FULCRUM NONPROFIT LEADERSHIP WHITE PAPER

Permission to Fail

PREPARED BY

Chris Looney
Founder and CEO
Fulcrum Nonprofit Leadership

chris@fulcrumleader.com

FULCRUM
NONPROFIT LEADERSHIP

Permission to Fail:

Creating Organizations Where People Have the Courage to Learn

A White Paper for Fulcrum Nonprofit Leadership

Nonprofit leaders regularly ask their organizations to innovate.

Find new donors. Develop new programs. Reach new communities. Improve systems. Use emerging technology. Create new partnerships. Generate more revenue. Solve problems differently.

And then, sometimes without realizing it, those same leaders create environments where people are afraid to get anything wrong.

That is an impossible contradiction.

Innovation requires experimentation. Experimentation involves uncertainty. And uncertainty means that sometimes an idea will not work.

If every initiative must succeed, people eventually stop trying things whose outcomes they cannot predict. They choose the proven approach. They offer the safe idea. They wait for someone else to take the risk.

The organization may still talk about innovation, but the culture has learned something different:

Do not get it wrong.

This is why permission to fail is an important leadership discipline.

It does not mean accepting mediocrity, abandoning accountability, or tolerating poor performance. It means creating an organization where people can take thoughtful risks, test reasonable ideas, acknowledge when something did not work, learn from the experience, and try again.

Most importantly, permission to fail does not exist because a leader says it does.

It exists when the people inside the organization believe it does.

The Innovation Paradox

Nonprofits operate in a world of shifting donor behavior, technological disruption, workforce challenges, changing community needs, and growing competition for attention and resources.

Doing exactly what worked yesterday is increasingly unlikely to be enough tomorrow.

Yet many organizations unintentionally create an innovation paradox:

They ask people to create something new while expecting them to guarantee the outcome.

Those expectations cannot comfortably coexist.

If the outcome were certain, it would not be experimentation. It would simply be execution.

A new fundraising strategy might work. A new program model might work. A new technology might dramatically improve productivity. A different approach to engaging volunteers might produce extraordinary results.

Or it might not.

If leaders want innovation, they must accept some degree of intelligent failure. Otherwise, people quickly learn that the organization's real priority is not innovation.

It is certainty.

The Cost of Playing It Safe

Failure has visible costs. Excessive caution often does not.

There is no financial statement showing the revenue that was never generated because an idea was never attempted. There is no dashboard measuring the employees who stopped sharing ideas because previous suggestions were dismissed. There is no report identifying the partnerships that never developed because nobody wanted to take the first risk.

Yet these costs are real.

Sometimes the safest decision in the short term becomes the riskiest decision in the long term.

Future ready organizations must therefore manage two kinds of risk:

the risk of trying something new and the risk of never trying it at all.

Intelligent Failure Is Different from Poor Performance

Permission to fail cannot become an excuse for lowered standards.

A healthy organization distinguishes between intelligent failure and preventable failure.

An intelligent failure occurs when someone pursues a reasonable idea, prepares appropriately, exercises sound judgment, works within agreed boundaries, evaluates the outcome honestly, and learns from what happened.

A preventable failure results from negligence, poor preparation, inadequate effort, reckless decision-making, ignored procedures, or repeatedly making a mistake whose lesson should already have been learned.

The first can advance an organization.

The second requires accountability.

Permission to fail is not permission to be careless. In fact, organizations that embrace intelligent failure should become more disciplined about asking:

What are we trying to learn?

What assumptions are we testing?

How much are we willing to risk?

How will we measure the outcome?

What will we do with what we learn?

Failure without learning is simply failure.

Make Smaller Bets

Giving people permission to fail does not mean betting the organization.

One of the best ways leaders can encourage experimentation is through small bets.

Test the new fundraising approach with one donor segment. Pilot the program with one population. Introduce the technology in one department. Prototype the event before committing significant resources.

This changes the question from:

"Are we certain this will work?"

to:

"Is this worth testing?"

A small experiment that fails may actually be inexpensive intelligence.

A $5,000 pilot that exposes a flawed assumption could prevent a $100,000 mistake. A fundraising test that underperforms could reveal something valuable about donor preferences.

The discipline is to design experiments so that learning has value even when the desired outcome is not achieved.

Culture Is Revealed When Something Goes Wrong

Few moments communicate organizational culture more powerfully than failure.

Imagine an employee saying to a leader:

"I tried something. It didn't work."

The leader's first response matters.

"Who approved this?"

"How did you let this happen?"

"Why didn't you know this wouldn't work?"

Sometimes accountability requires difficult questions. But if those are the instinctive responses to every disappointing result, employees learn quickly.

Next time they may not experiment.

Even worse, they may not tell the leader when something is going wrong.

Consider a different opening question:

"What did we learn?"

From there, leaders can ask what was expected, what actually happened, which assumptions proved wrong, what should change, and whether the idea deserves another attempt.

Employees watch these moments carefully. They remember who was punished, who was trusted again, and whether a thoughtful experiment was treated differently from carelessness.

This is why permission to fail cannot simply be announced.

It must be demonstrated.

Leaders Have to Go First

Leaders can accelerate this culture by acknowledging their own failures.

"I thought this would work. I was wrong."

"I made that decision too quickly."

"If I could do it again, I would approach it differently."

These statements do not diminish credibility. Used appropriately, they strengthen it.

They establish an important cultural expectation:

We do not expect perfection from one another. We expect judgment, effort, honesty, accountability, and learning.

A leader who never appears to make mistakes can unintentionally create a workforce afraid to admit its own.

Boards and Donors Matter Too

Permission to fail extends beyond the staff.

Boards have a legitimate responsibility to protect assets, oversee risk, and ensure responsible stewardship. But oversight can unintentionally become an expectation of certainty.

There is a significant difference between asking:

"Why do we believe this is a responsible investment?"

and:

"How do we know this will succeed?"

Effective boards help organizations understand and manage risk rather than eliminate it. Stewardship is not synonymous with preservation. It also means preparing the organization for the future.

Donors can play a similar role.

Organizations do not need to present every new initiative as a guaranteed success. Instead, they can invite donors into the learning:

Here is the problem.

Here is what we believe might work.

Here is what we are testing.

Here is how we will measure it.

Here is what we hope to learn.

That turns philanthropy from funding certainty into funding discovery.

The Goal Is Learning

No organization should aspire to fail more often.

The goal is to become better at learning.

Future ready organizations execute what they know with discipline while exploring what they do not know with courage.

They capture what experiments teach. They share those lessons. They change course when evidence tells them to. They stop investing in ideas that do not work and expand those that do.

Failure is not the objective.

Discovery is. Learning is. Progress is. Mission impact is.

And this brings us back to the most important distinction.

A CEO can tell employees to innovate.

A board can encourage management to take risks.

A manager can tell a team that mistakes are okay.

But people determine what is truly permitted by watching what happens when someone actually fails.

They watch how leaders react. They notice whether the person is trusted again. They see whether the decision is evaluated based on the information available at the time or only by the eventual outcome. They learn whether admitting a mistake is safe.

That lived experience becomes the culture.

So leaders should ask themselves:

Would my best people bring me an unconventional idea?

Would they tell me quickly if it was not working?

Would they acknowledge a mistake before I discovered it?

Do they believe a thoughtful failure will be treated differently from carelessness?

The answers matter far more than anything written in an employee handbook or organizational values statement.

Because permission is not something leaders declare.

It is something people experience.

And ultimately:

The question is not whether your organization gives people permission to fail.

The question is whether your people believe they have it.

For more information about Fulcrum Nonprofit Leadership, please visit our website at www.fulcrumleader.com or reach out to us directly via email at hello@fulcrumleader.com.