

A Preliminary Analysis of the Canadian Social Innovation Lab Landscape

Gary Martin, PhD., Wakefield, QC; Professor Ann Dale, Royal Roads University; Dr. Christopher Stoney, Carleton University
April 24, 2017

Part 1. *Social Innovation Labs in Canada Project Overview*

Social innovation laboratories or ‘labs’, sometimes referred to as ‘living labs’, have emerged in the academic, public, private, and not-for-profit (NFP) sectors in response to the complex and interdependent challenges facing society, such as poverty, affordable housing, climate change and sustainable community development. These labs vary in their organization, their governance, their funding arrangements, their engagement of the wider communities in which they are embedded and their capacity to effect social change. In spite of growing numbers and a rise in public awareness, very little is known about their efficacy for social change and informing public policy, as well as how well they are engaged with communities.

This preliminary research addresses the following research questions and gaps.

1. How many social innovation laboratories exist in Canada and where are they located?
2. What type of projects do they undertake and what approaches do they adopt?
3. Are they effective in generating innovative solutions to complex social problems?
4. What are the best practices with respect to funding, governance, structure, leadership and culture, both domestically and internationally?
5. What are the main challenges and barriers faced by social laboratories?
6. How much intra-organisational collaboration and learning is occurring and how might this be better facilitated and improved?
7. To what extent (and how) are communities engaged in identifying and implementing solutions?
8. What are the implications of social laboratory risk taking and knowledge co-creation for funders, managers and the institutions that host them?

This preliminary research is designed to lead into a larger project that has the following objectives.

1. Create and disseminate open data and inventory capturing the current state of social innovation labs across Canada including where they are located, the kinds of projects they undertake; the facilities they provide as well as best practices in governance, organizational and funding arrangements.
2. Identify best practices, indicators for success and test them with leading lab practitioners.
3. Contribute to better outcomes for laboratories, their host institutions and community partners.

We believe that such research is timely and critically important to Canadian competitiveness and comparative advantage by examining leading innovations and social learning through Canadian labs and accelerating the take-up of those practices across the country.

Part 2. Interview Methods

At this preliminary stage of our research, “social innovation” is defined as:

“...a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than current solutions. The value created accrues primarily to society rather than to private individuals” ([Stanford, 2017](#)).

Prior to selecting a sample, an environmental scan was conducted of labs across the country. The scan included suggestions from Drs. Dale and Stoney of labs of which they are aware, as well as using a variety of internet search terms to find labs including the following.

- social enterprise lab
- social innovation laboratory
- urban lab
- living lab
- incubator
- innovation lab
- hub
- design lab
- community engagement labs
- design thinking
- think tanks
- catalyst
- change labs
- collabs
- collaboration studios

The environmental scan resulted in a network map composed of around thirty labs that were carefully screened to ensure that they met the criterion in the Stanford definition above. The full network map can be found at [Innovation Labs in Canada](#). Further screening resulted in seven labs chosen to be a mix of postsecondary-linked and independent organizations. Five labs responded to requests for interviews and one informed that (despite their on-line presence) they were “not a social innovation lab”. A lab resource centre was added to the 5 labs to provide a broad overview.

The following are excerpts from interviews with the resulting sample of managers of five social innovation labs and one lab resource centre in Canada. The interviewees are hereinafter referred to as *respondents*, and each was guaranteed anonymity.

Three of the five labs are embedded in postsecondary institutions (PSIs). Two of the labs operate almost completely independently of academic partners. The sixth respondent directs a lab resource centre. All six of the organizations are located in large urban centres, are staffed by full-time professional managers, and occupy dedicated space.

The following summary of the interviews is structured to provide depth of insight into the state of labs in Canada rather than specifics about particular labs. Their responses are discussed in the aggregate with regard to:

1. the physical and organizational structure of the labs;
2. types of projects undertaken by labs;
3. if and how labs share information with their communities and with other labs, and
4. challenges and solutions for labs.

Interviews were conducted virtually and recorded using Zoom© meeting software. Respondents were asked at the start of each interview for permission to record the discussions on the condition that they and their labs would not be named in any reports from the interviews without written permission. Interviews ranged in duration from thirty minutes to one hour.

The researchers used information provided on websites to screen and select labs for interviews. Despite the challenge of maintaining timely and accurate information on websites, respondents assured us that their sites accurately reflected their social innovation function and their problem-solving methods. Consequently, the respondents represent a purposive sample of self-selected managers of facilities that are (a) active, (b) engaged in social innovation activities, and (c) representative of lab functions.¹

The interviews were exploratory. While we are confident that the following discussion is current and representative of trends in lab functions, the sample is too small to extend generalizations of the findings across the field, which will be addressed in subsequent research. The remainder of this report shares the data gathered from six social innovation lab practitioners.

Part 3. Interview Results

Respondents were very willing to share their expertise and we thank them for taking time from busy schedules to participate. They provided rich details on the four main questions (above). Their responses are analyzed in the following sections.

Part 3a. Overview of Physical and Organizational Structure of Labs in the Interviews

The organizations in this part of the research inhabit a variety of spaces. One lab in the interviews occupies offices only and conducts their work on their partners' sites. Another works out of their offices on campus and also collaborates internationally. A third occupies four buildings in two cities and has dedicated staff in each. As mentioned, three of the labs in the interviews are located on the campuses of postsecondary institutions (PSIs). They include offices and meeting facilities where research and problem-solving collaborations are staged, and where staff, faculty and students mingle. Two labs are completely detached from academia according to the respondents². The oldest labs in the research – one aligned with academia and one not - have existed since approximately 2003, which points to the fact that labs are a relatively new phenomenon in Canada.

All of the labs employ professional managers, but staffing varies. In the three labs embedded in PSIs, management consists of a small, lab-dedicated staff that shares responsibilities (and some facilities and equipment) with the PSI. Two of the three PSI-embedded labs were also integral to

¹ One lab manager stated that the lab's website was years out of date.

² In one case this is deliberate because, as the respondent from that lab claimed, working with academics presents challenges. See Part 3d.

academic credit programs focused on social innovation, which apparently lent some stability to the labs. One respondent stated that the mix of faculty, students and project partners in these spaces also creates an “ecosystem effect” where ideas “collide” and become visible and tangible. Apparently credit programs operating with and through these two labs were popular with students, so they were more likely to be seen as viable to the institution they inhabit.

One of the PSI-embedded labs occupied a large space which included workshop/hotdesk space, offices and kitchens on two floors of a campus building but “the rent was insane” so they downsized to a third of their original space to become more self-sustaining. For two of the respondents, the financial relationship with the PSI is fraught, a topic discussed in Part 3d. But one respondent made a pointed comment about space: “The space is a prerequisite for sure, but not the business we see ourselves in”, which might be interpreted as a reference to the priority of the process and methods of change-making over the physical structure of a given lab, as well as the utility of virtual/electronic means of drawing input from beyond a lab.

As is evident from the interviews and the network map (see [Innovation Labs in Canada](#)), labs serve numerous functions and address myriad challenges in Canadian society. However, all of the labs in these interviews share similar approaches to problem-solving for similar societal challenges. The following section summarizes projects in which the selected labs are involved and their methodologies for innovative problem-solving.

Part 3b. Types of Projects and Approaches

With regard to the variety of labs, one respondent stated that “Canada is the venue for many petri dishes. There are many different flavors and models out there” in a relatively new phenomenon. Interviews reinforced this observation, but there were a number of commonalities across the labs in the interviews.

The five labs in this study and the lab resource centre foster social innovation as per the Stanford definition provided on the second page of this report. One respondent stated that their lab works to “create better futures for the many, not the few.” Part of this lab’s mission involves “designing with, not designing for” in a “radically co-creative approach”, and the lab considers inclusivity to be a measure of success. Collaboration with communities and across public, private and nonprofit sectors is a key approach to problem-solving for all of the respondents in this research.

Labs are typically engaged with topics of interest to their community networks, be they geographically proximate or communities of practice. In other words, a lab’s “community” may be the local neighborhood or it may be a more geographically dispersed academic or professional network. It appears that established labs attract projects as opposed to labs seeking projects, as might be the case with newer labs, which raises the question of whether or not they are reaching ‘unlikely suspects’ and challenges.

Topics broached fall into several general categories such as health (both personal/physical and community), environment, technology for social good, financing, social entrepreneurship, urban development, fogod, poverty reduction, First Nations concerns, youth issues, and governance. The one aspect that distinguishes these labs from others that were scanned for this research is that social innovation lab processes are not dedicated to generating profit for any one individual.

The common thread is broad social benefit, and it seems metrics for success for these social-benefit goals and results are much harder to develop and communicate as will be discussed in part four.

All of the labs are designed to respond to partners' needs in a flexible fashion. In other words, expertise is drawn in from a given lab's network as required, and/or as identified by partners. The three labs in PSIs claim to deliberately draw from all sectors (academic, nonprofit/NGO, private and government). In the interviews, there were repeated comments about the importance of diversity of stakeholder input as reflected in the following comments.

- The necessity of identifying “executors and change-makers who need to be involved to make change happen”
- “Innovation benefits from diversity that matches the complexity of the problem”
- “Co-creation engenders ownership”
- The benefits of attracting “deeply experienced professionals” while “taking the lead from the community”
- Using top-down and bottom-up outreach to recruit “community ambassadors”
- Intentional “multidisciplinarity” and “intersectionality”

With regard to novel approaches to problem-solving, one respondent informed that s/he is building an “innovation ecosystem” which s/he described as “an intuitive model for advancing strategic issues” and which s/he distinguished from “intentional problem-solving processes that evolve around a particular challenge or problem statement.” In other words, this respondent intends to build a new, flexible, experience-based problem-solving “practice” that is more “organic” than conventional problem-specific approaches. Explaining further, s/he “seeks balance between intentional and organic” responses to community needs.

The three labs embedded in PSIs have the additional responsibility for including students in their problem-solving processes. Two of the labs are integral to social innovation programming at their PSI, with credit courses attached to and offered through the lab, a configuration which enables experiential learning through working directly with practitioners in the field on real-world challenges. The same two labs mix credit courses with experiential learning, drawing students into their particular versions of integrative design with local and non-local clients as consultants on real-life projects, and involving students from start to finish in the process.

The third PSI-embedded lab works to make connections between the institution and local community to co-create social innovation projects and “harness the energy of students who are eager to engage and connect”. The lab then provides “leadership development for students who want to make positive change in world.” These efforts led to a partnership with an off-campus hub to create a year-long course featuring engaged learning workshops on process and stakeholder mapping, creating a business model canvas and marketing, all of which were “anchored with practitioners” in the field. In addition, the same respondent mentored/coached another twelve students in social innovation on specific projects, and reached out to faculty doing work in community-engaged research and pedagogy, contributing \$200k of support via workshops, grant-writing, access to facilities, and assistance with program development, all of which resulted in several social enterprises and helped people on campus to see the value provided by the lab.

The five labs in this sample all use variations of theories of change, systems thinking, ecosystem analysis, human-centred design and multi-sectoral collaboration. All directly engage with their respective communities for the purposes of problem-solving and all six respondents are committed to education and building capacity through various means. One of the main interests for the researchers is if and how labs learn from each other and their communities. Because labs are essentially about experimenting and social innovation, we now turn to the important question of how labs share learning both internally and externally.

Part 3c. Sharing Information

When asked if and how respondents shared information with their communities or with other labs, all six respondents were concerned that labs generally do not communicate with the world very effectively for a number of reasons (see Part 3d). Regardless, when prompted, respondents revealed that they do share information, but they chose to distinguish between communication in day-to-day operations on the local scale from sharing information or professional development at larger scales.

Within each lab's particular milieu, information exchange is their *raison d'être*, and labs utilize various methods to achieve that goal. Methods include using outreach to find "community ambassadors"; recruiting student project participants through dedicated lab, institutional, student and public internet media; and drawing partners from various sectorial and profession-specific networks. One respondent suggested the term "collision theory" to describe how learning occurs when partners from multiple sectors are invited into a charrette space to work face-to-face "for mutual knowledge and gain." Another respondent claimed to define the lab's success by the degree to which they "help partners and clients achieve the learning they desire." Certainly in PSIs, information exchange is doubly important because pedagogy is by default a principal lab function. One PSI-embedded respondent noted that "buy-in" from both the institution and the community is crucial for longer term planning "especially since [the institution] is intentionally enmeshed with community" and the lab tries to instill community connections as a cultural element on campus. This respondent also spoke of extending the lab's research, collaboration and information-sharing activities by creating a "virtual social innovation ecosystem" composed of regional actors working in person and on-line through various internet-based tools. The intention to build and share knowledge seemed especially prevalent in the PSI-embedded labs, perhaps because of formal institutional goals, and these labs may be more effective at, for example, maintaining updated websites.

Beyond each lab's particular project-based milieu, there was a common refrain about growing networks that appeared to be a combination of engagement with other similar organizations as well as drawing from community (in the broader popular and multi-sectoral sense suggested above) resources and expertise. Several respondents pointed to the work of the McConnell Foundation which strives to create an "enabling ecosystem" to share and foster skills being developed in labs across Canada and abroad. One respondent in particular promoted sharing across sectors, stating that "the biggest field-building segment of this universe is the public sector labs" especially with regard to tools and learning.

Despite recognizing room for improvement, respondents in these interviews all actively network and "diffuse knowledge" in on-line forums, at conferences and workshops, and informally.

These activities sometimes extend to other countries, and each respondent advocated “open and clear communication for mutual knowledge and gain”³.

Communicating with other labs and more broadly was identified as one area of lab functions in need of improvement. In these interviews, sharing information was identified as a key challenge in this rapidly expanding field. The next section highlights the importance and challenges of sharing information in addition to other challenges and opportunities for improvement in Canadian social innovation labs.

Part 3d. Challenges

The biggest challenges identified by this sample of respondents were:

- communicating what they do both in terms of knowledge transfer as discussed in the previous section, and in terms of justifying their existence to communities and funders
- sustainable funding, and
- defining “success”, or demonstrating the value generated by labs.

The above are not in order of importance. In the interview transcripts all are intertwined, and all seem to be functions of the pace of change in a new field, the complexity of the problems addressed by labs, and the necessarily tense relationship between the often messy process of innovation and the tidy conventional metrics of funding agents. The labs in this research are all change agents on the outskirts of the status quo, but dependent on institutions that depend at least in part on the status quo for operational and financial resources.

The social issues in which these labs engage are usually complex, and solutions require collaborative approaches involving a high degree of process and engagement. According to one respondent “most of the time there’s no definitive understanding of why the problem is the way it is” and also “there’s very little guarantee that the solutions will actually work”. However, “The other fact is that... this is supposed to be a lab, and it wouldn’t be a lab if every one of the initiatives proceeded to full completion.” Sometimes this respondent makes a decision that the partners and the lab have learned enough from a project and they should stop. This respondent and others pointed out that there is much to be learned from failure, but it appears that little time is allowed for contemplating lessons learned from particular projects. Again, the metrics of success may be incongruous. The same respondent then pointed out that the labs movement is young and there seems to be no “definitive suite of tools or methods you can employ”. S/he also claimed that data on the effectiveness of innovation labs “are close to nil”. To complicate the issue, several respondents mentioned that there seemed to be “no clear definition of social innovation” an understated assessment of a larger problem to which this report will return in section four.

³ That they are intent on information exchange is evident in the quick and accommodating responses to requests for interviews. The labs that we chose are all eager to participate in and to learn from this research project.

Communication

With regard to an apparent lack of data on labs, as mentioned earlier in this report, all of the respondents felt that they do not communicate well with the world. One respondent stated “For us that’s a real weakness. We have a lot of learning, but it’s embodied knowledge. The process of articulating it has been hard because we don’t have the resources to really describe or write about it in language that would be helpful to others”. Another respondent asserted that knowledge transfer takes limited time and resources away from solving problems for their communities. A third respondent claimed that students and the lab do a lot of social media but not always enough. S/he asked “how can we leverage a lot of this knowledge to look for sustainable funding and to get the word out there? Because we’re looking ahead at research.” Explaining, s/he said the lab wants to be better known to attract interesting partners, but publicizing their work feels like a conflict between roles, and publicity takes second place.

Regarding links between academic researchers to social innovation labs, there appears to be several barriers. One respondent, from one of the two labs in the sample that are not aligned with a PSI, expressed ambivalence about working with academic partners for three reasons. First, s/he claimed they are often not as grounded or practical as innovation labs and typical lab partners, and they may lack insight into challenges that would enable informed discussion about solutions between academics and lab partners. Second, because they are so focused on publishing, academics are subject to the lengthy peer review process that adds unacceptable time to finding solutions to urgent problems. Third, s/he mentioned the constraints of risk-averse institutional bureaucracy (e.g. ethics clearance) that also interferes with timely participation by academics. S/he referred to research by the International Development Research Centre which found that about one-third into a project “that’s the learning spot”. In other words, academic partners and papers are often of limited utility to the groups that the lab serves. But s/he was hopeful: “There’s opportunity there...to better match-make and educate.” This respondent was willing to work with academics who are “grounded in practice and iterative and agile and responsive”.

All of the respondents remarked on the need for knowledge-sharing across Canada and especially internationally. Regarding communication within the field, all six respondents listed professional and field-based networks, workshops, conferences and informal exchanges in which they take part, but according to one respondent, the typical lab business model does not help evolve the network: s/he claimed that “these things are expensive” and require dedicated resources, and s/he claimed these expenses should be included in lab business plans from the outset.

Dollars underpinned all of the interviews. The next section summarizes the responses to questions about funding.

Funding

Networking and sharing appears to be constrained by lab business models that are hindered by available dollars. Funding and the constant quest for funding arose repeatedly in the interviews. One respondent asserted that “Many people are interested in participating in a lab. Very few are interested in actually paying for it.” Long-term dollar support seems rare. Several respondents mentioned that the time frames required for projects rarely match funding. According to respondents, innovation can be a long process due to the necessity for finding partners, gathering

feedback from communities, testing and refining ideas, maintaining interest and involvement of community including public officials, and so on. Another respondent stated that “Funding is not the challenge but *sustainable* funding, so we’re not always looking for it”. Like networking, pursuing funding was seen as time-consuming and as taking resources away from programs and projects.

At one point the researcher conjectured that private sector, profit-generating partnerships will pay better than social innovation projects, but the respondent (from an independent lab not aligned with an academic institution) disagreed, instead suggesting that stages of a project are probably more important. S/he pointed out that it is harder to attract dollars at the start of a project. Foundations tend to fund the exploratory early stages of projects. “Later when you have something more concrete, governments are willing to fund. And corporations fund when you have a lot more clarity”. This respondent further offered that governments usually initiate engagement with a lab with a specific outcome in mind, an intention which doesn’t fit the “lab” model. S/he thought that if one has a concrete policy objective, one should do regular research and policy projects rather than engaging an innovation lab.

A PSI-embedded respondent pointed out the disparity between funding and deliverables: “Academic projects... definitely what we deliver does not match what is funded. Absolutely not. When you’re delivering a multi-pronged strategy with a number of well thought-out proposals for projects... knowing ten people have been working on it for months and a number of faculty... absolutely not.” S/he claimed that the lab is getting better at explaining value for dollars invested and the extra time required for their teaching function to partners.

In reference to institutional support, another PSI-embedded respondent stated bluntly “I don’t know what funding is”. This respondent reported that, despite a long and excellent track record, the lab gets “zero dollars from the institution” and the PSI provides no staff to the lab. This respondent pointed out that s/he occasionally “forced the hand of the administration” by using applications for SSHRCC funding for the lab as levers to get course release to run the lab, which s/he described as “obnoxious brinksmanship”. Further, s/he claimed that lab space was “not going to get pulled away [by the institution] if we fail to perform, but we’ve never tested that by failing to perform.”

Two of the three PSI-embedded labs were critical of the lack of political support from the PSI. As mentioned previously, one lab shrank its space by two-thirds because, as the respondent reported, rent charged by the PSI was “exorbitant”. This particular lab was set up to generate revenue for [the PSI] and it was never going to generate enough income to pay rent and staff salaries based on the [original] business model”. The two PSI-embedded labs also referred to the challenge of communicating the idea of an innovation lab to an internal community that tends to be skeptical and protective of the status quo at postsecondary institutions in Canada. As one respondent asserted, labs require “license to break out of institutional norms and culture.” The politics of institutional “turf” is beyond the scope of the interviews, but segues into a current and pressing topic within the field about revenue generation versus “creating value” a topic that preoccupies all of the respondents.

Interview respondents uniformly assured that labs are “creating value” but seem not to have the time or marketing savvy to define their value. One respondent suggested that “innovation labs around the world are still struggling to come up with a consistent and compelling way to evaluate

the value of the labs themselves. It's very hard to sell the value of a lab". How does one *count* the value of social innovation, especially when the term itself is, as yet, in the process of being defined, and when outcomes are nebulous? And how do labs develop suitable outcomes indicators when their projects, clients and formats are constantly in transition?

A respondent speculated that labs might devise their own measures of their impact. This respondent thought it best that labs not have metrics "imposed by the system", but if a lab must create metrics and measure their impact or "success" or "value" they create, it meant "a new thing to do" and "your work just got twice as complicated." The concern seemed to be about who would pay for the labs to justify their continued existence. Labs require finances to operate but conventional financing mechanisms are tied to institutions that avoid uncertainty. Concrete outcomes assessment, the topic of the next section, might allay the concerns of funders.

Part 4. Measuring Impact

According to a respondent, "The times are about measurement." The respondents in the interviews all remarked on the tension between innovation and the need to generate measurable outcomes. The tension is ubiquitous in social enterprise, and it seems to be the tension between dollar incomes and comprehensively demonstrating value. There was a contradiction hovering behind all six interviews. Labs work towards sustainable futures for their communities but they rarely generate dollar profit, so how can they contribute to their own sustainability? How do they plan for the future while financially ensuring their own futures, especially when both activities are hard work?

Certainly information-sharing at multiple scales is key, and all six of the respondents agreed they could do more. It seems time and resources are in short supply to take part in conferences, workshops, social media exchanges and content-creation for the larger goal of educating each other, their respective institutions and the communities they serve. Labs are about learning, but the labs in these interviews claim they would like to learn from each other more. However, this researcher found that all of the on-line resources offered by the labs in these interviews were comprehensive and very informative, even if not perfectly current. But websites are tailored for community and funding partners. Lab managers might benefit from sharing information directly with other labs (including about failed projects). Also, complaints about funding constraints are common in the nonprofit sector, and social innovation labs might examine successfully funded organizations in other parts of the sector (and the world) especially with regard to how they justify their existence to funders. Sharing is crucial. Appropriate metrics are crucial.

A respondent pointed out that due to rapid society-wide system change, many existing systems are under strain, and that labs can "connect the dots between those difficulties and what we need to do." Social innovation labs provide clear evidence-based identification of weak spots and tools and solutions within social system. Labs are beginning to demonstrate their own cost-effectiveness and generating savings through unique and tailored collaborative research and problem-solving. If innovation requires experimentation and success is measured by an outcome such as learning that does not lend itself to conventional outcomes indicators, it behooves labs and researchers to create appropriate metrics to justify their methodologies.

Demonstrating value, communicating those benefits, and funding are intimately linked. For example, one PSI-embedded respondent worked very hard to mitigate institutional silos and

skepticism. This lab's mission also included drawing PSI researchers into the community and drawing the community into the academic forum. Students were directly involved. The respondent stated that the experiences helped students to think about transitioning to the workforce, an area where PSI's are accused of being deficient. Regardless, this respondent encountered PSI politics that seemed to be directly and dramatically impeding the work of a busy social innovation lab. Generating institutional support was a struggle, and this respondent took responsibility for not being able to communicate the full contribution of the lab to students, the institution and the surrounding community. Again, effective sharing and appropriate metrics might have helped the argument.

According to one respondent (and as was the case with two of the three PSI-embedded labs in this research) the trend is to anchor social innovation into academic programs, incorporating into a minor or Master's concentration or certificate in social innovation. Incubators at two PSIs have buy-in from professors and students and this model contributes to generating "bums on seats" and dollars for faculties and departments. And, according to the three PSI-embedded respondents, students and external communities love the mix.

The three PSI-embedded labs chosen for this interview research appear to be struggling with the same institutionalized constraints as the two independent labs. Despite their assertions that they are all doing valuable work, the constraints for these labs seem to be centred around defining and explaining what they do to people who hold the purse strings, and creating outcomes indicators that are acceptable to conservative, risk-averse institutions.

So exactly what is "social innovation"? I find the Stanford definition (see p. 2) to be inadequate. I began interviews with this question, and have yet to encounter a definition that seems likely to open the coffers of skeptical private, government and institutional funders.

Part 5. Conclusion

Clearly, the business case for social innovation labs has yet to be made, and it may be impossible to define social innovation in a way that appeals to precise metrics. Social innovation labs in and of themselves have to be innovative to succeed, have to take higher risks to be at the leading edge of change, and yet, must tackle the really tough questions like homelessness, poverty alleviation, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and how to engage diverse, highly plural communities. Its metrics by definition will have to be less clear cut, less definitive, and perhaps a strategy may be to at least convene a collaborative workshop space to develop the business case. Another strategy would be for those labs involved in academic programming to ask their business schools to become involved in this development as well as determining appropriate metrics.