

## The Five Conditions of Collective Impact

<b>Common Agenda</b>	All participants have a shared vision for change including a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed upon actions.
<b>Shared Measurement</b>	Collecting data and measuring results consistently across all participants ensures efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable.
<b>Mutually Reinforcing Activities</b>	Participant activities must be differentiated while still being coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action.
<b>Continuous Communication</b>	Consistent and open communication is needed across the many players to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation.
<b>Backbone Support</b>	Creating and managing collective impact requires a separate organization(s) with staff and a specific set of skills to serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and coordinate participating organizations and agencies.

## Isolated Impact vs. Collective Impact

Isolated Impact	Collective Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Funders select individual grantees that offer the most promising solutions.</li> <li>◆ Nonprofits work separately and compete to produce the greatest independent impact.</li> <li>◆ Evaluation attempts to isolate a particular organization's impact.</li> <li>◆ Large scale change is assumed to depend on scaling a single organization.</li> <li>◆ Corporate and government sectors are often disconnected from the efforts of foundations and nonprofits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Funders and implementers understand that social problems, and their solutions, arise from the interaction of many organizations within a larger system.</li> <li>◆ Progress depends on working toward the same goal and measuring the same things.</li> <li>◆ Large scale impact depends on increasing cross-sector alignment and learning among many organizations.</li> <li>◆ Corporate and government sectors are essential partners.</li> <li>◆ Organizations actively coordinate their action and share lessons learned.</li> </ul>

## Phases of Collective Impact

Components for Success	PHASE I Initiate Action	PHASE II Organize for Impact	PHASE III Sustain Action and Impact
<b>Governance and Infrastructure</b>	Identify champions and form cross-sector group	Create infrastructure (backbone and processes)	Facilitate and refine
<b>Strategic Planning</b>	Map the landscape and use data to make case	Create common agenda (goals and strategy)	Support implementation (alignment to goals and strategies)
<b>Community Involvement</b>	Facilitate community outreach	Engage community and build public will	Continue engagement and conduct advocacy
<b>Evaluation and Improvement</b>	Analyze baseline data to identify key issues and gaps	Establish shared metrics (indicators, measurement, and approach)	Collect, track, and report progress (process to learn and improve)

## Backbone Organizations

Types of Backbones	Description	Examples	Pros	Cons
<b>Funder-Based</b>	One funder initiates CI strategy as planner, financier, and convener	Calgary Homeless Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to secure start-up funding and recurring resources</li> <li>Ability to bring others to the table and leverage other funders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of broad buy-in if CI effort seen as driven by one funder</li> <li>Lack of perceived neutrality</li> </ul>
<b>New Nonprofit</b>	New entity is created, often by private funding, to serve as backbone	Community Center for Education Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perceived neutrality as facilitator and convener</li> <li>Potential lack of baggage</li> <li>Clarity of focus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of sustainable funding stream and potential questions about funding priorities</li> <li>Potential competition with local nonprofits</li> </ul>
<b>Existing Nonprofit</b>	Established nonprofit takes the lead in coordinating CI strategy	Opportunity Chicago	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Credibility, clear ownership, and strong understanding of issue</li> <li>Existing infrastructure in place if properly resourced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential "baggage" and lack of perceived neutrality</li> <li>Lack of attention if poorly funded</li> </ul>
<b>Government</b>	Government entity, either at local or state level, drives CI effort	Shape Up Somerville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public sector "seal of approval"</li> <li>Existing infrastructure in place if properly resourced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bureaucracy may slow progress</li> <li>Public funding may not be dependable</li> </ul>
<b>Shared Across Multiple Organizations</b>	Numerous organizations take ownership of CI wins	Magnolia Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lower resource requirements if shared across multiple organizations</li> <li>Broad buy-in, expertise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of clear accountability with multiple voices at the table</li> <li>Coordination challenges, leading to potential inefficiencies</li> </ul>
<b>Steering Committee Driven</b>	Senior-level committee with ultimate decision-making power	Memphis Fast Forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broad buy-in from senior leaders across public, private, and nonprofit sectors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of clear accountability with multiple voices</li> </ul>

Hanleybrown, F., Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (January 26, 2012). Channeling Change: Making Collective Impact Work. Stanford Social Innovation Review. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/channeling\\_change\\_making\\_collective\\_impact\\_work](https://ssir.org/articles/entry/channeling_change_making_collective_impact_work)