

Measuring the Maybe

— *some thoughts on evaluation and social innovation*

by vivian Hutchinson

vivian Hutchinson is the Executive Officer of the Social Innovation Investment Group and the New Zealand Social Entrepreneur Fellowship. This paper is based on his presentation to the workshop on *Innovation and Evaluation* held in Wellington, New Zealand in November 2008.

“Civil society often hopes too much in the short-term. But it also often hopes too little in the long-term – and it is vital that pragmatic managerialism isn’t allowed to obscure civil society’s role as the restless agent of change, as a place where society dreams as well as acts ...”

— Geoff Mulgan, *the Hinton Lecture (2007)*

“If you are an optimist ... then you are probably not looking at the data. If you are a pessimist ... then you are probably only looking at the data.”

— Paul Hawken, author of *Blessed Unrest (2007)*

1.

I’m here because I want to help solve some tough problems. Actually ... I want to succeed in solving them. As a community activist and a social entrepreneur, my life has been motivated by responding to some of the harder questions that we ask of our communities:

How do we get enough well-paid jobs for everyone? How do we especially get enough good jobs, training and educational opportunities for all our young people?

How do we revive the smaller towns who have been left behind when their major employers move out and take the local jobs overseas?

How do we find enough housing for everyone that needs a home, and at prices that are affordable?

How do our communities become more resilient in the face of the global economic collapse that has hit us this October?

How do we spark the active citizenship that will be needed in our communities to address these issues?

How do we continue to foster generosity in the face of these challenges?

These questions are about addressing some of our most challenging social and economic problems. And they are particularly tough problems to solve for several reasons:

— They are tough problems because *they are complex*. Recently, many of us in the community sector have come to better understand the difference between a complicated problem and a complex one. A *complicated* problem requires a lot of very good management. If you get the details right, then you can usually sort it out.

But a *complex* problem requires something else ... something that is not as easily managed. Complex problems involve building relationships, trust, vision and the engagement of communities ... all things that are messy and organic and usually out of your own direct control.

Understanding and working with complexity is one of the major challenges in dealing with tough problems. But we've had some help lately ... the once-esoteric "complexity theories" that are found in the academic world of science and biology are now finding their way into popular culture. These theories are providing us with a whole new set of metaphors with which to view our work in our communities.

The old "machine" metaphors that come from physics are giving way to "living systems" metaphors that come from biology. And they are a more useful and hopeful way to look at the world because "living systems" are self-organising and adaptive. They act-and-learn at the same time.

— The second reason problems are tough, is because *no-one is really in charge*. It's not the British Army out there. There's no corporate CEO at the helm.

Our toughest social problems do not exist beneath any sort of command and control structure. They are part of the messy woven living system. And the way these systems grow and change and hold onto their dysfunctions, or break through to become something else ... is often a real mystery to those who wish to change things.

— The third reason these problems are tough, is because they exist at a time when we have a *deficit of leadership*. We have a particular deficit of leadership for the common good. We have a deficit of leadership that can speak to our toughest problems in a way that authentically connects to the highest aspirations we have for our communities.

And we especially have a deficit of the leadership that knows the important difference between *organising* a problem and *healing* a problem.

2.

I have a stake in this workshop today because I am a part of two *learning communities*.

Actually, these groups used to be called committees or associations ... but lately we've found that calling them *learning communities* does something different to how we engage with our common goals. Calling ourselves *learning communities* constantly reminds us to look at our work through the lens of what we are learning.

And like living systems, we're not just in these committees or associations to get on with our "action points". We are there to act-and-learn at the same time.

In the first learning community, I am part of a group of fifteen social entrepreneurs from around New Zealand who meet every six months to talk with one another about how to solve tough problems. This group was brought together by the leading New Zealand business entrepreneur, Stephen Tindall, and has been funded primarily by his Tindall Foundation.

The New Zealand Social Entrepreneur Fellowship is a three year learning community. It's a *peer* learning community, and that's an important point when social entrepreneurs often find themselves as solitary leaders in their own fields. The members have committed to using this time together as an opportunity to develop their own skills of social enterprise, and to give each other support and feedback on the particular challenges they face as social innovators. The group includes:

– *Brian Donnelly* from the NZ Housing Foundation who is directly creating affordable housing developments for low-income families, and exploring new financial models for home ownership.

– *Emeline Afeake-Mafile'o* who has created a Pacific style of mentoring programmes which are being run in many schools in South Auckland.

– *Gael Surgenor* who has led some major social marketing campaigns from within the Ministry of Social Development ... campaigns which are fostering better parenting skills (*SKIP*) and addressing family violence (*Are You OK?*)

– *John Stansfield* recently headed up the Problem Gambling Foundation, where he led efforts to reframe problem gambling from an addictions issue to a social justice issue. He now leads the Waste Resources Trust on Waiheke Island.

– *Kim Workman* who used to lead the Prison Fellowship, and more recently has set up a national campaign to re-think our attitudes towards crime and punishment.

– *Major Campbell Roberts* directs \$100 million worth of social service programmes which the Salvation Army runs in New Zealand, Fiji and Tonga. He is also a highly-respected international advocate on social justice issues.

– *Malcolm Cameron* has created many innovative youth development and training programmes in Dunedin. He started 4Trades, which is a smarter way to run an apprenticeship system.

– *Ngahau and Debbie Davis* have established a whole range of youth training and economic development initiatives in the Northland town of Moerewa.

– *Nuku Rapana* runs community and economic development initiatives that serve the Pukapuka community in New Zealand. These people are descendants of families who once lived on a small Pacific atoll which is part of the northern Cook Islands.

– *Philip Patston* is a thought leader in the human rights of people who live with disability. He is also a comedian and provocateur who has a unique way of getting people to re-examine their responses to diversity.

– *Robin Allison* led the creation of the Earthsong Eco-Neighbourhood in West Auckland, where the houses have been designed for energy efficiency, and the community has been organised to practice ecological and social sustainability.

– *Stephanie McIntyre* runs the Downtown Community Mission in central Wellington where she has been trying to establish “wet house” accommodation for the city's chronic relapsing alcoholics.

– and *Viv Maidaborn*, from CCS Disability Action, has recently established Lifetime Design and the *Lifemark*, which is an initiative to improve the design of New Zealand homes so that they can work well for people of every age, stage and ability.

... so as you can see, it's a very diverse group. It has been part of the intention of this project to create a meeting place that would force us all to think outside of "the silos" that the social services in our country continue to exist within.

3.

These Fellowship members are not just good social service providers. They are in this learning community because they are trying to create fundamental change. In whatever field they may be working in, they want to permanently alter the perceptions, behaviours and structures that are leading to the tough problems that we all trying to solve. What makes these people *social entrepreneurs* is their ability to focus on that creative edge that comes when your thinking shifts from *managing* problems to *healing* them.

Successful social entrepreneurs don't just have good ideas or creative imaginations ... they've got a track record of making things happen. They can see the big picture, and they can deliver on the details, create new processes, and forge the relationships that turn a social innovation into reality.

As social innovators, they often have an unusual way of looking at the world. They know that the source of their innovation is often a very elusive thing.

It was the German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer who once wrote that innovation is not so much about discovering something that no-one else has yet seen ... but it comes from thinking differently about that which everybody sees.

4.

The second learning community I am a part of is called the Social Innovation Investment Group. This is a group of grant-makers and community leaders who want to foster social innovation in New Zealand, and support these social entrepreneurs who have the gift for making it happen. It is this Investment Group that sponsors the Social Entrepreneur Fellowship.

And because many of the members in this second learning community are directly involved in philanthropy, they have been challenged to think differently about how they support social innovation. They have been challenged to look anew at their own grant-making processes and ask how they could be much more effective.

This is where we connect with this meeting here today. These grant-makers want to support social innovation ... and they are also asking:

How do you measure it? How do you ascertain the value of what's being done?

What are the best evaluation methods to use when assessing social innovation?

How do we know we are getting value for our money?

These are important questions ... and they are not just being asked here in New Zealand. In all the places where I've been working with the networks of social entrepreneurs and social investors overseas, I find they are asking the same questions, and debating the same methodologies and measurements that are being proposed.



5.

A year ago, I led a retreat workshop with the Social Entrepreneur Fellowship on “evaluation that fosters innovation”.

Everyone agreed that evaluation is a necessary thing. It gets you to think about what you have achieved in an organised way ... and helps you tell your stories and justify the funding you have received from government departments, from corporate sponsors or from charitable trusts and foundations.

But during the workshop, there wasn't any clear agreement on the best way that evaluation should be done ... particularly when dealing with innovations. And it wasn't long before the Fellows shared all sorts of horror stories about the evaluations that they have endured.

They talked about the inappropriate methods used, and how “the rush to judgement” too early on in the lifecycle of a project could be toxic to whatever they were trying to create. There were stories about the inappropriate use of business paradigms in a complex social context, and the anxious drive to reduce results into simplistic commercial terminology in order to gain support from funders.

There were frustrations shared about dealing with funders who want to be seen to be participating in an innovation ... but also want the social entrepreneur to take all the risk and responsibility involved in trying things, often failing, and struggling to learn and keep the project moving forward.

And there were angry stories told of evaluations and evaluators often being used by authorities as part of an pre-determined exit strategy from their funding support.

Don't get me wrong. I don't think anyone here was saying that you shouldn't have to justify the funding you are receiving, or be able to spell out what you mean by “success”, or be clear and accountable for the results you have created along the way. Of course we all should.

But how this applies to social innovation is complex and contestable ... and usually reflects the world-view of whoever has the power to determine the methods used and how they will be interpreted.

6.

What really stuck out for me during this retreat workshop was that few members of our Fellowship could wholeheartedly recommend any of the evaluators they had been working with as being great examples of how to evaluate social innovation.

For all the good work that was going on ... that seemed pretty sad. It got me thinking: there's obviously an opportunity here. And I started to wonder: *How can we do things differently? What sort of conversation is going on within evaluation professionals about these issues? Who are the thought leaders in this field?*

This led me to conversations with Marion Blake at Platform (the national network of community organisations that provide mental health and addiction services). Marion has been thinking about this for some time ... and we found that we were asking much the same questions.

And these questions found a juicy home amongst the network of Wellington community development workers and evaluators who have organised this meeting today.

7.

I don't want to understate the importance of what we are doing here.

In the last few weeks, the world has found itself in the middle of the most serious global economic collapse in a hundred years. We are all still trying to figure out what it is going to mean on our home patch ... and most of us suspect that it will very quickly have a systemic impact on all the services and activities we are trying to provide in our communities.

If our political leaders learn from the last Great Depression, then they may well embark on an FDR-type of economic stimulation which will mean reinvesting in our infrastructure, including our social infrastructure.

In the US, in Britain and in Europe there is an emerging debate on how this reinvestment can be done in a way that will also foster social innovation and social entrepreneurship.

Barack Obama's Presidential campaign in America has led calls for a substantial reinvestment in social innovation by the next administration. Obama knows what he is talking about, especially with his own background as a community organiser.

Obama points out that while the US federal government invests \$7 billion in research and development for the private sector, there is no similar effort to support innovation in the non-profit and social sectors. He has promised as President to launch a new Social Investment Fund Network, and start a new Social Entrepreneur Agency to make sure that small non-profits have the strong support they need.

So if "social innovation" and "social investment" are really going to become the next "hot topic" in government affairs, especially at this time of economic crisis ... then you can also bet that how you evaluate and measure it is also going to become the next "hot potato".

8.

I was reading an internet blog this morning by the UK social entrepreneur Craig Dearden-Phillips. He was commenting on the coming recession and how it will effect the community and voluntary sector. He's predicting a mass cull of thousands of community organisations that (in his view) are providing very little "... except a comfortable employment for their staff". In short, he predicts that the sector is going to have to step up to becoming more measureable and accountable.

Dearden-Phillips: "*For years we have got away with being the sector of great anecdotes. When asked about the difference we make, we often bang on about our best-ever success or offer improbable statistics that would do a Soviet-era government proud ("our two staff provide services for 267,000 people" and so on). In a tougher climate, those who properly measure and prove impact will thrive while those who bleat that it's all too difficult will sink.*"

I find this sort of commentary challenging ... and I think we can expect much more of it in the coming economic climate.

I accept that the anecdotes and stories of our projects should exist in a contestable space. But I wouldn't rubbish the story-telling entirely. In many cases, stories and anecdotes are the best way to capture the value of a social innovation. Stories are also an important way that we can show each other the possibilities that lie beyond what the data is telling us.

I like what the business entrepreneur and environmental activist Paul Hawken has to say about this.

He points out that if you are considering the state of the world and our environment today and you are *optimistic* ... then you are probably *not* looking at the data. He also says that if you are looking at the world and you are *pessimistic* ... then you are probably *only* looking at the data.

9.

There's something here that we just don't talk frankly about: there's a struggle going on between the social innovations and the status quo. Actually, there's *a war* going on.

And the evaluator very often finds themselves in the de-militarised zone in the middle.

It is a power struggle. Anyone who is involved in social change knows that the world isn't changing because of the lack of good ideas. There are plenty of wonderful proposals out there on how to make our problems so much better.

But things do not change for the lack of ingenuity or creativity. They do not change because there is a lot of energy invested in keeping things exactly the way they are right now.

It is this power struggle that the social innovator or social entrepreneur has to negotiate. And it's not always a pleasant or elegant journey for them.

10.

Back to Schopenhauer. The same philosopher once remarked that there is a life-cycle of introducing new ideas and innovations into our culture. He says it goes through three separate stages:

Firstly, the new ideas are *ridiculed*.

Secondly ... they are *violently opposed*.

And finally, they are *treated as self-evident*.

Most social entrepreneurs recognise this story-line. They and their projects have lived it. They carry the bruises and scars that come with those first two stages of ridicule and violent opposition. And they often also bear the resentments that come when everyone else claims ownership of the innovation ... when the need for it has finally become self-evident.

It's almost as though our culture has some sort of immune system that struggles against change and fights against the new. And there is some profound and brutal truth at work here ... because that immune system understands that the innovations need to push against something before they can take their rightful place within the overall social eco-system.

It's healthy to have this war going on. The tension here is okay.

And perhaps one of the main ways we can re-imagine the role of an evaluator is to see that one of the roles they can play is to be the "fierce friend" who straddles this tension in the middle. Their task is to construct a permeable wall of common sense between the passionate and progressive new ... and the resistance of the status quo.

Great social entrepreneurs understand this. They know that the resistance they get to their innovations can be the stone that hones the blade of their new ideas.

One of the great British social entrepreneurs was Michael Young who created the Consumers Association, The Open University, the University of the Third Age, the School for Social Entrepreneurs, and a host of other new social services.

Michael Young knew the importance of the tension between the innovation and the status quo. He knew it was a valuable place to learn and shape the details of your inspiration. He was always treating "No" as a question. And he was always going around pestering his friends, and strangers, to get them to tell him what was wrong with his ideas.

He knew that his ideas only got better as they made their unique journey through that permeable wall of common sense.

11.

The irony of social innovation is that it doesn't happen if you just focus on solving the problems. This has been a hard lesson for an old community activist like me to get to grips with ... particularly when you identify as being a problem-solver.

Sure, we all want to solve tough problems ... but the irony here is that focussing on the problems is not the best place from which to do your healing work.

Social innovators focus on the possibilities. They pay attention to what *may be*. And when you make this essential switch of attention — from the problems to the maybes — then a whole fresh palate of creativity and opportunity emerges before your eyes.

This is an important thing to consider when drawing up a schedule of “achievable and measurable outcomes” for a particular project. If your outcomes are solely focussed on the problems ... then you may miss a whole range of possibilities available to you.

You may find yourself trapped in trying to fix a re-occurring past... rather than trying to create an emerging future.

12.

I have been challenged this year by reading Peter Block’s book *Community — the Structure of Belonging*. Peter Block is well known for his writings on the principle of “stewardship” within a business context. In this latest book he writes about how to change the context of our community activism from one that focuses on deficiencies, special interests and entitlements ... towards one that focuses on possibilities, generosity and gifts.

Peter Block: “ *We believe that defining, analysing, and studying problems is the way to make a better world. It is the dominant mindset of western culture. Community-as-problems-to-be-solved has some benefits. It values the ability to implement, is big on doing, has a certain honesty about it, and worships tangible results as the ultimate blessing. It is not that this (or any other) context is wrong; it just does not have the power to bring something new into the world...*”

It is this “bringing something new into the world” that is our business here. It is at the heart of social innovation ... the art of paying attention to what *may be*.

Eric Young is a Canadian who specialises in social marketing, and he has written eloquently about how the word “maybe” so accurately describes the relationship that a social innovator has with their work and service. Young argues that “maybe” isn’t a vague hopefulness. It is a potent word for the brave, the inventive and the adventurous:

Eric Young: “ *‘Maybe’ comes with no guarantees, only a chance. But ‘maybe’ has always been the best odds the world has offered to those who set out to alter its course ... It is not a cautious word. It is a defiant claim of possibility in the face of a status quo we are unwilling to accept...*”

13.

This brings me to the Canadian book, *Getting to Maybe*, which is probably one of the best books written on social innovation in the last decade. It has been quickly read and embraced by many networks of our friends and colleagues.

There are so many great ideas in this book ... but the one that most concerns us today is the concept of *developmental evaluation* as described by Michael Quinn Patton (who is a highly regarded thought leader in the evaluation profession).

Last year, *Getting to Maybe*'s lead author, Frances Westley, visited New Zealand and gave a series of workshops. She told us that an original chapter in the book on developmental evaluation had been cut right back ... and a good deal of it was relegated to the footnotes. Well, I must say that this was one of the most photocopied footnotes that I have seen being passed around my colleagues!

Getting to Maybe gives us a refreshing insight into how to do evaluation within a complexity framework. The book (and its footnotes) spell out the tension that exists between evaluations that serve learning, discovery and generativity and evaluations that are simply about accountability and compliance.

The writers invite us to consider the idea of evaluators working alongside the social innovators ... to help them focus on capturing the learning, capturing the issues and the statements of value as they emerge.

All this points to a different approach to evaluation ... an approach to evaluation that serves the work of social innovation.

14.

I don't expect that there is any one person here with a recipe on how to do the perfect evaluation that is also going to foster and support social innovation. There's probably going to be a whole bunch of ideas, stories and processes and modalities that will have something to offer this purpose.

And I'm looking forward to hearing what they might be ... and to the working groups and conversations that will take place in this workshop, and to the ongoing dialogue that will be generated beyond these two days.

I've been creating learning communities all my adult life ... whether it is within these social enterprise projects, the Heart Politics gatherings, or more recently in the ChangeMakers 5-10-5-10 community groups.

But I have only recently come to understand that *you don't really get to choose what you are learning*.

This is especially true when you are fostering innovations.

You may not get to choose what you are learning ... but you *do* get to choose whether or not you are paying attention.

That is what a workshop like this is for. It's another chance to practice paying attention.

And maybe we'll see.



vivian Hutchinson
November 2008

Notes and Links

- This paper is based on a presentation given by vivian Hutchinson to the workshop on *Innovation and Evaluation*, hosted by Platform in Wellington, New Zealand, on 3-4 November 2008.
- This paper can be also downloaded in PDF format from www.scribd.com/people/view/102096-agathis
- Special thanks to Platform CEO Marion Blake, and the workshop team which included Andrew Morrison, Carmen Payne, Jenny Blagdon, Jo Hodge, Lyndsay Fortune, Maree Maddock, Mary-Jane Rivers, Ruth Jones, Vicki Wilde and Virginia MacEwan.
- The *Innovation and Evaluation* workshop was co-sponsored by the Social Innovation Investment Group and the Tindall Foundation.
- vivian Hutchinson is the Executive Officer of the Social Innovation Investment Group and the New Zealand Social Entrepreneur Fellowship. He hosts learning communities and retreats on the subject of social innovation and entrepreneurship, and he supports projects and activities that have the potential to make a fundamental difference to New Zealand's social challenges.

vivian has been one of the pioneers in community-based action for jobs in New Zealand, especially in establishing programmes for the support and education of unemployed people. He was a founder of the Taranaki Work Trust, the Skills of Enterprise Business Courses, the Jobs Research Trust, *The Jobs Letter*, and the New Zealand Mayors Taskforce for Jobs. As an adviser, vivian has helped with the establishment of enterprise and economic development units at a local authority level, and the creation of government employment agencies and programmes. vivian is also a co-founder of the Heart Politics Gatherings, the Stewardship Learning Community, and of ChangeMakers 5-10-5-10. For more information see www.vivianhutchinson.org.nz.

- thanks to the members of the *Social Innovation Investment Group* — Sukhi Turner, Rodger Smith, Simon Mortlock, George Salmond, Stephen Tindall, Alan Broadbent, Trevor Gray, Iain Hines, and Kate Frykberg.
 - The website for Platform, the national network of community organisations that provide mental health and addiction services, is at www.platform.org.nz
 - The website for the New Zealand Social Entrepreneur Fellowship is at www.nzsef.org.nz
 - *Geoff Mulgan quote* ... is from his Hinton Lecture, 21 November 2007, given to the UK National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO). This lecture can be read at www.scribd.com/doc/8492268
 - *Paul Hawken quote* ... this has been attributed to his speech on “*The New Great Transformation*” hosted by the Long Now Foundation, San Francisco, California on June 8th 2007. You can watch this talk online at http://fora.tv/2007/06/08/Paul_Hawken_New_Great_Transformation
- There are also varieties of this quotation in different interviews undertaken by Hawken to promote his book *Blessed Unrest*. Paul Hawken: “*If you look at the data about the environment and social conditions in the world and are optimistic, then you don't understand the data. However, if you meet the people who are addressing these issues and aren't optimistic, then you may want to make sure your heart is beating. Both are happening at the same time, a worsening of conditions and a response that is quite extraordinary.*” — *Ode Magazine*, May 2007
- *Complexity Theories* ... see interview with Brenda Zimmerman at the Tamarack Institute for Community Engagement <http://tamarackcommunity.ca/ssi8.html>.
 - *fifteen social entrepreneurs* ... see “*Tindall picks 'first XV' to find solutions to social problems*” by Simon Collins, *New Zealand Herald* 16 December 2006 www.nzsef.org.nz/061216
 - *Arthur Schopenhauer* ... German philosopher (1788-1860) see en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arthur_Schopenhauer
 - *inventing fire* ... adapted from Dwane Powell editorial cartoon 18 November 2008
 - *Craig Dearden-Phillips* “*Let's raise a glass to the coming recession*” 29 October 2008, on *Third Sector* website at www.thirdsector.co.uk.

- *Michael Young, British social entrepreneur* for more information see <http://vivianoxfordo7.blogspot.com/2007/04/young-foundation.html>.
- *Peter Block* book “*Community – the Structure of Belonging*” (pub 2008 Berrett-Koehler) is available at the NZSEF bookstore on Amazon at <http://astore.amazon.com/nzsef-20/detail/1576754871>.
- *Getting To Maybe* ... book by Frances Westley, Brenda Zimmerman and Michael Quinn Patton (pub 2006 Random House Canada) is available at the NZSEF bookstore on Amazon at <http://astore.amazon.com/nzsef-20/detail/067931444X>
- *Eric Young* ... quote is from his Foreword to the book *Getting to Maybe*.
- *Michael Quinn Patton* ... see “*Evaluation for the Way We Work*” by Michael Quinn Patton, *The Non-Profit Quarterly* Spring 2006, available on the NZSEF pdf archive at www.scribd.com/doc/8233067. This article includes the useful summary table below:

TRADITIONAL EVALUATIONS ...	COMPLEXITY-BASED DEVELOPMENTAL EVALUATIONS ...
RENDER DEFINITIVE JUDGMENTS OF SUCCESS OR FAILURE	PROVIDE FEEDBACK, GENERATE LEARNINGS, SUPPORTS DIRECTION OR AFFIRM CHANGES IN DIRECTION
MEASURE SUCCESS AGAINST PREDETERMINED GOALS	DEVELOPS NEW MEASURES AND MONITORING MECHANISMS, AS GOALS EMERGE AND EVOLVE
POSITIONS THE EVALUATOR OUTSIDE TO ASSURE INDEPENDENCE AND OBJECTIVITY	POSITIONS EVALUATION AS AN INTERNAL, TEAM FUNCTION INTEGRATED INTO ACTION AND THE ONGOING INTERPRETIVE PROCESSES
DESIGN THE EVALUATION BASED ON LINEAR CAUSE-EFFECT LOGIC MODELS	DESIGN THE EVALUATION TO CAPTURE SYSTEM DYNAMICS, INTERDEPENDENCIES, AND EMERGENT INTERCONNECTIONS
AIM TO PRODUCE GENERALIZABLE FINDINGS ACROSS TIME AND SPACE	AIM TO PRODUCE CONTEXT-SPECIFIC UNDERSTANDINGS THAT INFORM ONGOING INNOVATION
ACCOUNTABILITY IS FOCUSED ON, AND DIRECTED TO, EXTERNAL AUTHORITIES AND FUNDERS	ACCOUNTABILITY IS CENTERED ON THE INNOVATORS' DEEP SENSE OF FUNDAMENTAL VALUES AND COMMITMENTS
ACCOUNTABILITY TO CONTROL AND LOCATE BLAME FOR FAILURES	LEARNING TO RESPOND TO LACK OF CONTROL AND STAY IN TOUCH WITH WHAT'S UNFOLDING AND THEREBY RESPOND STRATEGICALLY
EVALUATOR CONTROLS THE EVALUATION AND DETERMINES THE DESIGN BASED ON THE EVALUATOR'S PERSPECTIVE ON WHAT IS IMPORTANT	THE EVALUATOR COLLABORATES IN THE CHANGE EFFORT TO DESIGN A PROCESS THAT MATCHES PHILOSOPHICALLY AND ORGANISATIONALLY
EVALUATION ENGENDERS FEAR OF FAILURE	EVALUATION SUPPORTS HUNGER FOR LEARNING

- *developmental evaluation* see also “*Emerging Learning about Developmental Evaluation*” by Jamie Gamble (2006) available at www.mcconnellfoundation.ca/default.aspx?page=68
- *evaluation and social entrepreneurship* ... see also Mark R Kramer’s report to the Skoll Foundation “*Measuring Innovation: Evaluation in the field of Social Entrepreneurship*” (Skoll FSC Report 2005) available on the NZSEF pdf archive at www.scribd.com/doc/8233430
- *other speeches and papers by vivian Hutchinson* relating to his work with philanthropy and social innovation, are available on the internet at www.scribd.com/people/view/102096-agathis