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KEY MESSAGES

1. Social innovation is a maturing field that is advancing in its development of theory and empirical research, as well as its application to practice. Social innovation is about “doing differently” to advance social goals and is often, though not always, driven by social entrepreneurs who apply entrepreneurial processes to challenge the status quo.

2. In the last decade there has been a shift away from “great man” theories of social entrepreneurship to more sophisticated analyses of the dynamics and complex systems of social innovation, including macro (society), meso (organizational) and micro (individual) level factors which enable or constrain the development of a social innovation ecosystem. There are rich literatures developing and opportunities for further exploration.

3. Additionally, more in-depth explorations of issues relevant to the practice of social innovation are underway, including research on implementation issues, financing options, organizational processes, and structures. While progress has been made in defining “practice areas” in an effort to move beyond the anecdotal, the focus tends to be on important issues such as poverty alleviation and the environment, rather than issues related to peace, human rights, or diversity and inclusion. Moreover, while some governments have social innovation strategies in place, implementation is uneven. Further examination of “practice areas” may provide the key to understanding systems change.

4. Interest in social innovation is global with governments around the world engaging with non-governmental organizations and the private sector to tackle complex and intransigent problems. Our study found social innovation case studies from almost every continent and discussions of government policies and supports in Canada, the US, Jamaica, Brazil, the UK, France, Belarus, Finland, Sweden, Latvia, Uganda, South Africa, India, Bangladesh, China, New Zealand, and more. There is a recognition that social innovation can begin in any sector, but partnerships between governments, the non-profit sector, the private sector and educational institutions have been found to be important to ensure they scale.

5. While attempts to measure and assess impacts still fall short, there are efforts to develop evaluation frameworks, including social return on investment (SROI), and to apply them to social innovation initiatives. There is a significant opportunity for further research in this area.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction
This report provides an overview of the literature on social innovation, social entrepreneurship and social finance over the last decade in order to better understand their potential to address Canada’s “grand challenges” and “wicked” problems. Understanding social innovation (SI) concepts, stakeholders and processes is critical to enabling Canada to thrive in an interconnected, and evolving global landscape. In the past decade, academics across disciplines and innovators across sectors have been advancing SI research to build individual, organizational, and institutional resilience in the face of increasing “global shocks,” or intractable and transnational social challenges such as those relating to inequality, discrimination and identity and arising from globalization.

Social innovation remains an emerging interdisciplinary field of scholarship and practice with exciting potential to help frame and reframe collaborative approaches to driving social change. Our synthesis is a comprehensive review of the state of SI in Canada, with a deep dive focus into SI partnerships, collaborations, and their impacts. This project compiles and reviews Canadian and international academic and industry literature to address identified KSG themes and future challenge areas through our project’s six themes:

- Definitions of SI
- Models of SI
- Networks and Collaboration
- Measuring Impact
- Canadian Social Innovation Ecosystem
- Emerging Trends

Specifically, this synthesis used standardized search terms to identify and analyze almost 500 academic books and articles as well as “grey” literature produced over the past decade in order to understand themes, emerging issues, knowledge gaps and opportunities for further work on the project themes.

Definitions of SI
Social innovation (SI) is “a new combination of practices in areas of social action, with the goal of better coping with needs and problems than is possible by use of existing practices” (Howaldt et al., 2014). Research examining SI models has identified multiple definitions and approaches related to SI, ranging from discipline-specific models to those focusing on SI processes or outputs. There is now more than 20 years of debate about what is and what is not SI and what types of initiatives should and should not be included in its definition. There are disciplinary and conceptual differences that stem from understandings of what innovation is broadly, and what social innovation is particularly. In general, while there is some agreement that social innovation requires large-scale change, it is often difficult to identify initiatives that have such potential in the early stages. There is widespread agreement that “social” can be broadly interpreted (many use the UN sustainability goals as a framework). However, the debate about definitions and boundaries of the field persist with some investing significant time and energy into establishing criteria for inclusion and exclusion. Others argue that current definitions of innovation (and entrepreneurship) are sufficiently robust to cover activities which are primarily motivated by economic or social goals. Moreover, they argue that dichotomizing for-profit and social goals may be counterproductive, as objectives exist on a spectrum. Regardless of the definitions, and boundaries, it is important to distinguish between “innovation” and “invention.” We subscribe to the notion that innovation is about “doing differently” and “advancing social goals,” rather than creating a new product or process for the first time.

Models of SI, Both Theoretical and in Practice
Alongside increased government interest in SI, academic and policy research on social innovation has grown considerably over the last decade, delving more deeply into organizational and societal dynamics which promote or constrain innovation. In contrast to the earlier literature in this domain, which focused on individual “social entrepreneurs” without much attention to process or context, there has been
increased attention paid to understanding complex systems change and the inter-related forces at the micro (individual), meso (organization or practice) and macro (societal) levels.

While some insist that social innovation must, by definition, drive system-level change, others see it as potentially targeting sub-system level change. In our conceptualization, social innovation is not necessarily, but can be situated at the level of societal sub-systems or “practice fields.” A new social practice within a local initiative can be considered a social innovation, regardless of whether or not it produces change on the level of a societal system; it is often difficult to predict what will scale or disrupt. In this way, social innovation and system innovation might overlap, but not necessarily. New models attempting to further distinguish social innovations have emerged, differentiating three levels: social innovation, system innovation, and game changers that drive societal transformation. This is in part because of the difficulty of anticipating what new ideas, processes, services or technologies will end up being transformative.

Networks and Collaborations Within and Across Sectors
Cross-sectoral partnerships are fundamental to driving social innovation. While much has been written to try to shift the process of SI from individual endeavours to collective partnerships and, increasingly, to cross-sectoral partnerships, gaps remain in identifying successful strategies to foster meaningful collaborations and/or measure their effects. There is general understanding that government, non-profits and the private sector can all be the source of social innovation, often working together to fill gaps and address new opportunities to advance social goods (broadly defined). Some scholars critique SI as a form of government downloading that extends neoliberalism and increases performance demands on already-strained nonprofit actors; this critique spills into practice. Many individuals or groups who would fit the definition of “social entrepreneurs” who are using processes which would fit the definition of “social entrepreneurship” do not self-identify in this way making it difficult to define and study the sector.

While some reject “corporatization” of public service and nonprofits, there is also increasing recognition in some domains that adopting the tools of business is not synonymous with adopting the ideology of business. Much emphasis has remained on using entrepreneurial approaches to generate new sources of funding and revenue streams, or establishing new social enterprises which bridge nonprofit goals with private sector processes, but these are not social innovation.

Measuring Impact
Debates emerge around best practices for measuring the impact of SI initiatives, including what to measure and how to measure. Social return on investment (SROI) approaches remain most popular and have gained ground among practitioners and certain funders, although some researchers caution against the foregrounding of economic indicators and propose alternative development-based evaluation strategies. To date, impact evaluations are lacking – most using single or multiple case studies to assess specific dimensions. Other stakeholders are developing new toolkits, which combine multiple methods. Meanwhile, systems mapping exercises, while conceptually strong, have not yet addressed the fundamental problems associated with measuring impact, particularly at the systems level.

The Canadian Social Innovation Ecosystem
Work on modelling and assessing innovation ecosystems has been in progress for decades with large-scale models used to compare countries on a global innovation index (Grandi, 2016) or on a global entrepreneurship scale focused on both entrepreneurial intent and framework conditions conducive to entrepreneurship (Herrington & Kew, 2017). One of the largest exemplars has added social entrepreneurship to its model and assessment tool,
examining a range of stakeholders and factors (e.g., government and government policy, funders and financing, and infrastructure), and how they interact. Applying these frameworks to the Canadian system suggests that the elements of an innovation ecosystem are there – government policies, emerging social financing, post-secondary institutions with ideas, talent and facilities, incubators, private sector partners and funders, entrepreneurial-minded non-governmental organizations and social enterprises. However, there remains considerable fragmentation, as well as gaps between theory and practice, or strategy and implementation, which appear to mean that the whole is less than the sum of the parts.

**Emerging Trends**

Trends over the past decade include deepening of the research on levels of theory and practice, growing rigor and diversity in questions and research methods, more focus on evaluation and impact assessment, and more focus on the combined efforts of multiple actors working in “practice fields.” Social finance and new applications of technology are also dominating the recent literature and there is considerable emphasis on using institutional theory and “competing logics” to frame the tension between social and economic goals. Some social goals appear to have more traction with social innovation researchers than others – for example, work on the environment, poverty alleviation and health – while others, such as peacebuilding or human rights, equity and inclusion, appear not to have garnered as much attention. Diversity and inclusion is an emerging cross-cutting theme in social innovation studies, but mostly from the perspective of the engagement of diverse groups as actors, rather than harnessing social innovation to achieve equity and inclusion goals.

**Implications**

Our review of recent literature on social innovation, both in Canada and internationally, reveals a rich, diverse and growing body of research that addresses theoretical, empirical and practical aspects of social innovation. There is considerable opportunity to explore the implications of the research for new policies, processes and practices to advance social innovation generally, as well as its application to achieve specific social goals.

Social innovation has the potential to harness new resources and ideas to help advance Canada’s goals, including novel approaches to poverty alleviation, advancing human rights, building diversity and inclusion, bridging the skills gap to create a highly skilled workforce, improving accessible and affordable health care, promoting sustainability, and reducing crime and violence. However, it requires leaders who are prepared to challenge the status quo, bureaucracies that are willing to embrace entrepreneurial approaches and to erode silos, funders who are able to take a systems view, NGOs that are ready to collaborate with business and adopt accountability frameworks and post-secondary institutions that are willing to engage with new roles as community builders and engines of social innovation. There has been much conceptualizing, conversing and convening around social innovation at a high level. We have also seen exciting new initiatives in a variety of domains. Still, the whole remains less than the sum of the parts. We need coordinated and evidence-informed frameworks, policies and platforms to advance action in specific practice fields and/or communities. We also need better ways of assessing the social return on investments (SROI), learning from successes and failures and sharing promising practices.
INTRODUCTION

Facing “wicked” social and ecological challenges and the need to do more with less (Marr & Creelman, 2011; Head & Alford, 2015), individuals and institutions are turning to social innovation (SI) as a means of building resiliency to safeguard societal institutions and provide new ways of tackling entrenched social issues (Moore & Westley, 2011; Nicholls & Murdock, 2011). Understanding SI on a macro level – its models, usages, and evaluation metrics – as well as lessons learned from individual SI initiatives in practice, provides critical insight into how Canada will meet global challenges given the increased competition for scarce resources.

Understanding SI concepts, stakeholders and processes is critical to enabling Canada to thrive in an interconnected world and evolving global landscape. Our synthesis of Canada’s evolving SI landscape expands upon, refreshes, and refocuses research previously funded by SSHRC and the Government of Ontario, and previously presented in industry publications. We conducted a comprehensive review of the state of SI in Canada, by taking a “deep dive” into SI partnerships, collaborations, and their impacts. The present study builds on and contributes to the theoretical, empirical and practical work in the emerging field of social innovation in several, specific ways. Specifically, it compiles and reviews Canadian and international academic and applied (industry) literature to address identified KSG themes and future challenge areas through our project’s six themes:

- Definitions of SI
- Models of SI
- Networks and Collaboration
- Measuring Impact
- Canadian Social Innovation Ecosystem
- Emerging Trends

Fundamentally, it is important to differentiate, in the social innovation space, between new ideas or claims; invention (the creation of a new process, technology or service); implementation (the adoption of new processes, technologies or services) and diffusion of those new ideas or services to drive large-scale change. As noted by Howaldt et al. (2014), the “decisive criterion in a social invention becoming a social innovation is its institutionalization or its transformation into a social fact in most cases through planned and coordinated social action” (p. 153). A “big tent” approach to social innovation recognizes that the source of change may come from many players and that the focus is on outcomes. While research is important to provide frameworks for action, social innovation is about “doing” differently.
Definitions

Social Innovation
It is clear that the study of social innovation is an emergent academic field that is creating new knowledge (Dacin et al., 2011) but remains incredibly fragmented, as scholars continue to frame similar phenomena in different ways in part depending on their disciplinary background (Benford & Snow, 2000). Commonly referenced definitions draw from Schumpeter’s classic theory on innovation and add the adjective “social.” “Social innovations are new combinations that produce social change” (Swedberg, 2009, p. 102). “Specifically, we define social innovations as new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships and collaborations. In other words, they are innovations that are both good for society and enhance society’s capacity to act” (Murray et al., 2010, p.3). The focus on societal need, or “social good,” as Mumford (2002) described it, then raises issues about how to define social good, particularly given the tradeoffs and unintended consequences which can pit one good against another (e.g., animal rights versus Indigenous rights). Most often they are framed by the UN Millennial Goals (now Sustainability Goals) (Cukier et al., 2011).

Research on SI is broadly divided into two areas of focus: processes and outcomes (Nicholls & Murdock, 2011). Within these areas, definitions range, often in accordance with disciplinary origins (Baregheh et al., 2009), for example from a nod to SI products, services or models (Hubert, 2010), or an emphasis on an initiative’s social outputs (Bugg-Levine & Emerson, 2011; Howaldt et al., 2014). Others take a wide breadth to situate SI as a flexible, adaptable framework usable across sectors (Porter & Kramer, 2011; Salim Saji & Ellingstad, 2016).

A number of reports attempt to compile and analyze different definitions of SI (Martin & Osberg, 2007). Choi and Majumdar (2015) noted that some researchers view social innovation as a very broad concept, whereas others consider only very specific phenomena as social innovations. They found three major uses of the term “social innovation”: i) a process of social change; ii) a description of innovations that are intangible and manifest only on the level of social practice; iii) a description of innovations that explicitly aim to create social value and induce positive social change (Choi & Majumdar, 2015). They also suggested that different disciplines address these uses differently (Choi & Majumdar, 2015). Definitions within SI research are highly varied, likely because SI is a relatively new and highly fragmented field of scholarly inquiry, but some argue that while the goals are different, classic definitions of innovation, entrepreneurship and entrepreneur serve us well regardless of whether their goals are for profit or social good (Dacin et al., 2011). There are those whose definitions of social innovation are grounded in critique maintaining that it is a rhetorical reframing of downloading government responsibilities onto the third or nonprofit sector. Overall, scholarship on SI has articulated the differences between SI and social entrepreneurship (Mair & Marti, 2006), and includes research spanning individual and meso levels of analysis (Dufays & Huybrechts, 2014; Gagnon et al., 2013).

Social Entrepreneurship
Social innovation is the overall process for driving change towards social goals whereas social entrepreneurs are the individuals often leading the efforts (Bornstein, 2004). In the early phases of academic work in this domain, considerable effort was devoted to these issues and to sorting through myriad definitions (Brock et al., 2008). Debates continue about whether social entrepreneurship needs to be distinguished from entrepreneurship writ large; for example, Tina Dacin (2011) argued, there is no need for a separate definition particularly because the demarcation between for-profit and social goals is often not absolute but on a continuum. She follows Drucker (2014 [1985]) who wrote that “the
entrepreneur always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity” regardless of whether that opportunity is commercial or social in nature (p. 42).

Early work on social entrepreneurs focused very much on individuals in part because entrepreneurs like Bill Drayton, founder of Ashoka (a non-profit organization dedicated to finding and supporting social entrepreneurs worldwide), and Jeff Skoll (founder of eBay), creator of The Skoll Foundation, described social entrepreneurship as supported by individuals. Charles Wankel (2007) points out that the Skoll Foundation promotes social entrepreneurs as “motivated by altruism and a profound desire to promote the growth of equitable civil societies” alongside a desire to “pioneer innovative, effective, sustainable approaches to meet the needs of the marginalized, the disadvantaged and the disenfranchised. Social entrepreneurs are the wellspring of a better future” (Wankel, 2007, p. 26). This concept of social entrepreneurship was first popularized by recent publications including David Bornstein’s (2007) book How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas. Bornstein (2007) cites Drayton, who understands a social entrepreneur as “a path breaker with a powerful new idea, who combines visionary and real-world problem solving creativity, who has a strong ethical fiber, and who is ‘totally possessed’ by his or her vision for change” (p. 37). This is echoed in later additional publications that define social entrepreneurship (Curtis, 2014; Dey & Steyaert, 2016; Saveska, 2014). During this period much of the work was on telling stories of mostly “great men” and deciding who was and was not a social entrepreneur. Some noted that this was in large part rhetorical reframing of phenomena previously studied as part of social movement or change theory (Cukier et al., 2011). For example, Muhammad Yunus, known for defining social finance as the founder of Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, was a preeminent social entrepreneur according to some (Mair & Marti, 2006; Roper & Cheney, 2008) and a leader of a social movement in earlier work (Kar, Pascual, & Chickering, 1999). John Woolman and Anthony Benezet, who led the Quakers to emancipate the slaves, were social entrepreneurs according to Bornstein (2004) and social activists according to D’Anjou and Van Male (1988). Women’s rights activist Susan B. Anthony was a social entrepreneur according to Yohn (2006) but a social activist according to Ryan (1992). Roger Martin was preoccupied with these issues of definition, explaining for example that while Martin Luther King was a great man he could not be considered a social entrepreneur because his work did not include generating profit (Martin & Osberg, 2007).

Dey (2003) notes that the rhetoric of social entrepreneurship based on anecdotal illustrations of “heroic deeds” overlooks the importance of process and context. As the academic field evolved, the focus shifted from the person – the entrepreneur – to the process – entrepreneurship. “Social entrepreneurship is an innovative, social-value-creating activity that can occur within or across the non-profit, businesses or government sector” (Austin, Stevenson & Wei-Skillern, 2003). It includes new processes that emerge to alleviate social problems and galvanize social transformation (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004). More recently, scholars have highlighted the need for more focus on the process of social “entrepreneuring” rather than the individual “entrepreneurs” (Hartigan, 2006).

As with social innovation, the issue of social entrepreneurship is not without its critics. Eikenberry and Kluver (2004) for example, critique “neoliberal marketization” and this discourse, which is ongoing within academia, remains a barrier to implementation. Sengupta (2015) critiques scholarship on social innovation for its Eurocentrism. Sengupta (2015) argues that the literature assumes “a Eurocentric characteristic of economic growth, while social innovation from Indigenous communities is implicitly assumed to have an imitative character. In other words, the useful social innovation is assumed to be of the Eurocentric variety, while simultaneously existing Indigenous knowledge is presumed to be of significantly lesser value or at best an imitation of Eurocentric knowledge and innovation” (p. 146).

Some, including Austin (2006), Dees & Anderson (2006), Light (2006), and Duke University’s Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (2008) argue for a broader approach to social
entrepreneurship that embraces a wide range of activities and organizations that can occur within or across the non-profit, business, and public sectors. These thinkers argue that the “social innovation school” and “the social enterprise school” are complementary but distinct.

Models of Social Innovation: Linking Theory and Practice
While there are significant conceptual and ideological divides and it is not without controversy, academics, governments, foundations, and some community organizations have embraced the potential of social innovation to address complex, intransigent social problems – ranging from climate change to poverty – in times of constrained resources. One of the principal challenges in the field is balancing the expectations of groundbreaking systemic social innovations (or radical innovations, as per the common language of innovation theory and research) (Giddens 1984), and the nameless yet still important social innovations that respond to everyday social demands (or incremental innovations) (Norman & Verganti, 2014). Some scholars, such as Westley (2008), maintain that social innovation by definition must involve societal transformation but others are less insistent on this point. Research on the process dimension of social innovations concerns the creation and structuring of institutions as well as behavioural change (Hoffmann-Riem, 2008), and the empowerment of actors through the “social innovation cycle” (Murray et al., 2010).

The Importance of Multi-level Analysis
To develop an integrated theoretical foundation for understanding social innovation, a theoretical framework is needed that considers social innovation from a micro-, meso- and macro-level perspective. Writing about entrepreneurship broadly speaking, Jennings (1994) distinguishes between research focused on the individual characteristics of entrepreneurs, the organizational/corporate entrepreneurship processes, and broad macroeconomic theory. These levels of analysis may be differentiated as micro (focusing on the individual), meso (focusing on the processes or the organization), or macro (focusing on the broader social/economic/political context).

“A theoretical framework is needed that consider social innovation from a micro-, meso- and macro-level perspective”

Micro-level analysis
Micro-level research currently dominates the larger field of entrepreneurship research (Wright et al., 2001), and mostly focuses on the individual from a psychological and sociological perspective (Arenius & Minniti, 2005; Collins et al., 1964; Lumpkin & Dees, 1996; McClelland, 1961). Such studies tend to focus on the laudable characteristics of individual entrepreneurs through assessments of demographic and psychological factors. Many of these studies draw on psychology to explore the motives of social entrepreneurship, highlighting the importance of emotions (Arend, 2013; Miller et al., 2012; Ruskin et al., 2016) or “moral intensity” (B.R. Smith et al., 2016). Other studies of “social entrepreneurs” focus on an individual entrepreneur’s traits and leadership capacity (Drayton, 2002; Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000). Most of the definitions, as Brock et al. (2008) point out, focus on the character of the individual social entrepreneur. For example, many case studies focus on the individual social entrepreneur as a lone “heroic” actor or “social entrepreneur” solely responsible for identifying opportunities and creating solutions (Light, 2006). In these studies, as noted earlier, social entrepreneurs are characterized as change agents and/or visionaries with entrepreneurial attitudes and competencies (Orhei & Vinke, 2015). For example, the personal nature of leadership in socially entrepreneurial ventures “may be more than beneficial; it may be necessary” (Roper & Cheney, 2005, p.101). Mumford (2002) notes that “social innovation involves certain cognitive operations and expertise not always seen in other forms of creative thought. Leaders must, for example, identify social restrictions on potential solutions and analyze the downstream consequences of social implementation as they generate, revise and develop new ideas” (p. 262). The characteristics attributed to
or discussed in relation to social entrepreneurs, including public sector entrepreneurs, parallel those associated with business entrepreneurs, including leadership, charisma, risk perception/tolerance, motivation, personal attributes, family issues and marginalization (Dees, 1998; Lewis et al., 1980). Some research focuses on the motivation of the individual social entrepreneurs. For example, Yujuico (2008) suggests that social entrepreneurs are not only motivated by altruism but also outrage and resentment at injustice. The role of identity is also studied (Dey & Lehner, 2017). Others have focused on particular areas of social entrepreneurship; for example, Wagner (2012) looks at the “sustainability orientation” and Wood (2012) examines strategies linked to personality types for engaging individuals. Similarly, Yitshaki & Kropp (2016a; 2016b) examined entrepreneurial passion and other dimensions of identity. This focus on “the new heroes,” celebrated as such by Ashoka founder Bill Drayton, is grounded in theories which ascribe significant agency to individuals in effecting change. Although many books and articles focus on telling the stories (e.g., Jain 2012; Maak & Stoettner, 2012; Rees, 2011) of these individuals, some organizations and researchers critique this focus on the individual. Some organizations deem it elitist (e.g., CASE, 2008), while others emphasize instead the forces shaping an individual's entrepreneurial intent (Ayob et al., 2013; Sastre-Castillo et al., 2015; Schmidt et al., 2015) and still others suggest that the stereotypes may not reflect reality (Bacq et al., 2016).

Meso-level analysis
For decades there has been research focused on entrepreneurial organizational processes as ways to foster innovation (Burgelman, 1983, 1984; Cooper & Bruno, 1975; Dollinger, 1984; Jack & Anderson, 2002; Quinn & Cameron, 1983; Timmons & Bygrave, 1986; Zahra 1993). These approaches have been elaborated upon in the last 10 years. Those influenced by the “Practice Turn” in the field of social sciences (Reckwitz, 2003; Schatzki et al., 2001), note that practice is an important component of a theory of social innovation (Howaldt & Schwarz, 2010). Social innovations encompass new practices (e.g., concepts, policy instruments, new forms of cooperation and organization), methods, processes and regulations that are developed and/or adopted by citizens, customers, and politicians in order to meet social demands and to resolve societal challenges in a better way than do existing practices. SI-DRIVE defined these terms differently and distinguished “social practices” from related “projects/initiatives”: proposing that a “practice field” is a general type or “summary” of projects and expresses general characteristics common to different projects while a “project/initiative” is a single and concrete implementation of a solution to respond to social demands, societal challenges or systemic change (e.g., Muhammed Yunus's Grameen Bank, various car-sharing projects, or activities at the regional-local level).

Building on earlier work, which identified factors common among entrepreneurial enterprises such as focusing on opportunities, not resources (Dees, 1998; Guclu, Dees, & Anderson, 2002), researchers have added empirical weight to claims. They have added a resource-based view of social entrepreneurship and examined the processes they employ, including building partnerships, financial capital, innovativeness, organizational structure, and knowledge transferability (Meyskens et al., 2010). New research grapples in more detail with how social entrepreneurs obtain resources to support their work. One of the dominant themes over the last 10 years has been on the question of resources. Some, for example, have explored microfinance in detail (Ault, 2016; Ibn Boamah & Alam, 2016). Others have examined new models such as crowdfunding (Assenova et al., 2016; Bradley & Luong, 2014; Brown et al., 2017; Dularans, 2014; Dushnitsky et al., 2016; Greenberg & Mollick, 2017; Lehner, 2013); and others have undertaken case studies of how organizations ensure financial sustainability (Stecker, 2014) and the relationship between financial and social capital (Lehner, 2014). Jindřichovská (2012) examines the role of new philanthropic models including “Big Society” in the UK and Collective Impact in the US.

Previous research on social entrepreneurship included analyses of organizational forms, goals and structure (Curtis & Zurcher, 1974), governance and management issues (González, 2005), stages in the social entrepreneurship process (Thompson, Alvy, & Lees, 2000), and new approaches...
to public sector management (Leadbeater, 1997) and work in these areas has continued. In fact, several scholars insist that more focus is needed on the organizational level (Agafonow, 2014). Mair et al. (2012), propose a typology of four models which leverage social, economic, human or political capital and add to the theory of organizational design. Some examine specific forms. For instance, Bobade and Khamkar (2017) examine hybrid organizations combining social missions with financial goals in India in order to develop public services. Warnecke and Houndonougbo (2016) consider hybrids as a model for addressing energy shortages and suggest that the social enterprise accelerator is a model for scaling up social business. Wilson and Post (2013) explore social businesses and how they should be designed. Case studies continue to grapple with questions of “what works.” Dufour et al. (2014) examined the conditions that facilitated and impeded the implementation of an initiative focused on vulnerable children. Additionally, new research examines success and failure factors and proposes models to scale up to challenge broader institutional barriers (Westley et al., 2014).

Over the last decade, research on the processes for achieving social goals has focused a great deal on the competing logics of social entrepreneurship and how organizations mediate between the social and the business values and practices. Drawing on institutional theory, Costanzo et al. (2014) explore the dynamics of dual-mission management in social enterprises suggesting that the approaches vary along a continuum, from compartmentalization to integration. Researchers have explored these tensions and the often-competing discourses that emerge in social innovation (Tomlinson & Schwabenland, 2010). For example, Miller et al. (2012) focused on the competing value systems in international development. NGOs such as Save the Children are driven by a moral mission to “rewrite the future for children” and use utopian statements to imagine a new world. In contrast, the funders of these initiatives are often driven by rationality and linear planning techniques, even more so with the renewed focus on new public management, value for money, and social entrepreneurship within public discourses in general. This business-focused model is based on the assumption that social transformation can be planned and implemented from the top down (Mowles et al., 2008).

W.K. Smith et al. (2013) explore the diverse type of tensions that arise between the social mission and business venture suggesting the matter of competing logics is an important area for further research. In contrast, Sundaramurthy et al. (2013) found that Indian social enterprises successfully blended their social and business goals. Di Zhang and Swanson (2013), similarly, suggested that a majority of non-profits are into social entrepreneurship to ensure financial viability by balancing competing logics. Dees (2012) also considers the issue of competing logics; from a cultural studies perspective, he suggests that success requires integration of the values of business and charity. Similarly, Cegarra-Navarro et al. (2016) explore how competing logics align with outcomes. Masseti (2012) focuses on the “duality” of social enterprise and proposes an ethical framework to help guide choice and navigate competing logics. B.R. Smith et al. (2012) focus on skills development to manage the tensions. Williams and Nadin (2012) found, in an interview of 70 informal entrepreneurs, that entrepreneurs operated on a spectrum from purely commercial to purely social, with most combining the objectives. Focusing on the process of entrepreneurship, a number of researchers identify common factors. For example, Zahra et al. (2009) proposes a typology of entrepreneurs’ search processes to outline how they discover opportunities for new ventures and what kinds of competing ethical concerns they consider.

**Macro-level analysis**

Research at this level focuses on entrepreneurship as part of economic and social development, informed often by models introduced by Schumpeter (1934). At the macro level, there are studies that attempt to understand the broad structural, cultural and economic forces that shape social entrepreneurship, such as neoliberalism. Some of these forces drive government policies, such as tax policies, regulatory frameworks, and education that in turn promote entrepreneurship. On these same grounds, as noted earlier, some critique the very notion of social entrepreneurship, maintaining that it is merely a
positive reframing of government downloading or new public management that minimizes the reality that the voluntary sector is increasingly forced to “innovate” as a response to increased performance demands and decreasing resources (Marr & Creelman, 2011). Among the work focused on the macro level is The Global Entrepreneurship Model, which considers the economic context and complementary activity among different groups (Herrington & Kew, 2017). GEM recently added social entrepreneurship to its analytical framework (Pathak & Muralidharan, 2016) and its data are now being used in order to assess the context for social entrepreneurship (Lepoutre et al., 2013). Some economists are assessing the impact of social entrepreneurship at the macro level (Bahmani et al., 2012).

Paralleling the entrepreneurship literature, we see similar macro efforts to conceptualize social entrepreneurship within the broader environment. For example, Weerawardena & Mort (2006) consider its iterative relationship with social development, including peace and human rights. They discuss the stages of development of a “civil society” as well as interactions among movements and groups, while considering other contextual factors such as politics, communications and social infrastructures. Pathak & Muralidharan (2016), for instance, reviewed almost 60,000 survey responses from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor and suggest that societal collectivism increases the likelihood of social entrepreneurship. Finally, there are also studies that consider the interaction among these levels. Nichols and Murdock (2011) examined the impact of waves of technological change to understand the macro environment. Often, attention here is focused on the impact of national or cultural contexts (Tukamushaba et al., 2011) or the significance of policy (Brouard et al., 2012; Dodd et al., 2011; Grimm et al., 2013; Hawkins, 2016; Head & Alford, 2015; Jing & Gong, 2012; Pot et al., 2012; Stecker, 2016; Tarnawska & Ćwiklicki, 2012; Terjesen et al., 2016).

One of the thorniest problems in this rich area of research is the relationship between small-scale initiatives and models of broader systems change.

Interactions between these levels

It is also important to examine the degree and nature of interaction between these levels. As Mair & Marti (2006) suggest, social entrepreneurship needs to be understood as a process resulting from “the continuous interaction between social entrepreneurs and the context within which they and their activities are embedded” in turn linking the individual, the process, and the context (p. 40). With their emphasis on process dynamics, ecological approaches in social science and humanities help to clarify and explain the complex interactions within and between the micro-, meso- and macro-level processes. For Moore & Westley (2011), the connectedness between levels has become a prominent object of study. Crevoisier and Jeannerat (2009) developed the concept of multi-level knowledge dynamics in innovation. Bacq and Janssen (2011) explore four levels – the individual, the process, the organizational, and the environmental. Battilana & D’Aunno (2009) consider the relationship between actors and their institutional environments. The establishment of a global community for social innovation research that links to and builds on existing networks to further advance the new scientific field of social innovation. One of the thorniest problems in this rich area of research is the relationship between small-scale initiatives and models of broader systems change; there is scant literature that has been able to bridge which is often a theory-versus-practice divide.
Some scholars (e.g., Westley, 2013) conceptualize social innovation as being “systemic” by definition. In our conceptualization, social innovation is not necessarily but can be situated at the level of societal sub-systems. A new social practice within a local initiative can be considered a social innovation, regardless of whether or not it coincides with change on the level of a societal system. Social innovation and system innovation might overlap, but not necessarily. The same applies to the distinction between gamechangers, narratives of change and societal transformation. Avelino et al.’s (2014) model (see Figure 1) attempts to distinguish social innovations at three levels: social innovation, system innovation and game changers that drive societal transformation in part because of the difficulty of anticipating what new ideas, processes, services or technologies will end up being transformative. According to the working delineations presented above, a societal transformation can be perceived as a gamechanger, but not every gamechanger necessarily refers/leads to societal transformation. A gamechanger can also refer to a short-term trend or hype (possibly having a long-lasting transformative impact, but not necessarily). It also tries to grapple with the relationship between the people (actors) initiatives and networks that interact to create change.

**Networks and Collaborations**

Phillips et al. (2008) emphasize that “most difficult and important social problems can’t be understood, let alone solved, without involving the non-profit, public, and private sectors.” Cross-sectoral cooperation and the significance of networks as success factors for social innovation are key elements of an integrated theory of innovation (Rammert, 2010) that links social, economic and technological aspects of innovation. As noted above social innovation can be initiated by government, the private sector, or an NGO; however, it occurs most often at the intersection of the three sectors. Models involving multiple actors, organizations, sectors and networks are of increasing importance to academics and practitioners alike because they address social problems and provide new ways of conceiving of
Collaborations in Canada now span sectors and include public-private SI partnerships (Klievink & Janssen, 2014). In practice, these collaborations often manifest in incubators or co-working spaces designed to facilitate idea pollination and knowledge sharing (e.g., Hub Ottawa). This idea of “open social innovation” centers on collectivity and collective action to counter the traditional individual “hero” narrative of social entrepreneurship (Chesbrough & Di Minin, 2014; Chalmers, 2012). Further, approaches to analyzing SI collaborations are also increasingly inter-disciplinary.

Proponents of cross-sectoral SI partnerships suggest initiatives involving individuals, institutions, and governments may broaden impact, create enduring social value and advance an initiative’s sustainability (Huybrechts, 2012). Others suggest collaborations across sectors have high potential to address systemic change since they span cognitive, resource and sectoral boundaries (Le Ber & Branzei, 2010a; Vurro et al., 2010), allow diverse constituent logics to be brought to the table (Vurro et al., 2010), and increase access to funding (Shier & Handy, 2015). Ultimately, a better understanding of SI as it relates to cross-sectoral partnerships will support the life cycle of collaborations, processes, and knowledge sharing across sectors, and expand the capacity of Canadians to use SI to challenge intractable problems and compete on the global stage (e.g., Westley, 2008).

To succeed, social actors and stakeholders must often bring together competing perspectives and discursive practices on social issues (Teasdale, 2011). Recent investigations have revealed gaps between the governmental, entrepreneurial, and academic discourses on social innovation (Ilie & During, 2012). Often there are important differences in ideology and language between and within groups of stakeholders – service providers, community groups, companies, policymakers, academics – that differ in form and perspective but seek to advance the same social goals (Gagnon et al., 2013; Selsky & Parker, 2005; Vurro et al., 2010). For example, an organization may consider social innovation from a business and values-based perspective in an attempt to gain legitimacy in and achieve success for the for-profit and non-profit realms (Dacin et al., 2011; Dees, 2008; Castells, 2012). Networks are identified and analyzed as driving mechanisms of transformative social change and social innovation; through networks, socio-technical transitions co-evolve (Powell & Grodal, 2005). Social innovation is rooted in the concurrent engagement of networks of civil society, in social responsibility and social entrepreneurship. The way these networks communicate and share knowledge and practice are increasingly based on new information and communication technologies (Castells, 2012). Networks are a neglected but fundamental driver and conduit of individual and group behaviour, and thereby an essential component of change and innovation in economic and social systems (Ormerod, 2012). Much of the literature over the last decade has focused on how social enterprises build and use partnerships and networks to accomplish their goals. Calton et al. (2013), for example, suggest the importance of decentered stakeholder networks, global action networks and a focus on “faces and places” to understand the dynamics of social innovation projects. Arenas et al. (2013) discuss the collaborations between firms and civil society and the role of conflict and collaboration through four case studies. Edwards-Schacchter et al. (2012) discuss the dimensions of collaboration between public, private and the third sector and ways that “living labs” – wherein the university and the community partner to solve local or regional problems – can facilitate collaboration. Similarly, Shier and Handy (2016) propose four analytic categories for cross-sector partnerships – the structure of engagement, alignment among the partners, clarity of outcomes and interpersonal dynamics. Further, Harrison et al. (2012) as well as Westlund and Gawell (2012) explore case studies of particular partnerships and alliances. Meyskens and Carsrud (2011) stress the particular importance of partnerships for social ventures in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Social challenges and learning about processes of change (Moore & Westley, 2011; Nicholls et al., 2013; Phillips, 2008). The multi-stakeholder approach ranges from “collective social entrepreneurship” (Montgomery et al., 2012) to the development of networks to incubate multiple SI initiatives within an ecosystem (Rammert, 2010; Sakarya et al., 2012).
2012). While discursive differences reflect multiple perspectives and can be important for unpacking "wicked" problems (a term coined by Rittel & Webber (1973)), they may also indicate a lack of information sharing that can in turn impede progress.

**Measuring the Impact of Social Innovation**

What to measure? How to measure?

As noted above, research has shifted from identifying key SI stakeholders to untangling the thorny issue of SI impact. Strategies to increase impact range from scaling (Westley & Antadze, 2010) to merging SI with design thinking (Brown & Wyatt, 2010) to increasing an initiative’s resilience by embedding SI within networks (Moore & Westley, 2011).

In the earlier phases, much of the literature challenged the evidence of the impact of social innovation and entrepreneurship. Some argued that much of the work on impacts relied on anecdotal evidence (Cukier et al., 2011) and some suggested that not everything that has value can be measured (Marée & Mertens, 2012). Recently, there have been efforts to address this drawing on new models for measuring social impact and social return on investment. On the whole, however, there remains a gap in current research with regard to awareness of the impact of social innovations. Clark and Brennan (2012, 2016) reviewed current practices and propose a model for measuring long-term impact of social innovations that encompasses the externalities of social value. Moody et al. (2015) note that, increasingly, philanthropists are looking for social return on investment measures and explores the associated implementation challenges.

However, understanding SI’s impact is more complex. Scales exist to measure related concepts such as CSR, including the Global Reporting Initiative and Global Compact (Matten & Moon, 2008), but SI’s impact can be more diffuse and thus difficult to measure (OECD, 2010; Salim Saji & Ellingstad, 2016). Debates emerge around best practices for measuring an initiative’s impact. While the SROI approach remains most popular (Antadze & Westley, 2012; Arvidson et al., 2013), some stress the limits of engaging such economic-based indicators (Kaplan & Grossman, 2010; Marée & Mertens, 2012), while some propose alternative developmental evaluation strategies (Antadze & Westley, 2012). Still others urge finding middle ground to avoid the “financial-social return gap” (Bugg-Levine et al., 2012) or related but distinct evaluation forms such as validation (Carraher et al., 2016). Arvidson et al. (2013) examine the challenges related to implementing social return on investment in the UK and characterize the tension between the value of volunteering and the quantification of benefits. Some scholars engage cases studies of evaluations while others focus on conceptual frameworks (Kroeger & Weber, 2015) or tools (Jackson & Jackson, 2014). Urban (2015) examined 165 social enterprises in South Africa in an effort to develop reliable and valid tools for measuring impact. K’nife et al. (2014) propose adapting Kushner’s Model of “An Open System Model of Organizational Effectiveness” to develop a methodology and instrument.

Debates and tensions exist between the perceived need for large-scale radical systemic innovations to the small, “incremental” SIs of the everyday (Avelino et al., 2014; Norman & Verganti, 2014; Vester, 2007). It also notes the need for empirical evidence. “Current success stories, while powerful and moving, lack hard data or proven measures of success, scalability, and sustainability. Otherwise, this could look like a field with lots of little ventures that are admirable but almost never come close to the espoused goal of widespread, lasting impact, and that never match up to the problems they are designed to solve” (CASE, 2008, 8). Specifically, there is a lack of robust data directly linking social entrepreneurship with social improvements. Indeed, some authors have even suggested that the proliferation of new organizations may actually create competition and inefficiency within an already highly fragmented social sector. Finally, in addition to documenting “success,” it has been noted that there is also a need to understand failures (CASE, 2008; Dees & Anderson, 2006; Nicholls, 2006).

**Mapping Social Innovation: An Effort to Advance Best Practices**

Theory development and empirical research build on existing innovation research, including studies on technological and business innovation while focusing on mapping the overall system and projects within it,
exploring impacts and factors for replication. Currently, there are a multitude of projects across Canada, which are included under the social innovation umbrella but have limited connection to a systems perspective limiting the ability to scale up these initiatives or to move them into a broader system and creating transformation through the linking of opportunities and resources across scales (Moore & Westley 2011). Our review of the literature still shows limited large-scale empirical studies of social innovation. The largest studies tend to be surveys focused on social entrepreneurial intent or self-reported processes and priorities (Herrington & Kew, 2017) with no reference to impact. As a result, the research is difficult to reconcile with efforts to understand larger systems and change processes.

In terms of specific goals, the most frequent area of focus was poverty alleviation, and the second more frequent was education. While environmental issues are very prominent as an area of focus in practices, there was little literature specifically on social innovation and the environment. Literature on health care innovation is widespread but is seldom defined as “social innovation.” Very limited research was found addressing human rights, equity or diversity as a goal for social innovation although there were discussions of gender and social innovation noting that women are better represented among social entrepreneurs than for-profit entrepreneurs.

Case Studies
The most common method used in the empirical literature remains the case study with some comparative case studies but generally a small number. The most recent large-scale mapping exercise was conducted as part of the EU-funded project SI-DRIVE, which was called “Social Innovation: Driving Force of Social Change” and which mapped 1005 social innovation initiatives belonging to seven policy fields across the world in an effort to better understand social innovation actors, processes and system change. The SI-DRIVE Atlas shows the wide range of initiatives and policy areas in play around the world but also underscores the lack of consistency in terms of definitions or impact analysis (Howaldt et al., 2014). Of the 1005 cases considered by the SI-DRIVE network (which were effectively crowdsourced), the greatest number were categorized as primarily addressing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Transport &amp; Mobility</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Health &amp; Social</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Poverty Alleviation &amp; Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Other Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably absent from the cases were issues related to peacekeeping or human rights or equity and diversity, although gender and diversity did emerge as cross-cutting themes. Although SI-DRIVE was one of the largest and most ambitious mapping projects undertaken to date, it still fell short in terms of applying a rigorous definition of social innovation or robust measures of impact. Consequently, we would argue, it shed light on the richness and diversity of new approaches to solving stubborn social problems, but did not help address the issue of “what works?” particularly in driving system-level change. SI-DRIVE did, however, develop and advance the notion of “Practice Fields,” which the network described as a general type of different initiatives within a thematic area at meso-level for analyzing the complex process of interaction of different innovation activities in contrast with initiatives which are single and concrete implementations of a solution to respond to a particular need, challenge, or issue. A practice field expresses general characteristics common to different projects such as the shared features and experiences of micro-lending programs. By
quantifying the similarities between social innovation initiatives around the world through clustering, we can draw broader inferences about how social innovation can be better applied to solve the challenges of our generation.

Within the total sample of the more than 500 social innovation, entrepreneurship and innovation articles identified for our study, case studies were used to illustrate some of the themes. Poverty alleviation and economic development (e.g. Calton et al., 2013; Murray et al., 2010; Saefarian et al., 2015), environment (Griskevicius et al., 2012; Le Ber & Branzei, 2010b) and education projects were identified but the work was almost silent on issues related to peacebuilding although there was one article on policing and crime prevention (K’nife et al., 2013). Similarly, the literature is mostly silent on projects addressing social goals related to human rights or social inclusion although these issues sometimes intersect with the primary theme under discussion (Alzugaray et al., 2012; DeClercq & Honig, 2011, Greenberg et al., 2016; Karam & Jamal, 2013). Previous studies have found similar trends (Cukier et al., 2011). There was virtually no attention given to migration or refugees except in so far as the poverty alleviation projects address these inadvertently. This likely reflects political concerns that limit the possibility of framing these issues through an innovation/entrepreneurship lens. Though knowledge was created and expanded through the mapping of these social innovation models and sharing insights and best practices across the network, the diversity and unevenness of these cases is consistent with the overall pattern in the literatures and underscores the need for further research.

Innovation Indices
Innovation indices provide an empirical analysis of the factors believed to shape innovation, and determine a country’s capacity for and success in innovation. Innovation indices enable economic development practitioners a practical measure of the degree of innovation capacity, which they can use to examine the capacity of their economy to support innovative companies relative to other regions. Prominent innovation indices include the Global Innovation Index (GII), which measures the innovation performance of 127 countries and economies across 81 indicators. The GII is guided by five input pillars (institutions, human capital and research, infrastructure, market sophistication and business sophistication) and two output pillars (knowledge/technology outputs and creative outputs).

Canada ranks 18th on the Global Innovation Index and is recognized for its strong infrastructure (7th).

Other indices measure capacity across the regions within countries. The Innovation Index developed by the University of Indiana, for instance, compares regions across the US based on four components: human capital, economic dynamics, productivity and employment, and economic well-being. In Spain, RESINDEX measures social innovation.

Notably, the Nippon Foundation and *The Economist’s* Intelligence Unit created an index for G20 and OECD nations, which measures the capacity for social innovation in particular. In measuring a country’s potential and capacity for social innovation, it emphasizes four pillars: institutional and policy framework (weighted at 44.44%), availability of financing (22.22%), level of entrepreneurialism (15%), and depth of civil society networks (18.33%). On this index, Canada is ranked 3rd overall and is recognized as the best financing environment.

Innovation indices offer an important supplement to case studies. While case studies offer relevant examples of key stakeholders in social innovation initiatives and what these initiatives look like in practice, an innovation index can provide the hard data to create evidence-based development strategies. Further, innovation indices are attentive to and measure the potential for social innovation to address persistent social challenges such as poverty alleviation.

To be successful with a national strategy, innovation leaders and key stakeholders face a number of
challenges: designing a process of collaboration, defining the practical boundaries of the region, establishing a governance process, defining a common vision, creating shared regional initiatives, making collective investment decisions, agreeing on clear outcomes and metrics, and determining how to evaluate and adjust. One challenge, however, of such indices is that they struggle to measure cross-border applications of social innovation, wherein innovation funds in one country support the creation of social innovation in another; the 2017 GII takes an important step forward in this regard by measuring for the first time international comparisons.

Innovation indices enable practitioners to explore innovation in the region by guiding questions and conversations about the region’s performance. The data help to focus discussions among regional stakeholders. Leaders who have access to critical information are able to make better decisions more quickly.

**Social Innovation Ecosystems**

Recent research on SI has identified theoretical frameworks as well as models in practice from around the world. The debate about investments in innovation compared to outcomes persists across countries and applies to social as well as for-profit innovation. In general, ecosystems are fragmented and under development as governments move to translate strategy into action. International organizations including the European Commission, the United Nations, the OECD, and the World Bank are beginning to embed social innovation language into their strategies.

Some countries have also established national Social Innovation strategies but often there remain gaps between policy, implementation and impact. The United Kingdom’s experience in promoting social innovation through a coherent set of government, financial and other supports is perhaps aided by its government structure and compact geography. More than a decade ago, the Social Investment Task Force (UK), an initiative of the UK Social Investment Forum, was given broad scope to advance its agenda, including:

- A Community Investment Tax Credit to encourage private investment in community development
- Community Development Venture Funds, a matched funding partnership between government and the venture capital industry, entrepreneurs, institutional investors, and banks;
- Disclosure of individual bank’s lending activities in under-invested communities
- Greater latitude and encouragement for charitable trusts and foundations to invest in community development initiatives, even where these include a significant for-profit element
- Support for community development financial institutions, including community development banks, community loan funds, micro-loan funds and community development venture funds (Goldberg et al., 2009).

It recommended, in 2008, the development of a social investment bank that would transform the third sector’s service delivery role and change the role that charities and social enterprises can play in the delivery of public services by: developing financial instruments and structures to raise capital for the third sector; acting as a wholesale intermediary between suppliers and users of capital in the sector; providing advice and support to market participants, including research and other materials to attract additional finance into the sector; working with governments, foundations, and service providers to develop programs of investment in specific markets where gaps are identified (Goldberg et al., 2009). Since then the evaluations of the initiative have been mixed (Trenholm & Ferlie, 2013) although there is little doubt that the UK has embraced and implemented massive innovations (for good or for ill) and is globally recognized for its work in transforming the delivery of public services ranging from the National Health Service to the Universities with a heavy focus on outcome measurement and pay for performance.

**Canadian Social Innovation Ecosystem**

Canada’s social innovation ecosystem is currently in a state of growth. A burgeoning literature on social innovation and social enterprise in Canada has started to onomize and catalogue the myriad social innovations and enterprises across the country.
McMurtry et al. (2015a; 2015b) focus on social enterprises, and offer a review of the context, models and institutions in Canada. They situate social enterprises in terms of their relevant legal and policy frameworks, place within university and research institutions, existence as networks or spaces (McMurtry et al., 2015a; 2015b).

There is a prominent focus on case studies as a way to apply different frameworks for thinking through social innovation such as social transition framework (Moore et al. 2012) and developmental impact testing (Geobey et al., 2012). Moore et al. (2012) examine how one organization in Vancouver navigated relationships with intermediaries brought in to support and implement social innovations. Brouard et al. (2015) employ case studies to outline exemplary models of and context for social enterprise in Ontario in particular. Hamdouch and Gaffari (2017) draw on Quebec to suggest that when strong innovation networks are embedded in the social context, social innovation supports the flourishing of small and medium-sized towns.

Canadian scholarship on social innovation and entrepreneurship has focused on the presence and impact of social innovation in Quebec and Indigenous communities. Scholars who focus on social innovation, social enterprise and social economy in Quebec make reference to the long-established “Quebec model” of social innovation (Klein et al., 2010) which sometimes overlaps terminologically with its social economy (Bouchard 2012a; Bouchard et al., 2015). Social innovation in Quebec saw renewal in the 1980s as a response to the province’s economic and state crisis (Bouchard et al., 2015). The combination of increased unemployment, greater demand for social protection and services, and a decrease in public finances engendered the conditions for de-institutionalized local solutions carried out by new social actors. Klein et al. (2010) find that this model has transformed, through the deconstruction of traditional arrangements, the institutional and social environment in Quebec.

There is also a growing literature on social innovation/entrepreneurship among Indigenous peoples and communities in Canada. Sengupta et al. (2015) draw on case studies to present an overview of the current state of Indigenous social enterprise in Canada; Lionais’s (2015) case study highlights the diversity of social enterprise across Atlantic Canada. Sengupta et al. (2015) call for more attention to culture and gender in analyses of social enterprises and social innovation. Sometimes, these endeavours are recognized as cooperatives even though they have social and economic development are integral to their objectives. Sengupta (2015) notes that these are part of the “new cooperative” movement that challenge neoliberal values and function as “agents of decolonization, self-determination, and revitalization of communal Indigenous ways of being” (p. 122). Similarly, Curry et al. (2016) conducted surveys and interviews with Indigenous entrepreneurship as well as analysis of Statistics Canada data; their results suggest that the development corporations that flourish in Indigenous communities in Canada are a form of social entrepreneurship because they embrace social and community goals and are making a tangible difference in Indigenous communities and lives.

Canadian Government

There is increasing interest in social innovation from government players at all levels. In addition, there is evidence of emerging “practice fields” within governments but this is nascent and under-development. SI is a key strategic focus for the federal government of Canada. In 2016, the government announced the launch of a Steering Group on Social Innovation and Social Finance Strategy and the Honourable Jean-Yves Duclos, Minister of Families, Children and Social Development stated that “social innovation and social finance will help the government to achieve social outcomes in a smarter and more efficient manner, while also improving the capacity of the social sector to achieve their objectives.” Many individual departments in the federal government have embraced social innovation as a strategy but few have implemented change. Granting agencies such as SSHRC have supported work in this area for more than a decade laying the foundation for much of what has occurred over the last ten years (Goldberg et al., 2009).
However, in spite of these programs, SI and SE are not embedded across government policies or in funding in obvious practice fields (health, environment, public safety, etc.). Where departments and agencies at the provincial and federal levels are talking about the importance of innovation, these discussions remain exploratory and have yet to be implemented in policy. As a result, the connection between strategies and implementation are still unclear. In 2015, the Government of Canada launched discussions and invited feedback on an “innovation agenda,” which indicates that “clear outcomes and targets will be used to measure progress toward the vision of positioning Canada as a global leader in promoting research, accelerating business growth, and propelling entrepreneurs from the commercialization and start-up stages to international success.” Prominent Canadian scholars on innovation, including Richard Hawkins and David Wolfe, critique the agenda for being too technology-centric, pointing out that innovation occurs in fields beyond STEM (Siebarth, 2016). At present, while social innovation or social entrepreneurship policies and program are uneven and fragmented at the federal or provincial level, a number of government-sponsored reports on social innovation have been published (Elson et al., 2016; Harji et al., 2012; McCooleman et al., 2015; McIsaac & Moody, 2013; Volynets et al., 2015). Notably, some provinces such as BC and Newfoundland and Labrador have a dedicated social innovation agenda that is intended to mobilize policy (Elson, 2016; Elson et al., 2016). Key thinkers on public policy in Canada stress that progress on social innovation and social entrepreneurship is attributable to the degree of political investment seen thus far, and that continued political engagement will enhance traction for social innovation and entrepreneurship funding and opportunity across Canada (Lindqvist & Vakil, 2016; Pue & Breznitz, 2017).

At the provincial level, there are a range of initiatives in place. Launched in 2014, Alberta’s Social Innovation Endowment (SIE) is the largest in Canada, investing $1B to support the creation and dissemination of new knowledge, the design and testing of innovations that can have a social impact, and social finance initiatives. Ontario’s Office of Social Innovation as well as initiatives undertaken by the Ontario Centres of Excellence are also present, but these have not yet been mainstreamed for maximum impact across ministries in the policy areas most likely to be affected.

While supports are growing, initiatives remain fragmented across multiple policy venues and institutions. Without centralized or coordinated support for social innovation, initiatives not yet embedded at a systems level or in public innovation programs become highly dependent on individual champions.

Post-Secondary Institutions
One might argue that in Canada, post-secondary institutions have gone further in defining their roles in the innovation ecosystem than in many European countries with recent focus on experiential and work integrated learning as well as entrepreneurship more broadly, Canada has been the site of a growing number of social innovation initiatives in which the University is an active player rather than simply a developer of ideas. Some argue, for example, that SSHRC’s Community University Research Alliance (CURA) program was designed to advance and the initiatives led by Ashoka and The McConnell Foundation. In contrast, European discussions of the role of the university see them more as generators of ideas and expertise than leading the “doing” of social innovation (Cunha & Benneworth, 2013). The idea of the University as a central player in innovation ecosystems in not new but is generally understood more in the context of technological innovation for economic development and the language of social innovation ecosystems and post-secondary institution’s roles remains relatively new. Research is emerging on the university’s role in collaborations (Hewitt et al., 2013) and some are focusing on the engagement of universities in social innovation arguing that it aligns best when institutions already have a social mission (Păunescu et al., 2013). Others are focusing on examining the curriculum, competencies and pedagogy associated with social innovation and entrepreneurship (Driver, 2012; Kickul et al., 2012a, 2012b, Miller et al., 2012; Pache & Chowdury, 2012; Prieto et al. 2012; Smith & Woodworth, 2012; Worsham, 2012).
Non-Governmental Organizations
The uptake of social innovation and social entrepreneurship as a framework is mixed among Canadian NGOs. Many, for example, are engaged in social entrepreneurship, if one applies the definition, but they do not necessarily define themselves in that way. While there are numerous surveys that claim that Canadian NGOs are increasingly using social entrepreneurship processes (Trico, 2016) and many are being required to by their funders (McIsaac et al., 2013) there is still limited research on the impacts of this in terms of changing practices or outcomes. Again, there area mixed views of whether this is a good thing or a reflection of increasing withdrawal of support and growing precarity (Bains et al., 2014).

Social Ventures and Enterprises
Yet, despite this long history, there is no accepted typology of social enterprises (Bouchard et al., 2015). Bouchard et al. (2015) note that “certain types of enterprises that are recognized as aiming at a social goal are still understudied and have yet to be properly categorized into a typology” (p. 50). Lévesque (2013) suggests a typology wherein social economies are categorized in terms of their objectives, their methods for the distribution of surplus, and their governance and representation, forming three groups: cooperatives and mutual societies; nonprofit cooperatives and associations; and unions. In their review of social economy in Quebec, Bouchard et al. (2015) propose a typology that identifies three types of enterprise: fully institutionalized enterprises, enterprises that incorporate some elements of institutionalization, and all other enterprises that pursue social innovation in spite of how they are organized. Canada’s Directory of Social Enterprises identifies almost 100 organizations which have self-identified as social enterprises including private sector organizations with a social mission, non-profits applying private sector tools to achieve social goals and public-private partnerships. Mapping and analyzing social enterprises presents many conceptual and methodological issues including how broadly or narrowly one defines them (Cukier et al., 2011; Dart et al., 2010). There are many sites and guidebooks aimed at supporting them including a growing number of government programs and incubators and the academic literature is growing (Brouard, 2015; Dart et al., 2010; Defourny & Nyssens, 2012; Gupta, 2010; Madill & Ziegler, 2012; Manwaring & Valentine, 2012).

Incubators
There has been recent work to adapt the notions of incubators to the social innovation space – providing infrastructure to support nascent social enterprises, build capacity and collaborations to tackle social challenges. Some are linked to the Canadian university ecosystems (e.g., Social Venture Zone at Ryerson), others are university-private sector and foundation collaborations (e.g., SiG at Waterloo), and several are public-private partnerships (e.g., MaRS Discovery District). Alongside key players such as the Centre for Social Innovation, Ashoka U Canada and the J. W. McConnell Foundation, hubs, incubators, and networks connect, grow and support social innovators and their organizations across Canada. By identifying what we know and where knowledge gaps persist about Canadian SI in academia and in practice, this project provides key information to policymakers and practical stakeholders for evidence-based policy making and to support smart institutional investment.

Funding - Philanthropy and Social Finance
Increasingly, foundations are intentionally promoting social innovation models as a way of doing more with less and building capacity to develop evidence based approaches, collaborations and new forms of revenue generation. Some are focusing on pay for performance models of giving to tie outcomes to donations.

In Canada, social finance is a growing federal and provincial government priority, although it remains exploratory (Echenberg, 2015). The federal government first invested in social finance in 2011 and continues to do so in subsequent budgets.
particularly through the implementation of accelerator initiatives that help social innovations become investment ready (Echenberg, 2015). The degree of the federal government’s commitment to social finance is signaled by Employment and Social Development Canada’s recent launch of the Social Innovation and Social Finance Strategy, which will support community organizations in developing new ways to tackle persistent social problems. Further, the federally appointed Task Force on Social Finance was formed to, through MaRS Discovery District, mobilize the development of an investing market place in Canada so that social entrepreneurs can put private capital toward public good. The 10th Annual Social Finance Forum, an exchange of impact investors, entrepreneurs and business leaders at MaRS in Toronto is also emblematic of increased interest in Canadian social finance. Private players including RBC’s Social Finance Initiative are similarly seeking to ignite growth and shape the direction of social finance in Canada, while a number of other private organizations are developing avenues to support Canadians looking to engage with social impact investing. Again, while there is extensive academic literature on social finance the research focused on Canada remains limited (Phillips et al., 2014). Some Canadian scholars and policy makers note that the Canadian government’s interest in social finance is appealing because it encourages participatory citizenship and corporate social responsibility but they also raise concerns about its potential to drive the further privatization of public services (Joy & Shields, 2013; Loxley, 2013). For example, Poole et al.’s (2016) critical discourse analysis of policies and rhetoric surrounding social finance in Canada suggests that government and private sector actors use the language of social finance to manufacture consent for increased privatization of public services. In contrast, others (e.g., Harji & Hebb, 2010) find that social finance has the potential to generate considerate social impact in Canada, but it remains undercapitalized because the market still needs to adequately assess opportunity and risk and develop appropriate incentives for intermediaries and investors. They point out the ongoing challenges in setting up social finance in Canada and call for more supply-side analyses (Harji & Hebb, 2010).

There are a number of burgeoning social finance initiatives in Canada, many of which are guides or portals that connect investors to opportunities. For instance, the National Crowdfunding Association of Canada (NCFA) is a frequently updated, national nonprofit portal that connects interested investors to social crowdfunding and alternative finance opportunities. Organizations listed in NCFA’s portal include: SVX, an Ontario-based impact investing platform for ventures, funds and investors looking to achieve financial and social impact; Quebec’s yoyomolo, which describes itself as “the only open online donation platform in the world” to use a multilevel solicitation system where multiple players and participants can fundraise towards a given priority; and British Columbia’s FrontFundr, an online investment platform for social investors.

Additional resources comparable to NCFA include the Crowdfunding Guide for Nonprofits, Charities and Social Impact Projects (Ania & Charlesworth, 2015), launched by HiveWire, Inc. and the Centre for Social Innovation is designed to provide social innovators and entrepreneurs guidance on launching a crowdfunding initiative.

Appendix 1 provides a list of selected players in the Canadian ecosystem. Figure 2 below proposes a model for social innovation ecosystem, adapted from existing modes of innovation more broadly.
Figure 2. Social Innovation Ecosystem
Emerging Trends
University Engagement
In the last 5 years, several Canadian institutions have become part of the Ashoka Changemaker Campus network. In 2013, Ryerson University was the first university to gain the Changemaker designation. It was followed by Wilfrid Laurier (Waterloo and Brantford), Simon Fraser University (Vancouver), Mount Royal University (Calgary), Georgian College (Barrie), and Royal Roads University (Victoria).

“"You can’t learn surfing from a textbook”- Jim Balsillie, founder, Blackberry.

This movement grew as a result of increased social focus on entrepreneurship and innovation, which includes specific programs such as the J. W. McConnell Foundation’s RECODE program, which works to enhance the social impact of Canada’s post-secondary institutions. Changemaker campuses have especially expanded curriculum and practice and have impacted research. Carleton University’s Sprott School of Business hosts a Centre for Social Enterprises; the University as a whole hosts the Carleton Centre for Community Innovation (3ci). The University of Waterloo hosts the Waterloo Institute for Social Innovation and Resilience (WISIR) as well as the Social Innovation Generation (SiG), which offers a Graduate Diploma in Social Innovation. In Quebec, the Université du Quebec à Montreal (UQAM) hosts the Centre de recherché sur les innovations sociales (CRISES); it also hosts a Canada Research Chair (CRC) in social economy, and offers an MBA degree in collective businesses and a graduate diploma in social and collective enterprise management. Simon Fraser University is home to a social innovation lab called RADIUS. Scholars have started to examine issues related to the role of post-secondary institutions in the social innovation ecosystem as well as training and education of students to advance social innovation culture outside the classroom consistent with the global trends noted above.

Social Finance
Social finance has been identified in recent literature as one of the new methods for funding civil society and social entrepreneurship. Social finance is “a sustainable approach to managing money that delivers social, environmental dividends and economic return through social enterprises operating in the non-profit or public sector” (Dramin, 2008, p. 12). The Grameen Bank, for example, offered microcredit loans to the poor so that they could build businesses. Social finance instruments were a critical piece of the UK’s social innovation strategy and have been coupled with accountability mechanisms, including pay-for-performance. Sources of funding include foundations (which conservatively have assets of more than $20B and dispense $1B a year (Dramin, 2008), labour investment funds, government funds (e.g., Ontario’s Social Venture Capital Fund), and private funds (e.g., Social Venture Partners). The Federal Government of Canada recently created a new committee to explore ways to accelerate social finance, including use of dormant funds and tax incentives. Much of the literature, particularly in the last five years, has focused on the issues of social finance, including new instruments as well as new technologies such as crowdfunding.

Impact Assessment and Evaluation
One of the major criticisms of the literature that emerged in 2008 was its lack of analytic rigour. Arguably, much of what was written during this early period was essentially evangelical, for it was an effort to draw attention to this new phenomenon (or to the reframing of existing practices as social innovation) (Cukier et al., 2011). In the last decade, focus has shifted toward issues of measurement and accountability, as discussed below.

Deep Dives into “Practice Fields” and Regions
Another development that has taken shape over the past 10 years is increased recognition of the differentiation of social innovation processes in different contexts. Research focus is moving beyond individual social entrepreneurs or distinct enterprises to look at sectors or practice fields and regions. The practice field approach allows for analyzing the processes of diffusion beyond the micro-level of single, small-scale social innovation case studies and a data collection at a more societal level, where wider user groups and a certain societal impact has been reached and where moments of societal change are observable. At the same time, the approach allows
researchers to study the interplay between small-scale developments and their impact at the systemic level.

**Beyond the “Great Man” Theory of Change**
During the evangelical phase of social innovation literature, there were many studies that, as noted earlier, focused on profiling the people, primarily men, who were deemed to be great social entrepreneurs. Much of the research associated with this period also focused on defining the specific characteristics of social entrepreneurs, their intentions and behaviours. In the last decade, focus has shifted to include more emphasis on issues at the meso level (organizations, strategic, processes) and the macro level (culture, policy, economic trends) as well as on articulating complex systems theories that explore their interactions.

**From Theory to Practice and Back**
While seminal research and theory building on social innovation predates this review, a considerable amount of the work prior to 2008 focused on defining the field. Research in this early period asserted that social innovation was a new field and documented success stories, which were often individual cases that previous researchers would have framed in different ways (e.g., as social movements, social activism, or social marketing) (Cukier et al., 2011). The sophistication of the research questions, research methods, and empirical data analysis have increased in recent years, although gaps still remain.

**Diversity Issues**
While diversity, inclusion, and human rights are seldom discussed as targets or outcomes of social innovation, there are more articles examining the diversity of social innovators noting, for example, that women and seniors comprise a considerable number of them. Additionally, there is far more national diversity with studies from both emerging and industrialized economies. Among the articles over the last 10 years we found national or case studies from virtually every continent.
IMPLICATIONS

A review of extant literature demonstrates the increased theoretical and empirical sophistication of social innovation literature in the past decade. Emerging scholarship in this field highlights several core conditions which enable social innovation, as well as those which constrain it.

Individuals and groups are often found to stimulate or catalyze social innovation. Supporting citizens who are actively engaged in social innovation thus enables the development of a social innovation ecosystem. These individuals or groups require access to the financial resources to establish and grow their businesses or initiatives, and funding has been an important factor in the relative success of social innovation in the EU. Financial resources beyond the individual entrepreneur or group to facilitate sharing of information can also foster a supportive environment for social innovation.

New technologies and networks that establish or strengthen cooperative relationships between different stakeholders provide new opportunities for social innovation to tackle pervasive societal challenges. For example, mobile platforms and social media are two such examples of technological infrastructure supports for SI, and networks including incubators, co-working spaces and cross-regional and international networks like Ashoka enable information sharing and support across stakeholders with a range of experiences and expertise.

At the macro-level, legislative environments can drive or hinder social innovation ecosystems. Supportive legislative spaces offer opportunities to experiment with new solutions to ongoing social issues. In some cases this is out of necessity, due to economic constraints and reforms in societies that have experienced an economic crisis. On the other hand, positive regulatory reforms and political changes have also been enabling factors for social innovation. Increased public focus and perceptions of urgency can also push particular social issues onto the political agendas and lead to increased support and acceptability of new, innovative approaches to replace traditional approaches (which are presumed to be inadequate).

Conversely, factors that constrain social innovation include inadequate funding models, such as short-term funding models, which do not provide enough time to properly test and demonstrate impact, and the lack of funding for scaling promising innovations. Further, the overall complexity of the processes to acquire funding and requirements to provide matching funds are significant barriers.

Risk aversion within traditional and hierarchical organizational entities like governments can slowdown decision-making and innovation processes, particularly in fields such as health care. In addition, conflicts may arise in the context of cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder collaborations, where a variety of objectives are at play. Finally, ineffective knowledge sharing across groups and individuals working in the social innovation space has also preventing the sharing of lessons learned, which would help accelerate social innovation.
In order to better understand the questions at hand, our project examined the existing English and French Canadian and international literature on SI partnerships, collaborations, and their evidence of their impact in Canada and internationally.

1. We conducted a comprehensive environmental scan of current and past academic research, industry reports and policy papers in order to synthesize knowledge on SI that will contribute to Canada’s ability to thrive in an interconnected, evolving global landscape.

2. We utilized academic search portals such as ProQuest, Academic Search Premier and Google Scholar, as well as Google, to systematically identify literature published in English and French between January 2008 and October 2017. Search terms included:

3. For the period we identified a total of 478 unique academic articles in French and English. The number of articles identified in each year fluctuated between 24 and 72 articles with no discernable pattern or explanation of the ebbs and flows.

4. Additionally we undertook a Google search to identify relevant websites, programs and projects related to social innovation in Canada. These are included in Appendix 1.

5. After identifying, downloading and sorting the articles, focusing on the most recent, we systematically coded the articles using open coding, we then grouped the codes together around themes: i) Theory (definitions and models); ii) Policy; iii) Organizational Processes (structures, organizations, networks); iv) Case Studies (sectors/projects); v) Individuals; vi) Impact and Evaluations; vii) Mapping/Cross-National Comparisons; viii) Other. After 10 years, the majority of articles remain focused on issues related to theory and processes with minimal empirical research beyond case studies.

6. Based on this analysis we identified promising frameworks, policies, practices and initiatives, which are summarized in this report.

7. The results from this project are being shared with a range of policy makers, social innovators, researchers and other relevant stakeholders through diverse KMb methods to help inform policy development and practice.
CONCLUSIONS: THE STATE OF KNOWLEDGE ON SOCIAL INNOVATION

In Canada there are many rich resources on different aspects of social innovation theory, evidence and practice. Canada is recognized internationally for the work of some of its scholars – Frances Westley (Waterloo) and Tina Dacin (Queen’s), for example, are highly cited in international scholarship.

Whereas traditional social innovation and diffusion research offers ex-post explanations of how individual innovations have ended up in social practice, the goal here is to develop approaches to understanding the genesis of innovations from the broad range of social practice. Special attention should be paid to multiple innovation streams, fed by an evolutionary interplay of invention and imitation. There is a predictably strong interaction between the process of innovation, the adaptation imitation of those solutions to other projects, and the way these mutually reinforce each other. This is supported by empirical data: approximately half of the initiatives are original innovations or approaches, whereas almost the same number of initiatives moderately or significantly modified existing ones.

Canada also is well-regarded internationally for practical work on social innovation in its own right. Framed by the United Nations millennial goals, for example, Canada is regarded as a world leader for some its work on diversity and inclusion, for peace-building and for education and social mobility. Canada has also made great strides in embedding social innovation practice particularly through work integrated learning into curriculum and has some of the leading incubators of social innovation (for example the Centre for Social Innovation which has recently expanded its operations internationally to New York, NY).

Despite many areas of strength and substantial activity, the research suggests that work on social innovation in Canada remains fragmented with multiple sites and organizations operating without much interconnection. While there is considerable work on the theory of social innovation and new centres and programs have emerged aimed at advancing social innovation (including some within government) there is limited empirical work examining the practice and impact. Funding programs for social innovation are limited and still fragmented – foundations, governments and private sector donors do not coordinate their investments nor the learning gained and the impacts of the program that do exist are not widely known. There are many conferences and workshops and centres focused on social innovation aimed at bringing academics and practitioners together but limited collaboration among them and limited documentation of outcomes. While the J. W. McConnell Foundation’s RECODE program along with Ashoka have advanced post-secondary institutions commitments to social innovation significantly, but there is limited rigour in the definitions, evaluation of impacts or research on the results. Finally, there is little evidence of links between small-scale initiatives and larger scale, systems change.

Certainly, many contexts can benefit from additional research on social innovation and entrepreneurship. It seems that deepening the investigation of social innovation in specific practice areas such as environment, poverty alleviation, diversity, and health could advance our understanding of systems and indicate how to identify the most effective levers to create change. An approach that moves beyond theory on the one hand and small case studies on the other is crucial. We also need better frameworks for assessing SROI and for mapping social innovation initiatives. We need more coordination as well as national platforms to share lessons learned from successes and failures. More work on understanding the relationship between individual initiatives and large-scale systems change is key to learn how to scale promising practices. Additionally, in-depth work on cross-cutting initiatives in specific communities, where, for example, coordinated and intensive efforts are undertaken to address inter-related issues (poverty,
education, employment, mobility, diversity and inclusion) can dig deeply into data and examine interactions in a microcosm. Perhaps most of all, we need to understand how to address the individual, organizational and institutional barriers that impede progress and to find ways to build cultures and practices of innovation, whether they achieve economic or social goals. Further investment into social innovation in Canada is crucial in order to fully realize its potential to enhance Canada’s position at the global level.
Appendix 1 outlines some of the additional Canadian resources available to those interested in exploring Social Innovation in more detail. There are four types of sources: government (both the Federal Government of Canada and the Provincial Government of Ontario have social innovation offices) non-governmental organizations and community organizations (e.g., Ashoka, the J. W. McConnell Family Foundation), academic institutions that have research centres (e.g., the University of Waterloo’s SiG), incubators (e.g., Ryerson’s Social Venture Zone; SFU’s Institute for Diaspora Research & Engagement), and credit or non-credit programs (e.g., Sauder School of Business’s (UBC) Centre for Social Innovation & Impact Investing; University of Toronto’s Social Economy Centre; University of Waterloo’s Social Innovation Generation); and a number of service providers such as social finance organizations and consulting firms focused on issues such as social return on investment (e.g., Social Capital Partners). Further, there are a plethora of sources on social innovation, including an extensive set of initiatives funded through the European Union, Centres on Social Innovation (e.g., Social Finance, University of Glasgow Caledonia; Skoll Centre, Oxford; Cambridge Centre for Social Innovation, Cambridge; ZSI, Austria; and the Bertha Centre for Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship, South Africa).
The knowledge synthesized in this study is being shared widely with industry, government, not-for-profits, social innovation networks, educational institutions, students and the general population. In addition to this report, we have developed a series of plain language summaries. Research in this report has also been shared in a number of networks and organizations including PRIME, SI-DRIVE, Ashoka and more. Not only are we participating in the KSG knowledge mobilization workshops in Ottawa, we will be hosting a webinar on the subject in the new year and have papers in process for the annual conferences of the Administrative Studies Association of Canada and the Academy of Management. Working with Ashoka, the results of this study will also be shared with other Changemaker campuses around the world at the next Exchange. We are also targeting peer-reviewed journals and preparing submissions that align with our existing work that applies a social innovation lens to diversity; journal targets include the *Journal of Social Policy*, *Dimensions*, *the International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, and the *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. We are also connected to a number of committees and consultative groups including Ashoka, RECODE, and SI-DRIVE. We will also reach out to organizations that run annual meetings on Social Innovation including MaRS, TRICO and Social Innovation Generation (SiG). The publication of research findings in both academic and popular publications will enrich public discourse about SI collaborations in Canada and internationally. To help inform policy, the Diversity Institute is also participating in discussions with relevant policy makers and is participating in the new council on Social Finance co-chaired by Senator Ratna Omidvar and the J. W. McConnell Foundation.
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# Appendix 1: Selection of Canadian Social Innovation Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSI Connect</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“ABSI Connect seeks to bridge and amplify social, economic and ecological impact initiatives that are successfully challenging the status quo in Alberta, to transform the way we forge solutions to our province’s most complex challenges.” <a href="http://absiconnect.ca/">http://absiconnect.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate Okanagan</td>
<td>Okanagan, British Columbia</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“Provides tools, programs, mentoring, networking opportunities, market intelligence, and market validation training through its innovative not-for-profit, zero-equity-stake model that receives core funding from various government and public sector agencies.” <a href="https://www.accelerateokanagan.com">https://www.accelerateokanagan.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Awesome Foundation</td>
<td>Nova Scotia; Ontario</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“The Awesome Foundation is a global community with several fully autonomous chapter. Each chapter supports awesome projects through micro-grants, usually given out monthly. These micro-grants, $1000 or the local equivalent, come out of pockets of the chapter’s &quot;trustees&quot; and are given on a no-strings-attached basis to people and groups.” <a href="http://www.awesomefoundation.org">http://www.awesomefoundation.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka Canada</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“Ashoka has identified the new framework needed for living and working together in this radically different world drawn from insights working with our global network of Ashoka Fellows, the world’s leading social entrepreneurs. The four elements of the framework are empathy, teamwork, new leadership, and changemaking. Ashoka also advances social innovation on University and Colleges certifying Changemaker campuses.” <a href="http://canada.ashoka.org">http://canada.ashoka.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Centre for Social Enterprise</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“Ours is a virtual Centre composed of a non-profit organization (which provides fee-for-service technical assistance) and a charity (whose mandate involves public education and research) dedicated to promoting social enterprise development in British Columbia Canada, and across the nation.” <a href="http://www.centreforsocialenterprise.com/index.html">www.centreforsocialenterprise.com/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Social Economy Roundtable</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Strategic services for impact-driven businesses. Social profits are changing the world and changing the way the world does business. For almost 20 years, Realize has been providing our clients with the tools and expertise they need to navigate change and build sustainable, impact-driven businesses.” <a href="http://ucscoop.com/ser">http://ucscoop.com/ser</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Tech Fund</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“The $100-million BC Tech Fund will help BC tech companies access the early stage venture capital they need to grow and stay in BC, help diversify the economy and create high-paying jobs for British Columbians.” <a href="https://bctechstrategy.gov.bc.ca/bctech-fund/">https://bctechstrategy.gov.bc.ca/bctech-fund/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buy Social Canada</strong></td>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service Provider</strong></td>
<td>“Buy Social Canada works with social enterprises to increase their business opportunities and grow their social impact. We support the enhancement and growth of your organization through webinars, workshops and consultation. Buy Social Canada is your platform to connect you to the community and promote your organization's impact locally and nationwide.” <a href="https://www.buysocialcanada.com">https://www.buysocialcanada.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B4C Social Venture Accelerator</strong></td>
<td><strong>New Brunswick</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service provider</strong></td>
<td>“B4C seeks to accelerate sustainable and scalable high impact ventures with blended value propositions.” <a href="https://www.b4changeprogram.com/">https://www.b4changeprogram.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caledon Institute of Social Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td><strong>NGO</strong></td>
<td>“The Caledon Institute of Social Policy does rigorous, high-quality research and analysis; seeks to inform and influence public opinion and to foster public discussion on poverty and social policy; and develops and promotes concrete, practicable proposals for the reform of social programs at all levels of government and of social benefits provided by employers and the voluntary sector.” <a href="http://www.caledoninst.org">www.caledoninst.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Business for Social Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td><strong>NGO</strong></td>
<td>Aims to: “accelerate and scale corporate social and environmental sustainability in Canada by strategically bringing together stakeholders to collectively tackle key issues; be the most relevant sustainability business network in Canada; and influence progressive public policy towards our vision.” <a href="http://www.cbsr.ca">www.cbsr.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Canadian CED Network</strong></td>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Organization</strong></td>
<td>“Community Economic Development (CED) is action by people locally to create economic opportunities that improve social conditions, particularly for those who are most disadvantaged. CED is an approach that recognizes that economic, environmental and social challenges are interdependent, complex and ever-changing.” <a href="https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/enpmb">https://ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/enpmb</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service provider</strong></td>
<td>“Social impact, environmental sensitivity and the economics of community building are three pillars that form the framework for the new Canadian Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility (CCCSR). This research-intensive centre uses creativity and innovation to push the boundaries of business in a way that encourages business leaders to consider their diverse stakeholders and improve the quality of life experienced by the communities they live and operate in.” <a href="https://www.ualberta.ca/business/centres/corporate-social-responsibility">https://www.ualberta.ca/business/centres/corporate-social-responsibility</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Federation of Voluntary Sector Networks (CFVSN)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Calgary; Ottawa</strong></td>
<td><strong>NGO</strong></td>
<td>“The CFVSN draws together local, regional, provincial and territorial networks of voluntary organizations. The Federation is dedicated to exchanging information and resources within the voluntary sector; facilitating and promoting collaboration; raising the profile of the sector; building the capacity of the voluntary sector; influencing public policy development; and entering into dialogue with other sectors.” <a href="http://www.ccsd.ca/index.php/research/funding-matters/social-innovation">http://www.ccsd.ca/index.php/research/funding-matters/social-innovation</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Canada</strong></td>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service Provider</strong></td>
<td>“Bringing together the ideas, people and resources that fuel social innovation.” <a href="https://capacitycanada.ca/">https://capacitycanada.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Social Entrepreneurship Foundation</td>
<td>Canada, with a focus on British Columbia</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>The Canadian Social Entrepreneurship Foundation brings a fresh, innovative, high impact and energetic contribution to the Social Entrepreneurship Field. Its focus on Education, mentorship, networking and resourcing is critical to the growth of a flourishing social economy in Canada. <a href="http://www.csef.ca/">http://www.csef.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Social Enterprise Development</td>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“We offer a continuum of support for social enterprise in the city of Ottawa, including access to technical expertise, coaching, financing, learning communities, training, and cross-sector partnerships. To date, we have worked with hundreds of clients developing their social enterprise plans and providing them with the tools, strategies, and support to perpetuate positive social change and grow profitably.” <a href="http://csedottawa.ca">http://csedottawa.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Social Innovation</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Coworking is only the beginning. From CSI Summits designed to spark new collaborations, to acceleration programs such as Agents of Change, to microloans and free consultations with experts, our mission is to help get you to impact.” <a href="http://www.socialinnovation.ca">www.socialinnovation.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Lab Action Research Initiative (CLARI)</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“CLARI is a cross-province, multi-post-secondary education partnership designed to support Nova Scotia communities with academic and research expertise, designated spaces and communications technology to address social and economic challenges.” <a href="http://www.smu.ca/research/clari/">http://www.smu.ca/research/clari/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantier de l’Economie sociale</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Chantieraims to construct a plural economy whose aim is the return to the community and the defense of the common good directly related to the needs and aspirations of the communities. Social economy enterprises provide collective control and perpetuate the economic, social and cultural vitality of communities.” <a href="http://chantier.qc.ca/">http://chantier.qc.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysalis</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Pushing the boundaries of disability services, The social and economic value of employment for persons with disabilities, Shared value approaches between non-profit organizations and for-profit corporations, Creation of sustainable jobs through the discovery process and customization of work, How to use collective impact for effective change.” <a href="https://chrysalis.ca/innovations-research/">https://chrysalis.ca/innovations-research/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Vancouver – Social Innovation Project Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coast Capital Savings Innovation Hub Incubator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Micro Lending</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vancouver</strong></td>
<td><strong>British Columbia</strong></td>
<td><strong>Southwest British Columbia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We are currently accepting expressions of interest (EOI) for projects that explore: How to support social innovation in Vancouver’s urban aboriginal community and How non-aboriginal focused projects can apply an aboriginal perspective to social innovation.</strong> <a href="http://vancouver.ca/people-programs/social-innovation-project-grants.aspx">http://vancouver.ca/people-programs/social-innovation-project-grants.aspx</a></td>
<td><strong>“The one-year program gives social entrepreneurs the opportunity to take their ventures to the next level of growth by providing a supportive community and critical resources for the highest chance of success. Entrepreneurs attend intensive workshops on topics ranging from strategic growth, marketing, and branding, to culture and talent management. In addition to providing mentorship from UBC and industry experts, the program also provides a paid intern for each venture over the summer. Entrepreneurs co-locate on the UBC campus for the year and work within a supportive and collaborative community of peer entrepreneurs.”</strong> <a href="https://www.uvic.ca/innovation">https://www.uvic.ca/innovation</a></td>
<td><strong>“Community Micro Lending is a non-profit society that connects local lenders to local borrowers. Local borrowers are people who want to turn their idea and passion into a livelihood but can’t get the credit they need from a bank or credit union.”</strong> <a href="http://www.communitymicrolending.ca">http://www.communitymicrolending.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Innovation lab</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Innovation lab</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Micro Lending</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ontario</strong></td>
<td><strong>Southwest British Columbia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Social Enterprise Accelerator is an incubation and training program that will provide 25 early-stage social entrepreneurs with access to training led by experts, as well as resources, to further develop their enterprises. The program will take place from February 2017 to June 2017. Participants will be recipients of the Ontario Social Impact Voucher, valued at $3000.”</strong> <a href="http://communityilab.ca/social-enterprise-accelerator/">http://communityilab.ca/social-enterprise-accelerator/</a></td>
<td><strong>“Community Micro Lending is a non-profit society that connects local lenders to local borrowers. Local borrowers are people who want to turn their idea and passion into a livelihood but can’t get the credit they need from a bank or credit union.”</strong> <a href="http://www.communitymicrolending.ca">http://www.communitymicrolending.ca</a></td>
<td><strong>“The one-year program gives social entrepreneurs the opportunity to take their ventures to the next level of growth by providing a supportive community and critical resources for the highest chance of success. Entrepreneurs attend intensive workshops on topics ranging from strategic growth, marketing, and branding, to culture and talent management. In addition to providing mentorship from UBC and industry experts, the program also provides a paid intern for each venture over the summer. Entrepreneurs co-locate on the UBC campus for the year and work within a supportive and collaborative community of peer entrepreneurs.”</strong> <a href="https://www.uvic.ca/innovation">https://www.uvic.ca/innovation</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E@UBC Impact Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>E@UBC Impact Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>E@UBC Impact Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British Columbia, specifically at UBC</strong></td>
<td><strong>British Columbia, specifically at UBC</strong></td>
<td><strong>British Columbia, specifically at UBC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“The fund invests in the highest impact ventures from the UBC community. We are looking for ventures that explicitly aim to create impact through their business operations and pursue impact-maximizing strategies. We support ventures where at least one of the founders, or key managers, is a current UBC student, faculty, staff member or recent alumni (within 5 years) or new ventures based around research undertaken at UBC.”</strong> <a href="http://entrepreneurship.ubc.ca/impact-fund">http://entrepreneurship.ubc.ca/impact-fund</a></td>
<td><strong>“Since its launch in 2008, SEF has provided loans of all shapes and sizes to more than 40 organizations. These loans are for everything from improving access to locally produced food to cleaning the environment. They can range from building affordable housing to creating jobs for at-risk youth.”</strong> <a href="https://www.ecfoundation.org/initiatives/social-enterprise-fund/">https://www.ecfoundation.org/initiatives/social-enterprise-fund/</a></td>
<td><strong>“Force est de constater que l’entrepreneuriat collectif, les entreprises d’économie sociale, les entreprises communautaires et les entreprises sociales s’inscrivent dans un espace économique pluriel. Ici, nous levons le voile sur les pratiques entrepreneuriales solidaires qui se distinguent et font toute la différence dans les communautés. Quelle belle occasion pour vous partager des informations judicieuses sur les approches en développement, les”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edmonton Community Foundation Social Enterprise Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>Entreprise Collective</strong></td>
<td><strong>Edmonton Community Foundation Social Enterprise Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edmonton, Alberta</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ottawa</strong></td>
<td><strong>Edmonton, Alberta</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Since its launch in 2008, SEF has provided loans of all shapes and sizes to more than 40 organizations. These loans are for everything from improving access to locally produced food to cleaning the environment. They can range from building affordable housing to creating jobs for at-risk youth.”</strong> <a href="https://www.ecfoundation.org/initiatives/social-enterprise-fund/">https://www.ecfoundation.org/initiatives/social-enterprise-fund/</a></td>
<td><strong>“Force est de constater que l’entrepreneuriat collectif, les entreprises d’économie sociale, les entreprises communautaires et les entreprises sociales s’inscrivent dans un espace économique pluriel. Ici, nous levons le voile sur les pratiques entrepreneuriales solidaires qui se distinguent et font toute la différence dans les communautés. Quelle belle occasion pour vous partager des informations judicieuses sur les approches en développement, les”</strong></td>
<td><strong>“Since its launch in 2008, SEF has provided loans of all shapes and sizes to more than 40 organizations. These loans are for everything from improving access to locally produced food to cleaning the environment. They can range from building affordable housing to creating jobs for at-risk youth.”</strong> <a href="https://www.ecfoundation.org/initiatives/social-enterprise-fund/">https://www.ecfoundation.org/initiatives/social-enterprise-fund/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stratégies de financement et d’investissement, les conditions essentielles au développement et à la croissance de ces entreprises!

https://entreprisessociale.ca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Provider Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancity Community Foundation: Social Enterprise Fund</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“We believe that social enterprises can be a powerful tool to meet community needs and address social and environmental challenges. From training and jobs for people with barriers to employment, providing innovative goods and services that address specific social or environmental issues, or generating sustainable sources of revenue that support the financial resilience and program delivery for non-profit organizations - social enterprises help build more inclusive, co-operative and sustainable local economies and communities. Together with Vancity Credit Union we offer comprehensive suite of financial and technical support to help organizations explore and test their ideas, launch or scale-up or expand their social enterprise initiatives.” <a href="http://www.enterprisingnonprofits.ca">www.enterprisingnonprofits.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to Maybe Social Innovation Residency</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Provide mentors, individual advisory groups, expert advisors. 2018 Themes: seeing systems, designing systems, self in system, encounters with the natural environment, creative practice, indigenous knowledge.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>“The Social Innovation and Social Finance Steering Group brings together 16 passionate and diverse leaders, practitioners and experts from multiple fields, including the community, philanthropic, financial and research sectors. The Steering Group will be responsible for co-developing a Social Innovation and Social Finance Strategy with the Government of Canada.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“To relieve poverty and benefit the community of Greater Fredericton by providing social planning to advance comprehensive community strategies guided by research, analysis and community defined goals.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Ontario</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“Groupe Convex is a non-profit organization. Our corporation, established in 2004, incubates and manages social enterprises, namely real businesses that have a social mission. We employ staff with different skills that occupy a variety of positions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch Ptno</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“Our members are start-ups, and small (1-2 person) businesses and non-profits, who need access to a flexible work and meeting space downtown. The pilot began in May of 2013 testing the co-working model. Hatch provides space rental services as well as event hosting space and necessities as a means of generating conditions for a socially innovative community.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


http://seontario.org/stories/hatch-ptbo/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HiVE</td>
<td>Vancouver, British Columbia</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“From simply sharing ideas over a communal meal to designing actionable solutions for the neighbourhood, HiVE members—over 200 social entrepreneurs, change-makers, activists, and artists—have built a culture of collaboration where people and the planet come first. Organizations cowork side by side, share resources, develop new programming—all with the shared goal of creating a more just, inclusive, and sustainable society.” <a href="http://www.hivevancouver.com">http://www.hivevancouver.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubcap</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“Hubcap is an initiative of the BC Partners for Social Impact, a network representing B.C.’s diverse population, with leaders in non-profits, businesses, universities, community groups, and government involved. The BC Partners was formed in 2012 as a result of the Action Plan Recommendations to Maximize Social Innovation in B.C. Together, the partnership continues to use innovative solutions to solve B.C.’s tough social challenges.” <a href="http://www.hubcapbc.ca/">http://www.hubcapbc.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine Canada</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“Imagine Canada is a national charitable organization whose cause is Canada’s charities. Our three broad goals are to amplify the sector’s collective voice, create opportunities to connect and learn from each other, and build the sector’s capacity to succeed. Imagine Canada strengthens and supports Canadian charities and nonprofits so they may better serve and engage individuals and communities here and around the world.” <a href="http://www.imaginecanada.ca">www.imaginecanada.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Investment Fund</td>
<td>South-eastern British Columbia (the Basin)</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“Invests in for-profit businesses, start-ups, social enterprises and non-profits that can demonstrate and quantify broader benefits such as social, environmental or community impact as a result of the investment. It creates a financing option for credible business opportunities not otherwise able to secure conventional financing.” <a href="http://ourtrust.org/iif">http://ourtrust.org/iif</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Boulevard</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“Innovation Boulevard assists companies to address health challenges by preparing them to showcase their solutions to public and private funders, as well as target markets.” <a href="http://www.innovationboulevard.ca">http://www.innovationboulevard.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire Nunavut</td>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“Inspire Nunavut is an extensive entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship training and mentorship program designed specifically for youth in Nunavut.” <a href="https://www.inspirenunavut.com/">https://www.inspirenunavut.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirit Foundation convening</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“ChangeUp grants create opportunities for people aged 18-34 to initiate creative solutions-focused projects that address issues of discrimination and prejudice in their local communities. The $10,000 one-time grants are for projects that implement creative strategies to open minds and shift attitudes that perpetuate prejudice and exclusion based on ethnicity, race or religion. The $10,000 one-time grants are for projects that implement creative strategies to open minds and shift attitudes that perpetuate prejudice and exclusion based on ethnicity, race or religion.” <a href="https://inspiritfoundation.org/grants-opportunities/">https://inspiritfoundation.org/grants-opportunities/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JustChange Canada Accelerates</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>Ottawa, Calgary, Toronto,</td>
<td>“JustChange Canada accelerates bold ideas for social, environmental and economic change through the creation of giving circles – groups of 10 to 15 individuals who pool their own funds in support of local initiatives.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell Foundation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>“The McConnell Foundation is a private Canadian foundation that develops and applies innovative approaches to social, cultural, economic and environmental challenges. We do so through granting and investing, capacity building, convening, and co-creation with grantees, partners and the public.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlaw Foundation</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Laidlaw Foundation invests in innovative ideas, convenes interested parties, shares its learning and advocates for change in support of young people being healthy, creative and fully engaged citizens. An inclusive society that values and supports the full engagement of its young people in the civic, social, economic and cultural life of diverse and environmentally healthy communities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlaw Foundation’s Youth Sector Innovation Grant</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>“The Youth CI Impact Accelerator gives participants the opportunity to step away from their day-to-day activities and think critically about the impact they are trying to achieve for young people through their work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’Arche Canada Foundation</td>
<td>Community Organization</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>“In L’Arche, people who have intellectual disabilities and those who come to assist share life and daytime activities together in family-like settings that are integrated into local neighbourhoods. L’Arche in Canada has nearly 200 homes and workshops or day programs. These are grouped into what L’Arche calls ‘communities.’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEDlab - Downtown Eastside Local Economic Development Lab</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>Vancouver Downtown Eastside</td>
<td>“A shared initiative of Ecotrust Canada and RADIUS Simon Fraser University, LEDlab incubates community-driven social enterprise concepts and business models, via a blend of social innovation lab practice, community development and social entrepreneurship.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFT Philanthropy Partners</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>“Has a core business of investing in the capacity building of social purpose organizations, we partner on strategic projects that support people, not-for-profit organizations and businesses across Canada to contribute to the social and economic success of our country.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaRS</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td>“Located in the heart of Canada’s largest and the world’s most diverse city, MaRS is uniquely placed to lead change. We bring together educators, researchers, social scientists, entrepreneurs and business experts under one roof. Founded by civic leaders, we have a mission that is equal parts public and private — an entrepreneurial venture designed to bridge the gap between what people need and what governments can provide. As a home to entrepreneurs and a bridge to the business world, MaRS helps companies bring breakthrough innovations.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Service provider
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Service provider
“Located in the heart of Canada’s largest and the world’s most diverse city, MaRS is uniquely placed to lead change. We bring together educators, researchers, social scientists, entrepreneurs and business experts under one roof. Founded by civic leaders, we have a mission that is equal parts public and private — an entrepreneurial venture designed to bridge the gap between what people need and what governments can provide. As a home to entrepreneurs and a bridge to the business world, MaRS helps companies bring breakthrough innovations.”

MaRS
Toronto, Ontario
Service provider
“Located in the heart of Canada’s largest and the world’s most diverse city, MaRS is uniquely placed to lead change. We bring together educators, researchers, social scientists, entrepreneurs and business experts under one roof. Founded by civic leaders, we have a mission that is equal parts public and private — an entrepreneurial venture designed to bridge the gap between what people need and what governments can provide. As a home to entrepreneurs and a bridge to the business world, MaRS helps companies bring breakthrough innovations.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaRs Social Innovation</td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Provide a social impact lens to MaRs venture clients in their four key sectors (Energy &amp; Environment, Finance &amp; Commerce, Health, and Word &amp; Learning). Helps social ventures connect with capital. Scope: advice, social finance support, ecosystem development, and support for social entrepreneurs.” <a href="https://www.marsdd.com/about/social-innovation/">https://www.marsdd.com/about/social-innovation/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maytree Foundation</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Community Organization</td>
<td>“Maytree is committed to advancing systemic solutions to poverty and strengthening civic communities. We believe the most enduring way to fix the systems that create poverty is to have economic and social rights safeguarded for all people living in Canada.” <a href="http://www.maytree.com">www.maytree.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell Foundation’s Innoweave Coaching</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Innoweave fosters social innovation and large-scale impact through Canada’s social sector. To achieve this, Innoweave helps community organizations learn about, develop, and implement innovative approaches that enhance their impact.” <a href="http://www.innoweave.ca/">http://www.innoweave.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf Foundation – Innovation Fellowship</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“The Metcalf Innovation Fellowship program provides critical thinkers with opportunities to address complex ecological, social, economic, and cultural issues. We are interested in the exploration of ideas that challenge the root causes of unsustainable practices related to topics such as labour market inequalities, conditions of climate change, or resource scarcity within the cultural landscape.” <a href="http://metcalffoundation.com/our-programs/program-area/innovation-fellowship/">http://metcalffoundation.com/our-programs/program-area/innovation-fellowship/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishnawbe Aski Development Fund</td>
<td>Fort William First Nation, Ontario</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“In partnership with Ontario Women’s Directorate, Nishnawbe Aski Development Fund’s (NADF) microlending program supports low-income Aboriginal women who are seeking to start their own micro-business by providing financial literacy training, entrepreneurial mentoring and skills development and life skills support.” <a href="http://www.nadf.org/article/microlending-1275.asp">http://www.nadf.org/article/microlending-1275.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador University’s Centre for Social Enterprise</td>
<td>NFLD &amp; Labrador</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>“The centre works within the social entrepreneurial ecosystem to create linkages among students, faculty, community, and company leaders for networking and mentorship opportunities. It’s a platform to support creative linkages between academic disciplines to nurture innovation in social entrepreneurship.” <a href="https://www.mun.ca/socialenterprise/about/">https://www.mun.ca/socialenterprise/about/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NouLab</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“We help the public and innovators act together to address our most pressing social, environmental, and economic challenges. By connecting change agents from across sectors, convening them around pressing issues, and facilitating”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their journey to deep change, NouLAB is making the change process smarter.” [https://noulab.org/home-english/](https://noulab.org/home-english/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ontario Social Enterprise Demonstration Fund</strong></th>
<th>Ontario</th>
<th>Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Social Enterprise Demonstration Fund (SEDF) supports job creation and economic growth by providing opportunities for social enterprises to get funding. Providing mentorship, coaching, and supports to the social enterprise providing funding to the social enterprise in the form of a grant, a loan, etc.” <a href="https://www.ontario.ca/page/social-enterprise-demonstration-fund">https://www.ontario.ca/page/social-enterprise-demonstration-fund</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ontario Social Impact Voucher (OSIV) Program</strong></th>
<th>Ontario</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Initiatives focus on identifying and implementing enterprise growth strategies that include: Building a customer base; Raising capital; Expanding to new markets; Using tools to measure economic and social impact; And other needed value-added social entrepreneurship business supports/services. Social entrepreneur and enterprise applicants can review the educational programs offered by the various Delivery Organizations and select the program and service that will be of greatest benefit to their business.” <a href="http://www.oce-ontario.org/programs/entrepreneurship-programs/osiv-program/how-it-works">http://www.oce-ontario.org/programs/entrepreneurship-programs/osiv-program/how-it-works</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Philanthropic Foundations of Canada</strong></th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Charity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“PFC promotes the growth and development of effective and responsible foundations and organized philanthropy in Canada through provision of membership services, resources and advocacy. PFC is a member association of Canadian grantmakers, including private and public foundations, charities and corporations. We seek to support Canadian philanthropy and our members by: encouraging public policies that promote philanthropy, increasing awareness of philanthropy’s contribution to Canadians’ well-being, and providing opportunities for foundations to learn from each other.” <a href="http://www.pfc.ca">www.pfc.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Plan Institute</strong></th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Plan Institute is a non-profit social enterprise that works to improve the lives of people with disabilities by collaborating on community-based projects, offering a suite of learning initiatives, and advocating for policy reform.” <a href="http://www.planinstitute.ca">www.planinstitute.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Planet Hatch</strong></th>
<th>New Brunswick</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Planet Hatch is Fredericton’s entrepreneurial hub, where startups are connected to the best resources in order to help them soar. We focus on providing mentorship, targeted programming, and networking for startups in all sectors.” <a href="http://planethatch.com/en/programs/">http://planethatch.com/en/programs/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Propel ICT</strong></th>
<th>Atlantic Canada</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The &quot;Build&quot; program supports companies with some initial traction who need our help to grow. The program will develop the entrepreneurial skills required to grow the company with a strong emphasis on sales and marketing internationally. This program is delivered across multiple locations throughout Atlantic Canada, overnight travel may be required.” <a href="http://www.propelict.com/build">http://www.propelict.com/build</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Quebec Community Groups Network – Community</strong></th>
<th>Quebec</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “The Community Innovation Fund (CIF) is a new resource for Quebec’s English-speaking communities to put social innovation in action. Between April 2017 and March 2019, CIF will invest more than $1 million in social initiatives while building partnerships to increase funds that will be injected into the community. Through CIF, community organizations providing direct support to

Queens University - Smith School of Business – Centre for Social Impact | Kingston, Ontario | Academic | “The Community Solutions Lab creates the space for community-serving organizations in the Kingston area to work with innovative and passionate students, staff and faculty from across Queen's University to solve complex organizational challenges. Social Impact Summit: The Social Impact Summit is an engaging and inspiring conference program that brings together leading academics and practitioners to expose delegates to a variety of issues and topics in the area of Social Impact and Responsible Leadership. This two-day Summit is a mixture of keynote speakers, panel discussions, skill building workshops and networking opportunities designed to educate and inspire delegates to be impactful and responsible leaders both in their careers and in their local communities.” [https://smith.queensu.ca/centres/social-impact/index.php](https://smith.queensu.ca/centres/social-impact/index.php)

RADIUS | Vancouver, British Columbia | Service Provider | “RADIUS serves as a hub for entrepreneurial education and acceleration—building a network of ventures, programs and people embedded within the university and the innovation ecosystem. RADIUS’s First Peoples Enterprise Accelerator supports the development of Aboriginal entrepreneurs and advances early stage businesses and social ventures that contribute to the development of sustainable, healthy economies.” [http://www.radiussfu.com/](http://www.radiussfu.com/)

Recode, McConnell Foundation | Canada | Academic | “Fostering a culture and practice of social innovation, Recoding the undergraduate experience, Harnessing post-secondary assets to increase community impact, The McConnell Foundation engages Canadians in building a society that is inclusive, reconciled, sustainable and resilient—and that advances progress toward the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.” [https://mcconnellfoundation.ca/initiative/recode/](https://mcconnellfoundation.ca/initiative/recode/)

Renewal Partners | British Columbia | Service provider | “For the past 18 years, Renewal put the powerful tools of business and philanthropy to work in the creation of a triple bottom line economy. It provides investments, grants and collaborations (for entrepreneurs, investors and activists) in support of long-term societal solutions in British Columbia and beyond.” [http://www.renewalpartners.com/](http://www.renewalpartners.com/)

Resilient Capital Fund | Vancouver, British Columbia | Service Provider | “Financing from the program aims to bridge the gap that social enterprises sometimes experience between government and other grants and access to conventional lending. The program helps organizations grow by giving them access to financial capital that is not commonly provided by other financial institutions.” [https://resilientcapital.ca/](https://resilientcapital.ca/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provider</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Social Enterprise Constellation</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“RSEC connects, supports and grows social enterprise (SE) in rural Ontario. It’s a unique partnership among a diverse network of supporters and doers of rural social enterprise. RSEC connects work that’s happening on the ground with policy and strategy at regional and provincial levels.” <a href="http://theonn.ca/ruralsocialenterpriseconstellation/">http://theonn.ca/ruralsocialenterpriseconstellation/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEontario</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“The SEontario website is a community-driven showcase of social enterprise (SE) and the social economy in Ontario. With a platform created by a collaboration of regional, provincial and national nonprofit organizations, SEontario demonstrates the geographic scope and community impact of SE across the province.” <a href="http://seontario.org/">http://seontario.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson University – Ryerson University, Social Venture Zone</td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“At the SocialVentures Zone, we work with innovators to develop their ventures, supporting them with coaching, training, work space, and funding opportunities— all delivered in a growing community that is passionate about making change happen. Ventures at the SVZ have focused on issues as diverse as the environment, urban poverty, food security, gender-based violence, conscious consumption, and accessibility.” <a href="http://www.ryerson.ca/svz/about/">http://www.ryerson.ca/svz/about/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Fraser University – Institute for Diaspora Research &amp; Engagement</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“The Institute for Diaspora Research &amp; Engagement (IDRE) at SFU will establish a Social Innovation Incubator that supports diaspora-driven innovation for development in their countries of attachment. These initiatives may include development projects, social innovation initiatives, and social enterprise. Three core services: Capacity building, advisory services, and funding.” <a href="https://www.sfu.ca/diaspora-institute/what_we_do/development_incubator.html">https://www.sfu.ca/diaspora-institute/what_we_do/development_incubator.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Delta</td>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“Social Delta offers consulting services to individuals and organizations wishing to conceive, design, launch or expand a social enterprise. Our goal is to help our clients build community value through business activities.” <a href="http://socialdelta.ca/">http://socialdelta.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Enterprise Development Innovations</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Founded in 1986, Prosper Canada is a national charity dedicated to expanding economic opportunity for Canadians living in poverty through program and policy innovation. As Canada’s leading national champion of financial empowerment, we work with governments, businesses, and community groups to develop and promote financial policies, programs and resources that transform lives and foster the prosperity of all Canadians. Our aim is to ensure that all financially vulnerable Canadians have access to the financial policies, programs, products and advice they need to build their financial wellbeing.” <a href="http://www.sedi.org">www.sedi.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital Partners</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“At Social Capital Partners, we believe that applying market-based solutions to systemic social issues is the key to sustainable impact. We are a small but dynamic team of private sector and non-profit professionals who are tenacious about influencing systems change and developing innovative social finance solutions in Canada.” <a href="http://www.socialcapitalpartners.ca">www.socialcapitalpartners.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Change Institute</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>“Social Change Institute is an intergenerational gathering of social change makers: people working and organizing to shift, change or disrupt the world so that equity and justice can prosper and thrive. We come together in community to hone our skills, upgrade our tools, and focus on both our individual and collective leadership development.” <a href="https://hollyhockleadershipinstitute.org/sci/">https://hollyhockleadershipinstitute.org/sci/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Economy Hub</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>“To work with the regional research centres, national partners and others to foster research into the Social Economy so as to make it more accessible and useful to policy makers, Social Economy practitioners, and people in communities as well as for academic engagement. The CSEHub is a community-university research alliance between the University of Victoria, represented by its Principal Investigator Ian MacPherson, and the Canadian Community Economic Development Network, represented by its co-director Rupert Downing.” <a href="http://www.socialeconomyhub.ca/hub">www.socialeconomyhub.ca/hub</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Enterprise Institute</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“The Social Enterprise Institute gives you easy-to-use, action-based tools to solve the community and environmental issues you see.” <a href="https://socialenterpriseinstitute.ca/">https://socialenterpriseinstitute.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Enterprise for Northern Ontario (SENO)</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“About SEE Social Enterprise and Entrepreneurship (SEE), Northern Region Partnership aims to bring together Northern Ontario to grow a movement of social enterprise, entrepreneurship and social innovation.” <a href="https://seethechange.ca/programs/sono/">https://seethechange.ca/programs/sono/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Finance Blog</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“Since 2008, SocialFinance.ca has been a forum to discuss and debate the rapid rise of social finance in Canada. Currently operated by the MaRS Centre for Impact Investing, it has provided a much-needed space for diverse voices to be heard and opinions to be aired – helping to create the social finance movement.” <a href="http://socialfinance.ca/blog">http://socialfinance.ca/blog</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Innovation Generation (SiG)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“Social Innovation Generation (SiG) is a group who believes that serious social problems can be solved. Our focus is on fostering social innovation to achieve impact, durability and scale by engaging the creativity and resources of all sectors. SiG is a collaborative partnership founded by The J.W. McConnell Family Foundation, the University of Waterloo, the MaRS Discovery District, and the PLAN Institute. Our ultimate goal is to support whole system change through changing the broader economic, cultural and policy context in Canada to allow social innovations to flourish.” <a href="http://sigeneration.ca">http://sigeneration.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Social Venture Partners International | Vancouver, Calgary, | Service Provider | “We are people for whom improving our community is part of our life’s journey – whether we work in the nonprofit or corporate world. We are volunteers, parents, community leaders, philanthropists – a global network of local partners
Waterloo, Toronto | committed to a better and more just tomorrow for all people. We see the chasm between the challenges in our world, and the scale at which we are tackling those challenges. And we’re ready to cross that chasm. Together. We believe that nothing truly great is accomplished alone. Every person in our network has something to teach and something to learn. We are never satisfied, never settled. We know we have more to give, and that more needs to be done. Most importantly, we believe it can be. Where others see insurmountable problems, we see potential.”
http://www.socialventurepartners.org/

| SVX - Invest for impact | Toronto | Service Provider | “SVX is an impact investing platform for ventures, funds and investors seeking social and/or environmental impact alongside the potential for financial return. We provide a single access point for raising capital and making investments. We work across sectors including cleantech, health, work and learning, food, and social inclusion, providing support to enterprises focused on early cancer detection to community power co-operatives producing renewable energy.”
https://www.svx.ca/about

| Tamarack Community | Waterloo | Service Provider | “Collective impact, community engagement, collaborative leadership, community development, and evaluating community impact.”
http://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/

| The Next Big Thing (TNBT) | Canada | NGO | “The Next Big Thing (TNBT) is a national charitable organization that supports the entrepreneurial growth of youth through programs that give them skills needed to succeed in the Canadian and global economies. TNBT identifies and empowers young change-makers, rule-breakers, and entrepreneurial spirits through its intensive Fellowship Program and Youth Bright Idea Program. Through these programs, TNBT connects young Canadians with a highly influential professional network, practical business and technical skills, and each other. Since 2014 the organization has supported 56 entrepreneurs, all under 25, who have launched 36 ventures and have raised $4.8M in capital.”
http://wearetnbt.com

| Tides Canada Foundation | Canada | Charity | “Our mission: to provide uncommon solutions for the common good by helping Canadians secure a healthy environment in ways that promote social equity and economic prosperity. As a national charity, we connect and empower a wide range of people and initiatives across the country to take on tough social and environmental challenges, building a stronger Canada. We work to accelerate positive change and achieve greater impact across the country by bringing giving, investing, and doing under a single roof. From Canada’s big cities to its remote land, waters, and rural communities, Tides Canada provides uncommon solutions for the common good.”
www.tidescanada.org

| Toronto Enterprise Fund | Toronto | Service provider | “Funds social enterprises that contribute to the reduction of poverty and homelessness in Toronto through the innovative use of the social enterprise model. Aims to be a leader in supporting the development and sustainability of social enterprises that result in improved community involvement, economic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trico Foundation</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>“Leverage social entrepreneurship to close gaps in society, Provoking innovation and building capacity in social entrepreneurship, Values: innovation, integrity, impact, community, best practices.” <a href="https://tricofoundation.ca/">https://tricofoundation.ca/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC Sauder School of Business – Centre for Social Innovation &amp; Impact Investing</td>
<td>Vancouver, British Columbia</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>“The Centre for Social Innovation &amp; Impact Investing (Sauder S3i) is focused on leveraging business tools to advance social innovation and sustainability, through research, incubation, and application. The core research themes at Sauder S3i are building the low carbon economy, social innovation, and economic development with First Nations.” <a href="http://www.sauder.ubc.ca/Faculty/Research_Centres/Centre_for_Social_Innovation_and_Impact_Investing/Programs/Centre_Internships">http://www.sauder.ubc.ca/Faculty/Research_Centres/Centre_for_Social_Innovation_and_Impact_Investing/Programs/Centre_Internships</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto – Social Economy Centre</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>“The Social Economy Centre (SEC) of the University of Toronto promotes and disseminates multidisciplinary research and policy analysis on issues affecting the social economy. The Centre was established in 2005 by Jack Quarter and Laurie Mook as a unit of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.” <a href="http://sec.oise.utoronto.ca/english">http://sec.oise.utoronto.ca/english</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Victoria – British Columbia Institute for Co-operative Studies</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>“The BC Institute for Co-operative Studies was founded in January 2000 under the directorship of Dr Ian MacPherson, and is based at the University of Victoria. BCICS is a catalyst for research, learning, and teaching about co-operative thought and practice. BCICS collaborates locally, nationally, and internationally with other post-secondary institutions, the co-operative sector, governments, individuals, and communities interested in co-operative development. The purpose of the Institute is to understand how the co-operative model functions within different contexts, and to assess the contribution co-ops make to empowering people and communities in meeting their economic and social needs and controlling forces that impact their lives.” <a href="http://web.uvic.ca/bcics/research/health/health-coops.html">http://web.uvic.ca/bcics/research/health/health-coops.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waterloo Social Innovation Generation</td>
<td>Waterloo, Ontario</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>At the Waterloo Institute for Social Innovation and Resilience (WISIR), we are committed to generating trans- and inter-disciplinary knowledge about social innovations and the social innovation process (the dynamics of learning, adaptation and resilience). Our approach is to pursue collaborative research and projects that bridge University of Waterloo departments, involve researchers from around the world, and engage those beyond academia. WISIR seeks to mobilize this knowledge through a range of new curriculum offerings and training opportunities - both within and outside of a university setting. <a href="http://www.siq.uwaterloo.ca/social_innovation.html">www.siq.uwaterloo.ca/social_innovation.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waubetek</td>
<td>North-Eastern Ontario</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
<td>“The Social Enterprise Development Fund (SEDF) provides an interest free loan, with deferred payment for up to 6 months, in an amount that covers 45% of the total business start-up costs up to a maximum of $70,000. This amount may also be augmented by, or combined with, Waubetek’s regular business...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancity</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERGE Social Enterprise Loan Fund</td>
<td>London, Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Innovation Social Development Fund</td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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