ALLAMA IQBAL OPEN UNIVERSITY

USMAN NOTES
www.usmannotes.com

Name:

Registration No.:

Course Code: 1617

Program: Certificate of Entrepreneurship in ECE

Semester: Autumn 2026

ALLAMA IQBAL OPEN UNIVERSITY, ISLAMABAD

Course: Social Entrepreneurship (1617) • Level: Certificate of Entrepreneurship in ECE

Semester: Autumn 2026

Assignment No. 2 (Units 5-9)

Total Marks: 100 • Pass Marks: 50

SOLVED ASSIGNMENT GUIDE

(For Study & Reference)

Note: This guide is prepared for study and reference purposes. Students are advised to read the relevant units of the course book, understand the concepts, and then write the assignment in their own words. Copying this guide word for word is not recommended.

USMAN NOTES www.usmannotes.com

Question 1: Techniques for Generating Ideas and Solutions for Social Problems (20 Marks)

Discuss the techniques for generating ideas and solutions for social problems with the help of examples.

Introduction

Every social enterprise begins as an idea, but good ideas for social problems are not simply waited for; they are generated, deliberately, by techniques that widen thinking beyond the first obvious suggestion. Social problems are usually tangled, resources are scarce, and the people affected often have knowledge that professionals lack. A disciplined idea-generation process

therefore does three things: it defines the real problem with the community, it produces many different candidate solutions without judging them too early, and it then selects and tests the most promising. This answer discusses the main techniques — brainstorming and brainwriting, mind mapping, SCAMPER, the Six Thinking Hats, community consultation and focus groups, observation and empathy methods from design thinking, problem-tree and five-whys analysis, SWOT and environmental scanning, benchmarking, and prototyping — illustrating each with examples, particularly from early childhood education (ECE) and community work.

First Step: Understanding the Problem Before Generating Ideas

Idea generation fails most often at the start, when the group solves the wrong problem. Two analytical techniques protect against this. The problem tree arranges a problem as a tree: roots are causes, the trunk is the core problem, and branches are effects. If a team in a village lists "children unprepared for Grade 1" as the trunk, the roots may include no preschool access, untrained caregivers, malnutrition, parents unaware of early stimulation, and distance; each root suggests a different family of solutions, and the team can see that building a centre addresses only some roots. The five whys technique repeatedly asks "why?" — Why do children drop out of the centre? Because mothers work in the fields at those hours. Why does that stop attendance? Because timings clash and no one else can bring the child. The questioning continues until a cause appears that can actually be acted on (here, timings and a walking-bus arrangement, not "poverty" in the abstract). Fishbone (Ishikawa) diagrams do similar work by sorting causes into categories — people, money, materials, methods, environment — so that no category is overlooked. These techniques consume an hour and save months.

Group Creativity Techniques: Brainstorming, Brainwriting and Mind Mapping

Brainstorming, developed by Alex Osborn, is a group session governed by four rules: quantity is wanted, criticism is deferred, wild ideas are welcomed, and ideas may be combined and improved. A facilitator states the problem narrowly ("How might we enrol and retain 3–5-year-olds whose mothers work?"), and the group produces ideas for twenty to thirty minutes before any evaluation. In an ECE centre team this might produce: change timings to early morning and late afternoon; a mothers' rota to escort children; a mobile crèche at the harvest site; fees payable weekly; older siblings' reading hour. The value lies in separating generation from judgement: junior staff and parents speak because criticism is banned, and one wild idea (the mobile crèche) triggers practical ones.

Brainwriting corrects brainstorming's weakness — domination by the loudest voices. In the 6-3-5 method, six participants each write three ideas in five minutes, pass the sheet on, and build on others' ideas, yielding over a hundred ideas in half an hour, in silence. It suits mixed groups of teachers, parents and officials where hierarchy would otherwise silence exactly the people closest to the problem. Mind mapping (Tony Buzan) suits both individuals and groups: the problem is written in the centre of a page and branches radiate outwards — causes, actors, resources, possible services — with each branch sprouting sub-branches. A mind map for "low-cost learning materials" might branch into natural materials, waste materials, print, digital and community skills (a carpenter father, a seamstress mother), and quickly reveal resources the centre already owns. Mind maps also serve later as the skeleton of the project plan.

Structured Techniques: SCAMPER, Six Thinking Hats and SWOT

SCAMPER is a checklist of operations applied to an existing service: Substitute, Combine, Adapt, Modify (or Magnify/Minify), Put to another use, Eliminate, Reverse. Applied to a struggling preschool: Substitute bought plastic toys with made local materials, Combine the centre with a mothers' literacy class so attendance serves two purposes; Adapt the public-school classroom model to a home courtyard; Modify timings to the agricultural calendar; Put the centre building to another use as an evening women's skills venue (earning rent); Eliminate the admission fee barrier by a waiver quota; Reverse the flow — instead of children travelling to the teacher, the teacher travels to children (a mobile preschool). SCAMPER is powerful precisely because social innovators rarely start from nothing; improving and re-arranging what exists is cheaper and more acceptable than importing the wholly new.

Edward de Bono's Six Thinking Hats disciplines group discussion by giving everyone the same "hat" at the same time: White (facts and data), Red (feelings and intuition), Black (risks and criticism), Yellow (benefits and optimism), Green (new ideas), Blue (process and conclusions). A team considering a fee increase would first lay out White facts (costs, arrears), hear Red feelings (parents' anxiety, staff morale), test Black risks (dropout of the poorest), note Yellow benefits (a second teacher, better materials), use Green to invent middle ways (instalment plans, sibling discounts, sponsored seats), and let Blue draw the decision together. The technique prevents the common meeting failure in which optimism and criticism collide unproductively, and it legitimises emotion as data — vital in social work. SWOT analysis and PESTLE scanning work at the level of the environment: listing internal Strengths and Weaknesses and external Opportunities and Threats (and, in PESTLE, Political, Economic, Social,

Technological, Legal and Environmental trends) generates ideas by matching strengths to opportunities — for instance, a centre's strength (a trusted local teacher) matched to a policy opportunity (a government per-child grant for ECE) generates the idea of a registered community ECE centre rather than an informal class.

People-Centred Techniques: Consultation, Observation and Design Thinking

For social problems, the richest source of ideas is the affected people themselves. Focus group discussions bring six to ten parents, or teachers, or young people, into guided conversation; the facilitator's task is to draw out experience ("Walk me through a morning with your four-year-old") rather than opinions about a pre-decided scheme. Community consultation meetings, transect walks through a settlement, and participatory mapping (residents drawing their own map of hazards, resources and gathering places) routinely reveal facts invisible from an office: the flooded path that explains seasonal absence, the safe courtyard that could host a class. Observation and empathy methods, formalised in design thinking (empathise – define – ideate – prototype – test), go further: the innovator shadows a mother for a day, or tries enrolling a child using the actual forms, and records frustrations moment by moment (a "journey map"). Many celebrated social innovations are simply the removal of a frustration discovered this way — forms simplified, a payment broken into daily micro-instalments matching daily wages, a clinic queue replaced by appointment tokens.

Benchmarking and lateral thinking import ideas from elsewhere: visiting a high-performing centre in another district, studying how microfinance solved the trust problem through groups, or how mobile-phone companies reached poor customers through small prepaid units ("sachet"

thinking applied to fees). Crowdsourcing and open calls — inviting ideas from staff, students or the public through a competition — widen the pool further and create ownership of the winning idea. The Nominal Group Technique and the Delphi method add rigour when experts are scattered: ideas are generated individually, shared in round-robin, clarified, and then ranked by silent voting (NGT), or refined through anonymous questionnaire rounds until expert consensus emerges (Delphi) — useful, for example, in setting quality standards for ECE centres across a province.

Table 1: Idea-generation techniques at a glance

Technique	Best used for	Example in social / ECE work
Brainstorming	Many quick ideas in a team	Ways to retain children of working mothers
Brainwriting (6-3-5)	Groups where hierarchy silences voices	Parents, teachers and officials generating ideas equally
Mind mapping	Exploring a problem's full structure	Mapping resources for low-cost learning materials
SCAMPER	Improving an existing service	Re-designing a struggling preschool, point by point
Six Thinking Hats	Balanced group decisions	Deciding a fee policy with facts, feelings and risks
Problem tree / five whys	Finding root causes	Tracing Grade-1 unpreparedness to its causes

USMAN NOTES www.usmannotes.com

Focus groups & mapping	Learning from the community	Discovering the flooded path behind seasonal absence
Design thinking / prototyping	Testing solutions cheaply	Piloting a mobile preschool for one month
Benchmarking	Borrowing proven models	Adapting group methods from microfinance

From Ideas to Solutions: Selection and Prototyping

Generation must end in disciplined selection, or it produces only lists. Workable criteria for a social idea are: impact on the root cause, fit with the mission and values, feasibility with real resources, affordability for beneficiaries, acceptability to the community and authorities, sustainability of income, and risk if it fails. A simple scoring matrix — each idea scored 1–5 on each criterion by the whole team — makes the discussion concrete and defensible, and usually reveals that the winning idea is a combination: for example, a home-based centre (acceptability, low cost) plus a mothers' escort rota (retention) plus weekly fees (affordability). The selected idea is then prototyped: run at the smallest scale that produces real learning — one room, twenty children, one term — with simple measures fixed in advance (enrolment, attendance, parent satisfaction, cost per child, a basic school-readiness observation). Feedback from the prototype feeds a second round of generation, which is why idea generation is a cycle, not an event. Documenting rejected ideas and the reasons is also valuable: it prevents the team from re-debating settled questions and shows funders that choices were reasoned.

Conclusion

In conclusion, techniques for generating ideas and solutions for social problems share one philosophy: creativity is a process that can be organised. Analysis techniques (problem tree, five whys, fishbone, SWOT/PESTLE) ensure the real problem is addressed; group creativity techniques (brainstorming, brainwriting, mind mapping, SCAMPER, Six Thinking Hats) produce variety without premature judgement; people-centred techniques (focus groups, participatory mapping, observation, design thinking) ground ideas in the lived reality of beneficiaries; and benchmarking, crowdsourcing and expert methods import and refine outside knowledge. Selection criteria and prototyping then convert imagination into tested solutions. For the social entrepreneur in ECE, mastery of even three or four of these techniques — used with parents and staff, not merely about them — will reliably produce better ideas than solitary inspiration, because the knowledge needed to solve a social problem is distributed among the people who live it.

Question 2: Feasibility Analysis of a Business Idea — Concept and Types (20 Marks)

Explain the concept and types of feasibility analysis of a business idea with the help of examples.

Introduction

Between a promising idea and a launched enterprise stands a question that decides whether savings, loans and reputations will be wisely spent: will this actually work? Feasibility analysis is the disciplined attempt to answer that question before major resources are committed. Many

ventures — commercial and social alike — fail not because the idea was foolish but because nobody checked, in advance, whether customers existed, whether the sums added up, whether the team could deliver, or whether the law allowed it. This answer explains the concept, purpose and timing of feasibility analysis, then describes its main types — market, product or service, organisational, financial, technical or operational, legal, and, for social enterprises, social-impact feasibility — with examples, including a worked break-even calculation for an early childhood education (ECE) centre.

Concept, Purpose and Timing of Feasibility Analysis

A feasibility analysis (or feasibility study) is a preliminary evaluation of a business idea, conducted before a full business plan is written, to determine whether the idea is viable enough to deserve further investment of time and money. It is, in essence, an honest go / no-go / modify decision supported by evidence. Its purposes are fourfold: to test the idea against reality while changing it is still cheap; to identify the specific risks and conditions on which success depends; to give lenders, donors and partners credible evidence; and to prevent the emotional momentum of an idea ("everyone praised it") from substituting for proof. A feasibility study is not a business plan: the plan describes in detail how a venture that has passed the feasibility test will be run and financed, whereas the study asks whether it should be run at all, and in what form. Nor is feasibility a guarantee — it reduces uncertainty; it cannot abolish it, which is why conclusions are usually expressed as conditions ("feasible if enrolment reaches ninety children and the fee is not resisted") rather than as certainties.

The process normally runs in stages: a quick screening of the idea against obvious fatal flaws; data collection (small surveys, visits, quotations for costs, checking rules); analysis under each type described below; and a written conclusion with recommendations — proceed, proceed with modifications, postpone, or abandon. For a social enterprise, feasibility has an extra, defining feature: it must test the social mission as rigorously as the money. A centre that is financially strong because it quietly excludes the poorest children is commercially feasible and socially infeasible for a mission-driven founder, and the study should say so.

Type 1: Market Feasibility

Market feasibility asks whether enough customers or beneficiaries exist, who exactly they are, what they need, what they can and will pay, and who else is serving them. It studies the size of the target market, its growth, the purchasing power and habits of customers, and the strength of competitors and substitutes. Evidence comes from observation, interviews, small surveys, government statistics and visits to competitors. Example: before opening a day-care and preschool in a small town, a founder counts households with children aged 2–5 in the catchment area (say 420 children), finds one government ECE classroom (overcrowded, half-day) and one expensive private kindergarten serving about 60 children, and surveys 60 mothers, of whom 38 say they need full-day care because of work and 30 say they could pay around Rs 3,000 per month. The market conclusion might be: a real gap exists for affordable full-day care for roughly 100–150 children; the venture is market-feasible at a modest scale but not at the 300-child scale first imagined. Market feasibility protects against the most common

founder's error — confusing a genuine social need with effective demand at a price that covers costs.

Types 2 and 3: Product/Service and Organisational Feasibility

Product or service feasibility asks whether the specific offer works: does it actually solve the problem, is it of acceptable quality, can it be delivered consistently, and do target users want this form of it? Testing is practical — a pilot class, a sample product, a demonstration. In the ECE example, a two-week free pilot in a borrowed room, attended by 22 children with 80% returning daily and positive parent feedback on the play-based activities, is service-feasibility evidence; equally, if parents in the pilot demand rote teaching of reading and writing and reject play-based learning, the service must be re-designed (parent education added, visible early-literacy elements included) before launch. For a manufactured product — say, low-cost learning toys from waste material — this type includes testing safety, durability and cost of production against the price parents will pay.

Organisational (management) feasibility asks whether the people exist to run the venture: the founder's competence and commitment, the availability of staff with the right skills at salaries the venture can pay, and the governance and legal structure proposed. In the ECE example the critical question is whether two trained female ECE teachers can be recruited locally at the budgeted salary; if the nearest trained teachers are in the city and will not relocate, the plan is not organisationally feasible until a training arrangement for local women is added — which changes cost and timetable, exactly the kind of discovery a feasibility study exists to make. This type also covers partners and support systems: a centre supported by a parent committee, a

nearby public school and a health facility is organisationally stronger than an identical centre standing alone.

Type 4: Financial Feasibility (with a Worked Example)

Financial feasibility asks whether the venture can start, survive and sustain itself on the money realistically available. It has three parts: the total start-up requirement (premises deposit and furnishing, equipment and materials, licences, initial salaries and working capital until income stabilises, plus a contingency); the sources of that money (own savings, family, loans, grants, community contributions) and their cost and conditions; and the operating forecast — monthly income and expenditure, cash flow (which differs from profit because of timing), and the break-even point at which income covers costs. A venture can be profitable on paper and still die of cash-flow gaps, so the monthly cash forecast matters as much as the annual total.

Worked example — community ECE centre. Suppose monthly fixed costs (rent, salaries of two teachers and a helper, utilities) are Rs 180,000, the fee is Rs 3,000 per child per month, and variable cost per child (food, materials, consumables) is Rs 1,000. Each child therefore contributes Rs 3,000 − Rs 1,000 = Rs 2,000 towards fixed costs. Break-even enrolment = Fixed costs ÷ Contribution per child = Rs 180,000 ÷ Rs 2,000 = 90 children. Cross-check: at 90 children, income = 90 × Rs 3,000 = Rs 270,000; total costs = Rs 180,000 + (90 × Rs 1,000) = Rs 270,000. The accounts balance exactly, confirming the calculation. The analysis then continues: the market study promised 100–150 potential children, so break-even at 90 is demanding but plausible; if 15 of the 90 places are to be free for the poorest families (the social mission), paying enrolment must reach 90 while total enrolment reaches 105, or a sponsor must cover

the free places (15 × Rs 2,000 contribution = Rs 30,000 per month) — a precise, negotiable figure that only feasibility analysis can supply. Sensitivity testing completes the type: what happens if fees must fall to Rs 2,500 (break-even rises to 120) or rent rises by Rs 20,000 (break-even rises to 100)? The founder now knows exactly which assumptions the venture's life depends on.

Types 5, 6 and 7: Technical, Legal and Social-Impact Feasibility

Technical or operational feasibility asks whether the venture can physically and logistically be run: premises of the right size, safety and location; equipment and supplies and their maintenance; transport; water, sanitation and power; and the daily operating systems (admissions, attendance records, safeguarding). For the ECE centre this means checking that the building can be made child-safe, that clean water and toilets exist, and that learning materials can be sourced or made continuously — not merely bought once. Legal and regulatory feasibility asks whether the venture may lawfully operate and what compliance requires: registration of the organisation (society, trust, non-profit company or firm), any education or childcare licensing and standards of the province, building and health rules, tax status, employment rules for staff, and child-protection requirements. A home-based centre that is excellent in every other respect but cannot be registered, or that violates a housing rule, is not feasible until the legal form or premises change.

Social-impact feasibility, the distinctive type for our subject, asks whether the venture will in fact produce the intended social change, for the intended group, without unacceptable harm: Is the theory of change sound (does preschool attendance in this form actually improve school

readiness)? Will the target group really be reached, or will the better-off capture the service? What negative effects are possible (undercutting a public classroom, excluding children with disabilities by design oversight)? It also tests community acceptability — the consent and support of parents, elders and local authorities — which for social ventures is as decisive as any market statistic. Evidence comes from baseline data, comparison with evaluated models elsewhere, and structured consultation.

Table 1: Types of feasibility analysis

Type	Central question	Typical evidence
Market	Is there enough demand at a workable price?	Household counts, surveys, competitor visits
Product / service	Does the offer work and is it wanted in this form?	Pilot, samples, user feedback
Organisational	Can the right people and structure run it?	Staff availability, founder skills, partners
Financial	Do start-up and running sums add up?	Budgets, cash-flow forecast, break-even
Technical / operational	Can it be physically run day to day?	Premises, equipment, supplies, systems
Legal / regulatory	May it lawfully operate, and on what conditions?	Registration, licences, standards, tax
Social impact	Will it truly benefit the target	Baseline data, evaluated

USMAN NOTES www.usmannotes.com

	group without harm?	models, consultation

Conclusion

To conclude, feasibility analysis is the evidence-based examination of a business idea before commitment, ending in a reasoned decision to proceed, modify, postpone or abandon. Its types are complementary lenses: market feasibility tests demand, product feasibility tests the offer, organisational feasibility tests the people, financial feasibility tests the money — down to a verifiable break-even point — technical feasibility tests daily operability, legal feasibility tests permissibility, and social-impact feasibility, essential for social enterprises, tests whether the mission itself will be achieved for the intended beneficiaries. An idea that survives all seven tests has not been guaranteed success, but its founder knows where the cliffs are before driving towards them; an idea that fails a test has not necessarily died, because most failures point to the modification — a different scale, price, staffing model or legal form — that makes it feasible. That is the true value of the exercise: it converts enthusiasm into knowledge while knowledge is still cheap.

Question 3: Reasons for the Failure of Strategic Business Planning and Their Solutions (20 Marks)

What are the major reasons for the failure of strategic business planning? Explain. Suggest a solution for solving these problems with the help of examples.

Introduction

Almost every organisation of any size produces a strategic plan: a document setting out its mission, its reading of the environment, its goals for three to five years and the broad strategies for reaching them. Yet experienced managers observe that a large share of strategic plans fail — they are never implemented, are quietly abandoned within a year, or are implemented and still do not produce the intended results. The failure is rarely caused by bad handwriting in the plan document; it is caused by recurring weaknesses in how planning is done, who is involved, how realistic its assumptions are, and how weakly it is connected to budgets, people and review. This answer explains the major reasons for the failure of strategic business planning and, for each group of reasons, suggests practical solutions, illustrated with examples from business and from social and educational enterprises.

Reason 1: Unclear Mission, Objectives and Direction

Planning fails at the first step when the organisation does not know, or cannot agree, what it exists to do. Missions are written so vaguely ("to serve the community excellently") that they exclude nothing and therefore guide nothing; objectives are slogans rather than measurable targets ("improve quality") with no baseline, quantity or date; and different leaders carry different private versions of the strategy, so departments pull against each other. In such a vacuum the plan cannot arbitrate the real questions — which services to grow, which to stop, which customers matter most — and every decision is re-argued from the beginning. A small example: an ECE organisation whose plan says only "expand early education" finds its district teams opening centres wherever rooms are offered, including areas already served, while

unserved union councils nearby remain untouched, because the plan never defined the target population or the expansion criteria. Solution: invest the planning effort first in a short, honest mission and a small number of SMART objectives (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) that leadership publicly commits to — for instance, "by December 2028, operate quality ECE in 12 currently unserved union councils, enrolling 1,500 children, at least 50% girls, with a trained teacher in every classroom". A mission that can be disagreed with is finally a mission that can direct.

Reasons 2 and 3: Weak Analysis and Unrealistic Assumptions

A second family of failures is analytical. Plans are built on habit and hope rather than evidence: no genuine SWOT or PESTLE analysis, no data on customers or competitors, no consultation with the people who will use the service. Optimism bias inflates enrolment and revenue forecasts while costs are understated; planners assume grants will renew, staff will stay, and prices will hold, because the plan "needs" them to. Competitors and substitutes are ignored until they arrive. The classic commercial illustration is Kodak, which dominated film photography, possessed early digital technology, yet planned as if film demand would persist, because its assumptions and incentives were built around film profits; the plan was internally neat and externally blind. Nokia's failure to respond to the smartphone platform shift shows the same pattern at the level of industry analysis. In the social sector the equivalent is an NGO that plans expansion on a single donor's verbal assurance, or a centre that budgets for 150 children in a catchment containing only 90 children of the relevant age.

Solution: make evidence a rule of the planning process. Require every major assumption to be written down with its source (survey, accounts, official statistics, a competitor visit) and its owner; build three scenarios — expected, optimistic and pessimistic — and test the plan's survival in the pessimistic one; include at least one session devoted to disconfirming evidence ("what would have to be true for this plan to fail, and how would we know early?"); and invite an outsider — a peer organisation, a university teacher, a beneficiary representative — to challenge the draft. The ECE organisation above, for example, should verify child population from union council records and test parents' willingness to pay by a small survey before any expansion target is fixed, and should treat a donor's assurance as a scenario, not as income.

Reasons 4 and 5: No Participation, and No Link to Implementation

Strategic plans are frequently written by a small group at the top — or worse, by an outside consultant — and then announced to the people expected to deliver them. Staff who were not consulted do not understand the plan, do not believe in it, and sometimes quietly resist it, especially when it changes their work; middle managers, the layer that actually converts strategy into rosters, purchases and supervision, are the most commonly excluded and the most commonly blamed. Closely connected is the implementation gap: the plan states goals but assigns no owners, no deadlines, no budget lines and no indicators, so when the financial year begins, money and time continue to flow to the old activities. "The plan is a document, the budget is the real strategy" is a bitter saying in both business and NGOs because it is so often true. A plan that is not translated into annual work-plans, departmental targets and individual

responsibilities will lose every contest with daily routine, because routine is scheduled and the plan is not.

Solution: build the plan participatively and wire it into management. Representatives of teachers, field staff, finance and beneficiaries should contribute evidence and options from the start, even if the final decisions rest with leadership; participation is slower in the meeting and faster in the field, because implementers who helped design a change defend it. Then convert each strategic objective into an implementation matrix: actions, responsible person, partner, start and completion dates, budget, and a measurable indicator with its data source. Review that matrix monthly at management level and quarterly at governing level, with variances explained and corrections recorded. For example, the objective "trained teacher in every classroom" becomes: recruit and train 12 local women (owner: programme manager; by March; budget line 4; indicator: training completion and classroom observation scores) — an item that can be checked, funded and corrected, unlike the slogan it replaces.

Table 1: Planning failures and their solutions

Reason for failure	What it looks like	Solution
Unclear mission & objectives	Slogans; teams pulling apart	Short mission; few SMART objectives, publicly owned
Weak environmental analysis	No data on market, competitors, policy	Evidence rule; SWOT/PESTLE; outsider challenge
Unrealistic assumptions	Inflated income, understated costs	Written assumptions; three scenarios; sensitivity tests

No participation	Top-down plan; staff resistance	Involve implementers and beneficiaries from the start
Implementation gap	No owners, budgets or indicators	Implementation matrix; monthly/quarterly review
Poor communication	Staff cannot state the priorities	Launch, summaries in local language, repeat at reviews
Rigidity	Plan followed after conditions change	Annual refresh; trigger points for revision
Weak leadership & culture	Plan owned by one person; fear of reporting problems	Leadership team ownership; safe reporting; celebrate learning

USMAN NOTES www.usmannotes.com

Reasons 6, 7 and 8: Poor Communication, Rigidity and Leadership/Culture Problems

Even a good plan fails if it is not communicated: the document rests in a drawer or an inbox, staff cannot name the top three priorities, and partners and beneficiaries hear nothing, so they cannot align their own efforts. Plans also fail by rigidity: strategy is treated as a fixed contract although the environment — prices, policy, a flood, a new competitor, a funding cut — changes within the year; teams keep executing activities whose justification has vanished, because "the plan says so". Underlying both is leadership and culture: a founder who punishes bad news receives only good news until collapse; an organisation that rewards activity counts (meetings

held, centres opened) rather than outcomes will plan for activity; and where planning is seen as a donor requirement rather than a management tool, it is performed for the file. There is also simple overload: plans with twenty priorities have none, and initiatives compete until all are under-resourced.

Solutions follow directly. Communicate the plan as a story in the language of the staff: one-page summaries, discussion in routine meetings, the three priorities repeated until they are boring; alignment is achieved by repetition, not by circulation. Build in revision: a formal annual refresh, plus agreed trigger points (for example, funding falls 20%, or a policy changes, or enrolment misses target for two consecutive terms) at which the plan must be re-opened without blame. Develop a learning culture in which progress reports distinguish honestly between delivery problems (we did not do what we said) and strategy problems (we did it and it did not work) — the second is not a disgrace but the most valuable information a plan can produce. Finally, limit the number of strategic priorities to what resources can genuinely fund, and give the plan a named owner in the leadership team whose own appraisal depends on the review cycle happening. Kodak and Nokia remind us that intelligence is not the scarce resource; the scarce resources are honest information flowing upward, and the willingness to act on it in time.

Conclusion

In conclusion, strategic business plans fail mainly for human and managerial reasons rather than technical ones: unclear direction, analysis replaced by hope, unrealistic assumptions, exclusion of the implementers, no bridge from strategy to budgets and responsibilities, weak

communication, rigidity in a changing environment, and leadership cultures that suppress bad news. The solutions are correspondingly practical: a clear mission with few measurable objectives; evidence-based analysis with scenarios and outside challenge; participative planning; an implementation matrix with owners, money, dates and indicators; disciplined review; deliberate communication; and scheduled revision. A strategic plan should be treated not as a prediction or a ceremonial document, but as a living management system — a set of hypotheses about the future, resourced, monitored and corrected. Organisations, including social enterprises, that use planning in this way still face uncertainty, but they meet it awake.

Question 4: The Franchise Model for Social Enterprises (20 Marks)

Write a comprehensive note on the franchise model for social enterprises and give its examples.

Introduction

A good social enterprise faces a happy problem: its model works in one place and is needed in fifty places. Growing by opening every new unit itself is slow, capital-hungry and managerially heavy. Franchising offers a different route to scale: a proven model is packaged — brand, methods, training, standards and support — and licensed to independent local operators who invest their own money and effort, follow the system, and pay for the package through fees or margins. Adapted to the social sector as social franchising, the model has carried health services, eyeglasses, clean water, agricultural support and education across countries at a speed that direct expansion rarely matches. This note explains the franchise model, its working mechanism, its types, its advantages and limitations for social enterprises, and gives examples, ending with its relevance to early childhood education (ECE).

Meaning and Working of the Franchise Model

A franchise is a continuing commercial relationship in which the franchisor grants the franchisee the right to operate a business under the franchisor's brand and system, in a defined territory, for a defined period, in exchange for an initial fee and continuing payments (royalties, service fees or product margins), while the franchisor provides training, operating manuals, supply chains, marketing and quality control, and the franchisee provides capital, premises, staff and local management. In a social franchise, the same machinery is pointed at a social outcome: the franchisor is often a non-profit or social business; fees are set low, subsidised or replaced by product margins; and quality standards are not merely commercial but clinical, educational or ethical — because the "product" is a health treatment, a child's learning or safe water, and failure harms vulnerable people, not just brand value.

The model works through a disciplined exchange. The franchisor must first have a genuinely proven unit: a prototype whose results and unit economics are known, not hoped. The model is then codified — site criteria, layout, equipment lists, standard operating procedures, training curricula, record formats, pricing rules — into a package a competent local operator can reproduce. Franchisees are selected (local roots, integrity and some capital matter more than wealth), trained, launched with support, supplied through controlled channels (which also carry the franchisor's margin), and monitored through reporting, visits and outcome data, with renewal or termination depending on compliance. The economics must work at both levels: the unit must earn enough for the franchisee to live and repay investment, and the network must generate enough in fees and margins to fund the franchisor's training and quality system.

Where either level fails, the network stalls — a law that applies to burger chains and to clinic chains alike.

Types of Franchising Relevant to Social Enterprises

- **Product-distribution franchising.** The franchisee sells the franchisor's products under its brand (the soft-drink bottler model). In social enterprise, rural sales networks for solar lamps, water filters or fortified foods follow this pattern, with the social value lying in last-mile distribution.
- **Business-format franchising.** The whole business system is licensed — brand, format, procedures, training — as in fast-food chains. Most social franchises in health and education are business-format: a clinic or preschool that looks, operates and reports in the standard way wherever it opens.
- **Micro-franchising.** Very small, low-capital units designed for poor operators themselves: a kiosk, a sales agent's kit, a community health promoter's bag, a home-based childcare place run to a standard package. Micro-franchising creates livelihoods for the franchisees as part of the impact, not only services for customers.
- **Non-profit / subsidised social franchising.** The franchisor deliberately keeps fees below cost and covers its support system from grants, because the service (for example, family planning or tuberculosis treatment) has public benefits that users cannot fully pay for; the franchise disciplines quality and reporting while subsidy disciplines price.

USMAN NOTES www.usmannotes.com

- **Conversion franchising.** Existing independent providers are brought into the network and upgraded to its standards, rather than new units being created — common in health, where private clinics join a branded network in return for training, supplies and patients.

Table 1: Franchise roles at a glance

Element	Franchisor provides	Franchisee provides
Brand & model	Proven prototype, manuals, standards	Local operation exactly to standard
Start-up	Site guidance, training, launch support	Capital, premises, staff, licences
Continuing	Supply chain, marketing, refresher training, quality audits, data system	Fees/margins, reports, quality compliance
Risk & reward	Network growth without owning units	Local profit/income; business risk of the unit

USMAN NOTES www.usmannotes.com

Advantages and Limitations for Social Enterprises

The advantages explain the model's popularity. Speed and capital: growth is financed largely by franchisees, so a network can multiply with modest central funds. Local ownership and knowledge: franchisees are rooted in their communities, speak the language, hold local trust and bear the risk, which usually outperforms posted managers. Consistency with flexibility: the package guarantees a floor of quality and a recognisable brand (itself a trust signal to poor

customers who cannot judge quality), while franchisees adapt hours, outreach and small details to local conditions. Data and learning: standard reporting across many units lets the franchisor see what works, compare units and improve the model centrally, so every unit benefits from the network's experience. Livelihoods: micro-franchising turns beneficiaries into operators, aligning dignity and income with impact.

The limitations are equally real, and a comprehensive note must state them. Quality control at distance is expensive and imperfect; one negligent clinic or centre can destroy the brand and harm users, so monitoring systems must be funded before expansion, not after. The franchisee's incentive is profit at unit level, which can conflict with serving the poorest: operators may drift towards richer customers, skip unprofitable standards or resist reporting — mission drift inside the network. Codifying the model takes time and honesty; franchising an unproven or tacit model ("it works because our founder is gifted") multiplies failure. Franchisees need a minimum of capital and literacy, which can exclude the very communities most in need unless micro-franchise finance is arranged. Finally, legal and contractual capacity — agreements, trademark protection, dispute handling, safeguarding standards — is demanding for small NGOs. The model is therefore best suited to services that are standardisable, frequently used, quality-sensitive and economically viable at unit level; highly relational or context-specific work (for example, community organising) franchises badly.

Examples of Social Franchising

Health provides the most developed examples. Marie Stopes International and its partners have franchised family-planning and reproductive-health clinics in many countries, training and

branding independent providers and monitoring clinical quality; Janani in India similarly built a large network for family planning services in Bihar and Jharkhand. In Kenya, the HealthStore Foundation's CFWshops franchised small drug shops and clinics owned by nurses and community health workers, standardising drug quality and prices in rural areas where counterfeit medicine was common. Unjani Clinics in South Africa franchise nurse-owned primary-care clinics in standardised container facilities, aimed at employed but uninsured patients. VisionSpring uses micro-entrepreneurs and partner channels to sell very low-cost reading glasses through trained local sellers, applying distribution franchising to a disability that quietly destroys livelihoods. Living Goods (Uganda and Kenya) equips community health promoters as micro-franchise agents who sell health products door-to-door and deliver basic care, supported by mobile technology and performance data — a model studied worldwide for combining income and impact.

Beyond health, KickStart's distribution of human-powered irrigation pumps through dealer networks in East Africa applied franchise-like standardisation to agricultural tools; Honey Care Africa organised beekeeping and honey marketing with smallholders in a franchise-inspired structure; and in education, low-cost private school chains and networks (such as Bridge International Academies' standardised school model, and various franchised tutoring and early-learning networks in South Asia and Africa) show both the reach of format standardisation in schooling and the controversies it attracts — critics question scripted teaching and fee levels, while supporters cite consistency and data in places where state provision is failing. The controversy itself is instructive: in social franchising, standards are not neutral; they must be educationally and ethically defensible, not merely uniform.

Relevance to ECE and Conclusion

For early childhood education the model is promising in a specific form: a district-level support organisation acts as franchisor of a standardised community ECE package — a safe room layout, a play-based daily routine, low-cost local-material kits, a trained local woman as teacher, parent-engagement practices and simple child-progress records — while parent committees or women entrepreneurs operate the centres as franchisees or micro-franchisees. The franchisor's income might be a small per-child support fee blended with public or donor subsidy, in return for training, materials and quality visits. The safeguards must match the risks noted above: child protection standards are non-negotiable, free places for the poorest must be financed explicitly rather than left to each operator's charity, and quality monitoring must observe real classroom practice, not only registers.

To conclude, the franchise model lets a social enterprise scale by replication rather than by enlargement: a proven, codified model is operated by many local owners under common brand, standards and support, financed substantially by their investment and sustained by fees and margins at both levels. Its types — product distribution, business format, micro-franchising, subsidised non-profit franchising and conversion — fit different services and populations. Its strengths are speed, local ownership, consistent quality and network learning; its weaknesses are control at distance, mission drift and the cost of codification and monitoring. The examples from health, livelihoods and education show that, used where services are standardisable and unit economics are honest, social franchising is one of the most powerful scaling tools available to the social entrepreneur.

Question 5: Social Impact Assessment (SIA) — Definition and Procedure (20 Marks)

Define Social Impact Assessment (SIA). Explain the procedure of social impact analysis with the help of an example.

Introduction

Development projects and social enterprises change lives in ways that go far beyond their budgets: a new centre creates jobs and hope, but may also raise rents, shift workloads onto women, exclude a minority hamlet, or weaken an existing public service. Decision-makers who count only money and outputs discover these effects late, when they appear as conflict, dropout or reputational damage. Social Impact Assessment (SIA) exists to foresee, analyse and manage such consequences deliberately. This answer defines SIA and its guiding principles, distinguishes it from related assessments, and then explains the step-by-step procedure of social impact analysis, illustrated throughout by a worked example: the establishment of a community early childhood education (ECE) and women's skills centre in a rural union council.

Definition, Scope and Principles of SIA

Social Impact Assessment is the process of identifying, predicting, evaluating and managing the intended and unintended social consequences — positive and negative — of a planned intervention (a project, programme, policy or enterprise) on people: their way of life, culture, community, health and well-being, personal and property rights, livelihoods, and their fears and aspirations. The International Association for Impact Assessment (Vanclay and colleagues)

frames SIA more broadly still: it includes analysing, monitoring and managing the social consequences of development, with the aim of bringing about a more sustainable and equitable environment, and with affected people participating throughout. Three points in the definition deserve emphasis. First, SIA covers unintended effects and effects on third parties, not only the benefits promised to target beneficiaries. Second, it is concerned with distribution: an intervention can raise average welfare while harming a specific group, and SIA exists to make that visible. Third, it is a management process, not a one-time report: assessment continues into implementation through monitoring and adjustment.

SIA is related to, but distinct from, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which concentrates on the physical and biological environment; from monitoring and evaluation, which track an intervention's own indicators; and from social impact measurement of the kind used by social enterprises (for example, counting outcomes or estimating social return), which usually looks backwards at achieved impact, whereas SIA classically looks forward, before and during a decision. In practice the tools overlap and are often combined. Its guiding principles are: involve affected people genuinely and early; give special attention to vulnerable groups (women, children, the poorest, minorities, persons with disabilities); use local knowledge alongside technical data; be transparent about uncertainties; consider alternatives, including the option of not proceeding; and ensure that those who bear negative effects are compensated or the design is changed — assessment without influence on decisions is merely documentation.

Procedure of Social Impact Analysis

Although formats vary, the procedure of social impact analysis follows a recognised sequence of steps, summarised in Figure 1 and explained below. The steps are iterative: findings at any stage can send the analyst back to redesign the proposal.



Figure 1: The main steps in the procedure of social impact analysis.

- **Step 1 — Screening.** Decide whether a full SIA is needed, and at what depth. Screening considers the scale of the intervention, the sensitivity of the community, the presence of vulnerable groups and legal or donor requirements. Small, familiar, reversible interventions need a light assessment; large, novel or contested ones need a full study.
- **Step 2 — Scoping.** Identify the issues, groups and geographic and time boundaries that the assessment will cover, and the alternatives to be compared. Scoping is done with stakeholders, so that concerns the analysts did not anticipate — a disputed site, a seasonal

migration pattern, a religious sensitivity — enter the study early, when they are cheap to accommodate.

- **Step 3 — Baseline profiling.** Describe the community as it is before the intervention: population and its composition, livelihoods, incomes, education and health status, social organisation and leadership, gender relations, cultural and religious life, existing services, and current trends and problems. Baseline data (from records, surveys, interviews and observation) provide the "without-project" picture against which change will be judged, and often reveal that the community is already changing on its own.
- **Step 4 — Prediction and assessment of impacts.** For each affected group, predict the likely changes caused by the intervention — direct and indirect, short- and long-term, positive and negative — and judge their significance by magnitude, extent, duration, reversibility and the vulnerability of those affected. Methods include comparison with similar past projects, expert judgement, community consultation on expected effects, and simple modelling (for example, projecting enrolment and its effect on the public school). Cumulative effects with other ongoing changes are also considered.
- **Step 5 — Mitigation and enhancement.** Design measures to avoid, reduce or compensate negative impacts, and to strengthen positive ones. The preferred order is: avoid by redesign, then minimise, then restore, then compensate. Mitigation is costed and assigned, so it becomes part of the project rather than a wish list.
- **Step 6 — Social Impact Management Plan, monitoring and reporting.** Bring the commitments together in a management plan: who does what, by when, with what budget, monitored by which indicators, with a grievance mechanism through which affected people

can complain and obtain response. Monitoring compares actual effects with predictions; significant deviation triggers corrective action, and results are reported back to the community and decision-makers, closing the loop.

Worked Example: A Community ECE and Women's Skills Centre

Suppose a social enterprise proposes a centre in a village of 300 households: a preschool for 60 children aged 3–5, an afternoon tailoring course for 25 women, employing four local women, in a rented building near the main bazaar. Screening shows moderate scale but high sensitivity — children and women are the participants, land and traffic are involved — so a focused SIA is undertaken. Scoping with the community identifies the affected groups: children and parents; women trainees; the four employees and other women who applied and were not selected; the public primary school; shopkeepers near the site; residents on the lane (noise, traffic); and a minority hamlet at the village edge, whose inclusion the community itself raises as a question.

Baseline profiling establishes that 95 children aged 3–5 live in the village, of whom 18 attend a distant private kindergarten; most women are home-based, with average schooling of five years; the public school's Grade 1 has high repetition; water and sanitation at the proposed site are adequate, but the lane is unpaved and floods in the rains. Prediction then assesses the main impacts. Positive: school readiness and reduced Grade-1 repetition for up to 60 children; income skills and earnings for 25 women per course, with likely gains in their confidence and household standing; four local jobs; increased footfall benefiting nearby shops. Negative or risky: exclusion of the poorest if fees are charged, and of the minority hamlet if enrolment is by influence; safety risks to small children from bazaar traffic; increased time burden on mothers if

sessions clash with household work; disappointment and friction among women not selected for jobs or seats; a possible fall in the distant kindergarten's enrolment, affecting its owner; and noise for immediate neighbours.

Table 1: Impacts, mitigation and indicators in the example

Predicted impact	Mitigation / enhancement measure	Monitoring indicator
Poorest children excluded by fees	20% free seats by transparent criteria; sponsor fund	Share of enrolled children from poorest households
Minority hamlet overlooked	Reserved outreach and seats; hamlet representative on committee	Enrolment from the hamlet vs its share of children
Traffic risk to children	Staggered timings; escort rota; speed bumps requested from council	Safety incidents; parent reports
Women's time burden	Session timings fixed with trainees; childcare corner during class	Attendance and dropout reasons
Selection disputes (jobs/seats)	Published criteria; community committee; grievance channel	Complaints received and resolved
Positive: school readiness	Baseline and endline observation of children; share	Readiness improvement; Grade-1 repetition rate

USMAN NOTES www.usmannotes.com

	results with public school	

Following Steps 5 and 6, the management plan assigns each measure an owner (centre manager, committee chair), a budget line and the indicators in Table 1, reviewed quarterly with a community meeting. Note what the SIA has achieved: the project that finally launches is materially different from the first sketch — it has free seats, an inclusion rule, safer timings, an escort system and a grievance channel — and its risks are known, priced and monitored rather than discovered by scandal. Note also the honesty of the exercise: one negative impact (the rival kindergarten's loss) cannot be fully mitigated; it is recorded, the owner is consulted and offered a teacher-training place and referral arrangement, and decision-makers accept the residual effect consciously because the overall and distributional benefits justify it. That record of a reasoned trade-off is itself a product of SIA.

Challenges in Conducting SIA

A balanced account must note the difficulties. Predictions about social change are uncertain, and assessors must state confidence levels rather than perform false precision. Participation can be captured by local elites, so the assessor must deliberately hear women, the poor and minorities separately, in settings where they can speak. Baselines in poor communities rest on thin official data and require primary collection, which costs time and money that small projects begrudge — yet the cost of one serious unanticipated harm usually exceeds the cost of assessing it. Finally, SIA fails when it is commissioned as a formality after decisions are already

taken; its value depends on timing (before commitment) and on a genuine willingness to redesign or, occasionally, to stop.

Conclusion

To conclude, Social Impact Assessment is the systematic process of identifying, predicting, evaluating and managing the social consequences — intended and unintended, positive and negative, and their distribution among groups — of a planned intervention, with the participation of affected people. Its procedure moves through screening, scoping, baseline profiling, impact prediction and significance assessment, mitigation and enhancement, and a monitored management plan with grievance and reporting arrangements. The worked example of a community ECE and women's skills centre shows the procedure doing real work: changing the design (free and reserved seats, safety and timing measures, transparent selection), pricing the mitigation, and setting indicators by which the community itself can judge whether promises were kept. For the social entrepreneur, SIA is not bureaucratic decoration; it is the professional form of a moral commitment — to know, as far as knowledge allows, what one's good intentions will actually do to people's lives.

USMAN NOTES www.usmannotes.com