



# Futures Project

---

Evaluation Report:

*'Social Enterprise' forum*

## Introduction

---

The *Social Enterprise forum* took place on Tuesday June 21<sup>st</sup> 2016 at State-wide Resource Centre, Carlton over a two-hour session from 11am – 1.00pm. Thirty-six participants attended the session and thirteen completed the post-workshop evaluation questionnaire. Please note therefore, the evaluation results are limited due to the small number of respondents.

The post-workshop evaluation was composed of 2 Likert scale questions and 4 open-ended written response questions. These questions aimed to assess the relevance of the workshop topic to organisations, information and skills gained, strategies participants could implement in the future and how the forum itself could be improved.

Attendees were asked to circle whether they were attending the forum as an individual from an ethno-specific, multicultural or mainstream organisation. Of the 13 who completed the evaluation forms, 6 were from a multicultural organisation, 1 from a mainstream organisation, 1 ethno-specific a student and 5 did not respond.

## Conclusion

---

The overall results from the 13 participant evaluation questionnaires received indicate that there was a positive response to the *Social Enterprise forum*. Participants gained useful information on a range of topics, including the importance of networking. The presentations, relevance and clarity of the information were well received by the participants who indicated overall satisfaction with the event. Suggested improvements included examples of variety of social enterprises and some opportunities for greater audience contribution.

## Results

**Table 1**  
**Self-Assessment Post-Workshop Survey**  
**N: 13**

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>
<b>2. The forum topic was useful and relevant to my organisation.</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>54%</b>		
<b>3. The information was presented in a way that was clear and easy to understand</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>38%</b>		

Table 1 shows the results from both Likert scale type questions, assessing the relevance and the clarity of the information presented. The results indicate that all participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the topic was useful, and all agreed or strongly agreed that the information was presented in a way that was clear and easy to understand. This suggests that the information presented was interesting and dynamic and that the presentations were relevant to the individuals and organisations attending.

**Table 2**  
**Self-Assessment Post-Workshop Survey**  
**N: 9**

Survey Question	Participants' Comments
<b>4. What strategies were provided to you today that you plan on implementing in your finance &amp; fundraising plan?</b>	<p><i>At this stage, only considering options</i></p> <p><i>It's a step by step process</i></p> <p><i>Yes</i></p> <p><i>Will promote young with elder cooperative</i></p> <p><i>Channels to suggest initiatives</i></p> <p><i>Opportunity of collaboration. Social entrepreneur video. For FB page to explain what we are and how we operate</i></p> <p><i>Going for it.</i></p> <p><i>Formulating initiatives that are socially conscious</i></p> <p><i>Youth engagement. Accreditation training</i></p>

Table 2 shows which strategies participants planned to implement in their finance and fundraising plan. One participant noted that the strategies on how to engage young people and elderly were a vital resource they will use in the future.

**Table 3**  
**Self-Assessment Post-Workshop Survey**  
**N: 13**

	Yes... new improved marketing strategies	No... effective existing methods	Did not answer
<b>5. In its current form, I am confident that my organisation will be able to manage its social enterprise without improving the strategies for our finance and fundraising plan for the organisation?</b>	<b>2 (20%)</b>	<b>2 (20%)</b>	<b>9 (60%)</b>
<b>Participants' Comments</b>	<p><i>We are exploring various options to improve our sustainability.</i></p> <p><i>This statement does not reflect my organisation (X3). The above strategies are ones we know the organisation can greatly benefit from implementing which is what we hope to.</i></p>		

Table 3 shows participants' assessment of whether their organisation needed to improve their social enterprise strategies as a result of having to promote their services in a competitive market. While 20% of respondents feel content with their organisation's existing methods, the results show that the majority of respondents did not answer.

**Table 4**  
**Self-Assessment Post-Workshop Survey**  
**N: 13**

<i>Survey Question</i>	<i>Participants' Comments</i>
<p><b>6. Did you have the opportunity to network with other organisations and is there a possibility to develop formal collaborations and how?</b></p>	<p><i>Yes x 3</i></p> <p><i>Perhaps more structured "get to know you" could be useful.</i></p> <p><i>Invitation for presenters to contribute content on their organisations to the weekly ECCV eNews C/Leenie.</i></p> <p><i>Yes- committed to assist others.</i></p> <p><i>Some opportunity, but no collaborations possibilities at this time.</i></p> <p><i>Not really.</i></p> <p><i>Did have one interest expressed on how elders can contribute to youth enterprise.</i></p> <p><i>Volunteer work, interpreting services &amp; refugee</i></p> <p><i>The networking provided a means for my organisation to be aware of ways to get funding and work toward a common goal.</i></p> <p><i>Beginning. Break time and end.</i></p> <p><i>I briefly had a chat with a person interested in learning about age care services.</i></p>

**Table 5**  
**Self-Assessment Post-Workshop Survey**  
**N: 10**

<i>Survey Question</i>	<i>Participants' Comments</i>
<b>7. In what way could this information session be improved?</b>	<p><i>Quick intro of the attendees. Opp. to have a table for flyers</i>  <i>Maybe less presenters to have more time for networking time.</i></p> <p><i>Sound and PowerPoint facility.</i></p> <p><i>Limit audience members to questions, not unscheduled mini presentations!</i></p> <p><i>Examples of variety of social enterprises.</i></p> <p><i>Tighter time management. Had to pass on the last presentation due to the another commitment</i></p> <p><i>One way of improvement would be by allowing more audience contribution.</i></p> <p><i>N/A. Good work!</i></p> <p><i>I enjoyed the information session and was all relevant.</i></p> <p><i>No.</i></p> <p><i>More time for specific questions and possibly the opportunity to know other organisations present in the room and what they do.</i></p>

Table 5 identified ways in which the session could be improved. Allowing more audience to participate was raised by a number of participants as something to improve on. One participant would have liked more time for networking.

#### **Appendix 1: Names of Organisations that Attended**

- AMES Australia
- Brotherhood of St Laurence
- Casa Cultura/ Mosaik Experiences
- Dream Castor
- Ethnic Communities' Council of Victoria (ECCV)
- EuRaw Stories
- Eventbrite
- Foundation for Young Australians
- Fronditha Care
- Leadership Victoria
- LICAU-SED Inc

- Multicultural Arts Victoria
- NAB
- Northern Federation of Ethnic Senior Citizen's Clubs
- Northern Interfaith Intercultural Network
- RMIT Student
- SEEDS
- Sisterworks
- Student community development
- The Social Studio
- Two Square Peg
- PBS Radio
- Polaron Language Services