# Collective Impact
## FSG/The Collective Impact Forum

**Collective impact** is an approach which brings together different sectors for a common agenda to solve large complex problems. Collective impact is built upon five interconnected components that can produce strong alignment and lead to large scale results. The five components, as spelled out in the paper above, are:

* **Common agenda** – All participants share a vision for change that includes a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving the problem through agreed-upon actions;

* **Shared measurement** – All participating organizations agree on the ways success will be measured and reported, with a short list of common indicators identified and used for learning and improvement;

* **Mutually reinforcing activities** – A diverse set of stakeholders, typically across sectors, coordinate a set of differentiated activities through a mutually reinforcing plan of action;

* **Continuous communication** – All players engage in frequent and structured open communication to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation;

* **Backbone support** – An independent, funded staff dedicated to the initiative provides ongoing support by guiding the initiative's vision and strategy, supporting aligned activities, establishing shared measurement practices, building public will, advancing policy, and mobilizing resources.

The **role of the backbone** is:
* Guide vision and strategy
* Support aligned activities
* Establish shared measurement practices
* Build public will
* Advance policy
* Mobilize funding

**Readiness** for Collective Impact:
* Credible champions and neutral conveners
* Shared sense of urgency that more and better of the status quo won't solve the problem
* Significant resources/attention, public and private funders willing to collaborate
* Trust among the diverse leaders and stakeholders necessary to solve the problem

**Culture** of Collective Impact ("Culture eats strategy for breakfast," Peter Drucker)
* Being asset-based, engaging community;
* Diversity, equity, and inclusion;
* Building trust for collaboration
* Continuous learning
* Integrity and accountability

# Basics of Result-Based Accountability
*Trying Hard is Not Good Enough* by Mark Friedman

Result: a population condition of well-being for children, adults, families, and communities stated in plain language,

Indicator: Is a measure that helps quantify the achievement of a result.

Strategy: Coherent collection of actions that has a reasoned chance of improving results.

Performance Measure: a measure of how well a program, agency, or service system is working.
- What difference has been made?
- Quantity of Service: How much did we do?
- Quality of Service: How well did we do it?
- Quantity of Effect: How many people are better off?
- Quality of Effect: What percent are better off and how do we know they are better off?

Developing a Results-Based Strategy

1. Define Population, specifically and in geographic boundary
2. What result do we want for this population?
3. From our experience, how would we know this result is being met?
4. What indicators tell us that we are achieving the result for the population? A proxy that would tell us the condition is being met
5. What is the baseline and trend for the indicator(s)?
6. What is the story behind the curve? What do we think are the causes of the baseline and trend? Positive and negative causes/factors affecting the curve.
7. What data, information, and research do we need to gather about causes/factors?
8. What works in addressing those causes/factors (what is our evidence base)?
9. What strategies will move the causes/factors? Do they have reach, scale, validity, success probability, community fit, and capacity to move the highest-leverage factors and result?
10. Whose aligned actions implementing the strategies will be enough to move the result?

Proving Contribution

- It is extremely rare that one program by itself can turn a curve at a population level. Chaos and complexity theory teaches us that precise cause and effect relationships in complex environments are impossible to know

- You can demonstrate contribution if you pursued aligned strategies that had a credible chance (reach, scale, validity, etc) of making a difference, and it had a timely relationship to a turn in the curve. The contribution is even greater if the change in result runs counter to trends or comparable benchmarks for the rest of the city, county, state, nation or comparable populations/communities.

- Instead of proof of causality, we demonstrate circumstantial evidence that we contributed to change.