Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.

- Margaret Mead

765 Inc: The Power of the Collective

by

Andi Sharma

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

CHAPTER 2

CHAPTER 3

CHAPTER 4

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The socio-political and economic conditions in North America have been undergoing a considerable shift over the last several decades. The end of the post-WWII golden age heralded the gradual erosion of the Keynesian welfare state social safety-net (Forrest and Kearns, 2001). As a result, state funding was withdrawn from social services and non-profit organizations were forced to fill the void with increasingly limited fiscal and human resources. In response to these pressures, social enterprises and non-profits have engaged in clustering models in an attempt to reduce costs while building capacity. The concept of co-location (clustering) has been a practice of the third sector for decades, however new social research has uncovered that the benefits of sharing space go far beyond simple economic considerations. Specifically, Soots et. al (2009, 6) have found that sharing space can "break down silos, reduce costs, increase opportunities for collaboration and cooperation, create knowledge and learning networks and spark social innovation". These represent significant advantages that non-profits and social enterprises in Winnipeg could benefit from and it was exactly this reasoning that provided the impetus for the creation of the Social Enterprise Centre (SEC).

As part of my practicum placement at the SEC, I was tasked with uncovering how the mechanics of cluster theory could inform the practices of the tenants at the centre to realize the full potential of co-location, as outlined above. Accordingly, this paper draws on both primary and secondary research to formulate a series of recommendations for merging theory with practice in an attempt to foster the innovative environment that clustering is capable of. After a brief background on the SEC, an exploration of the theory will be followed by a presentation of the primary research findings and the resulting discussion of the identified gaps in theory and practice will serve as the foundation for developing a framework for implementation. The primary research is itself divided into two components. The first was a set of three interviews conducted with exemplary case studies of high-functioning cluster models across North America. The surveys were designed specifically for the tenants of the SEC in order to understand what they thought the gaps in implementation were. The objective of this research was twofold: to provide a thorough assessment of the theory and practice of clustering and co-location; and to use this assessment to inform the business practices for the SEC by way of a proposal for future consideration.

METHODOLOGY

As mentioned, the research involved both primary and secondary investigations into cluster theory. The secondary research was largely based on a literature review of what current best practices and identified challenges are for clustering models. After being granted ethics approval from the Senate Committee on Ethics and Human research and Scholarship (SCEHRS) at the University of Winnipeg I conducted primary research which consisted of three interviews and three surveys. The interviews were conducted over the phone with three different organizations. The first was with Katie Edwards, the Member Services Coordinator for the Non-Profit Centers Network, Tides Centre - based in San Francisco, CA. I also spoke with Tracy Boyer, Co-founder and Executive Director of The Hub in Halifax, NS. I was also fortunate to connect with Courtney Moss of the Centre for Social Innovation in Toronto, ON. Although I did not get a formal interview with Courtney, she directed me to their burgeoning literature on the subject and answered any questions that I had. Within the organization itself, I spoke with Mike Wolchuk Pollock’s hardware and Brendan Reimer of CCED-Net. These interviews were approximately 20 minutes long wherein participants were asked a series of questions. The first two respondents represent organizations that are exemplary co-location models and provided excellent insight into the mechanics of clustering. The questions were designed to glean advice on successful implementation and solutions for commonly faced challenges that arose through the growth and development of their clustered spaces.

The surveys and internal interviews were conducted with three of the tenants of the SEC. The survey questions were different from the external agency interviews insofar as they were more concerned about understanding the day-to-day activities of the SEC as it relates to the theory of clustering. Essentially trying to tease out whether and to what extent being co-located within the SEC is helping these smaller non-profits. A copy of the survey and interview guides can be found in Appendices 1 and 2 respectively. Both the primary and secondary research have served to inform the recommendations at the end of this research report.

WINNIPEG`S INNER CITY AND THE ROLE OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISE

The state of the inner city in Winnipeg has been well documented elsewhere[1] but it is worth mentioning some basic characteristics to demonstrate the need for a stronger network of social enterprises in our city centre. Winnipeg's core has high rates of poverty, which is also linked to high rates of unemployment, low rates of labour-force participation, street-gang activity, prostitution, violence and rundown housing (Canu, 2011). As one would expect, given such high rates of poverty, there is a disproportionately high incidence of unemployment, 44.22% (Point Douglas Revitalization Initiative, 2012), which is nearly six times as high as the average unemployment rate for the city of Winnipeg (Winnipeg Free Press, 2012.). These conditions require concerted effort to repair and the efforts of social enterprises provide exactly this support. Social enterprises form at the intersection of the public, private and non-profit sectors and are organizations that pursue both profit as well as social and environmental outcomes. These

[1] See Silver 2006; McKinnon and Silvius 2012; MacKinnon and Silver 2005; Deane 2006

organizations differentiate themselves from both traditional economic and non-profit models in that they are concerned with financial *and* social return on investment. They try to balance the need to develop social capacity in disadvantaged communities with the need to be financially self-sustaining. Essentially, this model "represents the new or renewed expression of civil society against a background of economic crisis, the weakening of social bonds and difficulties of the welfare state" (Defourny, 2001).

Currently the Province of Manitoba invests over $80 million in NGO funding annually in the inner city of Winnipeg in addition to an estimated $200 million in services as a whole; including civic, school board and provincial services (Point Douglas Revitalization Initiative, 2012). However, despite such considerable investment, the Point Douglas and surrounding communities continues to experience declining outcomes in several sectors. This marginalized population faces poverty at rates which are triple that of the national average, garnering them the infamous descriptor of "one of the poorest area codes in Canada" (CCED-NET, 2010). According to Mackinnon and Silver (2011) in order to keep generating tangible social outcomes "what is needed is consistency of investment in solutions that work". So given the poor outcomes of the public investment to date, especially when considered relative to the demonstrated benefits of social enterprise for building community capacity, there is a real case to be made for re-directing at least some of this investment to social enterprises. Furthermore, social enterprises have measurable outcomes and metrics which can provide quantifiable evidence as to the efficacy of social entrepreneurship: jobs created, individuals graduated, driver's licenses received etc. (Haugh, 2005).

Social enterprises are also uniquely positioned to contribute to the economic health of the city while providing much needed capacity development in Winnipeg's most disadvantaged area.

In fact, the sector has stimulated considerable growth in the inner city. In 2010, 118 social enterprises in Winnipeg recorded revenues of $55.4 million and paid out $23.5 million in wages to more than 3,750 people - of whom 3,450 were employed as part of the social mission of the organization (O'Connor et al., 2012). This means that directly as a result of social enterprise efforts, thousands of individuals facing multiple barriers to employment were able to be gainfully employed. These organizations also provide much needed training for multi-barrier individuals and almost 7,000 people were trained in 2010 (Ibid.). This represents an important policy area given that the public money infused into the system was a fraction of the return – essentially social enterprises offer a self-sustaining model with which to address the issues in the inner city. Thus it is clear that there is a significant role for social enterprise in the development of Winnipeg's inner city and as such, careful attention must be paid to any mechanisms which can serve to reinforce this sector to help it grow.

CHAPTER 2

THE SOCIAL ENTERPRISE CENTRE (SEC)

The SEC is a non-profit entity that is comprised of three smaller social enterprises. Pollock's hardware, Manitoba Green Retrofit (MGR) and BUILD own and operate the SEC which is home to several other small non-profits. MGR and BUILD are both construction-based social enterprises whose main trades are retro-fitting and fixing homes and apartments. Their social objectives are to improve skill sets for mostly young aboriginal males – train them in a trade such as construction then provide jobs and experience – in order to improve their future career opportunities and to stimulate overall economic development of the local communities. Pollock's Hardware is a co-operative model which "seeks to provide members with needed services at the lowest possible costs" where the members of the co-operative business each have one vote, irrespective of capital contributed (Desjardins, 2013). Further, "self-help…democracy, equality, equity and solidarity" and adhering to "ethics based on honesty, openness, social responsibility and caring for others" are objectives of co-operative models which align directly with the goals of the aforementioned social enterprises (Ibid.). Pollock's Hardware contributes to the relationship among the partners by providing building materials at reasonable prices and maintaining operations within local communities such as Point Douglas; a community where almost all commercial companies have vacated. This obvious alignment of business lines was an ideal fit for the 'recirculation of dollars' within communities. That is to say, by utilizing local talent and materials, it is possible to "build local strengths...create linkages within...and stem leakages from the community" which is paramount to successful community economic development (CED) (Silver and Loxley, 2007).

The SEC was borne out of a need for space to house these newly connected and growing partners which lead to the purchase of the warehouse at 765 Main Street, made possible by private and public funding. The building is managed by a board made up of members from the controlling partners' boards and is home to six small non-profit organizations all dedicated to improving the social outcomes of the inner city.

- Local Investment Toward Employment (LITE)
    - Dedicated to promote community economic development by supporting inner-city initiatives in Winnipeg which build capacity and provide jobs.
- Point Douglas Resident's Committee (PDRC)
    - Dedicated to providing support for Point Douglas community residents related to housing and safety
- Canadian Community Economic Development –Network (CCED-Net)

- Is an organization that believes in sustainable and inclusive communities directing their own social, economic and environmental futures. CCED-Net is a member-led organization committed to strengthening communities by creating economic opportunities that improve environmental and social conditions.

- Citizen Bridge
  - Dedicated to helping people to obtain proper identification, such as a driver's license, and manage their money — important tools to getting a job and taking care of regular pay cheques. (Winnipeg Rental Network, 2013)
- Aboriginal Circle of Educators
  - Exists to empower educators through holistic approaches and professional development and advocacy to advance indigenous knowledge for the success of future generations (ACE, 2010)
- Families and Communities Together (FACT, 2011)
  - A coalition of individuals and groups dedicated to working together for the benefit of children and families in the areas of Point Douglas and the North End.

It is clear that the SEC has been able to centralize and concentrate a portion of Winnipeg's social economy – but to what end? The centre was originally intended to "provide opportunities for community, researchers and social entrepreneurs to meet, share and develop social enterprise knowledge" (SEC Funding Proposal 2010, 3). Their stated objectives include a desire "to capture social enterprise-specific knowledge for the community economic development sector as a whole and provide an instrument for scaling up the partnering social enterprises" (Ibid.). The question now becomes: how and to what extent are these objectives attainable? How is the SEC in a position to deliver on these goals? The answer lies in the theory of clustering, co-location and sharing space.

THE THEORY: CLUSTERING, CO-LOCATION AND SHARED SPACES

Clustering refers to many organizations with similar objectives sharing a physical space and has "often been viewed as a route to economic and social well-being" for smaller organizations (Wei et. al. 2005, 8). The cluster concept is predicated on the simple equation: Physical Space + Community = Social Innovation. There are a variety of expressions of this equation as this concept is not only applicable to the social economy, but equally available to the private and public sectors. Gordon and Mcann (2000) distinguish between three different cluster models. The first two, the 'pure agglomeration economies' and the 'industrial complex' models, derive from the neo-classical tradition of economic organization. The former is concerned with external economies of geographical concentration insofar as the concentration of firms engaged in similar economic activity can attract bigger suppliers and depress input costs. The latter is more of a vertical supply chain integration cluster wherein firms involved in producing the same product, but located at different points in the value chain, cluster to derive benefits of reduced transaction costs.

The last model, termed social-network, "interprets clusters mainly in terms of strong local networks of inter-personal relations, trust and institutionalized practices" (Martin and Sunley 2003, 22). This categorization is designed for cluster models operating in the social economy and the SEC is certainly functioning under this delineation. Thus, under this model we have a situation where the route to social and economic well-being is directly facilitated by the relationships which grow naturally as part of being co-located within a shared space. These relationships “are not only economic, but also social and political, and rely on factors such as spatial, cultural and mental proximity” (Ibid., 11). Therefore the theoretical advantages of clustering that are seen to be predicated on these relationships include not only economic but social and political benefits as well.

ADVANTAGES

Industrial clusters have been studied extensively, with the conclusion that “the economic advantages of clusters are empirically documented and well established” (Martin and Sunley 2003, 35). These advantages take the form of increasing the “productivity, innovativeness, competitiveness, profitability and job creation performance” of their constituent firms (Ibid., 36).While these benefits are tremendous, they take more time to realize and require concerted effort in building the mechanistic aspects of co-location. The most significant and immediate benefit from sharing space is realized in the reduction of overhead costs. Reduced rent through cost sharing; sharing services such as human resources, marketing and accounting; and the access to shared amenities, such as a kitchen and meeting space, all contribute to lowering organizational overhead (Centre for Social Innovation, 2012). The importance of this, as anyone in the social economy can attest to, is that these resources can then be reallocated to the CED efforts of the various organizations.

In traditional, economically driven clusters the competitive nature of the cluster can sometimes lead to negative practices, such as labour poaching, which represents a significant drawback from co-location. However in the social-network model, predominant in the social economy, clustering offers the benefit of shared intelligence and access to a larger talent pool which serves to improve the overall knowledge and capacity of small non-profits or social enterprises (Gordon and Mcann 2000, 523). The threat of labour poaching is not as evident given the small sizes of the firms and the inherent understanding that collaboration and information sharing is at the heart of transformational social engagement for local communities (Himmelman 1996, 19). Furthermore, the advantages of sharing information in the social economy has the ability to stimulate social innovation and sector-wide learning which benefits all organizations pursuing the same social goals (Soots et. al. 2009, 7). Taken together, these social advantages represent compelling reasons to engage in cluster models.

Lastly, the political advantages that can arise from the social-network model of co-location can take two forms. The first results from the efforts of enterprising non-profits such as the Canadian Community Economic Development Network (CCED-Net) whose main focus is generating intellectual momentum and support for moving forward important policy changes in the pursuit of their social objectives. For example, the recent success of CCED-Net Manitoba in passing the Co-operative Development Tax Credit is a benefit that can be felt in the entire social economy and is derived largely from “member-led, collaborative input and advocacy” (Tenant Survey, 2013). The second form of political advantage derives from the cluster itself. Cluster policy predominantly caters to industrial clusters wherein tax credits and other economic incentives for co-location are offered to member firms to promote national competitiveness in a particular industry on the global stage (Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry [METI] Japan, 2009). Cluster policy is well developed in the state of Minnesota where it is designed to attract investment, create jobs and develop sectoral presence (Holmes et. al., 2011). This is largely accomplished through incentivizing organizations to engage in clustering models so as to incubate and generate innovation. These policy propositions can be adapted and transplanted to the social economic sector with similar ideas of stimulating self-sustaining community growth and development.

The theory presented above, drawn from secondary research methods, aligns closely with the primary research I conducted with respect to the identified benefits of sharing space. In speaking with the Centre for Social Innovation (CSI), I was directed to a body of research that they have compiled over the last decade of operating as a clustered environment. Drawing on nine years of experience with sharing space, the CSI (2010, 37) developed a framework for implementation that is widely available to the public and adaptable to almost any circumstance. They identified six key impacts that result from being part of a shared space as well as three areas of community animation that facilitate manifestation of these benefits.

THE IMPACTS OF SHARING SPACE

1. **Mission**: Being part of a co-located community offers a professional space with all the appropriate amenities that can allow the organization in the shared space to set aside worrying about administrative functions and focus on their missions. For example, access to professional office and meeting space, photocopiers and a shared kitchen are key features that must be present for the organizations to operate on a meaningful level. Moreover, shared space should also include low-cost access to shared services such as accounting or human resources. These amenities and services are usually out of reach for smaller non-profits but when you aggregate, you’re able to take advantage of scale economies.
2. **Networks**: Co-location also facilitates access to whole communities of like-minded individuals working toward similar goals. Sharing space “brings people together to learn from one another;

mutually aid and reinforce each other; and provide much needed access to talented people who are engaged in community development" (Ibid., 45)

3. **Ideas:** Ideas are at the heart of social innovation. Communities that grow in shared spaces foster innovation because it provides 'catalyzing inspiration'. By sharing space with other organizations you are "able to multiply the number of ideas that you are exposed to which expands your capacity to generate, expand on or reconceptualize new ideas" (ibid., 49). Being immersed in such a creative environment allows for continuous learning, inspiration and accelerated growth and development.
4. **Collaboration:** A common barrier for small groups is their organizational limits – capacity is a profound issue which affects every aspect of CED efforts. Sharing space "provides a ready-made pool of potential collaborators [and] allows innovators to leverage each other's strengths in service of shared goals" (Ibid.).
5. **Money:** At the heart of capacity issues lies a perpetual shortage of funding. Sharing space allows for access to larger markets through contact sharing and converging membership bases. As mentioned before, cost sharing is also a significant part of the reduction in overhead for organizations in shared spaces. Taken together, these efforts translate into more financial capacity to engage in CED efforts.
6. **Happiness:** Lastly, happiness is one of the more immediate and lasting benefits of co-location. Organizations involved in CED efforts are, more often than not, understaffed, overworked and underfunded. This translates into a hard and depressing work environment which will reduce the efficiency and effectiveness of the CED efforts. By sharing space with individuals who share the same gifts and burdens, individuals are able to rely on an emotional network of support.

These benefits are similar to those put forward in the theories based on industrial cluster research. Taken together they offer a comprehensive assessment and definitive evidence to support the notion that the shared space model is a critical factor in the success of small-mid size organizations engaging in CED efforts.

MANIFESTING SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

It is abundantly clear that there are significant benefits conferred on clustered organizations. Although it isn't yet clear how these advantages are manifested: what must co-located organizations do in order to reap the benefits of sharing space? Bathelt (2004) maintains that the central impetus for these advantages is borne of the learning and innovation that occurs in shared spaces. According to Bathelt (2004, 22), "learning and innovation are a result of interactive processes in which different actors come together to collaborate in solving particular problems". He further contends that there is a distinction between mechanisms that generate these processes of learning and social innovation. That distinction lies between "the learning processes taking place among actors embedded in a community by just being there" and "the knowledge attained by investing in building channels of communication" (Ibid., 31). This is an important distinction because of the implications for the SEC if the benefits of co-location are left unrealized due to an inability to appropriately animate the community.

With respect to the elements that must be in place in order for the theory of clustering to truly manifest, I found that the work by Morosini (2002) provided the most comprehensive and accessible assessment of what Porter (1998) termed "the social glue", which holds the cluster together. Porter (1998, 88) believed that there is great potential in the act of co-location, however simply sharing space " does not ensure its full realization". He held that what is needed to activate this potential is the “social glue that facilitates access to important resources and information”. Morosini (2002) further developed this concept and delimits five key capabilities which serve as the foundation of the social glue: leadership, building blocks, communication rituals, knowledge interactions, professional rotations.

1. ***Leadership*****:** Morosini emphatically asserts that a strong leader is necessary to champion the manifestation of social innovation. This person must command ``an explicit role fostering mutual cooperation, knowledge sharing and leadership coaching that are seen as benefiting the common interests of the members of the cluster`` (Ibid., 310). Essentially, someone who can dedicate time and resources to developing the mechanisms and ensure the quality of processes which contribute to the learning processes.
2. ***Building blocks*****:** Based on empirical evidence, Morosini calls for a clearly defined `common stock` of organizational knowledge that is shared by all members. This knowledge must necessarily include strong socio-cultural ties which ``create a common code of behaviour that facilitates trust and active collaboration; a common culture; and a common philosophy`` (310). Moreover, Morosini holds that that these things must be clearly agreed upon by the community. The spirit of this precondition lies in the fact that this common stock of knowledge is what defines the community values. Moreover the commonalities help to manifest the values in a meaningful way which helps to build trust, an element which Morosini asserts is paramount to effective collaboration.
3. ***Communication rituals:*** refers to the regular communication events and interactions that foster a common sense of identity among cluster members. These rituals “serve to continually

reinforce the community sense of identity" which theoretical[2] consensus reveals is a critical factor in the success of a cluster (Ibid., 311). Arguably, this represents the difference between being co-located and animating the community spirit to drive social innovation.

4. ***Knowledge interactions:*** refer to the exchange of technical and practical information relevant to developing the social economy (Ibid., 311). These interactions stand in contrast to the ritual communication events insofar as where the former are concerned with building community identity, these interactions are expressly for the purpose of sharing technical and practical information related to business operations. For example, sharing grant information or keeping constituent organizations apprised of various events are examples of these transfers of knowledge. The distinction is an important one because you may be able to build a sense of community, but without careful attention to building organizational presence and increasing opportunities for expansion, the cluster becomes less of a competitive advantage. It is fairly self-evident that raising awareness and continual growth is paramount for achieving social objectives.
5. ***Professional rotation:*** refers to the accessibility and mobility of the clustered talent pool; essentially the collaborative spirit of the shared space (311). This is important when considering the organizational limits of small non-profits and social enterprises. Talented individuals engaged in community development are far and few between, especially in small cities such as Winnipeg. Having the mechanisms in place to formally encourage collaboration creates trust between organizations and strengthens the sector as a whole.

These preconditions, according to Morosini, will translate into the ability for a clustered environment to animate the latent potential of co-location. They represent the structural aspects

[2] Porter 1998; Morosini 2002; Soots et. al. 2009

necessary to generate the benefits that stem from sharing space. Now that we have a theoretical foundation, it is possible to assess the primary data in an attempt confirm or disprove that theory informs practice. Essentially I attempt to find out whether it was possible to codify the steps that animate sharing spaces so much so that they would invariably lead to realizing the full potential of sharing space. Additionally, the case studies provide an exploration into whether the purported theoretical benefits hold in real-world situations.

CHAPTER 3

THE PRIMARY RESEARCH

In order to assess the veracity of the theoretical claims regarding the benefits of clustering and the methods of attaining them, I spoke with two organizations that were able to confirm the literature in many respects. The interviews were also invaluable for providing insights that were not contained in the literature as they gave unedited, in-depth answers to questions that dealt with the more humanistic, as opposed to technical aspects of sharing space. They were conducted with experts in the field of administering shared spaces and were an excellent resource for this investigation. The surveys were intended to assess whether and to what extent the SEC was incorporating the mechanisms and achieving the benefits laid out in the theory. As such, it provided the perfect forum for identifying gaps in the marriage of theory and practice and allowed for a comprehensive assessment of the situation at the SEC. Below is a discussion of the findings and a framework for incorporating the research into the daily operations of the SEC.

KATIE EDWARDS, NON-PROFITS CENTERS NETWORK
TIDES THOREAU CENTRE – SAN FRANCISCO

The Non-Profit Centers Network is "dedicated to building peer learning communities" which is to say that they specialize in setting up clustered environments for social economic practitioners (Edwards, 2013). They have members all across the globe, particularly concentrated in South East Asia, which lead Katie to speak to the fact that sharing spaces is truly an international concept. Tides began their involvement in creating shared space "when the rents shot up and [they] lost [their] lease" which has "been a consistent problem with most of the non-profits in San Francisco" (Ibid.) Katie spoke at length about this "need for affordable space" which was the impetus for purchasing their current location – a decommissioned army hospital in the Bay Area (Ibid.). She said that by sharing the costs and reducing the overhead of the constituent organizations, the Thoreau Centre has been able to save their tenants over $18 million since 2004. They have found that they can "reallocate this overhead cost towards mission related impacts" which is very much aligned with what the literature has said were the most critical and immediate benefits of co-location.

The Non-Profit Centers Network is a program of the Tides organization that is solely dedicated to managing the centre and is actively engaged in creating the shared environment. This demonstrates the aspect of leadership that is required to facilitate social innovation in shared space. The centre is home to sixty organizations that are all environmentally oriented. Katie outlined the shared green practices that they engage in across the 12 connected buildings that comprise their centre. She was careful to note their "building-wide composting, recycling and gardening activities" as community building mechanisms that reflect and reinforce their stated environmental goals and "dedication to green practices" (Ibid.). This aligns directly with

Morosini's notion of the building blocks in a shared environment. These mechanisms serve to actively create, define and bolster what the community at the Thoreau Centre is really about – environmental stewardship and conservation.

The communication rituals at the Centre are designed to ensure maximum participation with the minimum amount of continual pressure to participate. As well, having organizations host internal communication events allows for collaboration on relatively stress-free and small projects which builds trust among the constituents. For example, they host regular art gallery openings which have an added benefit of drawing crowds that are entirely different to those that generally engage with the environmental community. Katie also spoke about 'brown bag lunches' wherein members are encouraged to share their most recent successes, challenges, new research or funding avenues – essentially a method of "keeping a finger on the pulse of the Centre" (Ibid.).

The knowledge transfer channels at the Tides Centre are partially formally facilitated but are also designed with an awareness of the importance of informal communication, especially with actors in the social economy. Katie mentioned that there "has been some programmatic collaboration – but it has not been as widespread as [they] had hoped, or thought it would be" (ibid.) When pressed as to why she thought that might be, she cited a lack of mechanisms in place to really formally facilitate collaboration. As a result of this gap in services, they have instituted formal working groups, termed "Affinity Groups", that are specifically for the marketers of the different tenants to get together, pool resources, share ideas and keep abreast of recent sectoral changes. They are currently planning to expand these Affinity Groups to other functions or departments in the tenant organizations. She did also really emphasize the fact that "[their] tenants wanted more opportunities for chance encounters" as a method of sparking engagement. She mentioned their organic cafe which “[their] tenants found to be the heartbeat of Thoreau that provides opportunities for chance encounters” (Ibid.) and termed this “the water cooler affect – where you naturally run into people that you wouldn’t otherwise” (ibid.). Related to that was Katie’s insistence on creating space in these shared environments that “intentionally connect people and organizations” (Ibid). She was emphatic about ensuring that the physical location was “amenable to informal collaboration” (Ibid.). This is profound because the literature does not explicitly speak to informal ‘chance encounters’ and apparently this is an excellent supplement to the formal programming that encourages collaboration.

Related to these revelations, Katie spoke of the need to set clear boundaries and expectations of what it means to be in a shared space: “there are so many people involved in the centre that there are a lot of competing or unclear expectations about what comes from being shared in one space” (Ibid.). Developing these expectations are also really important for building trusts and, as Katie noted, “with collaboration of any kind, it’s all about the trust between organizations, and trust doesn’t happen overnight” (Ibid.). These shared space centers are all about creating collaborative relationships where social innovation can occur; however they must be aware of the significant time and effort that must go into relationship and trust building that are necessary precursors to collaboration. These are important insights that aren’t explicitly captured in the literature; whereas a first read would have the reader imagine that with all the ingredients, collaboration and social innovation is a given – there also requires a significant investment of time and relationship development as a precursor to producing the desired collaborative innovation. Simply sharing space can be beneficial in a limited way but without animating the community, it will not lead to social innovation.

This organization was chosen for its explicit focus on providing a revolving door, shared space experience. The organization doesn't have "fixed space" where tenants are enduring members of the community – instead it is a shared environment of rental office space which is booked on an as needed basis. This is very different than the stable communities of the social-network cluster model described previously and offers unique insight as to the benefits of simply co-locating versus community building which is purported to lead to social innovation. Essentially, it is only part of the equation where we have Physical Space but lack the aspects relating to Community building; so the question becomes: does this still lead to social innovation?

The Hub was co-founded by Tracy and it is expressly a for-profit organizational model. The main reason for opening was that a lot of their CED community was doing work from their homes and needed a professional place to come together and work on individual or joint projects. A lot of the projects "needed a space to really take these projects to the next level on a case-by-case basis" (Boyer, 2013). This was the impetus for the creation of The Hub, which was a loosely affiliated group that hosted everyone from environmental architects to interactive web designers. This "eclectic range of people" was brought together by the underlying ethos of The Hub which was to be engaged in work "to make the world a radically better place" (Ibid.). In recognition of the fact that "community work can't be done in isolation" Tracy started The Hub with the express purpose of "giving people in the community a place where they could start something and take it to the next level in a low risk environment" (Ibid.). This generally translates to very high turnover of clientele for Tracy, as their hosted organizations "often grow up and out of the space" which doesn't allow for community building or collaboration (Ibid.). Tracy was careful to mention that they did see The Hub as a centre for individual social innovation insofar as they provide a space for people to work, providing little else in the way of community animation. In this way, The Hub is more of an incubator or accelerator, where the end goals and perceived successes are to see the constituent organizations rapidly develop beyond the capacity of The Hub.

Tracy did admit that there was a "belief that if [they] brought people together from different backgrounds that there would be some social innovation that emerged" but in terms of whether it has actually occurred, the answer was less than inspiring. Tracy said that the organization isn't really designed to foster social innovation the same way that the CSI or the SEC are meant to; it is more about developing the individual capacities of the revolving tenants in the hope that they are one day able to make it on their own. The underlying philosophy of this partially developed clustered community stems from similar hopes for shared spaces. The rhetoric is the same, but the means and ends are different. For example, Tracy finds that "in a world that is too segregated and siloed it's so critical that we have more and more of these environments that bring us together and allow us to see our similarities and express our differences, so that we may have richer results that may inform our work" (Ibid.).

It was interesting to see the tenets of community being utilized as a way to further individual goals. She spoke of the community as being the key variable in their model which allowed their tenants to accelerate. To be sure, Tracy recognized the irony of this but was quick to mention that the difference isn't as pronounced as one would think, "You could work in isolation, and you might get somewhere, but you get there quicker when you work with people...people accelerate more quickly in these environments" (Ibid.). Essentially The Hub represents an understanding of the power of the collective to accelerate growth and development, but stops short of manifesting this as social transformation.

Despite this disconnect, the aspect of sharing physical space is the commonality which makes studying this model worthwhile. How far can simply being in the space take an organization? In the absence of community animation and concerted effort at creating a clustered entity with its own identity, can social innovation occur? As demonstrated by The Hub model, the answer is a resounding no. I chose this case study precisely because it demonstrates that sharing space produces benefits, but without the community animation, those benefits are not anywhere near their full potential. Moreover, the prospect of generating social innovation to catalyze social transformation is lost in the pursuit of the admirable though narrowly defined goals of the tenant organizations. I believe that this is essentially how the SEC is operating currently, without an explicit ability to animate the community to build a sense of identity for the Centre. The sum (of the SEC) has so much potential to be bigger than the parts and this can only happen with concerted effort. If not, you are left with a perfectly acceptable, functional model that simply provides much needed space for small organizations – but if your goals are to create change in the communities you serve, it is important to move beyond this into the spirit of shared spaces.

TENANT SURVEYS (ANONYMOUS)[3]

In speaking with a number of SEC tenants, a very clear picture began to emerge wherein there were both definitive advantages and disadvantages to being co-located. The surveys provided the necessary context of the strengths and weaknesses that characterize the SEC insofar

[3] Only three organizations responded to the survey so it's important to bear this in mind when contemplating generalizing to the larger SEC community (6 tenants), excluding the 3 partners. A mandatory survey, administered by the board, might have a better chance at capturing the depth and breadth of opinion which would provide a more robust analysis.

as its role as a locus of social innovation. The most notable weaknesses were mostly mechanistic in nature, focusing on issues that come of being a partially developed clustered community. For example, all of the tenants surveyed mentioned that the parking lot was a source of frustration as managing so many organizations, many with varying hours of operations and some that require huge trucks for materials transport, is difficult especially when it's uncoordinated (Tenant Surveys, 2013).

With respect to the space, there were "frustrations with location and security". It is important for the SEC to be located within the community it is serving, but the distinction was made between "those elements of the community that are proud, and those that are desperate. The desperate ones are who steals the batteries from our trucks to sell at the junkyard" (Tenant Interview, 2013). The SEC might consider better reinforcing their parking lots or putting up security cameras to assure tenant perceptions of safety. There was also a common theme of the lack of dedicated and professional meeting space with tenants finding that "it would be very beneficial if the building could be made more meeting friendly. I don't think the landlord knew how popular the meeting room aspect, particularly during after hours, would be" (Ibid.).

As an aside, I find that language of this statement to be particularly revealing. 'The landlord' refers ostensibly to the SEC Board and I think it's indicative of a clear lack of community interaction. Moreover, the term tenant (as opposed to member) even implies a degree of separation that is antithetical to the kind of community experience that social-network clustering is endeavouring to create. I would expect that with such a small community at the SEC it would at least be feasible to know who each other are on a more personal level that these titles. The sense of community that is intended in clustering should be such that it transcends these titles and landlords or tenants become people, with names and histories.

Another tenant spoke in frustration about the lack of cohesion in the centre, finding that "more community building events would be welcome to facilitate relationships and awareness" (Ibid.). This was echoed by sentiments calling for "quarterly meetings to give updates and stay informed" but was tempered by the fact that "meetings as needed would be better given the busy, often over-scheduled nature of community work" (Ibid.). There is a definite sense from the surveys that there is no strong sense of identity in the SEC community and that efforts directed toward building it are welcome; however the organizations surveyed were very careful to mention that they do not necessarily have the time or resources to contribute in developing this sense of community "[we are] a tiny non-profit barely affording staff as it is, where would the time and staff be taken from?" This poses a barrier for any efforts at trying to create an SEC identity – you need bottom-up buy in for this kind of process to work.

Another area for improvement as identified by the tenant surveys is the lack of external community awareness of the SEC, its tenants and the work being done there. One tenant found that "while there has been some good media attention, this can be improved. BUILD has had some great exposure but other organizations would benefit from this" (Ibid.) Likewise, another respondent identified that the public is not adequately informed of SEC activities and this is due in part because notification of media opportunities is often "at the last minute...[which] can be a cause of frustration, particularly for those of us who don't work in-office daily" (Ibid.).

It is important to consider all the wonderful benefits that the SEC is providing to these tenants as well – in order to provide direction for the future, it is equally important to build on strengths as it is to address weaknesses. An important revelation was that all of the tenants surveyed were grateful for being in the space because "the SEC offers tenants more direct lived experience and inspiration than if you're learning in a different environment – it's more of an immersive experience"; and that "the energy in the building is synergistic. Being surrounded by like-minded organizations has created more information exchange and positive information flow" (Ibid.). They mentioned that these could be improved upon by formalizing the mechanisms as "having multiple sources of information and knowledge is a definite benefit. Awareness of grants, webinars and workshops greatly impact the ability to do the job more effectively and efficiently" (Ibid.).

Being co-located at the SEC has also lead to positive benefits for the various CED efforts that each organization is engaged with, "we have gained members, increased face-to-face interaction with members, met new potential members and have been able to better expose our connections (government, funders other sectors) to CED and social enterprise" (Ibid.) This is a critical indicator of the efficacy of the SEC in facilitating these connections. One tenant also mentioned that having the SEC as a place tour potential members and the external community at large has been great exposure for CED efforts, "we are able to do more public education and exposure as groups are able to come to one place to get an idea of the CED sector" (Ibid.)

It was also somewhat surprising to see mention of the informal structures of information exchange as these were not explicitly addressed in the literature, but came up in the case studies: "It is the informal nature and internal building of networks that have grown organically that show there is less need for formal structures and a strong need for personal relationship building that makes SEC successful" (Ibid.). Ultimately there are a lot of wonderful things that the SEC is accomplishing and it is forging ahead on a worthwhile path, but there are things which can be improved upon to ensure that the SEC is fully realizing its potential.

CHAPTER 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the primary and secondary research I have conducted, I have crafted a series of recommendations that I believe will serve to build on the strengths and address the weaknesses of the SEC's operating model. I fully realize that the budget of the SEC is such that some of these recommendations may not be feasible at this point, but they are no less important to have in mind when crafting short, medium and long-term business plans.

The most important insight that came out of the research was the need for the SEC to be honored as the separate entity it is and managed accordingly. That is to say, it is currently only notionally a separate entity insofar as the talent that manages it, does so on the periphery of responsibilities central to their main positions within their respective organizations. This stretches an already understaffed group of organizations even further. Coupled with a shoestring budget, these conditions translate into the social objectives of clustering for the SEC often being set aside in favor of more pressing concerns relating to every-day operations for the three controlling partners. Thus my first recommendation is that a dedicated professional be retained to manage the aspects of community animation in the following recommendations. This also satisfies Morosini's call for a strong leader to champion the cause of co-location and fulfills the first element of the social glue.

The SEC should also create mechanisms which foster their social goals directly as part of developing Morosini's building blocks of co-location. More specifically, hosting 'new research nights' dedicated to new CED initiatives; having community feasts; or collaborating on free skill-building workshops for interested individuals from the community will accomplish this aspect of the social glue.

The community animation spoken of throughout this paper is largely divided into three areas: technical, physical and social (CSI, 2011). These will all serve to reinforce the knowledge interaction and communication preconditions in Morsoini's model. Technical animation refers to "activities that happen online or in a virtual space" (Ibid., 110). As we have seen in places like the SEC, members aren't always available onsite to be engaged and as such, having dedicated lines of virtual communication are important for tenants to feel connected. Suggestions include:

- Shared email lists
- Member portal/intranet
- Dedicated website for the SEC
    - Online member profiles
    - Online events listings
    - Online FAQ

Social animation refers to "activities that get to know each other" which we have seen from both the literature and the case studies, is paramount to realizing the full potential of a social-network cluster model (ibid.). Suggested activities include:

- Annual summer picnics
- Holiday parties
- Birthday Celebrations
- Salad/appetizer Clubs
- Drinks night

- Movie projector nights with popcorn
- Walking clubs at lunch

The onus of hosting various events can be rotated among the organizations, on a voluntary/scheduled basis. This allows for a fair distribution of responsibility in building the community spirit. The funding for these events can be in the form of an extra $10 on rent or a “social fund”. Further, the development of a social committee, drawn on a rotational basis from the tenant organizations, is a good way to get people engaged (of course this role could be filled directly by the SEC manager). With respect to fostering formal collaboration, the Thoreau centre offers a great example. They have a voluntary monthly session that is open to those organizations who find themselves with a little bit of extra time. The Centre provides a small amount of funding that comes from member dues to fund small projects that are expressly for the purpose of reinforcing member relationships in a formal, collaborative way. It is extremely important to be mindful that these activities cannot overwhelm an already overworked group of individuals – they must be perceived as stress-relieving, rather than stress-inducing, events. As such, careful attention must be paid to tenants when considering timing and frequency of these events.

Lastly the physical animation of the space is the least intrusive and the easiest to implement of the recommendations. It refers to “the artifacts or interventions that appear in the physical space as a means to foster connectivity and spark collaboration” (Ibid.). Suggestions include:

- Turning walls into chalkboards
- Hanging photos of members and captions about the organizational goals
- Comfortable couches in a common space for members to interact informally

- Notice boards, event listings, jobs postings

Brainstorming with the tenants about any or all of these community animation activities will be a perfect way to begin the engagement process of community building. An important aspect of any shared space is setting clear expectations and boundaries. Issues with the shared kitchen can be frustrating and can be solved with simple scheduling. These boundaries can also be delineated in a group brainstorming session involving all the tenants.

There may be some consideration given to the economies of scale that can be achieved by implementing a shared services model. More specifically, everyone at the SEC has marketing, accounting and HR needs that could be bought in bulk from service providers as reduced rates. Katie of the Thoreau Centre mentioned that their New York based Centre, which is home to 6 organizations, "managed to save $40,000 by sharing services, enough to pay for a full time staffer" and access to higher quality of services that they had before (Ibid.).

The SEC should consider hosting external events in their huge space. The artists upstairs might be a great place to start by offering to open up the space to host an art showing. This would draw in crowds that wouldn't normally come to the SEC and would provide exposure in a whole new way. Other events such as hosting book signings, church groups, subject matter expert speakers or band practice space are all examples of ways that have the potential to generate small income and would greatly increase the exposure of the SEC to the broader Winnipeg community.

Related to this is the need to build community awareness of the physical space – better signage would go a long way to accomplishing this. An online web presence would also go a long way to increasing public awareness. Creating active profiles on Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr, Linked-In and blogging all have a significant effect on generating public awareness. Also, taking advantage of interlocking directorates in the social economy can also serve to reinforce external networks and strengthen the presence of the SEC in the broader Winnipeg setting. If there are board members who sit on other boards, it might be good to promote the centre as a space to locate, either permanently or even just to hold events.

Though the SEC may not have the wherewithal to expand at this point, it would be an important consideration for the future. In my interview with one of the partnering organizations, it was mentioned that there is a waiting list of potential tenants who are interested in becoming part of the SEC community (Tenant Interview, 2013). Given that there is proven interests, it could be worth leveraging commitments from these interested parties into funding for expansion. Through expanding to neighbor lots it would be possible to develop a more commanding presence on Main Street as well as the ability to generate rental property income. Irrespective of whether the SEC is in a position to expand, revamping the space to include a dedicated and more professional meeting space has been identified as a need for the tenants.

It would also be a really great exercise for the Board of the SEC to get together and discuss the direction and future plans for the Centre in a visioning exercise. This is important because it will offer the guidance and leadership that is necessary for moving beyond co-location into a place where social innovation can occur.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the social-network model of sharing space has significant benefits for the social economy in Winnipeg. The concept is predicated on a simple equation:

$$\text{Physical Space} + \text{Community} = \text{Social Innovation}$$

The environment is paramount to creating a comfortable atmosphere wherein community can safely grow and develop, but the real magic happens here (CSI 2011). While there are some natural benefits to sharing space, the animation of the community that develops within a shared space is not a natural phenomenon – it requires directed and concerted effort. However our exploration thus far has demonstrated that there are significant benefits to engaging in community animation. An exploration of the literature furnished us with the features that need to be in place to generate some theoretically amazing benefits. The primary research conducted both within the organization as well as with external subject matter experts on sharing space proved extremely useful in providing guidelines for implementation of community animation. Based on the primary and secondary research, I have formulated a set of recommendations that I believe that help the SEC to fully realize its potential. The adaptability of the model, combined with its proven ability of increasing economic advantage and generating social innovation, positions this organizational framework as a critical success factor in the development of Winnipeg's social economy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aboriginal Circle of Educators (ACE). (2010). Retrieved from http://www.aboriginalcircleofeducators.ca/about_ace.php

Bathelt, H., Malmberg, A., & Maskell, P. (2004). Clusters and knowledge: local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation. *Progress in Human geography*, *28*(1), 31-56.

Canadian Community Economic Development Network (CCED-Net). (2011). Retrieved from http://ccednet-rcdec.ca/en/about

Canadian Community Economic Development Network (CCED-Net). *The Neechi Foods Co-Op Profile.* Retrieved from http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/sites/ccednet-rcdec.ca/files/ccednet/Profile_-_Neechi_Foods_Cox.pdf .

Centre for Social Innovation (CSI). (2011). Shared Spaces for Social Innovation: *Emergence*, *Proof and Rigor.* Toronto: CSI.

Deane, Lawrence. (2006). *In Their Own Voices: Building Urban Aboriginal Communities.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Defourny, J. (2001). *From third sector to social enterprise: The emergence of social enterprise*. London: Routledge.

Desjardins. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.desjardins.com/en/a_propos/qui-nous-sommes/fonctionnement-cooperatif/cooperative/

Expert Interview. (2013). Katie Edwards, Manager, Non-Profit Centres Network - Tides Thoreau Centre. San Francisco, CA.

Expert Interview. (2013). Tracy Boyer, Co-Founder, The Hub. Halifax, NS.

Families And Communities Together (FACT). (2011). Province of Manitoba Coalition. Retrieved from http://www.factcoalition.org/index.php/about-us/

Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood. *Urban studies*, *38*(12), 2125-2143.

Gordon, I. R., & McCann, P. (2000). Industrial clusters: complexes, agglomeration and/or social networks?. *Urban studies*, *37*(3), 513-532.

Haugh, H. (2005). A research agenda for social entrepreneurship. *Social enterprise journal*, *1*(1), 1-12.

Himmelman, A. T. (1996). On the theory and practice of transformational collaboration: Collaboration as a bridge from social service to social justice. In *Creating Collaborative Advantage. London: Sage Publishers*.

Holmes, H., Kucukciftci, E., Meyer, J., Mitchell, J., Nicholas, M., Solomonson, T. (2011). *Greater MSP IT Cluster Study.* Minneapolis: University Press.

Loxley, John and Silver, Jim. (2007). Community Economic Development: An Introduction. In

Loxley, John, Silver, Jim and Kathleen Sexsmith. (2007). (eds.) *Doing Community Economic Development.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

O'Connor R., et al. (2012). *A Survey of Social Enterprises in Manitoba*. A joint research project: CCED-NET, Mount Royal University and Simon Fraser University.

MacKinnon and Silvius. (2012). *Making employment work.* Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

MacKinnon and Silver. (2005). *Winnipeg's Inner City: Invest in prevention not detention.* Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Mackinnon and Silver. (2011). Election 2011 Unspun: *Inner City and North End Neighborhoods.* Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Martin, R., & Sunley, P. (2003). Deconstructing clusters: chaotic concept or policy panacea?. *Journal of economic geography*, *3*(1), 5-35.

Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI). (2009). *Industry Cluster Policy Project: Japan.* Retrieved from http://www.meti.go.jp/policy/local_economy/tiikiinnovation/source/2009Cluster(E).pdf

Porter, M. (1998). Clusters and the new economics of competition. *Harvard Business Review, 76(6), 77-90*

Province of Manitoba. (2012). *Integrated Systems Case Management Model: A Holistic Approach to Social Service Delivery and Poverty Reduction*. Point Douglas Revitalization Initiative (PDRI).

Social Enterprise Centre. (2010). Funding Proposal to the Manitoban Government for acquisition of the warehouse.

Silver, J. (2006). *In their own voices: building urban Aboriginal communities*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Tenant Interview. (2013). Pollock's Hardware.

Tenant Survey. (2013). Aboriginal Circle of Educators.

Tenant Survey. (2013). Point Douglas Residents Committee.

Tenant Survey. (2013). Canadian Community Economic Development Network.

Wei, P., Sugden, R., & Wilson, J. (2005). In Pitelis, C., Sugden, R. and Wilson, J. R. (eds.). *Clusters and Globalisation: The Development of Economies*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Winnipeg Free Press. (2012). Staff Writer. "Unemployment Rates Edges up in Manitoba." 9 March.

APPENDIX 1 – SURVEY GUIDE

Questions

1. Do you think that co-locating in the Social Enterprise Centre has positively impacted your organizations community development efforts?

____
____
____
____
____

2. If so, how?

____
____
____
____

3. If not, Why?

____
____
____
____

4. Would you agree that the Social Enterprise Center provides a site for community, researchers and social entrepreneurs to meet, share and develop Social Enterprise knowledge? (please circle the answer that best describes your opinion)

Strongly Agree   Agree   Neutral   Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. Are there any specific reasons for your answer?

____
____
____
____

6. Do you think your organization would benefit from having formalized communication structures with the SEC and among the social enterprises?

7. Would your organization have the resources (i.e.: time) to contribute to developing such mechanisms?

8. Does your organization have an suggestions as to how to animate knowledge-sharing within the social enterprises at the SEC?

9. Does your organization feel that the public is adequately informed about the activities at the Social Enterprise Center? (please circle the answer that best describes your opinion)

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral DisagreeStrongly Disagree

10. Is there any specific reason for your answer?

11. Does your organization benefit from being located at the SEC in terms of interaction and connections made between people interested in community economic development?

12. Have these interactions and connections served to help your organization grow or enhance your efforts towards community economic development?

13. Please specify any other thoughts your organization may have regarding how you think the SEC could better contribute to providing a space to gather and share knowledge related t the growth, development and social and business acumen of Winnipeg Social Enterprises.

APPENDIX 2 – INTERVIEW GUIDE

Participants: *Managers at other similar organizations to the Social Enterprise Centre*

Time: *1-1.5 Hours*

Location: *Conducted via Telephone or Email*

Equipment: *Recorder; consent forms; interview guide; pens and paper*

Script

Hello, my name is Andi. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. This research project is one of the requirements for my Inner City Seminar course at the University of Manitoba. **The project is focused on developing the mechanisms and processes that a local incubator for social enterprise, 765 Inc., needs in place in order to achieve its stated social objectives. The purpose of this interview is to assess similar organizations in order to ascertain best practices, avoid failed mechanisms and to learn about incubators and accelerators as they pertain to social enterprise**. I hope to learn about how theories on clustering, innovation incubators, and knowledge sharing can be transformed into practice to facilitate the process of providing a site for community, researchers and social entrepreneurs to meet, share and develop Social Enterprise Knowledge. This interview will only be shared with my professor, Dr. Ray Silvius of the University of Winnipeg.

Before beginning, I would like to request that you sign a consent form. By signing this form you agree to participate in the interview and acknowledge that you understand that information from this interview may be used for the research project. (Please attach e-signature and submit to ka.sharma@hotmail.com - alternatively, please indicate your willingness to participate somewhere on the consent form and submit.)

I just want to assure you that this interview is strictly confidential and your identity is completely protected.

[I will ensure that the interviewee has a copy of the consent form and has signed one]

Do you have any questions before we proceed?

Questions:

1. Can you tell me about the history of your organization?

2. Why did your organization engaged in a co-location model initially?

3. What objectives did you hope to achieve?
4. Has being a part of a clustered environment provided any direct benefit towards your social development goals?
5. If not, in your opinion, what are the challenges that are currently facing your clustered community in moving your stated social goals forward? (Essentially, why hasn't it worked thus far?)
6. Do you have any thoughts or suggestions for possible solutions to these challenges?
7. Communicating with the larger community has been identified as one possible area to focus on in developing the social agenda of social enterprises – how have your clustered organizations engaged with the larger community as a whole (if at all).
8. What are some of the successful mechanisms, metrics or other processes that have contributed to the efficacy of co-location? Specifically, as a group of organizations, how are you able to reap the benefits of being clustered in the same physical space? (weekly meetings? Regular communication? Etc.)

Thank you for your time and contribution. If you have any questions please contact me at the information provided on the consent forms.