was that such a project be aligned with their end goals; participation in the collaborative development of a framework would occur only if it would ultimately be adaptable to their own processes. However, this contingency is probably implicit in the notion of collaborative framework development and depends on the outcomes of the collaboration itself.

14 operators stated that their organization would be interested in the collaboration. However, many of these positive responses were conditional, primarily on the availability of the time and resources to participate. Others wondered about the collaborative format, timing, location, and logistics. Some simply want more details.

**Transparency**

All investor organizations are generally willing to share operational information, except where legal boundaries or confidentiality concerns would prevail. Most operators believe that their organizations are generally willing to share financial and program information. There is caution about sharing confidential information, sharing information with business competitors, or caution due to a general lack of clarity about what information would need to be shared and with whom.
Barriers

Investors. Three investors felt unequivocally that their organizations currently have the staffing and other resource capacity to participate in a social impact assessment process. Hesitation from others was from those not exclusively dealing with SE, and was mostly with respect to not knowing what is involved in such an undertaking. The next most important concern was the need to promote such a project within the larger organization; to promote SIA, to educate the board, or to have priorities shift from some activities toward SIA. Uncertainty in other situations is due to recent organizational changes, changes in the staffing situation or board capacity constraints. However, this again depends on what is involved. Some are committed to participate to the capacity they are able.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Investor SIA Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack knowledge of what is involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to promote within the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organization staff changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board capacity constraints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operators. Only one Se interviewee believes that their organization currently has the staffing and other resource capacity to participate in a social impact assessment process. The remainder said either ‘no’ (8), ‘maybe’ (6), and one abstention due to lack of information. Hesitation was based almost exclusively on concern with having staff resources. Other factors mentioned were timing, travel, and costs.

Not surprisingly, the additional resources most often mentioned as being required in order to be able to participate were funds for staffing costs. Second was having technical assistance provided. Also mentioned was the need to encourage interest among other staff and the board, to have other costs covered (travel), and the importance of timing. Several simply need more information about what participation would require.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE Operator SIA Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of staff resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to promote within the organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning

**Investors.** The average rating for investor interest in learning more about SIA is 4.5 on a scale of 1 to 5, which is consistent with the interest in knowing more about SIA and the need for organization education before making a commitment to involvement. Investors are generally motivated by a movement towards accountability and showing investment results, and by the limitations of existing tools that don’t clearly measure the value of social investments.

While some investors are interested in receiving general information on social Impact assessment, the following are specific interests:

- What are the tools, techniques, and information required to measure the performance of a wide variety of SE’s and take that information and measure the impact of our investments?
- What are methods, tools, and procedures that will not require a large investment on the part of organizations and investors?
- What are the particular types of enterprises or sectors where SIA can be done?
- At what stage of social enterprise development is it best to start thinking about SIA?
- What do I need to ask organizations in the grant application?
- What SIA methods have been proven?
- What data do I need in order to determine impact; how do I collect data?
- How can we operationalize principles and methodologies?
- What are appropriate, simple, and relevant methodologies that capture the story; that don’t lose the story in numbers but give the fuller story - the impact that the activity actually has and that is understandable to a non-practitioner audience?
- Can SIA capture the funding context of the target populations, show why funding is needed in particular geographic or social situations, educate investees by situating funding in the context of the target population, explain what constitutes a reasonable outcome and impact in a context?
- How do we value multiplier effects of investments?
- Where do we have to do primary research versus where can we get existing research; is it a good thing to use statistical rather than primary data?
- Can SIA allow investee organizations to define assessment?
- How can we encourage take-up of SIA among other investors and operators?
- Are investors really willing to change the way they review applications?
- How is SIA different in Canada compared with the USA context, given the history of government philanthropy in Canada? What are the implications of SE for investors in Canada?
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Operators. The average rating for SE organizational interest in learning more about SIA is 4.4 on a scale of 1 to 5. Where ratings were lower, it was due to concern about lack of staff or board member time. Operators want to know:

- What methods can prove the value of our activities? What are some methodologies? What do we measure? How do we measure? How is impact different from outcomes measurement?
- What tools are available and how are they applied?
- What is the actual process of measurement? How would measurement be made specific to our enterprise and sector?
- What are some definitions?
- What resources available? What information, expertise, training, and technical assistance is available?
- What is the experience of others? Are people already doing this (in Canada)? What are they doing? What issues are they facing? Why do people want to do this? What are some examples of organizations using impact assessment?
- Who is the audience for the assessment? How will measuring would make a difference to clients and their success? Will it help us achieve our goals?
- Is it practical? How can it be linked to strategic planning and day-to-day operations?

**Pilot Project Interest**

Six of nine investor interviewees stated unequivocally that their organizations would be interested in participating in a SIA pilot project. For the remaining three, participation is contingent on needing further information so that the project can be promoted within the organization, or on the project's alignment with existing measurement practices. Twelve operators stated that their organization would be interested in participating in a SIA pilot
project, three are unsure and one believes it is not relevant to their organization. Issues and doubt (in order of importance) are related to having the resources, needing more information, wondering if it would be a good fit for their organization, timing, and that there be a focus on sustainability.
Combined Interest Level Comparisons

- Framework Interest: 100%
- Collaboration Interest: 100%
- Transparency: 100%
- SIA Barriers: 80%
- Learning Interest: 80%
- Pilot Interest: 80%
Summary of Findings

Social purpose organizations can have multiple and layered definitions of organizational success, some of which are connected to multiple definitions of social enterprise success. In these situations, agreement on focused or single impact assessment objectives that would make an initial impact evaluation plan both credible and feasible may be difficult to achieve. However, this likely also depends on the organizational culture and its relationship to stakeholders. SE investors can also have multiple definitions of success, although they are often more focused when investment is also more specific.

Social investors recognize that engagement with SE operators over longer time periods and in addition to financial support are needed for investment success. Investor involvement is often investee-initiated and therefore potentially discontinuous and uncoordinated. Although individual investor involvement can be specific to the investment purpose, coordination among investors can help to ensure ongoing and relevant support. There is also a clear need for investors to track and measure the types and amounts of support they individually and collectively give SE if they are to assess and improve investment efficiency and effectiveness.

Social enterprises currently engage in both internal and external reporting and assessment - primarily for financial and business-related reasons. They want to assess and report their social impacts but lack the knowledge required and believe they also lack other relevant resources. Moreover, their primary complaint with respect to evaluation is with investor reporting.

Social investors mostly measure outputs. It is the exception that rigorous outcomes measurement is applied. SE operator organizations also often measure outputs. Some do assess outcomes, with variations in rigour. Outcomes measurement is more likely where it has been intentionally integrated in operations or where relevant data is available because of the nature of the organization’s transactions. At the enterprise level, the type and amount of data collected is a strongly correlated with the amount and type of assessment and reporting produced. Most measured are financial objectives, followed by other business-related measurement and then mission-related measurement. Exceptions to this pattern are more likely where evaluation is assisted by investors or where business and mission data coincide. In all cases, systematic data collection is part of the organizational culture.

It is likely that assessment and reporting protocols that are investor-coordinated, investor-initiated, and operator-focused would allow for more efficient use of existing resources and encourage a move toward improved evaluation quality. Both SE investors and operators are highly motivated to pursue social impact assessment for a range of important reasons. Both groups have high and multi-dimensional expectations and aspirations for SIA and they equally see SIA as a high priority for their organizations. For investors, SIA as a priority is tempered by a lack of knowledge in the larger organization and by other organizational priorities. Some social investor representatives want to raise the profile of social enterprise investment and SIA in their organizations, but paradoxically, they are perhaps unable to pursue this goal because the larger organization has lacks awareness or has other priorities.

Social investors generally have a theoretical understanding of SIA and limited practical experience. Although SE operators have much less knowledge about SIA, they nonetheless raise similar theoretical and practical questions and concerns. Both groups also have aspirations for and concerns about the social and political implications of SIA.
They also want a shared evaluation framework and are equally skeptical that it is possible to create a scaleable framework while maintaining individual flexibility and mitigating the risks of unfair comparisons among operators. Operators also fear that a shared framework entails investor-driven goals. For some, issues are the exclusion in SE discussions of environment sustainability and social sector areas beyond social services. The transparency required for successful collaboration is offered, except for potentially minor legal, confidentiality, or venture competition concerns. Also, investors identify moderately low barriers to participation in the development of a framework. Mostly they need more information about what is involved and the opportunity to promote the initiative within their organizations. Enterprise operators report a high level of barriers to participation, mostly because of a perceived lack of staff resources, other costs, and potential timing issues.

Both groups are highly motivated to learn more about SIA. Interest in participation in a pilot project is also high, but tempered again by a lack of information and need to promote within organizations.

**Discussion of Findings**

SE investors and operators want to learn more about SIA and to collaborate on the development of a shared evaluation framework. Of note is the high level of expectation for SIA coupled with limited knowledge, particularly for operators. This could be problematic where organizations are unaware that SIA can involve a significant degree of organizational engagement and that the field of social sector impact assessment is highly experimental - unproblematic methods and standards do not exist.

There may also be some misunderstanding that SIA measures impact on objectives and, in a sense, measures the results of activity management. It is ultimately one among other management tools and must be understood in order to be useful; quality assessment is related to organizational learning and will develop over time. The high level of interest in collaboration is encouraging, but, to be successful, requires that there be value for each and alignment with individual organizational goals, especially for investors.

Both investors and operators are experiencing accountability demands and the current general level of evaluation is inadequate. Progress toward quality evaluation will occur through collaboration, increased learning, and decreased barriers to SIA. Collaboration will decrease some barriers by sharing resources, metrics and methods, and encourage honest and accurate reporting. Lack of knowledge is the biggest barrier at the moment; hampered by confusion over terminology and methods.

To be successful, a social impact assessment project will have to increase understanding and collaboration, and decrease participation barriers. Simply turning attention to outcomes measurement will be a positive move, especially if a common framework can be adopted that will encourage collaboration and shared understanding. Success of any developed framework will depend on a broader stakeholder buy-in, which is more likely to occur if the development process is inclusive, balanced, and transparent. If evaluations that result from a shared SIA framework lack credibility, if reporting claims individual impacts that are collectively produced or otherwise produced, this lack of credibility will discredit the results and diminish potential impact assessment benefits.
Appendices

Highlights of Findings

- Organizations that operate social enterprises often have social missions that refer to two or three areas of focus and multiple definitions of organizational success.

- There is also a wide range in the amount and sophistication of organizational success measurement. The most common measurement is for financial viability. Other measures are sometimes for outputs, sometimes outcome-based. Measurement methodology rigor varies widely and can be anecdotal or non-existent, especially when corresponding definition of success is vague.

- Social investor organizations also define success in various ways. In some cases the definition is specific to its investee target audience and to its impact goals, but often based on reported achievements of individual investee projects or investor outputs. There is also a range of methods for measuring organizational success from that which reflects a theoretical social impact assessment standard to those based on project reports and outputs.

- Investors don’t consistently have a process to review funding applications with respect to social impact nor a process to assess impact against funding criteria.

- Most social investors provide grant-based funding. Consequently, they exit their investments by default.

- The purpose of social enterprises is usually to generate revenue for the parent organization and to fulfill at least one aspect of the organization’s social mission. The enterprise is successful first if it is financially viable and if it meets a social objective.

- Enterprise assessment and reporting is primarily regarding financial objectives, often regarding business operations, and less often for social mission-related reasons.

- Enterprise reporting or assessments are either internal, regarding financial and other performance objectives - or external - predominantly to investors.

- Reporting is less burdensome for larger organizations.

- Enterprises systematically collect data for business-related reasons and the majority also systematically collects data related to social outputs or impact.

- Enterprise operators are frustrated by not having methods and tools for reporting and assessing the scope and impact of their social activities. They are also frustration with the lack of market research or with organizational limitations such as staffing resources and skills, and data management.

- Enterprise operators complain that investor reporting is not synchronized with enterprise operations.

- From the social investor point of view, involvement with investee organizations is either limited by the short-term nature of the investor program or because close interaction must be initiated by the investee. On the other hand, other investors pursue or require close involvement with investees.

- It is generally acknowledged by all investors that support beyond dollars is necessary for investment success.
It is also generally acknowledged that a longer term of engagement with investees (minimally 3 years) is necessary for success.

It is impossible to calculate the amount of investment made by social investors in social enterprise because investment is often not categorized specifically as SE investment, or other means of support are not tracked and quantified. Support to SE given indirectly through intermediary organizations is not tracked as SE-specific investment.

Investors intend to increase their support to SE, both financial and non-financial support.

Social investment organizations do not consider SE investing is new to them.

Organizations that explicitly invest in social enterprise have the most rigorous reporting requirements. Otherwise, reporting is likely project specific, and may include financial statements.

SE operators have either little or some general knowledge of social impact assessments.

Social investors are more familiar and knowledgeable about social impact assessment than enterprise operators.

Investors are unclear about how to implement SIA theory.

Investors want shared and consistently used methods and metrics. They want to quantify outcomes; to prove, explain, and justify their investments. They also want to use social impact assessment to inform and influence investment strategies and goals, to create awareness of investment impacts, and to advocate for the work that is being done.

Investors want assessments to show the impact of investment on investee organizational asset development and their ability to attract resources, leadership, and mentors.

Investors want to know if goals being reached through social enterprise as a mechanism and whether the political goal of investing in social enterprise is to reduce social spending.

Most enterprise operators think that having a standardized social impact assessment framework that social enterprises and investors would use is a good idea. There is skepticism that a framework flexible enough to allow for individual interests and individual differences is possible.

Investors also support the idea of having a standardized social impact assessment framework, despite some skepticism that it can be done.

Investors want the same flexibility that SE operators ask for. Investors also want assessment to account for differences among enterprises.

Investors acknowledge that SIA will have to come out of the organizational goals of both enterprise operators and investors.

Investors and SE organizations are interested in collaborating to develop a standardized social impact assessment template.

Investors and SE operators are generally willing to share operational information.
Most SE organizations are interested in assessing social impact.

Social investors want to measure social impact, primarily to measure return on investment, but also the effectiveness of investment processes.

Most SE operators doubt that their organization currently has the staffing and other resource capacity to participate in a social impact assessment process.

Some investors believe their organizations currently have the staffing and other resource capacity to participate in a social impact assessment process. Others need more information, need to promote it within their organization, are uncertain because of organizational issues.

Organizations that operate social enterprises are very motivated to assess social impact, and therefore motivated to learn more about SIA.

Most investors are also generally interested in participating in an SIA pilot project but also want more information about what might be involved.

Social impact assessment is generally seen as a priority for social investment organizations.
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Interview Questions for Social Enterprise Operators

1. What is the social mission of your organization?
2. How does your organization define success?
3. Do you define levels (areas) of success? (i.e., individual, environmental, etc.)
4. What methods do you use to measure organizational success?
5. What is the purpose of your social enterprise?
6. What is the relationship between the enterprise purpose and organization mission?
7. How is the social enterprise success defined?
8. Do you currently do any kinds of enterprise assessment, including required reporting?
9. If no, why not?
10. If yes, what is the purpose of the current enterprise assessment(s) or reporting?
11. If yes, what resources do you currently use for assessments or reporting?
12. What are some challenges related to enterprise assessments or reporting? (i.e., challenges in assessing/reporting what you feel is important to assess/report)
13. What are some issues related to enterprise assessments or reporting? (i.e., issues with assessing/reporting what you feel is not important to assess/report and/or imposed assessments/reporting)
14. In order to measure enterprise outputs or impact, do you systematically collect data?
15. What aspects of social impact assessments are you familiar with?
16. What aspects are you unclear about?
17. Do you think that having a standardized social impact assessment template that social enterprises and investors would use is a good idea?
18. Is your organization interested in assessing social impact? Why/why not?
19. Would your organization be interested in collaborating with other organizations and investors to develop a standardized social impact assessment template?
20. Is your organization generally willing to share (financial and program) information about their operations?
21. Do you think your organization currently has the staffing and other resource capacity to participate in a social impact assessment process?
22. What additional resources might you require in order to be able to participate?
23. How much is social impact assessment a priority for your organization? Rating scale — 1 to 5
24. How interested would your organization be in learning more about SIA? Rating scale — 1 to 5
25. What topics or information would you like to learn more about?
26. Would your organization be interested in participating in a SIA pilot project?
Interview Questions for Funders

1. What is your organization's current level of investment in social enterprise?
2. Do you want to increase your level of investment in social enterprise?
3. Is social enterprise investing new to your organization?
4. How long has social enterprise investing been of interest to your organization?
5. What aspects of social impact assessments are you familiar with?
6. What aspects are you unclear about?
7. Is your organization interested in assessing social impact? Why/why not?
8. Do you think that having a standardized social impact assessment template that social enterprises and funders would use is a good idea?
9. Would your organization be interested in collaborating with other organizations and funders to develop a standardized social impact assessment template?
10. Is your organization generally willing to share information about its operations?
11. Do you think your organization currently has the staffing and other resource capacity to participate in a social impact assessment process?
12. How much is social impact assessment a priority for your organization? Rating scale — 1 to 5
13. How interested would your organization be in learning more about SIA? Rating scale — 1 to 5
14. What topics or information would you like to learn more about?
15. Would your organization be interested in participating in a SIA pilot project?
16. How does your organization define success?
17. What methods do you use to measure organizational (funding) success?
18. Do you have a process to review funding applications with respect to social impact?
19. Do you have a process to assess impact against funding criteria?
20. How do you identify an exit strategy with organizations that you fund?
21. How closely do you work with organizations that you fund?
22. Generally, what length of engagement with funded organizations do you find is needed in order to be effective?
23. What are your current reporting requirements?