transformative social innovation theory

Success Case Examples of Sustainable Social Innovation

Resourcing Strategies in the United States

By Michael B. Marks, Linda Hogan, and Paul M. Weaver

About TRANSIT:

TRANSIT is an international research project that develops a theory of Transformative Social Innovation that is useful to both research and practice. It is co-funded by the European Commission and runs for four years, from 2014 until 2017. The TRANSIT consortium consists of 12 partners across Europe and Latin America. For more information, please visit our website: http://www.transitsocialinnovation.eu/.

About the TRANSIT working papers series:

The TRANSIT working paper series aims to accelerate the public availability of research undertaken by TRANSIT researchers. It presents (intermediate) research results that in whole or part are suitable for submission to a scientific journal or book. It also considers those articles, which are appropriate for submission to (scientific) conferences, workshops or symposia. Our intention is to provide early access to TRANSIT research. All working papers can be found online: http://www.transitsocialinnovation.eu/working-papers.

About this TRANSIT working paper:

This Working Paper is an outcome of extensive collaborative research by the co-authors outside the remit of the TRANSIT project as Associates of Groundswell Research Associates, London, UK. The research reported here formed an input to the TRANSIT project workshop on Monitoring and Resourcing held February 16-17 2017 in Maastricht (NL).

Success Case Examples of Sustainable Social Innovation Resourcing Strategies in the United States

Authors: Michael B. Marks, Linda Hogan, and Paul M. Weaver

Abstract

We use a 'success-case' evaluation methodology (Brinkerhoff, 2003; Murphy, 2016), identifying a set of known social innovation organisations that are 'long term survivors' and exploring their resourcing strategies to identify core as well as divergent characteristics. The findings, drawn from US examples, highlight that even among a small selection of 'success cases' several different resourcing strategies and models can be discerned, but that core strategies based on 'diversified' approaches that provide for an element of autonomous funding are characteristics that recur across the success cases. We identify and describe several time bank/exchanges or related social/share economy initiatives that illustrate a range of approaches to resourcing. We describe and distinguish among the different resourcing models and resources that have been developed to enhance organizational sustainability. We also analyse the impact of this diversification of resourcing models on time exchange operations, including relationship to government entities and issues related to monitoring and evaluation. The paper concludes with suggestions for future study.

Keywords

Research Highlights

- The paper uses a success case methodology to identify and analyse the resourcing models of social innovation operations that have sustained over the long-term
- Several different resourcing strategies and models can be discerned even from a small set of success cases
- The choice of resourcing model has wide-ranging implications for social innovation operations that extend, inter alia, to internal and external governance relationships, organisational culture and methods for monitoring and evaluating
- Findings support related work on a typology of development pathways (Weaver and Marks, 2017; Weaver et al., 2017).

1. Introduction

This is one of a set of background papers on the theme of resourcing. One of the complementary papers to this (Weaver and Marks, 2017) reports insights obtained through the TRANSIT project about the cross-cutting theme of resourcing of social innovation initiatives that have transformative ambition or have transformative potential. The entry point for the present paper is a set of observations about social innovation organisations generally and about Time Banking as a social innovation specifically, using examples from the US to illustrate points. The general observation is that: "*an important aspect of having potential to be transformative is for the social innovation organisation to sustain and replicate or otherwise grow, but there are different ways of doing this.*" The specific observations are that Time Banking as a social innovation has survived now for several decades and has spread to different countries around the world, but that "its development is not as might have been expected". The total number of time banks in the UK for example has been stable at around 250-300 time banks since the early 2000s, but each year the composition of that 250-300 time banks is different. Annually many new time banks are formed, but equally an almost matching number of existing time banks fall away. Only a few time banks have managed to sustain over the middle- to long-terms. A similar pattern of time bank births and deaths has been noticed in the US (Weaver et al. 2016).

A phenomenon like this is worth exploring from the thematic perspective of resourcing. For a time bank or any other social innovation organisation to sustain it must at least secure the funds it needs to ensure its survival each year across the full lifetime of the organisation. What explains why some social innovation organisations manage to sustain over the long term while so many others, having often been established with great energy and enthusiasm, die within the first few years? The ones that sustain must be doing something right. But what is that 'something' and is that 'something' replicable or is it so specific to the characteristic of the particular organisation, the individuals running it, or the space-time context that there is nothing there to be learned for guiding others?

The present paper uses a 'success-case' evaluation methodology (Brinkerhoff, 2003; Murphy, 2016), which identifies a set of known social innovation organisations that are 'long term survivors' and explores their resourcing strategies to identify core as well as divergent characteristics. The findings highlight that even among a small selection of 'success cases' several different resourcing strategies and models can be discerned, but that core strategies based on 'diversified' approaches that provide for an element of autonomous funding are characteristics that recur across the success cases.

In what follows we identify several time bank/exchanges or related social/share economy initiatives that illustrate a range of approaches to resourcing. After a brief history and description of each, we will explore the diversification of resourcing models and resources that have been developed to enhance organizational sustainability; the impact of this diversification on time exchange operations; its relationship to government entities and issues related to monitoring and evaluation. The paper concludes with suggestions for future study.

2. History and Description of Identified Initiatives

Hour Exchange Portland (HEP) in Maine, launched in 1995, is one of the longest running neighbour to neighbour community time exchanges in the US and a historic leader in the time

bank movement (see: www.hourexchangeportland.org). HEP has over 500 active and diverse members that includes seniors, families, and refugees, many low income and/or experiencing disadvantage. Special programs include "access to the arts" in which members can attend arts and entertainment events for time credits; time credits used for mentorship, workshops and group marketing opportunities for artisans and crafters and "access to education" where time credits can be used to learn new skills, take classes or receive private tutoring. Health care has consistently remained the most utilized service in HEP, providing access to mental health services, therapies, nutrition counselling, childbirth support and transportation to medical appointments paid in time credits. In addition, HEP has focused efforts on supporting refugees and immigrant populations, thanks to an effective collaboration between HEP and Catholic Charities Refugee and Resettlement Program.

Partners in Care (PIC) is a time exchange community that offers services to Maryland seniors and individuals with disabilities in exchange for their donated time and talents. Its diverse 3200-person membership includes all age groups of seniors, their family members and friends, PIC staff and community members contributing to the time exchange and to the organization. Special programs include "Ride Partners" which provides door to door transportation to older adults with members using their own cars; "Repairs with Care" which provides handyman support, and "Member Care" which provides individualized support such as home visits, writing checks, light housekeeping, pet care and grocery shopping. Service exchanges and these specialized programs provide ways for improving the care of the current elderly and for securing their own elder care or care for relatives in the future, supplementing the nation's social security payments provided to seniors. PIC provides opportunities for everyone to contribute and benefit from elderly care regardless of income or job status. Membership in PIC is voluntary and not formally linked to national social security systems (see www.partnersincare.org).

Parent Support Network (PSN) of Rhode Island, which houses the Rhode Island Time Bank, provides parent peer support services to parents with children removed from their home, involved in the justice system on probation or placed in the Rhode Island Training School, a residential treatment provider for youth, under a contract with Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth and Families. Services include providing evidence based parent education, the "Nurturing Parenting Program"; preparation and attendance at child and/or parent treatment meetings, school meetings and special education planning meetings, and work with parents on improving their capacity to parent in order to be successfully reunified with their children. Volunteer peer support specialists, trained by PSN staff, work within PSN and other health and social service agencies in Rhode Island to provide support and services to parents and young people. PSN also has a youth group, "Youth Speaking Out" (YSO), for young people ages 13 to 17 years who have behavioural health challenges. YSO-involved youth learn leadership skills, work on community service activities and receive training in public speaking to prepare them to testify at local government forums and hearings in support of young people and their families. Volunteers and paid peer recovery specialists support these projects along with other program-involved youth and families and community members; many participate in the Rhode Island Time Bank, providing mutual aid to each other through reciprocal service exchanges (see www.psnri.org/)

The Open Table (OT) represents a second-level social and sharing economy initiative (note: OT does not operate a formal time bank) that seeks to build local economic opportunities and relationships by establishing cross-cultural and economic networks of individuals that pool and share resources. OT is an intervention model currently operating in 17 US states that utilizes the untapped capacity of congregation members to lift individuals out of poverty. OT trains up to 12 congregation volunteers ("table members") to serve as a support network for an individual/family ("brother/sister"). Table members work with brothers/sisters through a structured process over 8–12 months. They access friends, business contacts and fellow congregants to mobilize resources to support participant goals in employment, education, housing and personal skill development. Table team members make a one-year service commitment. The model is well defined with clear practices and processes. For example, early table meetings such as "Breaking the Bread" and "Developing the Life Story" are described in detail within OT's intervention manual, designed to facilitate brother/sister engagement and relationship-building with table members. Table members serve as life specialists, encouragers, and advocates for brothers/sisters, with each table member fulfilling a functional role in the process. The brother/sister is often referred by a government or community agency.

Keys to the success of the intervention are the reciprocal relationships that develop between table members and the brother/sister; the transformational changes that occur by table members through the volunteer experience including reconciling their own past struggles and views of people in poverty and a faith/shared purpose that develops between table members and brothers/sisters to improve the lives of people in poverty (VanDenBerg & Marks, 2017). Church leaders have identified Open Table as a "discipleship" process through which members create and serve in "missional" communities that are in direct and transformational relationship with the poor. To date, more than 80 churches with memberships as small as 40 and as large as 20,000 have launched Tables in more than 50 communities across 17 states. Populations served include families in poverty, young people in transition including those exiting the foster care system, veterans who are homeless, families of youth with complex behavioral challenges involved with multiple child serving systems and young people involved in sex-trafficking (see www.theopentable.org).

3. Resourcing for Sustainability

While the identified initiatives differ in terms of excluded groups targeted as members, history of origination, or role of the type bank in furthering the mission of the host organization, a common feature is the use of "non-rival" resources such as the unused labor of community members to support operations. All four initiatives incorporated "citizen-organizational" co-production where community members served as contributors and resources to further agency mission (Marks, 2009). In time-bank terminology, members earned hours benefitting the host organization in some capacity and in return, received benefits in services provided by other time bank members or from the time bank itself. The examples shared below were gleaned in discussions with leaders of the four initiatives or found on websites that describe the initiatives.

3.1 Social Businesses and Time Banks
Time bank members earn hours working on social businesses aligned with the mission of the time bank. The social businesses took on different forms with each representing a unique

collaboration. Three examples are identified below. Each afforded the time banks with reoccurring sources of revenue to support operations.

- *The Partners in Care (PIC) Boutique*: Time Bank members earn hours by staffing the Partners in Care (PIC) Boutique, a social business that provides close to $500K annually (about 35% of total agency revenue) in support of PIC programming for older adults in the community. In this example, the time bank owns the profit-making boutique. PIC trains paid staff and staff earning time bank hours that support the Boutique. Many of the staff are seniors that use their banked hours for transport or handyman repairs. The network around them combats social isolation as they stay engaged by working in the Boutique, receiving mental health and physical benefits, in addition to contributing to the financial health of PIC.

- *HEP and a Co-operative Business*: In this arrangement, the executive director of Hour Exchange Portland (HEP), Linda Hogan, and a member of HEP, Terry Daniels, launched a weatherproofing co-operative as a legally separate, tax paying business. A successful business model was formed, using the different status of two separate but collaborating organizations to leverage resources for both, providing mutual support and delivering positive social and environmental impact. The co-operative, a standard, fee-based business, was established to connect directly with and for HEP members. The co-op labor force came primarily from time bank members. This was done by the Cooperative inviting time bank members to earn hours working as "Green Teams" under the supervision of the Co-op Energy Technician. Members could then spend their hours for wanted services offered within HEP. The exchange of time currency between the time exchange members needing weatherization services and co-operative staff providing the services, reduced the operating costs of the co-operative, resulting in competitive customer fees. The Cooperative also attracted a host of in-kind and other resources through partnerships with other organizations. For example, necessary materials, tools and equipment needed for weatherization were donated by the State of Maine, Greater Portland United Way, the local community action agency, Habitat for Humanity and individuals. The co-op, however, was not eligible to secure government or philanthropic grants or individual donations. HEP, legally incorporated as a 501c3 (US-equivalent of a charity) was eligible for grant funding. HEP attracted grants from several foundations, banks and individuals, which supported a staff position to coordinate work between the co-operative and the time exchange. In turn, the time bank and its members reaped a number of benefits. The Weatherization Cooperative granted a portion of its revenue from its profits to support HEP. Interested time bank members received training in weatherizing their own homes, saving expenses. Two-time bank members gained employment in the weatherization field as a result of the training and experience they received as "green-teamers". One member was employed for a year before leaving the area, another became a manager in a private business.

- *HEP and Entrepreneurship:* An off-shoot of the aforementioned collaboration with the co-operative was an initiative by which interested members of the cooperative sought to establish their own business providing weatherization services. Here, the time bank helped to incubate, grow and sustain a small fledgling business. For example, HEP assisted these entrepreneurs by helping them start, expand and improve their businesses by charging "time" for support they received for mentoring, marketing, advertising, finding and securing facilities to house their business and other essential business incubation functions. HEP

members who were uninterested in actual weatherization but who wanted to support the business earned time providing transportation, lunches, or tools for the new entrepreneurs. These entrepreneurs also had access to time bank members as potential customers for their start-up businesses. In exchange, a portion of their business revenue was returned or "tithed" to the time bank in recognition of the assistance the time bank provided.

3.2 Partnerships with NGO's

In three of the four identified initiatives, the availability of time bank members to support the mission of the host organization and an identified target population in need made the time bank an attractive partner for other NGO's/non-profit organizations working with a similar target population. Subcontracting with the time bank for services occurred, contributing to financial diversification and sustainability. Examples include:

➤ HEP entered into a contract with local Catholic Charities to assist refugees and the immigrant population. Time exchange members assisted these populations in studying for their citizenship test or in learning English; new populations provided mutual aid to each other and exposed members to their food and culture. The subcontract was renewed annually for fifteen years.

➤ In Maryland, PIC received a subcontract with a local affordable senior living facility to offer community engagement opportunities and resource information to support elderly individuals.

➤ In Rhode Island, the PSN time exchange established a formal partnership with a substance abuse treatment provider to recruit families and young adult leaders in recovery to join the time bank and build a peer support network. Child care was identified as a need that prevented attendance at regular Narcotics Anonymous (NA) or Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) meetings. In response, three organizations, including the time bank, got together to offer on-site group respite care provided in part by Time Exchange members so that family members could attend meetings. Time Exchange hours were also used as in-kind contributions to help secure a small grant to further solidify the partnership project.

➤ Also in Rhode Island, PSN partnered with the Rhode Island Training School, a state youth correctional facility, to introduce young people to time banking while they were in the facility. Youth earned time bank hours by performing community service, such as sending supplies and letters to soldiers deployed overseas. Youth used their hours to secure special supplies from the store on the grounds of the facility. Family members of the young people were also allowed to "cash" in their hours earned to help meet the needs of the youth serving time. Most important, a number of youth stayed involved with the time bank post release, supporting successful re-entry.

➤ In Maine, the Maine Youth Opportunities Initiative (MYOI), part of a nationwide effort sponsored by the Jim Casey Foundation to ensure successful transitions for youth aging out of foster care, partnered with HEP to help provide youth with the financial, social, and vocational supports they need to succeed after discharge (Maine Youth Opportunities Initiative, 2006). Resources were secured to hire an AmeriCorps/VISTA volunteer to fashion programming within the time bank suitable to the needs of soon-to-be former foster youth.

3.3 "In-kind" Services Supporting the Time Bank and Target Populations

There are a number of examples within the four initiatives where members identified a service or organizational need and addressed the need "in-kind", through their own efforts and labor, in lieu of seeking outside resources. Examples include:

➢ In response to the needs of parents with special needs children, PSN established a Friday night group respite session, where families could drop off their children for a few hours to get a break. Time Exchange members staffed the Friday program.

➢ Within Open Table, some congregational leaders that led table meetings became part of the larger (nationwide) Open Table initiative, helping launch tables in other jurisdictions by introducing Open Table national leaders to important political stakeholders in state and local government. Also, former brothers/sisters became civically active, in congregations or within the Open Table initiative. Many decided to serve on tables as table members, assisting other people in poverty. Others provided input to improve the table intervention and used their voice to promote Open Table as a vehicle to improve relations between individuals across culturally disparate groups.

➢ In Partners in Care (PIC), members organically created "Warm Houses" which are monthly gatherings in homes to bring people together for socialization, friendship and connectivity. Also within PIC, two members, a retired professor and a social worker who wanted to stay active in their fields, were trained in the Stanford Chronic Disease Self-Management course (in partnership with the local Area Agency on Aging). In exchange for receiving this training, the instructors facilitated classes for the benefit of other PIC members.

3.4 Membership/Licensing Fees

Using membership and licensing fees, although sometimes used by Time Banks, is often discouraged because of the disadvantaged economic circumstances of its members and the perceived contradiction of asking members for money in an initiative that seeks to deviate philosophically from the use of money. Open Table, not a formal time bank, creatively uses this strategy to generate significant and sustainable sources of revenue in support of local capacity building activities.

Within Open Table, congregations are asked to pay a licensure fee to be trained and supported in implementing the intervention model. Fees are based on size of the congregation, ranging from $500 to $1000 annually. In addition, table member volunteers are asked to invest $120 to serve as a volunteer on the table. Some might find this surprising. However, congregational members often choose to make discipleship trips to other countries to assist and serve people in need and these trips can often cost upwards of US $2-4K. Instead of serving disadvantaged folks in other countries, congregants are asked to invest in an intervention that addresses poverty in their own back yard. Both of these requirements have stood the test of time with congregations and congregants willing to make these investments. Accommodations are made for those that cannot afford the fees, with either government departments paying the fees for the initial start-up period or more wealthy congregations supporting their less well-off brethren.

3.5 Private Foundations/Philanthropic Funding

All four initiatives currently receive or previously received private foundation/philanthropic funding to support the time bank. Support was secured from national, regional and local foundations. Funding was used to support programming as well as core operations. Some of the initiatives (e.g., Open Table, PSN) sought foundation/philanthropic funding on a limited and targeted basis, primarily to fill program gaps or to fund special initiatives. At the other extreme is PIC. PIC currently has 26 different philanthropic grants, mostly small, but nonetheless an essential component of their funding diversification strategy. Despite the breadth of awards, grants are small and come with no expectations of continuity. This is because PIC maintains a deliberate policy that the organization will not become dependent on these grants or any single funder. PIC policy deliberately assures a 'gap' of time between a grant awarded and submission of a new grant application. Further, PIC has a policy of maintaining the share of grant funding (philanthropic and statutory) in the overall mix of organizational income at or below 40 percent.

3.6 Government/Statutory Funding

All four initiatives receive direct statutory/government funding. However, as depicted in Table 1, government/statutory funding is one of a number of sources of financial support for the initiatives.

Table 1. Resources for Sustainability

Initiative	Membership or Licensure Fees	Income from Social Businesses including worker cooperatives	Partnerships with Other NGOs	Foundation, Philanthropic Funding	Direct Government/ Statutory Funding
Hour Exchange Portland (ME)		X	X	X	X
Partners in care (MD)		X	X	X	X
Parent support Network (RI)			X	X	X
The Open Table (AZ)	X			X	X

All but one of the initiatives consider government funding as supplemental to supporting their operation as opposed to resources that are absolutely essential for survival. Government funding often comes after the initiative has been established, to expand an existing service or meet a specifically identified community need. For example, in Maryland, PIC supplemented its Ride Partners program by purchasing two small wheelchair-accessible mobility buses to transport seniors with progressing physical limitations that precluded them from riding in member cars. Funding for the vans was provided by the State of Maryland Transit Administration through a competitive grant process. Within Open Table, a decision was made early on by its Board of Directors not to directly accept government funding. Open Table made this decision to ensure that its core principle of local determination and ownership of the model

are followed. This principle states: "*The expansion, scope, target populations served and larger system change efforts are locally determined by a community of business, non-profits, government and faith sectors and managed as part of a community vision of their system of change under a shared purpose. Faith communities are the implementers of Open Table at the sister/brother level and make final determinations at the model level*". Directly accepting government funding was viewed as having potential to compromise this core principle. An amendment to this policy was recently introduced, to allow for the acceptance of government funding to support core capacity-building functions such as training, start-up support and technical assistance to faith congregations (J. Katov (personal communication, July 12, 2016).

The exception to this targeted use of statutory funding occurs with the Rhode Island Parent Support Network (PSN). Due to its high need target population of youth and families and their often-formal involvement within the Social Services or Juvenile Justice systems, PSN sought out and won grants from a range of Federal, State and local sources to support the organization. Funding is provided by Rhode Island's Behavioral Health Developmental Disabilities, Children Youth and Families, Human Services, Education and Health Departments as well as the Federal Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). Government funding provides almost 100% of total organizational revenue. This diversification of government funding has contributed to the expansion and sustainability of PSN, supporting direct services to youth and families, coordination of volunteer services, group services for young people and advocacy and organizing work to improve policies for youth and families. Government funding also supports professional development opportunities for volunteer peer support staff. For example, through advocacy efforts, PSN became the lead partner agency to develop and implement the Statewide Certified Peer Recovery Specialist (CPRS) Program. With this initiative, interested volunteer peer support specialists can now gain a professional certification which qualifies them for positions in the formal economy, delivering peer recovery services in a range of health care venues across the state.

4. Summary and Implications

4.1 Integrity, Inertia, Insolvency, Innovativeness

Although insufficiently studied, there is evidence suggesting that diversification of funding beyond government/statutory sources has enabled the four initiatives to remain grass roots initiatives, responsive to community needs and interests. Government funding was used to supplement or expand upon services provided or leveraged by time bank members reciprocally exchanging with each other or supporting the host organization. By understanding and living in the community, members of the social innovation initiatives identified unmet needs and addressed these needs either through their own creative efforts or working to secure targeted government or philanthropic resources. A range of social businesses that provided a source of sustainable revenue for the organization were also created in this manner in response to member interests and needs. "Mission-creep", moving into program areas where funding is made available but is not aligned with core mission, was not evident. Diversification of business models and of resourcing/funding sources appears to be a countermeasure to deliver sustainability, spark innovativeness, and address organizational inertia while maintaining autonomy and integrity for time banks and the organizations supporting them.

Time banks as well as other social innovation initiatives and organizations are often aligned with policy goals of government and/or the mission of government organizations, such as preparing and supporting young people transitioning from the foster care system, helping prevent homelessness or caring for the elderly in their own homes. Government can support social innovation initiatives and organizations with direct funding, but more sensitive funding mechanisms and arrangements are needed if these are to avoid damaging the integrity of the social innovation organization or its capacity to innovate continuously. Further, if not a primary source of direct funding, government can support and help sustain social innovations in other ways. Using the studied initiatives as examples where applicable, roles for government include:

- Convening and leading meetings introducing the social innovation to other government entities, organizations or funders. For example, within Open Table, government representatives participated in meetings with interested congregations, exhibiting support for the innovation.

- Providing or assisting with "seed" and matching funding (co-funding) where needed: Social innovations may require up-front funding to launch a new initiative with an understanding that private resources will be made available as the start-up phase winds down. For example, PIC in Maryland has been approached by other jurisdictions to adapt its model for seniors in new locales. Start-up resources will be need if PIC decides to address these requests. Government agencies could take the lead in finding low cost loans or identifying government grants in support of this action.   Government leaders could also help identify private foundations that may have loan programs to assist in start-up and serve as a conduit to these foundations, introducing them to the social innovation host organization. Government endorsement of the project could become the impetus for foundation investment.

- Providing or arranging for targeted in-kind services: For example, Open Table is seeking training from government and government contractors in areas such as trauma informed care to best prepare table members to support young people leaving the foster care system.

- Agreeing to prepare and refer targeted participants: Some participants are referred to time banks directly by government workers. It is important that government workers be sufficiently oriented about the social innovation so that potential participants that could benefit are attracted to joining.

- Integrating/coordinating services with government staff: Similarly, time bank referrals may occur as a part of an "after-care" services plan; as a diversion from mandated government intervention or as a supplement to government delivered formal services. Understanding the respective roles of the volunteer and the government worker in supporting vulnerable and disadvantaged populations are important to successful integration/reintegration.

- Where multiple government funding sources are present, support blended funded arrangements to reduce, streamline and integrate accountability processes and government monitoring requirements.

- Funding the development of support programs to raise awareness of social innovation organizations to new funding sources and mechanisms and to make them 'investment ready'.

- Developing intermediation capacity between private social impact investors and social innovation organizations to help access new private funding streams.

4.3 Implications for Monitoring/Evaluation

The sustainability funding strategies employed by the time banks reviewed in this paper have implications for monitoring and evaluation priorities for time banks specifically and social implications generally. Issues of import include:

- ➢ Reporting and Accountability Requirements: One consequence of diversified funding is that each kind of funding source requires unique reporting and accountability requirements. For example, expanded government funding may result in submission of progress and outcome reporting that organizations sponsoring social innovation may not have the capacity to address or be of much relevance to social innovators. Social business reporting present legal requirements that organizations may not have experience with.

- ➢ Expanding Existing Information Sources: Social innovations, such as time banks, may have existing data systems that report on processes/activities associated with their innovation. For example, within time banking, software such as the US based Time and Talents systems, has been developed to track and report on time bank exchanges. These systems provide information on number of exchanges; parties involved in the exchange and kinds of services exchanged. The growing importance of outcome based tracking and diversified funding will necessitate a review of current data and financial systems to determine the extent to which these current systems provide an edifice to build on.

- ➢ Performance Management: As social innovations mature and diversify funding, they will need more advanced data systems and other feedback mechanisms that integrate performance data and financial systems, to be able to understand goals achieved and at what cost and identify strategies that are successfully implemented and those that face implementation challenges and how to correct them. These systems will be needed for internal management as well as external accountability, especially if innovations become part of performance based contracting initiatives such as Social Impact Bond funding arrangements.

- ➢ Rigorous Research: Social innovations such as time banks will increasingly be part of rigorous external research and evaluation studies in order to better compete for private, philanthropic and government funding. As social innovation initiatives become part of larger complex change initiatives the factors and directionality of change will not be readily apparent, necessitating unique research designs that capture this complexity (Fullbright-Anderson, Kubisch, & Connell, J., 1998; Schorr, 2016). Leaders and staff will need to understand the research projects they become involved with and organizations will need to build internal capacity in order to participate.

5. Suggestions for Further Study

More study is needed to better understand "how" financial sustainability with autonomy are achieved within social innovations. Of import are the type of leadership models used in successful social innovations that enables sustainability and autonomy gains to occur. Research questions worth exploring include: What kinds of internal leadership/governance models best drive success and sustainability of organizations and capacity for innovation? What key factors, such as member empowerment, connectivity to local communities and a culture of innovation, are impacted by these leadership models, moderating or mediating success and sustainability outcomes?

Early evidence suggests that leaders, including those of the four initiatives studied, practice forms of co-operative or collaborative leadership. "Co-operative" leadership is a commitment to shared leadership in which everyone is equal. It emphasizes people management; maintaining solid relationships, shared respect and a commitment to identifying and maintaining a shared vision. A co-operative leader maintains "controlled" energy in which she/he is in the background as a "quiet" leader (Centre for the Study of Co-ops, 2015). "Collaborative" leadership supports a process that includes everyone involved in addressing an important issue within an organization including key stakeholders outside of the organization. Collaborative leaders bring appropriate people together in constructive ways with good information, to create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the shared concerns of the organization or community. (Chrislip and Larson, 1994). Co-operative and collaborative leadership differ significantly from "charismatic" leadership, which often characterizes leadership within social innovations and can be associated with negative outcomes once the organization grows or the charismatic leader is no longer leading the initiative (Yukl, 1999). Better understanding the leadership models used within successful social innovations will provide insight into how these models can be replicated.

6. Conclusion

This paper uses a 'success-case' evaluation methodology to explore the resourcing strategies used by four social innovation organisations that are 'long term survivors'. Findings revealed several different resourcing strategies and models used by the organizations with a common core strategy involving the embracing of 'diversified' approaches providing for an element of continuous funding and reduction of risk should one or more funding sources no longer be available. Diversified funding approaches include income from a number of different social business models, sub-contracts with often larger NGO's working with similar target groups, philanthropic and private funders, and income from licensure or membership fees. Social businesses were especially noteworthy because of the contributions made by community member participants to the social business and the potential for long-term sustainable financial support provided to the host organization. Diversified funding enable organizations to maintain autonomy in setting strategic direction and keep to core mission. Government/statutory funding is included within diversified funding strategies but in all but one case, was purposively targeted and limited in order to maintain the positive elements of diversification noted above. Because of the potential impact that social innovations can have in helping to address pressing social problems, a new role for government in supporting social innovations is proposed that includes

raising the awareness of the social innovations, addressing obstacles to social innovation inclusion in partnership initiatives and introducing organizations to new potential funders.

Understanding how financial sustainability and organizational autonomy are achieved is essential to replicating these successes. Evidence suggests that co-operative and collaboration leadership models in contrast to charismatic leadership which is often represented within social innovations, are present in the success cases studied. Understanding the key models and features of leadership utilized in social innovations that are financially sustainable will help guide replication efforts.

Acknowledgements

References

Brinkerhoff, R. (2003). *The success case method: Find out quickly what's working and what's not.* San Francisco: Berret-Koehler.

Centre for the Study of Co-ops (2015, November*). Notes from the Co-operative Innovation Project.* University of Saskatchewan, Canada. coop.innovation@usask.ca coopinnovation.wordpress.com.

Chrislip, D., & Larson, C. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Fullbright-Anderson, K., Kubisch, A., & Connell, J. (1998). (Eds). *New approaches to evaluating community initiatives: Theory, measurement and analysis (Vol. 2),* New York: The Aspen Institute.

Maine Youth Opportunities Initiative (Fall, 2006). *Progress Report-May 2006-October-2006.* University of Southern Maine/Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service: Portland, Me.

Marks, M.B. (2009). *A theoretical and empirical investigation of co-production interventions for involuntary youth in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Dissertation Abstracts International* (UMI No. 3345766).

Murphy, N.F. (2016). "Nine guiding principles to help youth overcome homelessness: A principles-focused developmental evaluation". In M. Queen-Patton, K. McKegg & N. Wehipeihana (Eds.), *Developmental evaluation exemplars* (pp. 63-83). New York: The Guilford Press.

Schorr, L.B. (2016). "Reconsidering evidence: What it means and how we use it". In *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, January 8, 2016. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/reconsidering_evidence_what_it_means_and_how_we_use_it.

VanDenBerg, J. & Marks, M.B. (2017). *Bridging divides through transformational*

relationships: The Open Table faith-based poverty reduction intervention. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Weaver, P, Kemp, R., Strasser, T., Backhaus,, J., Pel, B., & Avelino, F. (September 2016). *Transformative change for an inclusive society: What might social innovations contribute?* Paper presented at SPRU Conference.

Weaver, P. M. and Marks, M (2017), "Social Innovation Resourcing Strategies and Transformation Pathways: A First-cut Typology", TRANSIT working paper #11, July 2017.

Weaver, P.M., Marks, M.B., Scropke, C. and Hogan, L. (in press) Social innovations and enterprises as integrative resources, strategies, and models: In: Ramos, B., Miesing, P. and Briar-Lawson, K. [Eds.] *Social and Economic Development in Transitioning and Market-Based Economies: Social Enterprises, Entrepreneurship, and Microenterprise as Integrating Institutions*: State University of New York Press, Albany.

Yukl, G. (1999). "An evaluation of conceptual weakness in transformational and charismatic leadership theories". *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.