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Purpose of document

This monograph articulates our Theory of Change (TOC) in promoting changemaking. Thus, a “theory of change-making.” This document is a complement to, and builds off, our participatory strategic planning processes and documents that comprise the Taylor Forward process (Taylor Center, 2017). The audience for this document is our Taylor Center team as well as affiliates on campus, community partners, sponsors and funding agencies, and other stakeholders.

A theory of change is intended to clarify the thinking behind what we do with resources we have, in the context that we work in. It clarifies how we envision that the valued changes we want to see will happen, while also keeping in mind our audiences, values, and community-building aims. A TOC also identifies key assumptions underlying and necessary to this approach. It clarifies our sense of the causal relationships that are at work: i.e., what (action) causes what change?

This document will guide our assessments and learning systems (e.g., program reviews) and it shapes our research agenda and methods. It can guide resource acquisition (grant-making, fund-raising, hiring) to align with programs, and shape communications to speak to audiences with appropriate language. It can help guide new program development to respond to dynamic contexts.
1. Introduction: Vision, Mission and Values

The Taylor Center was founded in 2014 as a university-based center within Tulane University to promote social innovation and changemaking, with design thinking as a central element. The center offers a range of and a cross-disciplinary unit community-engagement, social entrepreneurial programs, and social initiatives for the university community. The center was made possible with a generous donation by Louisiana native and Tulane alum, Phyllis M. Taylor.

Taylor Center aims to serve the entire university in its aims of education, research, and service. The Taylor Center 3 year strategic plan (Taylor, March 2017) clarifies the core values of the center, the vision for change we want to bring into the world, and our mission in contributing to making this vision a reality.

A core activity is academic and curricular—namely the SISE minor. Extra- and co-curricular programs include awards, visiting speakers, the Changemaker Institute+ social enterprise incubator, Taylor Your Life, the Fast 48 weekend workshop, and Paterson RLC residence hall. Support for faculty and scholar engagement include 10 Social Entrepreneurship Professorships, faculty fellows, Visiting Scholars. One “X prize” type of competition, invited teams from around the world to address the problem of excess nitrogen and hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico and other delta regions. It launched in 2011 and awarded the million dollar prize last year. These initiatives arose over several years of efforts by many people, from pioneering undergraduates to the former Tulane leadership and administration. All helped to bring social entrepreneurial ways of thinking, learning, and acting to Tulane as part of post-Katrina developments.

The Taylor Forward process (2016-2017) revealed the values of Equity, Community and Research & Scholarship on social innovation to be strategic priorities for the next few years. Our primary audience for all programs and outputs are the enrolled students at Tulane. Other audiences and stakeholders are the larger community of faculty, staff, administrators, and community-based organizations. These groups teach courses, produce knowledge, advise students, shape and execute university policies and systems, etc. –i.e., part of the fabric in which a university center resides.

Our core values surfaced through stakeholder discussion. These are: Respect, Connection, Learning, and Creativity. (Underlining by the author highlights values that illuminate our TOC, potential outputs and indicators, and assumptions to be explored).

- **Respect**: We are committed to equity and recognize humility and **empathy** as cornerstones of effective and ethical engagement with others.
- **Connection**: We see innovation as a social act that is grounded in the **relationships** between people across differences.
- **Learning**: We practice persistent **curiosity** and recognize that **everyone** has knowledge to gain and share.
- **Creativity**: We are committed to being **open** and at times **uncomfortable** as we seek out the **unexpected** in imagining a better world.

Our current Vision is a

“**powerfully connected network of changemakers who support and learn from each other as they work to create lasting positive social change in their communities.”**
Our stated Mission is to

“cultivate a diverse network of Changemakers who are working and learning together to create a more just and equitable society.”

We believe a range of 21st Century changemaking skills and attitudes are captured in these values. Central among them are capabilities for empathy, creative confidence, teamwork, adaptive leadership, system thinking, and problem solving. These should ideally be accessible to anyone, regardless of their ability to pay or societal position, reflecting a concern for equity.

These changemaking skills will aid us in recognizing and stepping up to address the systemic and structural inequalities at work in the world.) Changemaking, and the need for it, is getting more attention as a valued mindset for US society and for our youth (Brooks, 2018).

2. The Larger Impacts We Seek: the Change We Want to See

The impact we want to see in the world from our activities is

A thriving community of engaged and capable Changemakers --in all walks of life and diverse settings and institutions—actively and collaboratively addressing the substantive social & environmental problems they encounter, in ways that are consistent with our values, and aiming for positive social change.

By Changemakers we mean the definition proposed by Ashoka founder Bill Drayton: “people who use their skills, humility, expertise, gifts, empathy and power in a way that creates positive social change and affirms the humanity of all people.” (Taylor Forward, 2017).

Changemakers demonstrate “commitment to social change, constant learning, and working in partnership” with affected people. These Changemakers are intentionally diverse; they include students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community.

By positive social change, we mean social and environmental change that leads to more just, equitable, and ecologically sound society. Our measure of whether a change is positive is whether it leads to sustained improvements for those who are most affected by a given social or environmental issue.

If we are effective, this “Community of Changemakers” will be more visible here in New Orleans (as individuals and organizations) as well as in other specific geographic communities around the world; working at scales that range from local to global.

3. Situational Scan and Context

A situational scan clarifies the context, threats, opportunities in which our center, plans and programs exist and operate. It helps clarify the reason the Center exists and how programs evolved.
Taylor exists as a response of university-based individuals (enrolled students, faculty, staff, and administrators) and the philanthropic donor (Phyllis M. Taylor, a Tulane alum) to the pressing societal challenges with relevant Tulane-based programs and initiatives.

The relevant contexts in which the Taylor Center works span several domains: higher education (undergraduate education trends, professional graduate education, the university as an institution); and the location of New Orleans specifically, post-Katrina as a poster child for urban recovery. Another backdrop is the massive global scale and historical depth of societal problems we face, that faculty and students already engage with in classrooms, research and learning experiences. Sections below elaborate on these domains.

Higher education context is a specific domain of action. Universities face many challenges—competition, rising costs of tuition, infrastructure issues, insurance, policy shifts (immigration, international students). These are complex institutions with competing demands in our multi-cultural dynamic, globalizing world. SISE minor focus on undergraduate education shapes current programs (in some other universities, SI/SE programs started in a business school at the graduate level, so the reverse).

SI/SE courses and programs on a campus can be part of solution to these institutional and societal challenges, helping to transform university campuses to be more relevant to students, parents-- and to address social challenges.

Ashoka U is the branch or chapter of Ashoka that supports transforming higher education to cultivate changemakers (https://ashokau.org/). The Ashoka U Changemaker campus network works at a national and global level to support and sustain these efforts. The Taylor Center supports, and is supported by this network, building relationships and learning from each other (via, say, the Exchange, campus relationships and mentoring).

At the same time, this could be potentially a threat, as Tulane and Taylor are not unique among campuses in offering rich and innovative community-engagement, service learning, design thinking, and social innovation as part of the experience for undergraduates.

Taylor is part of Tulane, grounded in New Orleans geographical setting, culture and historical context. New Orleans is a 300-year-old city: multi-cultural, complex, and yet relatively small city (population ~400,000 in a greater metropolitan area). Characterized by many wonderful, delightful aspects of a rich cultural and historical legacy, it landed #1 on the NY Times list of destinations (https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/travel/places-to-visit.html).

New Orleans is also a microcosm of the US culture and conditions, characterized by structural racism and white privilege, growing economic inequality, widespread income poverty, serious environmental injustices such as pollution around chemical plants, housing discrimination and more. The “schools to prison pipeline” is a factor in high mass incarceration rates, especially among young African American men. Increasingly, more environmental (existential) challenges face the city and the gulf region as irreversible climate change proceeds. Owing to the ecological setting of the Mississippi river delta region in the Gulf, New Orleans is highly vulnerable, and the campus faces regular flooding events, among other problems. Rising sea levels, warmer temperatures, and more extreme weather events will aggravate existing environmental and economic injustices.
Tulane, based in New Orleans for over 150 years, committed to community engagement and service learning in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina (Cowen, 2014). The university is embedded in the city and region and strongly oriented to opportunities and specific challenges around that setting. Faculty, staff, and students are working in schools, non-profit organizations, health centers, economic development, and other community organizations.

Taylor Center intentionally builds on this New Orleans setting to connect and support the local social entrepreneurship movement. This arose during and after the Katrina-related devastation and recovery period, led by Propeller: a force for social innovation (that started as social entrepreneurs of New Orleans by Andrea Chen).

These local and regional social, environmental, and political challenges are no surprise to anyone. They are recognized in Taylor-centered programs and the strategic planning document.

Globally, around the world, many people face persistent inequality, exclusion from opportunities, violence of many forms--essentially, deprivations of many freedoms owing to their place of birth and structures of society. This takes forms of “structural violence” (Paul Farmer, 2004) and institutionalized inequality. Poor health, for example, results from the oppression and exclusion built into institutions of health, education, governance, finance, etc. These systematically exclude many people from opportunities to make a better life.

Tulane aims to be globally relevant, and many students, faculty, partners, and staff work around the world in health, engineering, humanities and social sciences. “Global” in the name and mission of many departments in the School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, for example.

Taylor Center strategy, values and community also recognize this global context. A global outlook is consistent with Ashoka, the social entrepreneurship movement founded in the 1980s by Bill Drayton. He sought to identify and support individuals (social entrepreneurs) who were generating fresh and insightful solutions to pressing social problems, addressing them in ways that transform (via social innovations) the underlying systems that perpetuate them. Drayton now expands the work of Ashoka to be about changemaking everywhere, and Taylor follows this philosophy.

4. An ecosystem approach and the science of cultivating change

Taylor programs should be consistent with these values and visions, stated above. They should also be guided by science and a clear, contemporary vision of how the world works. This section outlines a framework that explains how the world works, where we fit, and how change happens. This builds on a dynamic, non-linear, ecosystem-based worldview that is grounded in a scientific paradigm of complexity, complex adaptive systems and related fields (e.g. authors such as John Holland, Fritjof Capra, and Ben Ramalingam. A contrasting worldview, for example, would be a mechanistic and linear model of change.) See Figure 2 for an initial sketch of an ecosystem approach capturing Taylor center as a system. See cover illustration for a spaghetti diagram version of this concept.
An ecosystem approach means acknowledging the evolving qualities of the communities and ecological systems of which we are a part.

An ecosystem approach reflects that we are in a living community of different agents — people, organizations, and other elements—interconnected through flows of resources, such as money, ideas, encouragement, and information.

This interconnectedness brings more unpredictability and surprises—we don’t know what one action or event will lead to. Interconnectedness leads to technology-mediated proximity and influence, for better or worse: these are opportunities for an (small, single) individual, no matter where he or she resides, to have an out-sized, larger impacts on events around the world.

Relationships are multi-directional and feedback from one action influences others, such as alum hiring others and supporting research. Interconnectedness poses challenges of fragility in systems and negative, dampening feedback loops, such as in financial systems.

Many forms of incertitude abound —risk (calculable forms of uncertainty), uncertainty about facts and what will happen, ignorance (we don’t know what we don’t know), and ambiguity in understanding of problems and what’s at stake (see Leach et al. 2007; the STEPS Centre, 2018).

Reaching our primary audiences of learners—the students, faculty, staff in the university and partner organizations requires -- not just building individual skills but the supportive and resilient ecosystem to nurture these seeds of change within everyone.

We want to be planting changemaking “seeds” of curiosity to understand problems, and the people, institutions, and phenomena around them. We want to build skills in systems-thinking, persistence, design “thinking” (and doing and being creative), as well as practical business-related skills and strategies to pay the bills, find resources, and make a living as a changemaker.

These skills are nourished among individuals (Changemakers as “social intrapreneurs”) within a living community (Taylor Center, Tulane University and our partnerships and global networks). This happens through cultivating relationships, using resources/inputs to support the community – cultivating alum, reinforcing relationships. It means promoting positive feedback via practice, accountability, and virtuous
spirals. It means paying attention to dampening feedback loops for valuable information about what’s working, or not.

Also in keeping with this “ecosystem” way of thinking, an appreciation for changemaking skills must serve not only the campus but beyond --to new programs, campus life, and cultural spaces. It can go beyond the campus into the community via internships, organizations, partnerships. It can beyond degree programs to guiding relevant research, scholarship, and knowledge production generally.

Changemaker skills are relevant for addressing home, workplace, community, and global problems—and these are interconnected. Problems might seem to be (at first glance) societal, political, technological and/or environmental problems, and these are inter-related and require many disciplines. A wide range of faculty, staff, partners, and institutional systems are valued members of this living community.

Ecosystem thinking is especially needed for the 21st century, which presents many new “wicked”, ambiguous, ill-defined, difficult problems challenges that our world has not seen before. The increase in wicked problems relates to interconnectedness, new digital technologies, the pressures of 7.5 billion people (and growing), and our combined impacts. Rising levels of consumption, increasing inequality, and huge environmental, political, and social challenges are exacerbated by our global interconnectedness (and solutions might be found there, as well).

Since the community is living and the world is unpredictable, we need to be able to adapt to reality, new threats, and changing circumstances. Recognizing this worldview, during strategic planning (Taylor Forward) the willow tree was chosen as a metaphor to capture the work of the center as it represents regeneration and learning from the past. It is a biofilter, removing toxins from ecosystems. It is part of a resilient, healthy ecosystem—an interconnected community of individual agents (people, plants, animals) that can bounce back from threats and stressors and adapt (or evolve) to better handle these stresses.

5. A provisional logical model diagram for Taylor programs

Our desired outcomes and larger impact we aim to see in the world —and how we see getting there— can be captured using a standard logical framework (“log frame”) structure from evaluation theory. A provisional Taylor Center logical model is found in Table 1 (with a full-page version attached at the end). Like any logical frame, it simplifies reality, and doing so, highlights key features, causal relationships, and assumptions and external factors. There are inter-relationships and feedback loops—some examples are indicated within. This both embodies and communicates our theory of change, situational analysis, the context of Taylor Center.

Log frames and TOC are used to communicate and assess what we do. Thus, the larger outcomes will guide developmental evaluation of the Center. Outputs are documented in internal forms, assessments, classroom materials, workshops, etc. by program and can guide specific enquiry and assessments of activities. Below, find some provisional and illustrative evaluation questions (noted in italics). These help identify compelling questions and can kick-start planning for learning systems and evaluation of activities and the Center.
The next few sections below explain the middle columns of the table from left to right. This starts with the resources and inputs, then the specific activities and programs, then the outputs and larger outcomes (social impacts) that we expect to see.

### Table 1. Theory of Change Logical Framework for Taylor Center as Whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM and CONTEXT</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES &amp; IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education (universities) has evolved to be training students for professional careers that are no longer relevant to changing world; we need to transform higher ed. and campus cultures to support social innovation. Tulane prioritizes service learning and community engagement.</td>
<td>Human Capital: People, talent, skills, capabilities</td>
<td>Undergraduate-student oriented Curriculum: SCE minor for undergraduates SE/ST content in core SCE courses Co-Extra-Curricular: Potzner RLC, Ignite, Student clubs, Student Awards Taylor: Life (TVK) Taylor: Student Fellows</td>
<td>SCE alumni learn Changemaking skills (~$40-50/year)</td>
<td>All outputs feed into HS bigger social impact: A growing, adaptable, resilient, connected community of changemakers (e.g., the US and around the world) actively addressing pressing social &amp; environmental challenges wherever they are, and contributing to the health of the community and ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual learning university students seek changemaking skills and meaningful careers. Individual faculty and staff seek more meaningful work within the university and to align their research, scholarship, service &amp; teaching with the needs of society.</td>
<td>Social Capital: Relationships, trust and reciprocity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans context: social, political, economic, and environmental problems exist. A microcosm of the US; we should address these issues.</td>
<td>Intellectual Capital: Knowledge of the fields, disciplinary expertise, pedagogies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global challenges are immense and interconnected.</td>
<td>Financial Capital: Endowment funds, fee tuition, grants, donations</td>
<td>Graduate-student oriented Endowment: 20000 for grad students Taylor: Life for social enterprise DT/US in graduate courses DT/CM in other units (OES/HR, BME) Social Innovation Conversations Graduate assistants</td>
<td>Graduates have a background in social innovation and practice in a social impact setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach</td>
<td>Community Outreach: DT workshops for community/public</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen relationship with partners and campus and support the role of social design and design-led Changemaking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global outreach/solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:** This approach assumes that factors that are more within our control (to a degree) function as we envision: that forms of capital continue, that Center staff, resources remain stable and productive; that the curriculum, courses, training are based on evidence effective in cultivating Changemaking; that Tulane’s administrative support is consistent; that students are interested in Changemaking; that faculty are supportive; that the Ashoka U Changemaker campus network persists; that community partners remain aligned, that the alumni network is supportive. **External factors:** We are subject to dynamics of factors outside our control such as national trends in higher education/academia (enrollments, senior leadership, hiring, funding); local and national policies (immigration, banking emergency relief, global geopolitics [refugees, war]; extreme weather and climate change disasters; trends in philanthropy, foundations, grant making, sensitivities of global financial markets [affecting endowments], and other unknown factors.

### 6. Narrative Description of Resources and Inputs

Column 2 lists assets and forms of capital that the Center uses. These resources are the inputs into our activities. These activities are organized as forms of capital: human, social, financial, physical capital (infrastructure, facilities), and intellectual capital (our knowledge base). Discussion of these assets is organized around the activities listed above. *(Some provisional evaluation questions in italics)*.

- **Human capital:** The Center has (at writing) 8 full-time and several part-time staff and instructors, including the director. There are 10 affiliated faculty serving as SE Professors, faculty fellows, occasional visiting scholars and community and campus partners. There are 10 student fellows and graduate student workers who help deliver programs. Together these regular and affiliate team members possess abundant skills, knowledge, creativity, motivation, and energy to promote changemaking efforts generally, and to design and execute specific activities. There are also volunteers and part-time help on specific programs and projects with other organizations.

This means there are unclear boundaries and overlaps among people, a large and fluid network, and significant turnover from year to year requiring training and on-boarding. **Are the regular staff—and the whole team of diverse members—adequately equipped to deliver all the...**
programs, plus reporting, planning, communicating, etc? Ditto for discrete programs/activities. What are key gaps?

• Social capital: there are many bonds of trust and reciprocity seen in the relationships within the Center and with others on campus and in the community and other networks. These are the solid partnerships, exchanges with other staffers on campus, and strong personal connections that a small campus and town can afford and that are important to developing new and sustaining regular programs. Examples include relationships between SISE Minor team, TIDES, and CPS, and between SE Professors and different research and academic centers, and Taylor staff. Some questions that arise are:
  o What are the important relationships for changemaking efforts? How are we maintaining them? What are missing relationships (i.e., with alum, on campus, in local government, with other potential sponsors, etc.)?

• Financial capital: assets and revenue streams exist via endowments, specific monetized services, tuition revenues, fees, and targeted program funds. These include individual professorship endowments funds (e.g., Sachs Chair, the 10 endowed Professorships– all based on years of prior fund-raising efforts). There are annual SISE tuition revenues. There are small individual fees (regular Fast 48 workshop fees which support cost-recovery for a low-cost, accessible event) and project-based “Taylorized” facilitation fees for some partnerships. (There might be others; these are just examples of varied forms of financial capital). Questions arise:
  o Do we have adequate funding for all the people and programs we run? Do we use our financial assets wisely given our strategic priorities and goals?
  o Details of social cost-benefit assessment /activity would be instructive.
  o Other aspects of revenues could support the Changemaking goals, such as charging a small fee to support buy-in and changemaking growth, vs. offering “free” experiences. Should we consider that?

• Physical/Infrastructure: There is the Center’s regular physical space, staff offices, a classroom/ studio space, furniture, screens, and related equipment. There is access to university facilities (internet, libraries, water, electricity), the campus residence hall (RLC) and campus and community partners’ physical spaces for meetings and convenings. Individual SE Professors might bring additional physical infrastructure. Administration offers support for the Center in terms of physical infrastructure.
  o Do the physical spaces and facilities adequately should support Changemaking goals and vision/mission? What aspects are important, and to whom (more office space for the team, vs. the classroom or studio space?) How might it be improved to encourage efficient activities and promote the changemaking mission?

• Intellectual capital: As a university-based center, this asset is particularly necessary and expected. This refers to the combined knowledge and insights of team members across the fields of social innovation, social entrepreneurship, social change, design thinking, and changemaking, and how these intersect with academic disciplines. This form of capital is cultivated through different forms and disciplines of research, from experiments in labs to case studies, both here and around the world. It results from professional and classroom practices, and experiences in serving as thought-leaders within the Ashoka U network. It is a hybrid of these institutional change-making experiences and training as academic scholars and researchers in various disciplines and specialties. We – faculty, leadership, and students -- jointly
possess decades of theoretical, practical and case-based knowledge of how to design, build, evaluate programs, promote changemaking in our classrooms and via projects, internships, etc. Questions arise such as:

- This is a rich asset that is perhaps unique to an academic context, compared to other changemaking arenas: How is it being used within the center? How is it relevant outside the center? (I.e., for raising resources, guiding learning experiences) How might we use this intellectual capital more effectively?

Some general evaluation questions to pursue would be: Are these resources and forms of capital sufficient to deliver programs? Are the teams/positions appropriately staffed and aligned with needs of programs and context? Where might there be significant gaps in our resources? How do we envision the future directions of resources, across the forms of capital? In conducting a process evaluation of our work, we will assess the match between resources, activities and desired outcomes. Are we hiring the right people, and do processes support this?

Larger questions of impact get out matches: Are we funding programs effectively? Do our systems support our values, vision, and mission? Might there be gaps in how disciplines are represented (or not); are there possibly contradictory approaches to addressing social problems (entrepreneurial and market-based vs. social movements) that undermine educational aims? What are key forms of capital to achieve key outputs?

7. Narrative Description of Activities (Column 3)

The “Activities” column refers to regular programs, initiatives, events, and other activities that the Taylor Center runs. These activities span curricular, co-curricular, non/extra-curricular programs. They include research initiatives and institutional relationships on and off-campus. (The vision is that these lead to stated, desired outputs of Changemaker education and related outputs (column 4, below).

Academic programs tend to be oriented to specific audiences of students:
- Undergraduate students (BS, BA degree programs)
- Graduate students at the professional Masters degree and academic doctoral levels of instruction (e.g., MPH, MSW, MBA, JD, March, PhD, DrPH, MD)

There are also other learners and supporting elements in the ecosystem
- Tulane staff and employees running related programs, student services, etc. and themselves interested in changemaking in their roles
- Faculty, regular and part-time, as scholars, classroom instructors, curriculum designers supporting changemaking learning and research
- Tulane administrators with specific roles in leadership, academics, development, etc. supporting the work and needing to understand it
- The community at large, as our formal partner organizations, prospective organizational partners, and as individuals, government officials, business sector, and the general public who are interested in changemaking and can benefit from skills, knowledge and inspiration

Questions for evaluation activities arise that are central to our mission, such as:
• Are the activities reaching intended audiences who seek changemaking careers and skills? How might we target them better? (process question)
• The ecosystem approach makes a case for reaching all these types of people and their different roles to help to cultivate a supportive ecosystem and community, according to this theory of change. Is that happening? (process)
• A focus on equity calls for opening up activities to wider audiences and to making changemaking learning more accessible, beyond enrolled students and the campus. Is that happening? (relates to processes and outcomes)

Many specifically student-oriented activities include regular courses, the SISE minor, other electives, plus associated workshops, internships, awards, etc.

**Undergraduate** curricular programs reflect the core function of a university of higher education and professional training and the origins of SISE programs. The activities integrate changemaking skills development within the undergraduate experience over 4 years. The SISE minor is a series of several, 3-4 credit courses for any student, to complement any degree/major, offering a social innovation “toolkit”. Questions about curricular programs arise such as:

- **How is our SISE minor composition of students changing?** Recent updates in requirements to promote access, diversity and disciplinary breath aim to open this up for more arts & humanities; is that happening? (processes and outputs)
- **Does the SISE minor lead our alum to changemaking careers?** (the larger outcome we seek)
- **What other Taylor programs best support SISE learning experiences?**

Co-curricular and non-credit bearing opportunities include the Taylor Student fellows, speaker events, RLC, Ignite, student clubs, etc. These vary in intensity (15 hour/week fellowship, vs. a 1 hour speaker). They complement academic learning for an individual student. Highlights include

- “Taylor Your Life” course is creative life-design training for changemakers. It is available to any student, involves Advising team, and is expanding on campus. It is a one-off experience for participants, and also a training opportunity for staff seeking to serve as instructors.
  - Evaluation questions arise such as: **How can the program integrate and complement other Taylor programs, staff and learning?** Does it pay for itself? What are long-run outputs for participants?
- Financial awards such as Catalyst and Alvarez Spark awards, support student learning and “apprentice with a problem” experiences, and social enterprise development, via a competitive application process. **What can we learn from several years of offering financial awards? What students apply, and what is the value?**

General questions arise around non-curricular programs, such as: **How do SISE minor and co-curricular programs relate to each other? Can non-SISE experiences support changemaker education on their own?**

Extra-curricular programs for enrolled students offer learning experiences that not only do not offer credit or charge tuition but might even pay the student to learn. **How do these compare? Do any of these conflicts or compete with conventional academic, curricular programs?**

Some Highlights and signature programs:

- Paid work as **Taylor Student Fellows** offer employment and direct experience in running programs, while also cultivating individual changemaking skills and also building a network.
Students can return to the fellowship another year; can shift from one program area to another; learn about social innovation and get professional development for their career. The program has evolved from its roots in CELT as a student fellowship in engaged learning, to more Taylor-specific jobs and development in changemaking. Questions arise: This competitive leadership program helps deliver all the Taylor programs and build cohorts of young changemakers; how do results weigh against the financial investment? What are opportunity costs? (process, outcomes)

- Other student worker positions include TAs, project staff, and administrative support on an ad hoc basis. These are emerging to offer a cadre of graduate student workers and alum network: Questions arise from this opportunity: how might we make more of their position for mutual benefit?

- **Changemaker Institute/ CI +**: support students (individuals or teams) with specific ideas for a social enterprise to address a pressing social problem. The program has evolved to promote broader changemaking qualities and pathways vs. a social enterprise incubator. What can we learn from this experience of adaptation of the program? Where does social enterprise development fit?

- The Taylor Center supports student clubs and groups, like DfA and TEDxTU. Are these integrated into programs, resources? Do these clubs promote changemaking?

- Taylor offers programs at a residence hall (Paterson) with speakers, film nights, etc. Does this support changemaking? What does that look like to residents? What is the cost-benefit assessment for running programs?

**Graduate Students**

Social innovation and design training specifically for graduate students has been offered since 2013. One feature is the Fast 48 bootcamp weekend in design thinking for social impact offered once/semester. This offers intensive exposure and hands-on practice to complement any graduate degree program (at low cost, aiming to be affordable). Participants can return to learn to facilitate, coach teams, etc. thus we hope building their skills enhance employability. A partnership with a community organization helps it work to nurture the community as ecosystem. This event charges fee to meet costs and support participant “buy-in”; it requires trained, paid Taylor staff and student fellows to execute it. It is linked to a graduate level, 3-credit course. It will become part of a graduate focus area in Global and Community Health & Behavior (for an MPH degree in Community health).

Evaluation questions might be: Do Fast 48 participants learn what they need to seek social impact careers? Can they apply design principles in workplace and practice? (outcomes)

- How does it work integrated and package it with a for-credit course—is that a model we should institutionalize? Does the package support learning and pathways?

- What are prospects for financial sustainability and revenue streams to sustain and pay for teams? (resources)

- If needed, how might we scale this workshop to reach more people without costing more: duplicate it? Reinforce with shorter trainings? Sliding scale? If monetized on a market-model, what would happen?

**Faculty-oriented engagement**

Recognizing the need to cultivate a broad base of faculty interest and ownership in programs (rather than discrete student-oriented projects), and support for research, scholarship, and teaching; regular faculty and other scholars across the university are offered a chance to get involved via endowed
professorships, as well as faculty fellows, visiting fellows and other collaborations. The signature program is:

- **Professorships in Social Entrepreneurship**: The 10 endowed positions (from 5 in 2011) are filled by open recruitment and a competitive review process. Each fund is endowed by an individual donor. This position is not salary support but intended to complement any individual faculty member’s existing position in an academic department. It offers a fund to support their research, teaching, course development, and a formal affiliation with the Taylor Center. This hopefully sparks and cultivates their involvement in changemaking education and research. It rewards and incentivizes new research on social innovation and changemaking topics from any discipline.
  - Questions arise such as: *does the program outreach and recruitment reach a wide audience of faculty such that they are aware and able to apply? (Process)*
  - *Do SE professors themselves become changemakers in their discipline or department? How is that manifested? How do they support changemaking education and the larger community?*

**Staff-oriented programs**

Many trainings, workshops, etc. are open to staff and employees in a spirit of sharing, learning and generating support for the community of changemaking (recognizing an ecosystem approach). Staff with an understanding of what SISE and Taylor are about can better advise students, organize speaker events, partner on projects, etc. Many different collaborations can cultivate support for staff-Changemaking. TYL instructors can learn design thinking via Fast 48, for example; custom trainings can support Tulane staff as changemakers themselves. An example is the Advising team receiving “Taylorized” design training starting in 2015 and again in 2017 and using it for revamping their programs and spaces to better serve their constituents.

- Questions arise such as: *Is there individual demand for more staff-specific offerings to meet employee needs as changemakers (aside from Taylorized, custom support for any unit). What might that look like?*

**Community-oriented activities**

Community partners are valued and respected educators and hosts for internships and research and learning. In that spirit, and with an ecosystem approach, we offer learning opportunities; speaker events, etc. open to partner organizations. These trainings are offered not just as student programs. They reach campus and community units. The aim is cultivating a supportive community as the “soil” in which Changemaker seeds can flourish. Opening events to partners and the public addresses an Equity aim. One offering is design training and facilitation, recognized as a discrete program area and strength of the center.

Examples include:

- **Community Innovator Circle (CIC)**, an extensive, long-term commitment to partner with organizations in the local setting who share changemaker values and support SISE and Taylor mission.
- **Design-thinking crash courses and short workshops**— like “DT & Donuts”: an introductory workshop in design thinking for the public or community at large. The aim is to offer a welcoming space, to cultivate an informed and aware community --faculty, staff, partners, and students. These also train Taylor staff, fellows and affiliates in design practice, via hands-on doing (an apprenticeship approach, and constant reinforcement). This was piloted as an
emergent program after the Center was founded to reflect the spirit of “diffuse design” (Manzini, 2015). This has become a regular program supported by Center funds. Questions to pursue include: How well do DT & Donuts and other short public workshops serve aims of inviting collaboration, sparking interest in design thinking?

• Custom “Taylorized” facilitation of a design process, design training, and other design-led projects, by special request. Partners (client organizations on and off campus) can request training or assistance, and ideally pay something to offset costs. This supporting also increases the sense of ownership. This custom, Taylorized offerings is an example of an emergent program that evolved based on demand and has been shaped by institutional policies. Questions related to process and outcomes: What is the value of custom consulting for our changemaking mission? What types of activities and partners are consistent? Do these activities lead to social impacts and solutions?

8. Narrative Description of Outputs and larger Outcomes

This section refers to the Outputs in column 4, and the larger societal impact and outcomes (column 5) “to cultivate a resilient community of Changemakers...”.

Our activities should help cultivate a network of people with changemaking skills who are connected with one another in meaningful ways, and also able to access the resources needed to sustain the changemaking community.

This outcome will be visible--and measurable in various ways-- on-campus, in New Orleans, among alum and partners (i.e., virtually), and out around the world.

These sections describe programs as coherent aspects of the Taylor Forward strategy and values of cultivating and connecting changemakers. Italics represent some of the evaluation/assessment questions we might pursue that relate to these parts of the logical model.

Outputs (Column 4 in Table 1)
The outputs are the desired end-results of activities we engage in. These are the qualities of people as changemakers, the ideas and solutions, their connections and community, and knowledge about the world that we promote. Specifically:

Cultivating Changemakers, the people: This refers to the participants and alum of programs, minors, courses, workshops, etc. “Social mission and greater social impact should be the metrics we seek, and the goals we promote. We develop people keen to be involved in seeking social impact, not personal profit.” (Taylor Forward). This could be measurable as numbers of individuals involved in activities, and suitable variations and descriptors of the individuals and groups, such as:

• #s of students and other learners participating in and learning changemaking in specific courses, the minor, residential halls groups, specific workshops, etc.;
• #s of faculty supporting SI/Changemaking learning activities, and learning themselves
• #s of people and organizations involved in promoting changemaking education and action through richer and equitable partnerships and engaged research on societal challenges. Longer term: we can monitor alum for those pursuing changemaking careers or vocations (and those not, and why).
Changemaking ideas and potential social innovations: Visible in the actual concepts, prototypes, proposed solutions to identified problems. These are specific social innovations as potential (real if unevaleduated) solutions to identifiable pressing problems. Example: a potential solution to an identified societal problem that emerges from a program or classroom experience, such as OISS global café (SISE course) or PlayBuild PL@YMLK (from Fast 48)

New knowledge about changemaking: a deeper understanding and useful knowledge that comes from collecting and processing information using academic, analytical mindsets. This means researching, evaluating, assessing learning experiences, prototypes, etc. to generate useful knowledge for others of: how to cultivate designer mindsets for a diverse and diffuse audience; how to promote changemaking across a campus outside conventional classroom; how to connect campus and community via partnerships.

Cultivating community: Visible as new (and/or better) changemaking organizations that result from people engaging with our programs/activities. These might be student clubs, official organizations, start-up social enterprises, intrapreneurial initiatives within larger organizations, social networks and movements, campaigns, programs within community-based organizations, faculty research areas, etc.

University changemaking culture(s): shifting the culture and norms of a university campus from individual career focus to a societal-changemaking impetus. Instead of service learning as a pathway to personal advancement, the community would value the broader goals of changemaking. These values will be embedded in university culture spanning recruitment, majors and minors, pedagogies, faculty hires, focus on equity and diversity, research support, etc. The Ashoka U network calls for Change Leaders to act on campuses to promote change in the institution.

Questions around evaluation of outputs
Designing internal learning systems and evaluations to assess Taylor should keep in mind outputs and larger outcomes. We want to ask big questions such as:

- Does Taylor (and individual programs) actually cultivate the “changemakers” we seek? Are our alum and program participants actually equipped to address social challenges we face in the world? Do our alum see themselves as people equipped to address societal challenges and able to act and adapt appropriately?
- Does Taylor cultivate a community of these changemakers? For example: Are our changemakers (our alum) connected with one another meaningfully? Does our center, and city, offer to them all a supportive ecosystem to nurture these budding changemakers? If not, what is missing?
- Are alum address compelling social issues that reflect the pressing issues and systemic thinking—structural violence, legacies of racism and historical inequalities, systematic environmental injustices? (If not, what are they doing instead? And why are they perhaps not aligned towards these pressing issues? How might we do better?)

A note on timeframe and indicators for evaluation/learning system
The time frame involved in reaching the end-goal—more positive and system-transforming change in the world, thanks to Changemakers activities and community—is a matter of months, years, and decades. It can take time to plant seeds of change in a SISE course, to cultivate that and see it grow in an individual so that he/she becomes a change-agent.
This TOC refers to the work of the Taylor Center as a whole; various time frames are at work. Activities we run span different time-frames: a few hours, to days, weeks, to a semester, and years. Seminars and discussions can take a few hours, and perhaps switch on the light or ignite interest. A regular course will last 15 weeks over the semester to cultivate specific capacities, one building on another. The time frame for evaluating an event or program must be appropriate for that task.

An indicator refers the measures, signs, symbols and other ways to note change. Conventional indicators in development policy, for example, might be measures of “school enrollment” or “highest level of education” achieved. Indicators we need are not always explicit, and some are easier to gauge than others. A Changemaker will possess certain mindsets, which can be perceived. Some vocabulary and knowledge can be objectively tested (Define “social innovation”).

An individual’s subjective awareness as an effective agent of change is perhaps the important quality we hope to cultivate, and thus what we ought to aim to measure, and that can be difficult to capture for our range of audiences. Rather than large-scale survey research with quantitative measures alone, this requires qualitative, subjective, in-depth, and observational research.

9. Assumptions and external factors affecting this model

Various assumptions underlie the theory of changemaking captured in the logical-model and narrative above. These are written out in the bottom cell of the Table 2. These are (provisional) assumptions and external factors that would be explored further and monitored as part of our learning system, program evaluation, and assessments. As above, some potential learning system and evaluation-oriented questions for each assumption and external factor suggested are in italics.

First, the basic goal is “Cultivating Changemakers”. We are operating with a set of assumptions about why we and how we cultivate these Changemakers and these can be more explicit.

As to the Why: (for example) we are working to “cultivate Changemakers” as individuals equipped with certain qualities and capabilities. We do this because we believe that this is what the world needs -- in contrast to: new technology, on the one hand, or political revolutions on the other. Is this assumption appropriate and valid? Is it enough (to fix world’s problems)?

In terms of how: Learning skills of changemaking does not happen in a vacuum or as a purely theoretical process detached from real problems; our learners need engaged learning experiences, practice, etc. We offer service learning, internships, and support practical experience and immersions. Is this justified? If not, they might need more theory and reflection alongside practice, and more repetition.

Second: Embracing a complexity worldview and ecosystem approach to making social change calls for attention to supporting the larger community and the flows and relationships among them that nurture individuals as they grow. It means taking an ecological, adaptive, evolutionary, dynamic approach to the work, not just a fixed program. This in turn can make for difficulty in program design and resource allocation. It can create tensions between the need to establish a clear program, resource allocation and objectives, vs. the need for flexibility and adaptability. This could be seen in all aspects of Taylor Center programs, staff time, planning etc. Some questions to explore: Have we found the right balance (adaptability and structure)? Are some programs areas too fixed? (E.g. a minor might be too rigid to
support all student’s learning needs). Are some areas too flexible? (E.g. some awards criteria might need tightening to be consistent with our mission.)

Third, external events, here and around the world, will bring surprises. This is the unpredictability of our growing interconnected world. (It can also support timely, surprising synergies). Programs are dependent on other forces affecting the resources, talent, institutional home, the funding base, revenue streams, and overall, the healthy, thriving ecosystem we seek.

For this TOC to hold and for the programs to have effect (outputs and longer-term outcomes) several assumptions relating to the Center, university, community, global systems, and external world must hold steady or be manageable. For each of these, an evaluation process should explore: Are these assumptions holding true? What are we missing?

For the Center: that resources and forms of capital are appropriate:

- Staffing is stable, capable and qualified, and turnover is manageable (or we risk losing experiences and relationships, re-inventing the wheel, or losing momentum or specific team leaders. Staff resources are not spread too thin and able to align energies to meet demand and specific programs
- Desirable efforts towards inclusion and equity in programming via diversity training (e.g. Visions, cross-cultural communications and other trainings) can translate into meaningful action.
- Space (HT): identify appropriate physical space to house Center team, activities, etc. Where and how should Taylor have a physical presence to support the range of programs? How does the type and location of space affect various stakeholders?
- Financial resources: remain stable and accessible the center’s activities. Are these assumptions holding true?

In our student body, we hope to see:

- Continued interested in social innovation and changemaking education and programs
- More racial, class and ethnic diversity in the student body and SISE programs specifically
- Graduate student population shows level of interest we have seen in our trainings
- Are students at all levels aware of opportunities and able to access them? Do they perceive these as relevant?

And at the level of Tulane University:

- Administration continues to support New Orleans/regional community-engagement as part of student recruitment and in university policies and programs.
- Policies to support greater diversity, minority student representation continue
- Continuing faculty involvement, understanding, and support for Center work
- Capacity to coordinate effectively with other academic and co-curricular programs cultivating entrepreneurship and innovation for social challenges, such as NovelTech, BiolInnovation, Business Plan challenge, Small Center programs, etc. (These are related, and different, from SI/Changemaking education.)
- Questions to explore: Is our university community supportive, aware...? Where are gaps in synergistic collaborations? What are potential concerns?
In New Orleans and within the local community: Authentic, community-based partnerships are central to Taylor identity, values, and specific programs. What threats might undermine their ability to continue? What communities are we working with, and why?

- Service learning placements for SISE undergraduate education requires strong relations with good local organizations and center programs that are able to adapt programs to support start-up to established organizations. How do organizations perceive this relationship? How do students value (or not) the intensive nature of SL offered?
- Future (inevitable) disasters and extreme weather, affect the university as institution, residents in day-to-day operations, altering travel, canceling speakers, etc.: Do our systems and plans accommodate to unpredictable weather, storm days, etc.?
- Larger questions pertain to the specific community/ies that we serve—Are they within New Orleans only, or other parts of the world? Should these be reflecting the origins of student body and where they move to/from? Where are the priority problems? What are problems felt by the most people?

Outside our campus, we are embedded in the field of higher education and touched by the sector and trends:

- Ashoka U network continues to operate to support changemaking via higher education institutions, offering a supportive network to build connections across multiple campuses
- Higher education as an industry remains stable, attracting students
- High cost of tuition + challenges of student lending and debt are handled and do not prevent students from enrolling with us (graduate student level in particular)
- University as academic institution: funding, tenure, academics, accreditation—various trends affect the nature of the institution
- Do these assumptions hold true? What are we missing?

External factors include global trends, threats and surprises in the nation and around in the world:

- Financial markets are stable, and the endowments remain healthy with reliable payouts.
- US politics, trends reflecting a xenophobic stance in leadership affecting international relations, official policies and immigration stances. Will these be a continued threat to foreign student body population?
- The impacts of a changing global climate do not overload Tulane and New Orleans ability to respond to rising sea level, vulnerability to storm surge, hotter temperatures, longer hot season, extreme weather, etc. Do Center operations handle these challenges to operations? Should these or other topics be part of our program themes?

10. Dynamics, Feedback, and Emergence in this TOC

This logical model in Table 1 and this narrative simplifies a dynamical, changing, much more complicated reality. It is perhaps better captured in something like Figure 1, a rough sketch meant to capture an ecosystem approach. It is a spaghetti diagram with more feedback loops and new directions. Part of this responsiveness to external changes and drivers is visible in feedback loops that are working already. Some are suggested in Table 1 (logic model).
By feedback is meant that actions, events, and results in one area can lead to “positive” (amplifying or reinforcing) effects and/or “negative” (dampening) effects on other elements and processes.

Some amplifying feedback loops include:

- On campus: The Design for America (DfA) chapter was founded in 2015 by Tano Trachtenburg, our first DT Student Fellow, along with other Tulane students. DfA supports the cohort of Taylor student fellows and other Tulane students in learning, enhancing, practicing and spreading design thinking for social impact. This reinforces Taylor Center programs and offers the students useful support structures, like the DfA annual summit, guidelines, training-- and freedom, since they choose their own partners and problems.

- Recently: the Taylor Your Life (TYL) series of professional development workshops (no-credit and for-credit) helps Tulane students develop skills and envision more creative, non-conventional careers and life pathways. It’s success is now leading to a much bigger program on campus with other units to reach a more students and staff with changemaking skills. This growing program then builds the leadership and teaching capacity and expands opportunities for others. This becomes a stand-alone initiative, where TYL alum/participants/instructors then are motivated to access other Taylor programs for continued learning. This is another virtuous cycle.

- A single individual can support and diffuse changemaking efforts in our local community. Example: Sam Heyman (SISE Alum) of TopBoxFoods (a social enterprise started by Tulane students involved with SISE programs at Tulane) hosts Taylor Center and SISE students for internships. He reached out with request to partner with design thinking staff to train youth in the Liberty’s Kitchen program (part of “Taylorized” or custom work). This individual helps support a virtuous cycle of continued learning and deepening partnerships with roots in the local community. There are other examples like this around Grow Dat Youth Farm, A’s and Ace’s, PlayBuild New Orleans, Propeller, and other community-based organizations with whom we have substantial and extended relationships over the years.

Key insights from these examples are about the value of human relationships grounded in the community in specific ways (organizations) and built on deep appreciation for social innovation education and tools for changemaking.

Dampening feedback loops also likely exist, and call for reflection and adaptation. These are examples so far:

- The closure of a large graduate program at Tulane (unexpected and out of our control) also shut down one clear pipeline of MS and PhD students with an affinity for social innovation, affecting demand for graduate programs, research training, etc. How do we respond? How can we build programs that are resilient to institutional changes?

- Low attendance at certain public events (negative, dampening feedback), coupled with the large effort and cost in putting on the events, leads to re-assessment and redesign of a program of bringing in major speakers—That is an appropriate response?

Broader questions to explore will be: Are these and other dampening effects at work? What can we learn from them?

Campus and external factors and trends affect the center’s people, programs and activities and help shape emergent programs. Our people, programs, resource allocation, and activities should reflect aspects of a dynamical reality if we are to continue to promote changemakers of all sorts.
One approach is balancing regular, predictable programs and allowing freedom to respond to emergent issues.

For example, two programs that emerged in 2018/18 are both agile responses to two urgent, major social issues and build on extensive prior relationships and campus connections:

- A tide of sexual violence, campus-wide, and in the nation, calls for substantive responses. Title IX programs and Tulane administrators support a range of activities. A collaborative and inclusive process of discovering, understanding, and finding solutions with students and student fellows is led by staffer Allison Schiller, working with senior administration at Tulane. This project emerges from previous connections and relationships and university priorities. It contributes to Taylor’s “campus health & wellness” as a substantive theme for DT programs.

- Growing awareness of the challenges of climate change has led to plans for Climate Action Day on campus in January 2018. The Tulane Office of Sustainability was a leader, having been working on related themes for years. Academic programs like Environmental Studies, collaborative research centers like the ByWater Institute, Taylor Center, plus Student Government, and others joined in. Taylor contributed guidance and human resources for design-led interactive activities and panel discussions on areas of expertise (water management). Along with other activities, this contributes to “designing for climate change action” as a substantive theme for Taylor DT programming.

Unintended side effects might be happening: The workload and effort involved in the deeper, richer service learning experience with substantial attention to equity and inclusion processes --the model of SISE 2010-- might shape student interest in the gateway course, thus limiting the number of SISE minors via self-selection. Is this appropriate and intended? Is this desirable or at least acceptable?

Related to but outside the Taylor Center, an SE Professor has been learning and supporting changemaking education in his discipline focusing on human-centered design as a skillset. This is an example of integration into other non-SISE courses and programs in other departments. Lars Gilbertson, for example, has been embedding human-centered design workshops and training into the biomedical engineering (BME) team-design education and summer internships. This supported an NIH-training grant that has catalyzed interest among BME students and will help shape future changemakers in their fields of action. This lives outside Taylor, but is a result of the Fast 48, SISE, SE Professorships and Taylor programs. What other impacts are happening outside Taylor?

These examples are given that illuminate these natural and adaptive processes of responding to interest, opportunities, institutional changes, and real-world problems-- with partners who are invested and informed. What can we learn? What would we like to see more of? What might happen that we are not aware of yet?


This theory of changemaking is intended to complement the strategic planning (“Taylor Forward”) process, values, and priorities. It offers more structure and a theoretically grounded approach to viewing our resources, activities, assumptions, and aspirations.
This theory of change can guide informed decision-making about operations, as well as longer-term programs.

It will guide evaluation. These might be short and longer-term evaluations, most likely especially a formal approach guided by developmental evaluation.

For the case of on-going and internal decision-making, for example, we face:

- Decisions about new projects and opportunities and whether to take it on: Where does it fit (in our logical frame)? Does it displace other resources from other activities, or might it contribute (say, through strategic partnerships and growth)? Does it build our community (say, reinforcing alumni connections), or deplete it, taking us in other direction and diffusing resources? Is it justifiable on its merits in relation to our values and mission? Does it seem worth the cost (financial, time, other)? Are potential revenues balanced with changemaking goals for staff and key audiences and ethically justified in light a normative focus on equity?

- Decisions about what NOT to do anymore, given new demands: What activities have we inherited and/or operated for years while facing changing circumstances, resources and demands? Might we need to halt some activities to free up resources for programs, communication, learning, and adaptation? (Example: discussions about some types of visitors)

This TOC language and narrative might be helpful in the recruitment, hiring and training of core team members, student workers, and affiliates. This TOC lays out language and criteria to help guide on-going training and professional development.

Staff should be able to support our community of changemakers, and indeed hopefully see themselves as Changemakers.

Community building: attention to the ecosystem needs resources, too. Questions to explore are: Who is cultivating the connections, sustaining relationships, infusing new energy, handling “waste”, and reinforcing positive feedback loops in our community? If this is not happening, what should we do?

This “gardening” or maintenance tasks is possibly less exciting and might be much less visible than new programs, but it needs attention.

**Developmental Evaluation Approach**

We want to reach our desired outcomes and the greater impact we hope to see in the world. We want to know if our activities and the people we reach do in fact help participate in solving problems (and in a reasonable time frame). If not, we should adapt and adjust our resources and activities.

For this we need monitoring and documenting of what we do, and constructive learning and adaptation in response to what we learn.

We need structured programs, but also to remain open to learning from our evaluations and adapting as needed.

Developmental evaluation is a school of thought that offers an approach to valuing and assessing our activities and processes that is consistent with this ecosystem approach. We can apply key principles
from Gamble (2012) and Quinn-Patton (2010) for relevant approaches and mindsets of learning and adaptation. (In contrast, conventional evaluation approaches that test an intervention or treatment against a case-control, restricting adaptations.)

Methods these evaluation experts might suggest could include individual case studies, perhaps with a positive deviance approach (who is finding solutions in a context where many people do not?), and appreciative enquiry (what’s working here?).

Participatory approaches working with a selection of different and distinct stake-holders can help identify what’s working, and what is not, in a constructive fashion. This might reach out to key community partners (on the one hand), SISE undergraduates on another, and SE Professors, and their home departments and other academic units. **Who/where are changemakers arising? What social problems are we addressing, if any?**

This approach can help us guide community-building around the execution of specific activities, and an adaptive approach to cultivating Changemakers rather than seeking a fixed “intervention”.

Data collection for and around any activity, program, class/course, or event is useful and should continue. A positivist, quantitative, conventional, “summative” approach to evaluation that aims for definitive assessment of the efficacy or value of a single intervention is probably not the aim. We aim to not be static, mechanical, and fixed, but to learn and adapt as the context needs.

Indicators and measures need not be narrowly quantitative (but numbers of participants and trends over time will be useful to have). Measures should be shaped and determined by the participants; our potential Changemakers can help articulate what that an experience means to them.

Who should be involved? This work will be led by the Taylor leadership team, as well as all the staff, as and when appropriate. It might usefully involve undergraduate and graduate student workers, student theses, (MPH) practicum projects, and even dissertations. Separately, independent evaluation consultants and researchers can be useful to provide outside perspectives and complement limited internal capacity.

Synergies among activities: To be strategic and efficient, we should guide research and scholarship around these activities and suggested questions above. We can support smaller project evaluations of different, discrete activities, especially ones that might be expensive and “signature”, or seem outdated, or are energy/time consuming. The parts could be seen on their own merits, the findings also contribute to the whole, and the learning guides the Center.
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Annexes

About the TOC Process

This process began in 2016 with the strategic planning process. In 2017 we led short workshops for staff members to understand and explore elements of the TOC.

For Taylor, the TOC is a visual and narrative explanation of the change we hope to make in the world, and why and how we think it will work. Usually, non-profit and social sector organizations need this elaboration of values, principles and strategies and tactics to: articulate a plan of action and set of activities, evaluate and report on work, track and adapt programs and activities over time, make a case to donors. It helps align resources, plan more effective programs, communicate the mission and projects; it helps decide what not to do, to ask for and get feedback, to measure greater social impact and raise funds to support specific programs and resources needs.

We want to bring more Changemakers into the world via our Taylor Center’s innovative, learner-centered and community-oriented programs because we believe that positive change will happen as individuals are equipped and motivated to catalyze action wherever they are.

What is Taylor’s Theory of Change process has been:
- Implicit: the fields of Changemaking, SI, SE have their own TOC
- Emergent: we are making sense of our package of programs
- Envisioning: What does the world look like?
- Intentional: learning from strategic planning processes, going forward
- Nested: We have multiple TOC acting at different levels (in a classroom, in a course, in a minor).
- Participatory: Taylor staff have been engaged in crafting and refining statements and logic models for different elements

The document aims to elaborate the theoretical foundation underlying this, including a worldview (how does the world work?), an ethical stance and value statement (what is important, what should we be doing?) plus attention to unit of analysis and scale of action.

An ontological stance explains who we are and how do we relate to others.

Our epistemological stance is constructivist: Valid knowledge is shaped by various agents and forces. How will we know if this works? Rigorous evaluation approaches, participatory feedback, individual cases, stories, and subjective perceptions all have a role.

This should clarify the team and our context: Who is trying to do what, where?
# Theory of Change Logical Framework for Taylor Center as Whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROBLEM and CONTEXT</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES &amp; IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education (universities) has evolved to be training students for professional careers that not always relevant to changing world; we need to transform higher ed and campus cultures to support social innovation. Tulane prioritizes service learning and community engagement. Individual incoming university students seek changemaking skills and meaningful careers. Individual faculty and staff seek more meaningful work within the university and to align their research, scholarship, service &amp; teaching with the needs of society New Orleans context: social, political, economic, and environmental problems exist. A microcosm of the US; we should address these issues. Global challenges are immense and inter-connected.</td>
<td><strong>Human Capital</strong>&lt;br&gt;People, talent, skills, capabilities  <strong>Social Capital</strong>&lt;br&gt;Relationships, bonds of trust and reciprocity  <strong>Financial Capital</strong>&lt;br&gt;Endowment funds, fees, tuition, grants, donations  <strong>Physical Capital</strong>&lt;br&gt;Space, equipment, facilities, campus, community  <strong>Intellectual Capital</strong>&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of the fields, disciplinary expertise, pedagogies</td>
<td><strong>Undergraduate-student oriented</strong>&lt;br&gt;Curricular:  SISE minor for undergraduates  SI/DT content in non SISE courses  Co- &amp; Extra-Curricular:  Paterson RLC, Ignite, Student clubs, Student $ awards  Taylor Your Life (TYL)  Taylor Student Fellows  <strong>Graduate-student oriented</strong>&lt;br&gt;Fast 48 bootcamps for grad students  SISE 6100  Taylor Your Life C1+ for social enterprise  DT/Sl in graduate courses  SI/CM in other units (GCHB, BME)  Social Innovation Conversations  Graduate assistants  <strong>Faculty Engagement</strong>&lt;br&gt;Social Entrepreneurship Professorships cohort and network  Visiting scholars  NewDay Speakers</td>
<td>SISE alum learn Changemaking skills (~40-50 /year)  Creative life design experience leads to changemaker pathways (For X alum/ year)  5-10 Social ventures/year get support and develop social entrepreneurs and ideas</td>
<td>All outputs feed into this bigger social impact:  A growing, adaptable, resilient, connected community of changemakers in NO, the US and around the world who are actively addressing pressing social &amp; environmental challenges wherever they are, and contributing to the health of the community and ecosystem TU alum are employing CM/Si skills around the world to address problems (Feedback: alum support, internships, funding, research)  Our campus community is rejuvenated and enriched by visitors and speakers (Feedback: funding, student support)  Appreciation for CM/SI is embedded throughout the University academic units, programming and systems (Feedback: Learning CM/Si is the norm, recruitment, minors, internships).  Key faculty champions in the Uni support CM/SI (Feedback: Collaborative research, $, student learning)  Resilient community: New Orleans and regional communities of changemakers are supported and connected by Tulane campus and systems  Health and well-being are advanced. Hypoxia problem is reduced in gulf regions around the world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSUMPTIONS: This approach assumes that factors that are more within our control (to a degree) function as we envision: that forms of capital continue, that Center staff, resources remain stable and productive; that the curriculum, courses, trainings are basically effective (in cultivating changemaking); that Tulane administrative support is consistent; that students are interested in Changemaking; that faculty are supportive; that the Ashoka U Changemaker campus network persists; that community partners remain aligned, that the alum network is supportive.

EXTERNAL FACTORS: We are subject to dynamics of factors outside our control such as national trends in higher education/academia (enrollments, service learning, hiring, funding); local and national policies (immigration, banking emergency relief); global geopolitics (refugees, war); extreme weather and climate change disruptions; trends in philanthropy, foundations, grant-making, sensitivities of global financial markets (affecting endowments), and other unknown factors.