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# **Executive Summary**

Social enterprise organizations, particularly in the food and beverage sector, have taken on an ever-increasing presence as viable business venture. With more and more organizations emerging under this umbrella, understanding how they work and how they drive success is evidently important in a socio-cultural, and socio-economic context. This research project explores and investigates the best practises implemented by social enterprise organizations within the food and beverage industry, with the main intent of utilizing the insights to create recommendations for the betterment of the Regent Park Catering Collective (RPCC). As the RPCC has a business goal of becoming a sustainably profitable organization, understanding the ulterior motives of social enterprises and what factors define their success is consequential in informing their business acumen and decision-making processes. The data for this study was derived from the construction of a content analysis frame, which segmented different attributes of 19 different social enterprise food and beverage related organizations in the Toronto area to develop greater insight on best practices.  The major insights that form the basis for our recommendations are:

* 73.7% of organizations operate using a catering business model
* 89.5% of organizations had a social focus on unemployment
* 92.9% of catering businesses possessed their own commercial kitchens, allowing for centralized command and control.
* Only 5.3% of food and beverage social enterprises were using an app-based distribution channel, representing a significant opportunity for competitive advantage in this market.

*Figure 1:* Overview of social enterprise study results.

Some of the suggestions and recommendations drawn from this study are:

* For the RPCC to implement a proper employment structure.
* Continue to utilize a sufficient e-commerce platform to create further and sustainable business reach.
* Implement an app-based distribution platform, to streamline their business.
* Maintain their future commercialized kitchen which will enhance their business strategies and assist in their transition to a sustainably profitable organization.

Through these recommendations the RPCC has a true opportunity to expand their business, increase their exposure, and truly reap the benefits of working under a profitable business framework. These recommendations were mainly reached through a review of academic literature, an understanding of best practices, and a thorough investigation of the commonalities seen between the literature and the content analysis. Overall, through this report a more succinct understanding of how social enterprises function was developed, creating a pristine opportunity, to not only create recommendations for the RPCC. But to understand gaps in the research, limitations and pain points, and any potential opportunities for future studies to be conducted on this unique topic.
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# **Introduction**

In the ever-expanding competitive business world, social enterprises have “emerged as a business-like contrast to the traditional non-for-profit organization” (Dart, 2004, p. 412). Premised on facing societal turbulence and social issues head on, these businesses encompass what it means to be a true change agent in the world (Dart, 2004). Based in Regent Park, a historically impoverished area in Toronto (Loney, 2012), the RPCC has emerged as a food and beverage-based enterprise not only cooking up food, but “community, belonging and diversity” (RPCC, 2019). This catering collective has drawn upon its members’ diverse culinary backgrounds, truly fostering what it means to bring together personal and community development (RPCC, 2019). Despite this organization’s initial success, there is a knowledge gap in terms of how they can maintain a profitable business model while balancing their core value of economic development in their community. Additionally, there appears to be a gap in empirical research specifically relating to social enterprises in the food and beverage sector, despite it being an increasingly popular business choice (Kline, Shah, & Rubright, 2014). As these business structures have impacted and assisted certain types of communities (Popielarksi & Cotugna, 2010), they will be viable examples for the RPCC to utilize for their own success. The purpose of this research project is to explore best practices of social enterprises in general, and the food and beverage sectors specifically, and to examine how they can be applied to the RPCC’s sustainable growth and success. The key questions of interest are:

1. What defines a successful social enterprise?

2.   What are the common characteristics of successful social enterprises?

3. How prominent are social enterprises in Toronto?

4. What are the factors that contribute to a food and beverage related social enterprise being successful?

This research proposal will first present a literature review investigating the concepts necessary in understanding our research purpose. By conceptualizing each concept through research, media, and relevant industry information a greater picture will be built in the understanding of the specific research. Following the literature review this proposal will outline the data collection methods, sampling strategies, as well as the schedule/plan needed for a successful and constructive project structure. The quantitative results derived from our content analysis will be further delineated, followed by an in-depth discussion as well as recommendations for the organizations success. Lastly, the paper will conclude with a summary of the data uncovered, the project limitations as well as ideas for future research. It is the hope that this research can help provide a basis for the RPCC to develop strategies and plans to transform from a non-for-profit organization to a sustainable and profitable business model.

# **Literature Review**

The following literature review examines the critical concepts related to the research proposal including social enterprises, their challenges and structure, and specifically in hospitality sectors.

## **Social Enterprise**

Social enterprises are organizations that consider both commercial as well as philanthropic goals within their operations (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Bigley & Donaldson, 2018; Bull, Ridley-Duff, Whittam, & Baines, 2018; Kay, Roy, & Donaldson, 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Pache & Santos, 2013; Short, Ketchen, Shook, & Ireland, 2010; Thompson & Doherty, 2006). This approach was popularized in the 1980s by Bill Drayton, who depicted a social entrepreneur as “someone who is as innovative in addressing societal problems as a typical entrepreneur is in addressing a business opportunity” (Popielarski & Cotugna, 2010, p.58). These social entrepreneurship opportunities commonly stem from social causes in the philanthropic end of the spectrum, spawning the creation of a social enterprise. The motivations of the organization are frequently related to the marginalization or exclusion of certain socio-economic groups (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Bull et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006).

As these groups exist in a state of struggle in society, the organization’s members assemble with the aim to unite their efforts toward a better future (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Bull et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006). With a mission of betterment in mind, the organization identifies a business opportunity in the marketplace, creating a value proposition that makes sound economic sense while balancing the needs of the stakeholders (Alter, 2007; Martin & Osberg, 2015). Ultimately what makes a social enterprise different from a purely philanthropic organization is a balanced focus upon market-driven financial results (Alter, 2007; Bull et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Pache & Santos, 2013; Thompson & Doherty, 2006).

With the competition for public funds becoming increasingly more competitive, this hybrid approach of philanthropic and commercial goals creates a valuable source of funding while maintaining operational independence to pursue the identified mission (Alter, 2007; Bigley & Donaldson, 2018; Bull et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006).

## **Social Enterprise Characteristics**

As a model, a social enterprise is one which crosses the boundaries of industries and national borders (Alter, 2007); however, there are three general characteristics that are universally present in all social enterprises:

1. They follow a double- or triple-bottom line framework, extending the conventional measure of business performance to include positive social and/or environmental impacts (Alter, 2007; Kay, Roy, & Donaldson, 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006).
2. Financial resources are shared between the common purposes of the organization, with profits used in balance toward reinvestment into the enterprise and to the benefit of the community (Alter, 2007; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006).
3. The organization is accountable to not only its members, but the community it serves as well (Alter, 2007; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006).

Given these characteristics, there have been parallels drawn between social enterprises and social activism. Despite the fact that both models have an aim toward social transformation, the methods of action are quite different. Social activism is the driving force toward the public recognition of an unfortunate situation, being the overarching message that inspires action (Kay et al., 2016). Social enterprises take the message created by activists as inspiration for change, and through their business practices, make a direct effort toward societal betterment (Kay et al., 2016). Social enterprise, in turn, is a system based around the collaborative action of citizens to spur a shift in the economic equilibrium of their communities (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Bigley & Donaldson, 2018; Bull et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Pache & Santos, 2013; Short et al., 2010; Thompson & Doherty, 2006).

## **Major Challenge of Social Enterprises**

The primary challenge present in any social enterprise relates to the core integration of two potentially conflicting ideals (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Battilana et al., 2015; Ebrahim et al.,2014). While successful organizations find a balance between philanthropic and commercial logic by organizing themselves in an effective structure, the challenges of accountability for multiple (and sometimes opposing) performance indicators and stakeholders in the organization are always present (Battilana et al., 2015; Ebrahim et al., 2014). While a decision made by the organization may follow sound logic in the social mission of the organization, the resulting effects could possibly have negative economic ramifications toward the financial sustainability of the social enterprise. The opposite may be true as well, as the organization could follow a path that leads toward increased profitability but may lose sight of its social mission during the process (Battilana et al., 2015; Ebrahim et al., 2014).

In order to avoid these challenges, social enterprises must first create a clear vision that states exactly what the organization wishes to achieve (Battilana et al., 2015; Ebrahim et al., 2014). With a clear vision for the future, long-term goals must be set that equally address the social and business needs. These clear benchmarks and metrics for success will keep the organization focused and on-track. Finally, the creation of an organizational structure that allows for collaborative decision-making and action will allow for a balance of methodologies to exist.

## **Organizational Structures**

Given the fundamental challenge of social enterprises existing within the framework of hybridizing the philanthropic and commercial approaches, an effective organizational structure must be established to balance these sometimes-conflicting agendas.

There are two different methodologies that exist, being Differentiated and Integrated Hybrid Organizations. In a Differential strategy, organizational decisions are made primarily with the achievement of the social mission as being most important (Ebrahim et al., 2014). The Integrated Hybrid Organizations take the opposite approach, as revenue generation is the primary focus Ebrahim et al., 2014). While these two approaches both skew themselves slightly toward one end of the spectrum, a completely balanced approach may be taken as well. By dividing the organization in half, the responsibility for the social and economic purposes are assigned to different parties. These parties may pursue their areas of expertise, coming together in neutral ground to make collaborative decisions (Battilana & Dorado, 2010; Battilana et al., 2015; Ebrahim et al., 2014). While this arrangement creates a clear division in the goals of each side of the organization, tensions may arise without the existence of a system of governance. Using a neutral governing board of directors assists with the alignment and prioritization of business activities, ensuring that the organization maintains its hybrid approach (Ebrahim et al., 2014). The framework of this board must be made-up of a balance of individuals that are well-versed in both sides of the organization.

## **Social Enterprises in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry**

Social enterprises vary by sector and community and can take on a number of forms depending on location and market needs (Alegre & Berbegal-Mirabent 2016; Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014). Recently, this paradigm of social entrepreneurship has taken on an ever-increasing presence within the hospitality and tourism industry (Alegre & Berbegal-Mirabent, 2016). A facet of business which sees rapidly changing consumer demands, social enterprises are at the crux of a unique approach to ensuring social changes are accounted for and consumer needs are met. The tourism industry possesses the ability to be a conducive platform for social enterprises (Wang, Duan, & Yu, 2016). This is largely due to its ability to “intersect public policy, the market, and civil society” allowing it to create social change on a far-reaching scale (Wang et al., 2016, p. 1288). As social entrepreneurs have the ability to create “social, economic, and environmental impacts” this industry has been instrumental in utilizing social enterprises in order to “create social value, and solve social problems in local communities.” (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Bull et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006; Wang, Duan, & Yu, 2016, p. 1288). The importance of social enterprises as well within the hospitality industry has subsequently increased (Sigala, 2016). Not only do social enterprises support tourism sustainability, an ongoing discussion within the industry (Sigala, 2016; de Lange & Dodds, 2017), but also allow the tourism industry to generate value-based change using its already well-established network (Sigala, 2016).

The tourism industry being aligned with social enterprise appears to be an idealistic match. Upon further investigation, there are pain points and areas that raise omnipresent questions. Social enterprises connect appropriately to the social aspects that are espoused by the tourism industry (Altinay, Sigala, & Waligo, 2016). Often the enterprises that have a more profit-driven approach neglect the social implications of the business, proven to be a key contributor to the social and developmental growth of communities, societies, and destinations (Alitnay, 2016). Additionally, the method by which social value is created at its onset, as well as the motivating factors that push individuals toward social entrepreneurship in this industry is often unclear (Aileen Boluk & Mottiar, 2014). Ultimately, the concept of social enterprise in the hospitality and tourism industry has achieved fundamental popularity across a wide variety of institutions. (von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012). For the purpose of this report, the notion of social enterprise within the food and beverage sector will be of main focus of central analysis.

## **Social Enterprises in the Food and Beverage Industry**

Food and drink are something that connects people to nature, society, and one another (Costantini, 2017). Social enterprises thrive on creating value for communities through creative and innovative approaches (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Bull et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; McKay, Lippi, Dunn, Haines, & Lindberg, 2018; Tardivo, Thrassou, Viassone, & Serravalle, 2017; Thompson & Doherty, 2006). Food and beverage social enterprises can help solve pressing issues such as food insecurity amongst low income individuals and offer an “additional tier of support” beyond government and charities (McKay, Lippi, Dunn, Haines, & Lindberg 2018, p. 2). Variables such as a struggling economy to inadequate food banks continue to plague society (Popielarksi & Cotugna, 2010). Social enterprises are becoming increasingly important in remedy of these issues, with their existence offering a valuable source of support for certain communities (Popielarksi & Cotugna, 2010). Not only can these enterprises help reduce some of the stigma associated with food related issues, but ultimately can create a conducive environment that fosters community, inclusivity and the strengthening of self-sufficiency (McKay, et al., 2018). These organizations are consistently engaged “in a search for new ways of interacting in the production and consumption of food” while exemplifying a thorough and strong commitment to their communities (Costantini, 2017, p. 2). Although social enterprises in the food and beverage sector have never been more important, they simultaneously have been strongly misunderstood. Often the industry as a whole does not view these enterprises as sustainable and legitimate businesses (Bhuttae, 2013). In order to stand apart, much focus is placed on important variables such as premiere service quality, food surplus allocation, proper employment, and media utilization (Bhuttae, 2013). With the shift in consumer demands and societal eating norms, food and beverage social enterprises must be able to help drive the economic development of their local communities (Paetkau, 2014). Additionally, these organizations are not only helping to make food and beverage consumption more sustainable and ecologically resilient, but ultimately more socially just (Taub, 2014). As the ‘food movement’ in society has expanded, so too has the number of food-based entrepreneurs and socially inclined organizations (Kline, Shah, & Rubright, 2014). Ultimately like any social enterprise, it is of the utmost importance for these organizations to continue providing sustainable value to their consumers and continue to solve the problems most businesses tend to ignore (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Ebrahim et al., 2014; Kline, et al., 2014).

# **Methodology**

The central purpose of this research project is to uncover best practices of social enterprises in order to directly correlate it to the development of a viable business model. As a result, literature on social enterprises, their structures, challenges, and functionality in addition to enterprises within the hospitality industry (and more specifically the food and beverage sector) were explored and analyzed.  The following section will outline specifically what research methodology this study intends to utilize in ensuring we collect the most accurate and useful data.

# **Methods**

## **Content Analysis**

The central goal of this research is to find ways on ensuring that the business model of The Regent Park Catering Collective becomes sustainable long-term. There appears to be a strong knowledge gap within empirical research on what truly constitutes a successful social enterprise/organization, particularly one with a specialized catering business model. As this study intends to explore how viable social enterprises came about their success, the purpose of this study is exploratory in nature with an additional requirement for descriptive research on successful social enterprises and their journey.

In order to provide a valuable framework for the Regent Park Catering Collective, a content analysis will be conducted on other similar social enterprises and catering services that have shown signs of success - demonstrating best practices. Based on the literature review, we will be analyzing many areas ranging from organizational, financial and operational practices. Some categories that will be analyzed are factors such as organizational structure (Differentiated Hybrid Organizations or Integrated Hybrid Organizations), employment structure (employment or contract work), management hierarchy (tier-based or individual), investment ratios for commercial to social initiatives, degree of community involvement/engagement, corporate connections, and also supply and distribution channels. These areas of research are pivotal organizational determinants that would greatly affect a social enterprise business model. For example, the most powerful factors which would militate against catering profitability are sales instability and high fixed costs (Kotas, 1986), reviewing how the more successful social enterprises manage their fixed and variable costs would be beneficial for the Regent Park Catering Collective. This study will continue to adjust the main areas of research as industry best practices are uncovered, as these could shed light on the actions that the Regent Park Catering Collective can undertake to make their organization more sustainable.

Neuman and Robson (2018) state that conducting a content analysis is best for exploratory and descriptive research, which is directly relevant to this study’s research needs. This study will establish our definition of a successful framework to evaluate social enterprises that can provide relevant information. In terms of the organization’s employees, as well as the determination of whether they receive benefits, are paid contractors or full/part-time employees, and whether goods are purchased by the individual or the organization will be further explored in the content analysis. Moreover, variables analyzing whether strict measurement recipes are followed, and or if factors such as the existence of a corporate industrial kitchen or use of personal kitchen equipment are apparent will be outlined as well. These factors will be considered to help identify what the best practices the Regent Park Catering Collective could implement to ensure a sustainable and profitable business model.

A content analysis of social enterprises similar to the Regent Park Catering Collective would be the best data collection method by establishing itself through benchmarking of other successful organizations. The limitations involved in the content analysis are the discrepancies that can arise with content coding, as the data we collected will be filtered by multiple coders. If this study does not collectively manage inter-coding reliability, the analysis can be skewed by interpretation biases compared to more objective conclusions.

## **Coding Methods**

This study used a combination of manifest and latent coding in order to help focus the variables for the content analysis. Manifest coding is a quantitative method by which one identifies a pattern in the content being analyzed through specific words, phrases, or images (Neuman & Robson, 2018). Latent coding is a qualitative method that identifies patterns through subjective means of a general theme or pattern in the content (Neuman & Robson, 2018). Since we know we are looking for information in regard to successful social enterprises relevant to the Regent Park Catering Collective, a manifest content analysis will be utilized for the main categories of research such as organizational structure, purpose, off-site or commercial kitchens, and reinvestment ratios. This will be used toward the overall content analysis which advise as to best practices for the Regent Park Catering Collective to adopt. With manifest coding, the coding is quite reliable since the evidence is present but can limit its validity since some words can have multiple meanings (Neuman & Robson, 2018).

Once we exhausted all the manifest content coding for successful social enterprises and/or potential catering services, we took a qualitative/holistic approach for latent coding and see if key findings can be assembled for each objective. From the information that was manifest coded in our content analysis, we will analyze the coding for each example and see if there are any general themes or patterns that could translate into best practices the Regent Park Catering Collective could implement. The data will have some commonality between examples, and we could conclude which commonalities for successful social enterprises or catering services the Regent Park Catering Collective should consider for a sustainable business model. For example, we could potentially see that most of the successful social enterprises/organizations used contract workers to reduce costs, or have a strong online presence etc. For latent coding, it is more valid than manifest coding since it considers what the overall message is (Neuman & Robson, 2018). However, the reliability can be questioned since it is subjected to a person’s personal perspective which can be clouded by various bias so there is no confusion about the meaning of the code, just the reliability of the code (Neuman & Robson, 2018). Furthermore, we need to make sure we review our latent coding to ensure we have the appropriate interpretation and make it as reliable as possible.

## **Inter-Coding Reliability**

To ensure the overall consistency of coding for the content analysis, the research team will assemble a standard operating procedure under the framework of reviewing three successful social enterprises/organizations or catering services together, in addition to cross-over between coder responsibilities. We need to ensure we code the content in the right context. We will first discuss the different factors we are coding and what we feel would fall into those categories. We will then independently investigate relevant organizational structures and code them while we collaboratively compare our coding results to ensure the inter-coding is reliable. Once it has been established that there are no signs of major gaps in our coding process, we will maintain constant lines of communication, so that if anything changes for the coding process individuals are up to speed.

Since we went through the coding together, we were confident in our ability to code consistently. Therefore, only a few rules were implemented for inter-coding reliability such as keeping our points concise as possible and highlighting any issues or concerns in bright yellow. If anyone had any major objections, it was highly encouraged to contact the other members to address the issue at hand. In addition, we assigned a different group member each week to look over the content analysis to ensure there were no glaring differences in the coding of different members. There were some decisions we made during the coding process, for example, we agreed to keep the term “non-profit” broad to help streamline our analysis.

A few organizations indicated they are “not-for-profit” instead of “non-profit” and despite a marginal difference in meaning. Keeping the term broad helped our inter-coding more concise and avoids defining the difference – we also believed the results would vary marginally if we did so. We also consolidated the organization’s cause and purpose into one column as the reasons are quite similar while coding. As well, we agreed that for the initiatives column we would try to keep the information concise and consistent if possible. However, as we were coding, we found it was challenging to find consistent similarities within each organization. Therefore, we decided the initiative column would be a more informative column for the reader to gain insight on the organization. We will use latent coding primarily on the initiatives to see any patterns within the organization instead of trying to find quantitative results for this column.

## **Data Collection Method**

The data collection method for this study consisted of extensively reviewing and reading about each social enterprise through their produced websites, brochures/pamphlets, annual reports, and news articles. Illustrating relevant information about social enterprises/organizations for our in-depth content analysis. By researching online for content on successful social enterprises/organizations similar to the Regent Park Catering Collective, this study will find information about the history, journey, achievements and keys to success for different social enterprises/organizations. By collecting this information and properly coding it, this study identified key themes that can focus the analysis on the best practices for the Regent Park Catering Collective to adopt. This study will collect information from other social enterprises/ organizations that fit the criteria of our definition of a successful social enterprise/organization, which that is similar in concept to the Regent Park Catering Collective. The developed criteria will help this study to filter-out organizations that are less relevant. Certain factors that will be considered for a successful social enterprise/organization in the content analysis are as follows:

(1) Organizations that identify as a social enterprise

(2) Organizations that have social cause initiatives that are in the catering sector.

# **Sampling Strategy**

## **Sampling Population**

Based on the literature review conducted in this study, the study population includes the following: (1) Organizations that have adopted a hybridized approach of philanthropy and commercialism by identifying as or similar to a social enterprise/organization; (2) Organizations that use catering as a business model. Our main focus would be organizations that identify as social enterprises but there may be other organizations that could provide valuable information for our research that do not identify as a social enterprise/organization.

If any organization arises that commits a portion of their annual revenue for philanthropic purposes, they may be considered in the content analysis. Whether it is an association, membership club, or even a coalition, if it could provide insight for Regent Park Catering Collective. This study will focus on social enterprises in Toronto primarily, and then further beyond across Canada. The sampling parameters will be expanded if it becomes apparent that there is limited information on catering companies or social enterprises with a relevant business model in Toronto or Canada. Once this study has established a reliable sample population, this study will begin coding information that could be factors for a content analysis. Factors that will be considered for organizations include being for profit or non-profit and the type of organizational hierarchy/structure that they employ.

In addition, this study intends to investigate any catering start-ups or independent catering services as examples of best practices that the Regent Park Catering Collective could implement from a commercial standpoint. Despite not having any link to social enterprise or initiatives, these catering services could provide standard catering practices that would help outline keys to success for the Regent Park Catering Collective’s administration and management. They could provide information that websites and online content of catering social enterprises may not have readily available. Additionally, this study will consider the exploration of catering start-ups or independent catering services as an option if social enterprises/organization cannot provide enough information in this regard. Once we start our search for organizations to code, we will regularly check back with our content analysis structure/criteria to ensure we maintain a right balance of quality. As well as a meaningful list of organizations to code and a respectable quantity of organizations to increase the reliability of this study. The more organizations to supplement the coding for our content analysis the more valid our analysis and results would be. This is ultimately true as it would be foolish and less reliable if we concluded that successful social enterprises/organization only use full time employees if we only reviewed 3-4 organizations. Where perhaps there were a possible 12 possible organizations that could have been investigated to substantiate this claim. Additionally, Google has been used to develop a sampling frame as well, by searching specific keywords, we were able to product a list of food and beverage social enterprises in Toronto or food and beverage organizations that have a strong and sustainable community initiatives. By searching keywords “Social Enterprises in Toronto”, “Food Social Enterprises in Toronto” and/or “Catering Social Enterprises in Toronto”, we were able to find nearly all the social enterprises that fit our criteria and could provide the Regent Park Catering Collective with sustainable/profitable best practices.

## **Sampling Frame**

Our sampling frame consists of a few organizations that encompass various social enterprises in the food and beverage industry. Organizations such as Social Enterprise Ontario (SEO), Social Enterprise Toronto (SET) and the Food Cluster meet our criteria and can help the Regent Park Catering Collective in becoming a more sustainable and profitable business.

**Social Enterprise Ontario.** SEO helps identify the social enterprises in each area in Ontario as well as basic details, website URL and contact information. In addition, SEO provides a wide range of extensive resources, marketplaces and events, and provides regional, francophone and co-operative supports (Social Enterprise Ontario, 2019). SEO has over 250+ social enterprises on their directory and can be searched by city, postal code, address and name of organization. The social enterprises are located all across Ontario and the industries involved vary. Their criteria for joining the Social Enterprise Ontario consists in a framework similar to SET or the Food Cluster: “businesses or non-profits that use market mechanisms to achieve a social mission” (Social Enterprise Toronto, 2019).

**Social Enterprise Toronto.** SET was established in 2006 by social enterprise managers to create a self-managed network funded through a combination of annual dues and the support of Toronto Enterprise Fund/United Way Toronto. SET also boasts they will help build the social enterprise’s brand and drive more business to their doorstep or email inbox through various marketing and community engagement initiatives (Social Enterprise Toronto, 2019). Membership criteria for the Social Enterprise Toronto is fairly standard as they hope to increase their reach. Their website perfectly states, “memberships are open to non-profit social enterprises located in the Greater Toronto Area that create employment or training opportunities for low-income or marginalized individuals”. The Social Enterprise Toronto currently have 12 active members from various industries such as courier services to catering services (Social Enterprise Toronto, 2019).

**Food Cluster.** The Food Cluster is one of several initiatives started by Toronto Enterprise Fund (TEF) to help support local social causes by supporting local businesses to grow and prosper in Peel, Toronto and York Region. These food-based employment social enterprises have access to meetups, mentors, cluster project grants and an online network which will ensure they have all the resources for success. Also, these cluster members are able to connect with each other which in turn allows them to learn key insights as well as encourage one another. TEF is currently supporting 16 employment social enterprises and hopes to grow this cluster if possible (Toronto Enterprise Fund, 2019.). Current and prospective members need to be operating a food industry employment social enterprise in Peel, Toronto or York Region in order to apply and join the Food Cluster.

## **Purposive Sampling**

Purposive sampling is used more often for exploratory research and this study fits this sample frame and its three specific situations (Neuman & Robson, 2018). The first situation for unique cases that are informative fits our study since we only want to interview social enterprise employees or analyze social enterprises/organizations specifically (Neuman & Robson, 2018). The second situation is for a specialized or hard to reach population which social enterprises/organizations are very niche and specific (Neuman & Robson, 2018). Lastly, the researcher would want to identify specific types of cases for an in-depth interview or analysis (Neuman & Robson, 2018). This study would benefit from social enterprises/organizations that are working specifically in catering along with social enterprises/organizations in general. In addition to focusing on social enterprise employees or social enterprises/organizations themselves, this study would employ purposive sampling to those in the study population that offer the most reliable and readily available content compared to social enterprise/organization with minimal information on their website. As well, this study would purposively sample social enterprise/organization that are closer to Toronto and Canada since those models will have more reliable best practices that follow Canada’s laws and regulations. The limitation with employing purposive sampling is that it may disregard some well-known or reliable organization due to low meaningful content found online. This study will ensure all of the potential options for finding meaningful content for a social enterprise/organization are exhausted before moving on to another method.

## **Snowball Sampling**

        A potential snowball sampling may occur if this study is able to connect with professionals in the social enterprise industry (Neuman & Robson, 2018). These individuals may refer this study to other colleagues and their network who would have valuable information for our analysis. This would be very beneficial because it would save some legwork of trying to connect with other social enterprises/organizations independently. As most researchers use a combination of snowball and purposive sampling, this study is confident that this sampling frame will help to best utilize the sample population efficiently (Neuman & Robson, 2018). The limitation of snowball sampling is that it may cause this study to rely on the network of interviewed individuals for further interviews or analysis. Our connections may not have the network or may not feel comfortable sharing their network with us. We will have to make sure we do our due diligence for finding meaningful information through other means while ensuring we foster a strong relationship with our connections to ensure they will open their network to us.  

The central purpose of this research project is to uncover best practices of social enterprises in order to directly correlate it to the development of a viable business model. As a result, literature on social enterprises, their structures, challenges, and functionality in addition to enterprises within the hospitality industry (and more specifically the food and beverage sector) were explored and analyzed. The following section will outline specifically what research methodology this study intends to utilize in ensuring we collect the most accurate and useful data.

# **Results**

## **Description of Sample**

In total, 19 social enterprises in Toronto were identified, all of whom have a primary business purpose related to the food and beverage industry. Table 1 shows the list of organizations identified in the content analysis. In addition, their location as well as primary and secondary (if applicable) businesses were noted.

*Table 1:* Food and beverage social enterprises identified in Toronto.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** | **Location** | **Primary Business** | **Secondary Business** |
| Destination Cafe & Cleaning | Mississauga | Café |  |
| Friends Catering | Toronto | Catering |  |
| [The Coffee Sheds](https://www.coffeeshed.ca/) | Toronto | Café |  |
| [Livelihood Cafe](https://www.livelihoodproject.org/) | Toronto | Café | Catering |
| [Paintbox Catering & Bistro](http://paintboxcatering.ca/) | Toronto | Restaurant | Catering |
| Show Love Cafe | Toronto | Café | Catering |
| [Hawthorne Food & Drink](http://hawthorneto.ca/) | Toronto | Catering | Restaurant |
| [The Lansdowne Cone](https://www.thelansdownecone.ca/) | Toronto | Ice Cream Shop |  |
| [LOFT Kitchen](https://www.conccommunity.org/loft-kitchen/) | Toronto | Catering | Café |
| [Fabarnak](http://www.the519.org/fabarnak) | Toronto | Catering | Café |
| [Wayne's Cup](http://waynescup.com/) | Markham | Café | Catering |
| [Frontburners Youth Kitchen](http://www.frontlines.to/) | Toronto | Catering | Charity |
| [Lemon and Allspice](http://www.commongroundco-op.ca/) | Toronto | Restaurant | Catering |
| [Eden Food for Change](https://edenffc.org/the-learning-kitchen) | Mississauga | Catering | Charity |
| The Raging Spoon Catering Company | Toronto | Catering |  |
| Out of This World Café | Toronto | Café | Catering |
| College Street Café & Russell Street Cafeteria | Toronto | Café | Catering |
| Daniel et Daniel | Toronto | Café | Restaurant |
| [North York Harvest Food Bank](https://northyorkharvest.com/leadership-in-logistics/) | North York | Charity |  |

## **Factor Associated With Social Enterprise**

As discussed in the Methodology, factors were created toward the identification of the social enterprises listed above in Table 1. Figure 2 shows the employment of these factors.

* 100% of the organizations that were identified in the content analysis have established themselves as a social enterprise in the food and beverage sector.
* 73.7% of these organizations have adopted a catering business model.
* The remaining 26.3% of social enterprise organizations have an operation based in the food and beverage sector; however, do not provide catering services.

*Figure 2:* Factor criterion for the selection and analysis of social enterprises.

## **Location**

Figure 3 shows that 100% of the organizations identified exist to support social missions within Toronto or the Greater Toronto Area.

* 77.8% of identified social enterprises exist within the city of Toronto, while the remaining 22.2% operate in the Greater Toronto Area.

*Figure 3:* Location of identified social enterprises.

## **Social Focus**

Figure 4 shows the social causes identified by mission statements of the studied social enterprises. All organizations identified more than one social focus as a purpose of their existence.

* 89.5% of social enterprises in Toronto focus upon Unemployment as a social focus of their organization. This includes offering employment and skills-building to individuals that face barriers to entry in the workforce. This is the most significant social cause identified in Toronto.
* 63.2% of social enterprises in Toronto focus upon providing resources for those affected by Mental Health disorders. This is the second-most significant social cause identified in Toronto.
* 57.9% of social enterprises focus upon Poverty as a social cause of their organization. This includes the assistance of financial resources through employment and provision of food and shelter, with the aim of empowering individuals below the poverty line.
* 57.9% of social enterprises focus upon Training through skills-building toward improved employability. Combined with the 15.8% of social enterprises focused upon Education, this represents 73.7% of social causes in Toronto.

*Figure 4:* Social causes of social enterprises in Toronto.

## **Business Model**

Figure 5 shows the business model identified by each of the 19 social enterprises. As a number of these organizations claimed multiple business functions, each of their identified models were reported. For example, in the case of Livelihood Café, their primary focus is the operation of a café; however, the organization also acts as a technology start-up and incubator. An additional example is Destination Café also offers a commercial cleaning service.

* 73.7% of identified social enterprises operate using a Catering business model. This is the most significant food and beverage business model that is adopted by social enterprises in Toronto.
* 52.5% of identified social enterprises operate using a Café business model. This is the second most significant food and beverage business model that is adopted by social enterprises in Toronto.

*Figure 5:* Social enterprise business model.

Figure 6 shows the comparison of organizations that adopt a single business focus or revenue stream, compared to those that choose to have multiple revenue streams. An example of a multiple revenue stream business is Paintbox Catering & Bistro, which offers catering services while also operating a restaurant.

* 73.7% of social enterprises in Toronto identify as having more than one revenue stream.

*Figure 6:* Single versus multiple revenue streams.

Table 2 shows the that of the 73.7% of organizations that employ multiple revenue streams. Specific revenue streams were considered on an individual basis, even if an organization identified has having more than two revenue streams. For example, Paintbox Catering & Bistro employs a catering operation, restaurant, and events. As such, the factors in Table 2 exist independently as a percentage of total organizations that employ multiple revenue streams.

* 50% of reviewed catering organizations also operate a café.
* 21.4% of reviewed catering organizations also operate a restaurant.
* 14.3% of reviewed catering organizations use event spaces as a part of their operation, thus creating multiple streams of revenue. While these organizations monetize the space that they possess, these spaces also act as a hosting location for their catering product.

*Table 2:* Additional revenue streams employed by catering organizations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Additional Revenue Stream** | **Percentage** |
| Café | 50.0% |
| Restaurant | 21.4% |
| Events | 14.3% |

## **Independent vs Subsidiary**

Figure 7 shows the difference between independent organizations and those that operate as a subsidiary of a larger organization. For example, Friends Catering operates as a social enterprise that is associated with Fred Victor, a Toronto-based organization working toward ending homelessness. Friends Catering provides employment and skills-building to individuals facing barriers to employment in the homeless community, thus empowering these individuals toward self-sufficiency.

* 68.4% of reviewed food and beverage social enterprises in Toronto exist as a subsidiary of a larger organization. These social enterprises make up a portion of the larger organization’s corporate social responsibility efforts.
* 31.6% of reviewed social enterprises in Toronto appear exist as independent organizations.

*Figure 7:* Independent vs subsidiary social enterprises.

## **Profit Structure**

Figure 8 shows the comparison of organizations that operate for-profit as opposed to non-profit organizations. While the reinvestment ratio was unclear in most cases, these organizations were differentiated based on their stated operational practices. For-profit organizations appeared to identify themselves as a profitable business with an attached social cause. Non-profit organizations, on the other hand, clearly expressed their social cause to be a key driver of their overall existence, transparently stating a formal non-profit title, or that all profits were invested toward their social cause of choosing.

* 73.7% of reviewed social enterprises in Toronto identify as non-profit organizations, with all profits reinvested into their organizations and social causes. In most cases the specific profit structure of organizations in this study was unclear, and as such,
* 26.3% of organizations appear to operate for-profit, with a portion of these profits directed toward their social causes.

*Figure 8:* Profit structure of social enterprises.

## **Years in Operation**

Table 3 shows the number of years that the identified social enterprises have been in existence in Toronto. The average age of identified food and beverage social enterprises in Toronto is 11 years, with the youngest (Frontburners Kitchen) being 3 years old, and the oldest (Daniel et Daniel) being 38 years old.

* 31.6% of organizations have been in operation for five years or less, while 21.1% of organizations have been in operation for six to ten years.
* A combined 52.7% of social enterprises are ten years old or less, meaning that the food and beverage social enterprise model is relatively new in Toronto.
* 15.8% of organizations have been in operation for over twenty years.
* 15.8% of the organizations do not clearly report how long they have been in operation.

*Table 3:* Years of operation of identified social enterprises in Toronto.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Years in Operation** | **Count** | **Percentage** |
| 1 to 5 | 6 | 31.6% |
| 6 to 10 | 4 | 21.1% |
| 11 to 15 | 2 | 10.5% |
| 16 to 20 | 1 | 5.3% |
| 20+ | 3 | 15.8% |
| Not Reported | 3 | 15.8% |
| Total | 19 | 100.0% |

## **Food Preparation Infrastructure**

Figure 9 shows how food and beverage social enterprises in Toronto prepare their product offerings, in a comparison between the existence of a commercial kitchen or use of off-site kitchens.

* 85.7% of organizations possess their own commercial kitchen.

*Figure 9:* Social enterprise food preparation infrastructure

Table 4 shows the identified catering social enterprises and their use of commercial versus off-site kitchens. This figure is compared to organizations that operate using a single or multiple revenue streams.

* 92.9% of identified catering social enterprises overall operate using a commercial kitchen.
* 0% of identified social enterprises that operate using a single revenue stream possess a commercial kitchen, choosing to utilize off-site kitchens instead.
* 100% of multiple revenue stream social enterprises identified in this study have invested in a commercial kitchen in order to fulfill their business practices.

*Table 4:* Catering organizations and their food preparation infrastructure.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Business Model** | **Commercial Kitchen** | **Off-Site Kitchen** |
| Single Revenue Stream | 0.0% | 100.0% |
| Multiple Revenue Streams | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| **Catering Businesses Overall** | **92.9%** | **7.1%** |

## **Labour Structure**

Figure 10 shows the comparative use of labour to fulfill the operational needs of identified social enterprises in Toronto. As the Regent Park Catering Collective uses labour on a contract basis to fulfill their operational needs, this factor was reviewed to discover the labour practices of other comparable social enterprises.

* 100% of organizations use full- or part-time employees, as opposed to relying on contract workers.
* 38.9% of organizations also rely upon volunteer labour to fulfill their business needs.
* This study did not discover any organizations that use employees on a contract-base to fulfill their business needs.

*Figure 10:* Labour structure in social enterprises.

Table 5 applies the employment structure to the factor criterion used to initially identify social enterprises in Toronto.

* 43.8% of social enterprises with community social missions rely on volunteer labour, representing the most significant use of volunteer labour.
* 28.6% of catering operations rely on some form of volunteer labour.

*Table 5:* Labour structure compared to factor criterion in identifying social enterprises.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor** | **Employees** | **Volunteers** |
| (1) Social Enterprise | 100.0% | 38.9% |
| (2) Catering Business Model | 100.0% | 28.6% |
| (3) Community Social Mission | 100.0% | 43.8% |

## **Funding Structure**

Figure 11 shows the comparison of social enterprises in their reliance on public or private funding. Within the content analysis, this study reviewed the source from which organizations are receiving their funding or investment. This study has defined public funding as government-sponsored programs that provide monetary resources to charitable organizations, whereas private funding is defined as donations sourced from private entities such as individuals or corporations. As stated previously, not all of the organizations were abundantly transparent beyond marketing their business services. However, delineation was able to occur through the analysis of annual reports, stated public and private partners, subsidiary/parent relations, and in some cases, stated funding sources by the operation itself.

* Only 15.8% of organizations report sole reliance upon private investment.
* 42.1% of social enterprises report use of public funding.
* 42.1% of organizations use a blend of reliance upon both public and private funding. As such, it can be surmised that businesses that accept public funding also require private investment.

*Figure 11:* Funding structures in social enterprises in Toronto.

## **Distribution Channels**

Distribution channels refer to the methods by which an organization chooses to distribute their product. In the case of food and beverage social enterprises, it was abundantly clear that all organizations distributed their product by traditional means such as brick-and-mortar locations, telephone, or e-mail. As such, this study chose to review the adaptation of technological means that identified social enterprises in Toronto chose to use as a method of product distribution.

### **Online Product Distribution**

Figure 12 shows the difference between food and beverage social enterprises that have chosen to distribute their product offering online, compared to organizations that do not.

* 84.2% of organizations use some form of e-commerce model with the use of a website or app-based services, meaning that patrons have the ability to place an order on an online platform.
* 15.8% of organizations exhibit no evidence of online distribution.

*Figure 12:* Online product distribution.

### **App-Based Distribution**

Figure 13 shows the use of app-based product distribution in the identified food and beverage social enterprises in Toronto. Any application was considered in this criterion, with identified applications in use including Foodee and Platterz. Both of these applications are online platforms connecting catering businesses with potential clients. While neither of these applications have mission statements related directly to social enterprise, both present an opportunity for social enterprise catering operations to compete directly with catering organizations that have not adopted a social cause.

* 5.3% of identified social enterprise catering organizations utilize app-based distribution networks. This figure represents only one business: Paintbox Catering & Bistro. This is not only a significant area of competitive advantage in the social enterprise market, but an opportunity to expand the reach of the Regent Park Catering Collective product offering.

*Figure 13:* Use of app-based product distribution by social enterprises in Toronto.

### **E-Commerce Platform**

An e-commerce platform is an online marketplace where organizations can connect with their clients. While a number of organizations offer an e-commerce platform for order fulfillment, this study wished to evaluate their methods of operation. A standard subjective criterion was established toward the evaluation of the existing e-commerce platforms offered by food and beverage social enterprises in Toronto. This criterion is as follows:

1. Online distribution exists through the organization’s own independent website = 2 points
2. Up-to-date information = 2 points
3. Ease of navigation = 2 points
4. Interface = 4 points
5. Pictures and descriptions of product offerings = 1 point
6. Fulfillment instructions, including the advance notice for each order = 1 point
7. Delivery or pick-up instructions = 1 point
8. Online payment methods available = 1 point

Table 6 shows the individual e-commerce scorecard of each of the identified social enterprises, ranked based on their total score. This chart also shows the Regent Park Catering Collective’s e-commerce model, judged using the same criteria. As they had adopted a new e-commerce model at the mid-point of this study, both models were evaluated, noted in italics. The average score was 4.71 out of 10.

* Friends Catering exhibited the highest score of all the social enterprises, receiving a 9 out of 10. While it is frequently updated and easy to navigate, this website also contains all of the necessary information for placing and fulfilling an order. It is not perfect, as it could offer some additional product description; however, in the opinion of this study, this operation is the industry model that should be followed to be competitive in the e-commerce market.
* The Raging Spoon Catering and Out of This World Café exhibited similarly strong scores, receiving an 8 out of 10.
* Paintbox Catering & Bistro, although having one of the most aesthetically pleasing and impressive models, lost some Interface points based on their distribution and instructions. It must also be noted that they employ distribution on multiple app-based services, including Foodee and Platterz, which allow them to connect on a wider basis with potential clients.
* The former model employed by the Regent Park Catering Collective received a score of 4 out of 10, falling below the average industry score of 4.71.
* The new Regent Park Catering Collective model is a significant improvement, receiving a score of 9 out of 10. This new model is not perfect, but ranks among the top e-commerce models in the food and beverage social enterprise industry in Toronto.

*Table 6:* E-commerce model scorecard for food and beverage social enterprises.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Catering Organization** | **Exists** | **Up To Date** | **Navigation** | **Interface** | **Total** |
| Friends Catering | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | **9** |
| *\*RPCC - Current Platform* | *2* | *2* | *2* | *3* | ***9*** |
| The Raging Spoon Catering | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **8** |
| Out of This World Café | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **8** |
| [Livelihood Cafe](https://www.livelihoodproject.org/) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | **7** |
| [Paintbox Catering & Bistro](http://paintboxcatering.ca/) | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | **7** |
| [Hawthorne Food & Drink](http://hawthorneto.ca/) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | **6** |
| [Eden Food for Change](https://edenffc.org/the-learning-kitchen) | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | **6** |
| [Fabarnak](http://www.the519.org/fabarnak) | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | **4** |
| [Wayne's Cup](http://waynescup.com/) | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | **4** |
| [Lemon and Allspice](http://www.commongroundco-op.ca/) | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | **4** |
| *\*RPCC - Previous Platform* | *2* | *0* | *2* | *0* | ***4*** |
| Show Love Cafe | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | **2** |
| [LOFT Kitchen](https://www.conccommunity.org/loft-kitchen/) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **2** |
| [Frontburners Youth Kitchen](http://www.frontlines.to/) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **2** |
| College Street Café | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **2** |
| **Average** | 1.86 | 1.00 | 1.36 | 0.50 | 4.71 |

# **Discussion**

Upon analyzing the information that is derived from our data collection, it is apparent that the data found provides interesting insight on our literature review and overarching research questions. Ultimately, three central themes were seen throughout the quantitative data that we felt were necessary to categorize as they will provide significant insight into social enterprise best practices. These best practices are at the core of positive insights and recommendations that can be used to help better the RPCC. The three central categories are primarily centered around business structure, business model and focus, as well as business capability.

Determining best practices of these types of social enterprises is substantial to the RPCC’s ability to create itself as a sustainable and profitable business. Therefore, looking at the different factors that make up these organizations, and specifically where Regent Park falls within the mix, is consequential to this analysis. Furthermore, our literature review uncovered two unique definitions to what a social enterprise specifically can be defined as. These definitions prove as useful in uncovering the truth about what different functionalities surround a particular business model, and how that can be directly applied to the bettering of the RPCC. As consumer demands and societal eating norms are constantly shifting, food and beverage specific social enterprises must be able to drive wide ranges of development to the microcosmic communities they reside within (Paetkau, 2014). Consumers and the businesses alike are looking to create a mutual relationship, supporting each other’s needs and wants. Overall, the quantitative data derived from our content analysis was purposefully chosen to further investigate our research questions, related to understanding what defines a successful social enterprise, the characteristics of one, as well as best practices. As a result, it will allow for the analyses to be directly applied to the RPCC, with the intention of creating a more sustainable business structure.

## **Business Structure**

In trying to understand the realities behind social enterprises, one of themes we found through the content analysis were the structural characteristics of the various businesses. How a business structures itself, can reveal a lot about whether the business will succeed and how it is currently functioning, as a result this was of strong interest to our group. By business structure we mean the organizational structure and foundations set by a business, with a successful model showcasing its ability to adapt to its surroundings and consistently operate effectively (Bravo & Herrero de Egaña, 2016). This insight is significant as it can help exemplify which businesses fit under which structural category in relation to the RPCC. When analyzing the various businesses, the majority have been in operation for only 1-5 years, with only 3 having been around for 20+ years. Moreover, as Figure 8 clearly shows, only 26.3% of these organizations are for-profit organizations compared to the traditional non-for-profit model. The data taken from the content analysis reveals a staggering reality about the structures of these organizations. It is evident that the majority of the businesses are relatively new to the social enterprise world, exhibiting not only a novice management structure, but a strong ability for the RPCC to situate itself as a central competitor. Furthermore, as our literature review exemplifies, the motivations of many social enterprises are frequently related to the marginalization of certain socio-economic groups, therefore, it is no surprise that the majority of these organizations are non-for-profit in nature (Alter, 2007; Battilana & Lee, 2014; Bull et al., 2018; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006). As a successful business structure is one that can properly deal with and adapt to the ambiguity of the business world. The RPCC, should maximize on this data to develop further proper insights on why their competition is structured the way it is, in order to maximize on the current market trends and create the most satisfaction for their stakeholders.

## **Business Model and Focus**

For the majority of businesses how they model their business structure, and angle their market focus is key to their long-term success. In trying to understand how social enterprises function and situate themselves competitively, it was critical to first understand how these organizations model their business, and specifically what their business was focused around. Similar to how a business structures itself, business models are structured management tools, correlating to a succinct business focus, which is highly relevant for success (Wirtz, Pistoia, Ullrich, & Göttel, 2016). Therefore, in order for a business to justify that their model is successful, and their focus is relevant, customers and the community must see value in the services they are providing. Through the content analysis it was uncovered that a myriad of social enterprises exists, that being said for different reasons. As seen in Figure 3, 73.7% of the organizations investigated have a business focus around catering services, the exact service the RPCC operates under. Additionally, the purpose of the organizations’ focusses varied as well, with 17 being centered around unemployment, and the rest being dispersed around issues such as poverty, or addiction. Moreover, the literature defines specific social enterprise characteristics, such as being accountable not only to their members but the community it serves as well, or having a triple bottom line extending past the conventional business framework (Alter, 2007; Kay et al., 2016; Martin & Osberg, 2015; Thompson & Doherty, 2006). The RPCC, should be wary of the demographics of the organizations they are competing with, as many fall within the realm of a catering service. The RPCC truly functions within a unique a distinct vision and mission different than majority of its constituents. Therefore, as the RPCC continues to strategically define its business focus and tailor its business model, it has an excellent opportunity to see what other organizations similar to them are doing, and how they can leverage those differences and integrate them into their own business to situate themselves for success.

## **Business Capability**

The last category that provided paramount insight into the structure of the organizations is the capability of the businesses and what practices are utilized. For the sake of the project business capabilities or resources can be defined as “the tangible or intangible assets firms use to develop and implement their strategies” (Ray, Barney, & Muhanna, 2004, p. 24). Not only do these organizations have to create a convincing value proposition, in order to gain visibility in the competitive market. But in order to truly be successful they must be strategically capable of implementing relevant resources and organizing business functions in an easy and viable manner. For social enterprises under the catering realm these capabilities come in the form of e-commerce platforms, apps, and foundational work environments. Having these proper business functions in place is critical as they “are the way that the competitive potential of a firm’s resources and capabilities are realized” (Ray, Barney, & Muhanna, 2004, p. 26). From the quantitative data it is evident that there are various capabilities within a business that impact its success. For example, when looking at the data breakdown in Figure 9, 85.7% of these catering related businesses use a commercial kitchen, a massive advantage to the functionality of the establishment. However, when looking at the breakdown in Figure 13, a resounding 94.7% of the organizations were found to be incapable of any app use, a strong necessity in today’s technologically reliant society. Lastly 84.2% of the market sighted using a successful e-commerce platform, another necessity in today’s competitive market. The literature mentions that social enterprises have increased recently, particularly in the hospitality and tourism industry as well the food and beverage industry (Alegre & Berbegal-Mirabent, 2016; Kline, Shah, & Rubright, 2014). With this increase comes significant opportunities for these businesses to maximize on the gaps within the market, and utilize these resources to substantiate their business capabilities. It is crucial for The RPCC, to analyze the varying capabilities of its competitors and consider where they strategically align as well as what might need to be achieved in order to become a profitable, sustainable, and competitive organization.

# **Recommendations**

The quantitative data reveals excellent insights on how social enterprises are functioning on a multitude of factors. Ultimately, using that data along with the discussion insights, allows for the construction of some high-level recommendations to be considered for the RPCC’s long-term success. As the RPCC’s long-term goal is to reintroduce itself into the market as a sustainable and profitable business, these recommendations are designed to ideally assist in this transition, while allowing the organization to stay within the confines of their business values. Additionally, the recommendations are made sequentially, with the intent of each leading to the next, creating a holistically successful approach.

## **Employment Structure**

Employment is a very important aspect to any successful hospitality organization; the content analysis reveals this, demonstrating a stringent strategic planning on their employment structure. At a time where RPCC is ready to take the next step as a sustainable social enterprise it is imperative that a regulated employment structure is established. Labour is one of the highest costs for the F&B industry so ensure that the employment structure is sustainable to handle turnover or unexpected problems. Furthermore, enlisting more volunteers or non-paid internships would be a highly recommended as the demand is there and can save the RPCC additional costs to their bottom line. Additional volunteers could be utilized for larger or high-pressure catering orders or events to ensure there are no issues. Any orders or events that cannot be fulfilled threatens to lose a repeat customer or a future opportunity which is more valuable for a social enterprise in its early stages. It is recommended that they have a proper employment structure outlined as to make sure they maintain a competitive advantage within the market. Contract workers can be beneficially to mix in with volunteers to ensure there is enough accountability as well as fair compensation for the work needed. Certain volunteers that show their dedicated and proven their value could be rewarded with an 8-12-month contract with RPCC. This will incentivize exceptional employees to stay with the organization and retain the impactful work done as well ensure those short-term positions are given to the best talent. The connections and experience these employees could learn from the amazing staff at RPCC will create sustainable synergy. Both volunteers and contract workers can be trusted to provide invaluable insight and support since the opportunity to work with RPCC would be amazing on their resume and future employers. The employee turnover may be high through this structure, however, the opportunity given can command accountability and effort in their short duration there. By streamlining their employment structure and utilizing volunteers and contract workers RPCC can ensure longevity as employees are both happy and treated well through a proper employment structure

## **Utilization of an App Service**

As indicated in the discussion, very few of the food and beverage enterprises found utilized app-based services, an imperative factor to many successful businesses in 2019. According to Cohen (2018), there are many useful apps in the marketplace that can truly guarantee success for a business in a seamless way. Applications such as Buffer, which is a social media organization tool, to using food delivery platforms such as Foodora or Uber-Eats, will assist the RPCC in their ability to have a greater market reach and a more successful product suite.  As a catering business RPCC would focus its app services on catering jobs as small orders may not be cost efficient. However, individual ordering could be possible by setting minimum dollar amount per order as well as minimum items per for order. More prominent apps such as Uber-Eats may not allow these minimums however there are smaller scale food delivery platforms that definitely could still help us reach those new markets. In addition, RPCC could inquire about volunteer computer programmers who could develop a simple catering app. Along with marketing and clear communication, any catering app RPCC utilizes will help streamline the touchpoints for the consumer while supporting a great cause which will increase their overall satisfaction with their experience. This would be ideal as simplicity and ease of access can easily attract and retain consumers for any future catering events. Furthermore, as few of these organizations currently employ the use of these apps, this provides a strategic opportunity for RPCC to gain a sustainable competitive advantage over its competitors by using a service not used by most. Overall, in attempting to become a profitable organization, this strategy is recommended to assist them in expanding their businesses capacity far beyond an office, and can assist them in further business ventures such as facilitating the creation of more advanced infrastructure such as a commercialized kitchen.

## **Investment in Commercial Kitchen**

As indicated above, the investment a commercial kitchen is highly recommended for the RPCC’s long-term success. As it stands, the organization functions out of off-site kitchens, a temporary fix to a greater and largely unsustainable issue. Having an on-site commercial kitchen, as many of its competitors do, allows for the mitigation of stress, unneeded expenses, and the ability to have a central location to make business decisions. Additionally, through the creation of a commercial kitchen, RPCC would be able to handle the capacity increases due to their increase in marketing, something their current set-up does not allow. Having a commercial kitchen can assist in employment strategies, mitigating the need for contract workers and focusing on utilizing full- and part-time employees. As Figure 4 showed that unemployment represented a cause identified by 89.5% of social enterprises, this strategy would work to better align RPCC’s business practices with their social mission. Finally, through such an acquisition the current e-commerce platform could be expanded upon, allowing for more insights to be had and more information to be given to potential customers.As RPCC has its sights set on improving its business functionality, this move will pay dividends and it is seen as a necessity to make the jump into sustainable profitability.

RPCC have already acquired a commercial kitchen space and we are confident they are on the right track to propel their business and become more sustainable and profitable. Within the next year RPCC should be phasing into solely operating on-site from their off-site kitchens.Since RPCC is already implementing commercial kitchens, our recommendation strongly supports the idea of further investment. In order to optimally serve their customers, the RPCC could reserve certain funds to ensure their equipment are properly maintained and pay for unexpected expenses. In addition, the RPCC can add additional equipment to increase their culinary cooking variety as well as continually updating their equipment layout to increase efficiency. Ensuring the cooking staff have all they need ensure to fulfill their orders will in turn increase customer satisfaction and repeat business. The commercial kitchen is an important vessel that will help produce revenue for the RPCC, they could consider acquiring another commercial kitchen if they become more sustainable. The creation and continued investment of commercial kitchen would greatly improve RPCC’s sustainability and profitability if its properly managed and operated.

## **Proper E-commerce Platform**

The final recommendation is for the RPCC to maintain a proper and efficient e-commerce platform. Like most of the organizations investigated, the RPCC is successful in having an up-to-date platform, vitally important to its current success. These platforms are the industry standard for social enterprises and commercial businesses alike. In order to remain relevant and competitive, the RPCC must ensure that it not only has a proper e-commerce platform, but one that is easy to navigate and aesthetically appealing. As more and more businesses are moving towards fully integrated online businesses, it is recommended that the organization spends an appropriate amount of time updating their platform, and ensuring it is providing the necessary details to its stakeholders. In the hopes of the organization expanding its marketing, utilizing applications, and creating a commercial kitchen. This platform will be consequential in relaying relevant information about the functionalities of the business and the central services it provides. Overall, it is extremely positive that the RPCC currently uses an e-commerce platform, and as long as it is properly maintained it will continue to contribute to its success.

# **Conclusion**

In conclusion, social enterprises present a very unique and almost unconventional approach to the normalized business structure seen by majority of organizations. As the central motivation of this study was to uncover the true nature of social enterprise best practices in the food and beverage industry, it is clear that there is no one size fits all strategy for what defines a successful organization. Additionally, in the hopes of determining best practices to be applied to the RPCC’s sustainable success, it was critical to gain perspective on what is currently taking place in the market. Through the initiation of a content analysis, the main concepts of this research were substantiated through important insights which pointed towards the commonalties as well as sheer differences amongst a data-set of social enterprises in the food and beverage industry. The quantitative results exemplified an understanding of what social enterprises generally practice, as well as what brings them success. For the business of focus, the RPCC, these insights not only highlighted areas in which they are potentially faltering but major opportunities for significant advantages. Through the content analysis, overarching themes and categories were developed to further represent how these organizations situate themselves. It was uncovered that most social enterprises can be analyzed from the viewpoint of, location and structure, business model and focus, as well as business functionality. As these unique businesses are constantly adapting to the needs of their specific communities, understanding their motives and constituents of success, is imperative to understanding how the RPCC can find long term success in its strategic endeavours.

Although this study provided noteworthy insight into the business world of social enterprises, there were however many limitations and areas where this study could have improved. A significant pain point in our study was related to our sampling strategy. As our research was focused particularly on social enterprises within Canada but more specifically Toronto, we were limited to organizations only within this region compared to an international scale. This proved to be a limitation as there are many relevant examples of social enterprises in the food and beverage industry across Canada and the world, and therefore, we were tasked with finding ones only within Toronto, making our content analysis locally relevant compared to internationally. Furthermore, another limitation within our project was trying to decide which data from each organization was relevant for analysis to develop insights on best practices. As our content analysis was premised on creating a visual representation on what occurs within various social enterprises, there was an overarching concern that the wrong information was being pulled. That being said, our group took on a strategy of pulling out as much information as possible to mitigate the possibility of having a lack of informative data. We were optimistic that we were in an opportunistic situation with a diverse set of data from a myriad of organizations. An additional limitation our group faced, was trying to perfectly define what exactly a social enterprise was. This proved to be a complicated task, as not only were there various definitions of what a social enterprise was, but the lines between a completely profitable business and a totally non-for-profit business were very blurred. Our group therefore, tried to develop a few overarching definitions in the hopes that it would provide appropriate enough context to the organization’s we were researching including the RPCC. Research is often something that comes with many limitations, something our group totally acknowledged. However, it is thought that through seeing the weaknesses of this study, a project with a similar scope could vastly improve.

Although identifying the limitations of the study are important, it is also critical to acknowledge opportunities for future research. As our central focus of the study was on social enterprises within the food and beverage industry, it would be highly beneficial to perhaps explore best practices of social enterprises across a wide variety of functions. This will allow for more specifically tailored insights to be made, as well as a clear understanding if there is an overlap in the data between varying industries. Additionally, this study can assist other organizations similar to the RPCC that are interested in becoming a more profitable and viable business. As well as, allowing themselves to benchmark their organization against the competition and against the current community they operate within. Overall, this research project was critical in forming a more specifically tailored understanding on how social enterprises within the food and beverage industry operate, and what specific practices are being used that make them successful. Understanding this research is not only consequential for an organization like the RPCC, but is crucial in developing further insights into this very niche and ever-expanding business model.
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# **Appendix 1: Critical Path**

**Link to google spreadsheets:**

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1iPbXI0SJAxYHMfSQf-okNvXlMUM7IW_-DscNVcSpS2I/edit?usp=sharing>

# **Appendix 2: Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Minutes #1**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| Jan 23/19 | 10:00 | Tom’s Office | Kev, Geoff, Osama, Tom & Jessica |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Geoff | Kev | Osama |

Meeting Needs to End by: 11AM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Topic presentation by Jessica | * Social Enterprise in Regent Park | 30 minutes |
| HTR 841 - Application of topic to project | * Connect Social Enterprise organizations to the model followed by those in Regent Park | 15 minutes |
| Group Contract |  | 15 minutes |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| GROUP CONTRACT | * Complete | Jan 24 |  | ALL |
| PROPOSAL | * Meeting on Jan 24 to discuss as a team and complete initial framework |  |  | ALL |

**Meeting Minutes #2**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| Jan 23/19 | 4:00 | KHW 061 | Kev, Geoff & Osama |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Kev | Osama | Geoff |

Meeting Needs to End by: 5PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Proposal - Due Feb 1 | * Literature Review * Methodology | 45 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Proposal | * Introduction * Literature Review | Jan 31 | Social Enterprise | Kev & Geoff |
| Proposal | * Methodology | Jan 31 | Data Collection  Sampling | Osama |
| Proposal | * Appendices | Jan 31 | GANT Chart | Osama |

**Meeting Minutes #3**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| Jan 31/19 | 3:00 | KHW 061 | Kev, Geoff & Osama |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Osama | Geoff | Kev |

Meeting Needs to End by: 6PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Proposal - Due Feb 1 | * Literature Review * Methodology |  |
| Assignment #2 | * Literature Review * Methodology * Content Analysis Frame |  |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Proposal | * Introduction | Jan 31 | * Notes made in Google Drive | Geoff |
| Proposal | * Literature Review * Methods | Feb 1 | * Assemble & edit | Group |
| Assignment #2 | * Content Analysis Frame | Feb 15 | * Think about it | Group |

**Meeting Minutes #4**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| Feb 7/19 | 4:00 | Heidelberg | Kev, Osama, Geoff |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Kev | Osama | Geoff |

Meeting Needs to End by: 6PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Review Tom’s Notes | * SIMPLIFY the language we’re using | 60 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Introduction | * Reword & explain | Feb 14 |  | Team |
| Literature Review | * Follow Tom’s feedback & replace with new content | Feb 14 |  | Kev & Geoff |
| Methods | * Follow Tom’s feedback & replace with new content | Feb 14 |  | Osama |

**Meeting Minutes #5**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| Feb 14/19 | 3:00 | Hillel Ryerson Building | Kev, Geoff, Osama |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Geoff | Kev | Osama |

Meeting Needs to End by: 6PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Review each section prior to submission / tomorrow’s deadline | * Edit each other’s sections | 90 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Perfecting Content Analysis Frame | * Ensure all categories are present and relevant to the topic at hand | Feb 22 |  | Team |
| Coding | * Start coding various organizations | On-going |  | Team |
| Mid-Point Presentation | * Begin thinking about the presentation and its requirements | March 7 |  | Team |

**Meeting Minutes #6**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| Feb 21, 2019 | 3:00 | Heidelberg | Kevin & Osama | Geoffrey |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Osama | Kev | Kev |

Meeting Needs to End by: 5PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Content Analysis |  | 120 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Content Analysis | * Create criteria * Identify organizations * Research | March 7 |  | Kev & Osama |

**Meeting Minutes #7**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| March 7/19 | 11:00 | RPCC | Kevin & Geoffrey | Osama |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Geoffrey | Kev | Kev |

Meeting Needs to End by: 12PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Meeting with RPCC | * Discover greater insight to their operation & goals | 60 |
| Meeting with Jessica Griffiths | * Better the understanding of the scope of our assignment in comparison to student mentors | 20 |
| Meeting with Tom Griffin | * Check-in regarding research focus | 10 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Notes from meeting | * Send to full team | Today |  | Kev |
| Apply learnings to presentation | * Add insights of company to presentation | Today |  | Team |

**Meeting Minutes #8**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| March 7/19 | 2:00 | TRSM | Kevin, Geoffrey & Osama |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Kev | Geoff | Osama |

Meeting Needs to End by: 3PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Finalize Presentation |  | 60 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Ensure all topics are present | * Review | Immediately |  | Team |
| Practice |  |  |  | Team |

**Meeting Minutes #9**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| March 14/19 | 2:00 | SLC-732 | Kevin, Geoffrey & Osama |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Kev | Osama | Geoff |

Meeting Needs to End by: 4PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Report First Draft |  |  |
| Review of Previous Submission | * Address Tom’s Comments |  |
|  |  |  |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Report First Draft | * Results | March 20 |  | Kev |
| Report First Draft | * Discussion * Conclusion | March 20 |  | Geoff |
| Review Previous Submission | * Address Tom’s comments | March 20 |  | Osama |
| Clean-up Content Analysis |  | March 8 |  | Osama |

**Meeting Minutes #10**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| March 21/19 | 2:00 | SEC | Kevin, Geoffrey & Osama |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Osama | Kev | Geoff |

Meeting Needs to End by: 5PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Report First Draft | * Review, ensure completeness for submission | 120 |
| Editing, Formatting |  | 60 |
| Appendices |  | 30 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs  to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Report First Draft | * Results * Discussion * Conclusion * Exec Summary | Today |  | Team |
| Appendices | * Group Meeting Minutes * Critical Path * Content Analysis | Today |  | Team |

**Meeting Minutes #11**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| April 4/19 | 3:00 | KHE | Kevin, Geoffrey & Osama |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Kev | Osama | Geoff |

Meeting Needs to End by: 5PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Review first draft feedback | * Ask Tom key points about feedback | 30 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs  to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Address feedback | * Primary revamp of Results, Discussion & Recommendation | April 12 |  | Results - Kev  Disc - Geoff  Rec - Osama |
| Presentation | * Adapt mid-point to fit final presentation * Create copy for RPCC presentation | April 10 |  | All |

**Meeting Minutes #12**

Key Information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Date | Time | Location | Attendance | Absent and Reason |
| April 11/19 | 2:00 | SCC | Kevin, Geoffrey & Osama |  |

Roles

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chair | Minute Keeper | Time Keeper |
| Geoff | Kev | Osama |

Meeting Needs to End by: 5PM

Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | Points | Minutes on Topic |
| Review Final Draft Progress | * Address any missing points | 30 |
| Complete and rehearse final presentation |  | 120 |

Action Items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Topic | What needs to be done | When it needs  to be done | Notes | Responsibility |
| Presentation | Create copy for RPCC presentation | April 12 |  | All |
| Complete Final Draft | Final Review, Editing & Formatting | April 12 |  | All |

# **Appendix 3: Content Analysis Frame**

**Link to Google Spreadsheet with the frame:**

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1X3KI9v2QvgHW3hiFNxVs-0CgFseQ9Z-zlmxyhfSON6I/edit?usp=sharing>

# **Appendix 4: Final Draft Notes**

**Major changes made to the submission from the First Draft:**

* Focused strongly on improving the results section, by defining more clearly what we were showing, and why it was important to our overall research project.
* Spent time editing our discussion section, making it more concise and understandable. Tried to define concepts more clearly and correlate them to the project purpose.
* Focused as well on the recommendations section, which built off of our discussion. Similar to above tried to make it more succinct and understandable, additionally removed our marketing recommendation and replaced it with one about employee structure.
* Changed a bit of our methodology section, so our definitions of a social enterprise matched more closely with what we were discussing.
* Edited other small areas to make the overall report flow. For example, making tables or graphs in APA (removing a border), or editing sentences so they were not in the past tense.
* Made the Executive summary a bit more ‘punchy’ by adding bullet points.