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FSG works on collective impact in three mutually reinforcing ways

**HANDS ON SUPPORT**

- Age-friendly communities in MA
- Juvenile justice in Douglas County, NE
- Juvenile justice in NY State
- Childhood obesity in Dallas
- Substance abuse on Staten Island
- Cradle to career in King County
- Pre-term birth in Fresno
- Health in the Rio Grande Valley

**THOUGHT LEADERSHIP**

**LEARNING COMMUNITY**

www.collectiveimpactforum.org

The Collective Impact Forum is a field-wide digital resource designed to help curate and disseminate knowledge, tools, and best practices that support effective collective impact.
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Collective impact is the commitment of a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a complex social problem at scale.
Many social and environmental challenges are complex problems

• Influenced by multiple actors, who can’t see the full system, and no one has full responsibility

• The problems change over time and in different context, so solutions must adapt as well – they defy protocols

Complex problems can’t be solved using traditional approaches
Working together is easy – but working together for impact is tough and requires sustained dedication.
Collective impact only makes sense under certain circumstances

**APPROPRIATENESS**

- Addressing the issue will require leaders and organizations from **multiple sectors or systems**, including “strange bedfellows”

- Addressing the issue will require **different kinds of interventions or strategies** (e.g., data, policy, awareness, coordination, identifying new solutions, etc.) at the systems level and not just replication of programs and services

- The issue impacts a **significant* part of the population** and does so in varied geographies

* Defining “significant” is more art than science

**READINESS**

**Influential Champions**
- Champions are respected by and have ability to engage cross-sector leaders
- Government leadership is engaged

**Urgency for Change**
- Critical, complex problem in the community
- Frustration with existing approaches

**Availability of Resources**
- Committed, potential **funding partners** with sustained funding for 3 – 5 years for the collective impact infrastructure

**Basis for Collaboration**
- Trusted relationships among cross-sector actors
- Existing collaborative efforts
There are five conditions of collective impact:

1. Common agenda
2. Shared measurement system
3. Mutually reinforcing activities
4. Continuous communication
5. Backbone support
Hear from...  

In Kansas City, how did collective impact efforts look different from other partnerships or forms of collaboration?
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**Structures:** Collect impact involves diverse stakeholders playing different, complementary roles

- **Steering committee**
- **Community Member Council**

**Backbone support**
- Guides strategy
- Supports aligned activities
- Establishes shared measurement
- Builds public will
- Advances policy
- Mobilizes resources

*Adapted from *Listening to the Stars: The Constellation Model of Collaborative Social Change*, by Tonya Surman and Mark Surman, 2008.*
**Structures:** example of the various stakeholders involved in a juvenile justice collective impact effort

**Steering committee:**
20 leaders from
- County government
- Juvenile court
- Legal community
- Probation
- Detention
- Law enforcement
- Service providers
- Philanthropy
- School system

**Youth Council:**
15-20 former or current system involved youth

**Work group:**
7 Work Groups with a total of over 120 people
- Families
- Schools
- Prevention
- Case processing
- Equity
- Data
- Policy

**Community:**
Over 300 stakeholders engaged through
- Interviews
- Focus groups
- Community events
- Site visits
- Online forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backbone</th>
<th>Executive Director</th>
<th>Program Manager</th>
<th>Data Analyst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
How did you structure your work?
Case example: Kansas City Region’s Age-Friendly Communities Initiative

30 leaders from
- Local government
- Civic leaders
- Academia
- Health
- Service providers
- Community-based organizations
- Philanthropy

Six committees
(Composition: Advisory Board members and community stakeholders)
- Caregiving
- Civic Engagement
- Healthy Lifestyles
- Housing
- Regional Leadership and Public Awareness
- Transportation

Local jurisdictions
Currently 12 local jurisdictions officially participating.
- Champions (elected official or staff with responsibility to organize the city’s participation)
- Task forces
- Professional Network
- Joint meeting (peer group)

Backbone
Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)
Project Manager | Public Affairs | Data / Research
**Steering committee** members should be carefully recruited; the following traits are important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attract</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision maker</strong></td>
<td><em>X</em> Too much agreement / only the usual suspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-level / president able to drive relevant systems change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representative</strong></td>
<td><em>X</em> Too much disagreement / pre-programmed hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic coverage of effort as well as sectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influential champion</strong></td>
<td><em>X</em> People who are not able to “tune” (i.e. listen to others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commands respect of stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content expertise / practitioner</strong></td>
<td><em>X</em> People who can’t leave their egos at the door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar with subject matter to contribute substantively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passion and urgency</strong></td>
<td><em>X</em> People who polarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionate about issue and urgency for the need to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focused on the greater interest</strong></td>
<td><em>X</em> People who only come to the table because they think there will be funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to think and act in the greater interest of the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td><em>X</em> People who are too busy to put in the time and effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to commit time and energy to meetings and the work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lived experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brings experience with or affected by the issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steering committee lessons learned

**Relationships > Output:** In the long run, the relationships the Committee forms and the habits they build of working together are even more important than the initial strategies/indicators that they select.

**This Takes Time:** Past groups have spent anywhere from 5 – 18 months to agree on strategies and metrics, depending on internal dynamics and the extent to which the groups receive external support.

**Speed vs. Inclusion:** Both for the Steering Committee and Working Groups, multiple, large groups with many members can be tempting. However, most CI efforts find a need to balance broad participation with the ability to make nimble decisions and get stuff done.

**Facilitation Matters:** While some Steering Committees and Working Groups have evolved organically, these groups generally achieve their goals more quickly when outside staff support the Groups with facilitation and materials development.

**Groups Are Fluid:** Steering Committees typically evolve in their composition, and members may be added/subtracted over time; what’s important is their ability to adapt to new needs and refine their approaches as required.
**Working groups** have the following responsibilities

**Strategy and indicator development**

- Review research on effective strategies within local context (if applicable) and external best practices
- Use data to inform identification of strategies and ongoing refinement
- Develop and refine indicators

**Implementation**

- Coordinate activities among working group member organizations and other relevant partners
- Identify resources to support and/or execute strategies
- Provide progress updates to and learn from the steering committee, backbone, and other working groups

**Leadership**

- Champion the effort with relevant stakeholders
- Align member organizations’ work to the goals, indicators, and strategies of the working group where possible
Working group responsibilities are carried out by leadership and members

**Leadership**
- Two co-chairs
- Can commit the time (~3-4 hours/month plus meetings, but time will vary)
- Collaborative leaders and facilitators, conveners, able to “get stuff done”
- Also possess the traits below
  - Issue-aligned, collaborative, action-oriented
  - Can commit to attending meetings and reviewing pre-read materials
  - Are knowledgeable about the problem to be addressed
  - Usually one level down from the steering committee members, but have authority to represent organizations and make decisions
  - Cross-sector representation
  - 7-10 members initially (will vary by initiative)

**Members**
Working group formation is both art and science; here are some guiding considerations to help with this:

What specific working groups are required to meet the goal of the initiative?

- What does the **scope of the problem** reveal about the areas that need coordinated attention?
- What **types** of strategies are required, e.g., strategies that
  - increase coordination
  - enhance services
  - target advocacy and policy change
  - set up intentional learning through a pilot
- What **existing** coalitions and collaborations already exist that can be built upon?

How many is the right number, especially at the beginning?

- How many **strong leaders** exist that can lead these working groups?
- How many working groups can be the backbone **realistically** manage and get off the ground at once?
- Where is there **energy and momentum** in the community?

What do the working groups need to accomplish in the first six months?

- Using **data** to further understand the problem and developing an approach to continuous learning
- Identifying high-leverage **strategies** and **quick wins**
- Building **relationships** among members and maintaining a sense of excitement
- Transitioning from relying on the backbone to **relying on co-chairs** to lead and manage the activities (and meetings) of the working group

---

- **Don’t reinvent the wheel**
- **Less might be more at first**
- **Be ambitious but realistic**
## Structures: the backbone serves a neutral role “behind the scenes” in six ways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions of the backbone:</th>
<th>What the backbone is NOT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Guide <strong>vision and strategy</strong></td>
<td>✗ sets the agenda for the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Support <strong>aligned activities</strong></td>
<td>✗ drives the solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Establish <strong>shared measurement practices</strong></td>
<td>✗ receives all the funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Build <strong>public will</strong></td>
<td>✗ is self appointed rather than selected by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Advance <strong>policy</strong></td>
<td>✗ is “business as usual” in terms of staffing, time, and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Mobilize <strong>resources</strong></td>
<td>✗ do all of the work for the initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Backbones are not one fixed entity – structure, funding and even physical location can be split

- How many total FTE do we need in the backbone and which functions come first?
- Will the backbone (person) reside / be employed in a new or existing org?

- Who do they report to?
- Is the organization home also where the person sits or does it make sense to split fiscal agent from physical location?

- Are we looking for an organization (and just inherit staff) or are we looking for a person (and will find them a home)?
- Whether we post a job description or RFP, how open will the process be?

- Who will fund the backbone infrastructure (salaries, benefits, operating expenses) in the short-term (e.g., first 2-3 years)?
- What is the long-term funding plan?
Community engagement: community engagement is done using diverse tools to support different goals

Community engagement approaches. . .
- Stakeholder interviews
- Focus groups
- Town halls
- Human-centered design experiences
- Community café discussions

. . . Can support different goals
- Understand pressing systemic community challenges
- Co-create solutions
- Verify the direction
- Expand the reach of involvement
- Build community capacity to lead and sustain change
Hear from... 

KC Communities for all Ages

What lessons have you learned about forming, launching, and engaging these structures?
Discussion: establishing collective impact structures

What have been your experiences in thinking about or establishing structures to support collective impact efforts?
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Several elements make up a common agenda

**PRINCIPLES**
How are you going to work together?

**PROBLEM DEFINITION**
What is in and what is out?

**GOAL**
How will you define success?

**FRAMEWORK FOR CHANGE**
How are you going to split up the work and prioritize?

**PLAN FOR LEARNING**
How will you track progress and learn?

Icons by Blake Thompson and Jack & Steve Laing from the Noun Project
Common agenda: getting to “common” is hard!

A establishing a shared vision for change can be challenging due to:

- **Setting boundaries:** establishing boundaries for what issues, players, geographies and systems to engage in the project is essential to its successful execution, but it is hard to put an initial stake in the ground.

- **Siloed perspectives:** stakeholders are accustomed to tackling the day-to-day challenges of their organization’s work and are not as familiar with solving system-wide issues such as connections across players or gaps in service.

- **Distrust:** stakeholders may not be aware that they share similar motivations to others in the system, especially when they may compete for funding or hold conflicting philosophies; past failed attempts at collaboration further fuel distrust.

- **Misaligned incentives:** stakeholders are often not incentivized to collaborate with others to improve systems and share a vision for success; a common agenda requires stakeholders to go beyond the next “silver-bullet” program to longer term strategies for system change.
Discussion: getting to the common agenda

What have been your challenges in moving beyond collaboration around a topic to shared understanding of how to solve a problem? What might you do differently based on our discussion today?
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The Forum is a free online community for collective impact practitioners, partners and funders

www.collectiveimpactforum.org
Additional resources

Foundational research on Collective Impact

These articles are available at www.ssir.org

- Collective Impact (Winter, 2011) – Defines the five core conditions of Collective Impact and provides examples of successful initiatives in several sectors
- Channeling Change: Making Collective Impact Work (January, 2012) – Offers advice on implementing the principles of collective impact, using examples from the field
- Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact (July, 2012) – Draws on FSG’s work with six backbone organizations to explore their role in supporting collective impact

Recent research on the practice of Collective Impact

  A collection of thought pieces from 22 practitioners, funders, community organizers considering topics such as public policy, power, and community engagement

- Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact (May, 2014)
  www.collectiveimpactforum.org
  Offers advice on performance measurement and evaluation in the context of collective impact. Includes four mini-case studies as well as sample evaluation questions, outcomes, and indicators

- Collective Impact for Opportunity Youth (2012)
  www.fsg.org
  Provides a framework for using collective impact as an approach to improving outcomes for Opportunity Youth (youth between the ages of 16-24 who are neither enrolled in school nor participating in the labor market)