That little video really captures in a much more dynamic form than this definition what social innovation is about. I mentioned this in my opening, but let's reiterate this again. Our definition of social innovation is any initiative, product, process, program, or platform that challenges, and over time changes the defining routines, resources, authority, and beliefs of that broader system.

If you remember when last I was speaking last time, I talked about scale and I talked about Giddens' notion of institutional scale. We talked about his different structures of legitimation and domination and signification. Those, essentially, are the routines, resource, and authority flows (which is domination) and beliefs (which is the structures of signification and meaning) of this broader system.

We partly use that definition because we can actually see when that's occurred. And it may take a long time. Social innovations may take 100 years before they can really change this broader institutional framework. A lot of the time, that's not the scale we're working at. We work in the present, in the days and hours and years, maybe, that we have to devote to a particular project or time.

There are stages in this process and you can see shifts in these routines, resource and authority of flows, or beliefs, which can make you feel like you're on the right track. This isn't a process that is really possible to plan and control. I think you've heard enough about complex adaptive systems now to recognize that as a person, as what we call an agent working in this complex system, you can't plan or control this.

That's probably true of complexity even at lower scales and society. There's a colleague of mine who worked at McGill, Henry Mintzberg, who years ago—in fact, back in the late '70s—was looking at strategy and big complex organizations. He determined that it was emergent. It couldn't be planned. That, in fact, what you had was 5-year strategic plans, only 5% of which, in most big corporations, actually ever were realized.

[This is] a nice piece that you can measure because you have the plans and you can look five years later and see, *"Well, did they get there?"* These were plans that were very deliberate based on the best of what they knew right then. They were lined up with their goals, their mission, and their vision. They thought this is what they could do.

These were very bright people; but only 5% was actually achieved.

What happened? We know 95% was unrealized and the same 95% was what Henry and his colleague, Jim Water, said was *emergent*. It happened just in passing. It happened because of certain kinds of opportunities. It happened because of interactions between various themes and ideas across different scales in the organization.

This is the realm of any kind of innovation. It's emergent; most of it is emergent. It happens at low scales where people are trying to solve problems in a day-to-day kind of way, like we might try to solve a problem right here in this room. In fact, by clustering and attaching to other ideas over time, these can come to have a very large impact on institutions, just as these things could have an impact in five years on its strategy. The different ways of doing things, the problems that we solve, and innovate ways can be part of the mainstream. That's what we're concerned about trying to understand as we look at social innovation.

WISIR — **WATERLOO INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL INNOVATION AND RESILIENCE**

Another aspect that I already mentioned about social innovation, which is always worth remembering, is that, particularly, as it becomes successful, it's not, almost ever, a single thing. There's a French mythic figure who is called *the bricoleur* and they also use that term to refer to garbage collectors: people who go around picking up odds and ends and piecing them together. It is a mythic figure, as well, because the argument is that he tried to understand how new things come into a society. They are, most of the time, just a collection of old things but put together in new ways.

You can argue the old phrase of there's nothing new under the sun. There *is* novelty, but the novelty is generally made up of elements that have been used before in other ways. The novelty actually lies in the relationship between the elements. So, that's the second important piece to remember. Innovation is emergent. You can't really plan for it. As someone who wants to support social innovation, you have to actually bracket the idea that you can plan for it. You remember, before, we talked about the image of the child.

The second thing is that, when you're looking around and trying to understand innovation or create it yourself, you have to realize that it's very rare that one pure idea without any connection to other things actually makes it into the social sphere and has that impact. It's always a combination of pieces. You actually have to be able to decode or deconstruct a successful innovation to understand what the elements are and, much more importantly, the relationship between the elements.

The third thing is that many, many inventions—good ideas that are responding to circumstances and problems in the system—never actually make it in to a broader system change. They stay at the local level. They create adaptations so that they will tend to make the conditions for, perhaps, a particular vulnerable group more tolerable; but they don't challenge the system dynamics or feedback loops that create the problem in the first place. They just stay as a way to ameliorate or improve the lot of people who are suffering. That doesn't make them bad things.

When you invent some kind of a new technology that helps people who can't walk to actually stand and move around—an exoskeleton, for example—you've done a wonderful thing. It's an important invention. On the other hand, it doesn't necessarily challenge the broader institutional system that's making lives very hard for people who are disabled. When you invent a portable home for the homeless, it means that there are many fewer who are going to die of the cold in the winter; but it doesn't actually challenge the big economic and political dynamics that create homelessness in the first place.

Most things do not become the second kind [of innovation]. Most stay at local levels. Most are concerned with adaptation. So, invention does not equal social innovation. That doesn't mean that it's any less important to have; but it doesn't create the change necessary to create the system change that we're looking at.

That's what the object of today is: both to understand how you recognize those innovations—social innovations that are likely to have a broad impact—and what we've learned about system entrepreneurs, i.e. people who work to try to facilitate that growth and the durability of that impact.

WATERLOO INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL INNOVATION AND RESILIENCE