

6-1-2016

Rapid City Collective Impact: A City-Wide Effort to Create Quality of Life for All Its Citizens

Albert Linderman
Sagis Corporation

Follow this and additional works at: <http://pubs.lib.umn.edu/ijps>

Recommended Citation

Linderman, Albert (2016) "Rapid City Collective Impact: A City-Wide Effort to Create Quality of Life for All Its Citizens," *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies*: Vol. 3: Iss. 2, Article 5. Available at: <http://pubs.lib.umn.edu/ijps/vol3/iss2/5>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

The *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies* is produced by the University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing. Authors retain ownership of their articles, which are made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial license (CC BY-NC 4.0).



RAPID CITY COLLECTIVE IMPACT: A CITY-WIDE EFFORT TO CREATE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL ITS CITIZENS

Albert Linderman, PhD

Abstract

In Rapid City, South Dakota, community, business, nonprofit, and faith communities leaders, along with a number of citizens across all demographics, are collaborating in a unique plan to create quality of life for all its citizens. Named Rapid City Collective Impact (RCCI), this initiative began with the vision of several local philanthropists and has expanded quickly throughout the community. Cultural anthropologist Albert Linderman along with expertise from community based systems dynamics experts Don Greer, Megan Odenthal, and Christine Capra have formed a facilitative “backbone” organization for RCCI. Based on the model for “Collective Impact” made popular by an article by a Stanford Innovation Review article by authors John Kania and Mark Kramer, organizations and programs serving Rapid City citizens are committed to significantly increasing the amount of collaboration occurring within the social service sector, while business and other community leaders work to leverage newly understood leverage points within the intersecting systems of the city which often limits ability to address entrenched social issues.

Collective Impact, def.: a highly structured collaborative effort designed to achieve substantial impact on a large-scale social problem

Keywords: Collective Impact, systems dynamics, sense-making, collaboration

Copyright: ©2016 Linderman. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Noncommercial Attribution license (CC BY-NC 4.0), which allows for unrestricted noncommercial use, distribution, and adaptation, provided that the original author and source are credited.

During the summer of 2015 a group of philanthropists met and determined that they desired to improve life and living in Rapid City for all citizens. They set out on a path to pursue this desire. Brent Phillips, CEO of Regional Health, the largest employer in Rapid City, contacted me to visit the city and meet with the group. Over the course of the summer we met twice in Rapid City, communicated remotely, and co-created a Collective Impact approach encapsulated in the following statement:

With its arts, history, cultural activities, and great natural beauty, Rapid City is a dynamic city. However, significant issues plague the city. Large-scale social change comes from better cross-sector coordination rather than from the isolated intervention of individual organizations. Collective Impact will catalyze and harness the talent, skill, and perspective of grass roots citizens, businesses, nonprofits, government, and faith communities creating collaborative ways to make Rapid City a model 21st century city.
(www.rccimpact.com)

Once the group chose me to lead the effort, I relocated. Rapid City, situated in the Black Hills of Western South Dakota, with a population of 73,000, is an employment and cultural center for the six surrounding counties. There is much to tell about the fascinating first year of this comprehensive initiative, including the formation of an Emerging Leaders group with 50 Fellows; creation of a dynamic network map of all service provider programs, viewable from more than a dozen perspectives; creation of systems maps, models, and simulations; and listening intently and deeply to citizens' experiences with the service sector. Before getting into the specifics, here is some discussion of Collective Impact.

COLLECTIVE IMPACT

Some concepts are so simple you wonder why they weren't conceived previously. Such is the concept of Collective Impact. Coined by John Kania and Mark Kramer in an article in *Stanford Innovation Review* (Kania & Kramer, 2011), this concept has seismically expanded throughout the world in a variety of sectors, most notably in education and health care. In the seminal article, Kania and Kramer assert that "substantially better progress could be made in alleviating many of our most serious and complex social problems" (p. 38) regarding housing, jobs, education, hunger, family services, health, and the like when nonprofits, businesses, healthcare, philanthropy, governments, and the public put service to the community first and collaborate to create Collective Impact. Many funders and nonprofits overlook the

potential for Collective Impact because they are used to focusing on independent action or isolated impact, with its inherent turf protection and potential failure to do what's best for the community, as the primary vehicle for social change.

Kania and Kramer note that both in the United States and in other countries, initiatives engaging cross-sector collaboration generally do not fare well. They present three stories of collaborations that have been working well: Cincinnati, Somerville, Massachusetts, and Elizabeth River in southeastern Virginia. Regarding Cincinnati's efforts to improve education, more than 300 leaders cooperated in achieving some of the finest education success in the United States during 2009-2012 (Kania & Kramer, p. 36).

The authors present what they call three pre-conditions and five conditions for success in Collective Impact, conditions that they assert are not found in most initiatives of this type but that are common to the three studies they review.

The three pre-conditions for a collective impact initiative

1. Influential Champion(s) - the most critical element
2. Adequate Financial Resources (to last 2-3 years; generally an anchor funder is needed.)
3. Urgency for Change

Rapid City Collective Impact (RCCI) has these pre-conditions. The philanthropists behind the initiative all are influential champions in the community. Financial resources are solid. The desire for change is strong across the city.

The five conditions for collective impact

1. Common Agenda - 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.

2. **Shared Measurement** - Collecting data and measuring results consistently across all participants ensures that efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable.
3. **Mutually Reinforcing Activities** - Participant activities must be differentiated while still being coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action.
4. **Continuous Communication** - Consistent and open communication is needed across the many players to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation.
5. **Backbone Support** - 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 to coordinate participating organizations and agencies.

Hanleybrown, Kania, & Kramer (2012, p. 1)

Rapid City's funders, recognizing that they needed platforms with diverse players and different approaches to tackle community issues, began the process as conveners, champions, and matchmakers, connecting people, ideas, and resources and providing financial support for RCCI. Thus began the initiative with an intention to catalyze networks and engage the community instead of investing in discrete programs and individual organizations.

SUMMARY OF RAPID CITY'S VOLLECTIVE APPROACH

The Rapid City philanthropy group understands that they are fundamentally seeking to influence how citizens, service providers, business, government, and faith communities view their connection to the community. They wish to foster a "this is my community and I am contributing to it in an important way" attitude in every citizen, from the CEO of a large organization to those stuck in generational poverty. As John Ligtenberg, Executive Director of Love, Inc., and one of the executive directors (EDs) I interviewed during Phase 1 of the initiative, states it this way,:

“There is no greater tragedy than to be an amazing human being with tremendous potential and abilities and no opportunity to contribute.”

In the process of the initiative the funders intend eventually to impact poverty, employment, education, housing, healthcare, food insecurity, and substance abuse, while facilitating a collaborative model that will become intrinsic to what it means to live in the city. Accomplishing this will fulfill the initiative’s stated vision of “improving life and living in Rapid City.” The intention is in full recognition of human self-interest. It flows from a belief that at the heart of most people there is interest in the common wealth of the city, that improving life in the city will take a collective effort in which individuals and organizations give time, energy, money, and skills, and that by giving to the community, each citizen receives back the benefits of a high-functioning city that is working well for all.

The Rapid City group recognizes that historically funders and nonprofits generally overlook the potential for Collective Impact because they are used to focusing on independent action as the primary vehicle for social change. The nonprofit sector commonly operates with isolated impact that approaches finding a solution embodied within a single organization, combined with the hope that the most effective organizations will grow or replicate to extend their impact more widely. Funders historically search for more effective interventions “as if there were a cure for community health that only needs to be discovered, in the way that medical cures are discovered in laboratories. As a result of this process, nearly 1.4 million nonprofits try to invent independent solutions to major social problems, often working at odds with each other and exponentially increasing the perceived resources required to make meaningful progress” (Kania & Kramer (2011, p. 38).

A PHASED APPROACH

We conceptualized 3 phases. *See Figure 1.* Phase 1 involved researching and mapping all the service programs in the city. Phase 2 learned about the systems that underlie Rapid City’s landscape and their interconnections, chose areas of focus for Phase III’s

implementation and action, and created goals and strategy for each area of focus. Phase 3 begins the creation of initiatives addressing systemic problems. Throughout the Phases, network weaving is taking place.

Figure 1: Phases of RCCI

Phase 1. Launching & Laying Groundwork	Phase 2. Building Vision, Priorities & Backbone	Phase 3. Improving Services, Weaving Network
<p>Key Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage nonprofit sector, community leaders, faith communities, and residents to understand the landscape of our common wealth. • Discover local wisdom, insight and vision • Leadership Fellows: Cultivate emerging leadership • Cross-sector linkages, engagement • Network weaving: mapping and coordination • Build backbone organization 	<p>Key Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build platform for improving nonprofit services • Catalyze and increase collaboration across organizations, sectors • Articulate Shared Change Agenda • Community based systems dynamics mapping and modeling of city’s interconnected systems • Works streams addressing key areas identified in 3 day workshop 	<p>Key Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align strategies and engagement across organizations, sectors into Mutually Reinforcing Activities • Catalyze additional networks and collaboration • Deepen community education, engagement • Establish Shared Measurement System

Phase 1. Launching & Laying Groundwork	Phase 2. Building Vision, Priorities & Backbone	Phase 3. Improving Services, Weaving Network
<p><i>Results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase understanding, visibility of initiative • Increased social capital, insight for implementation of emerging vision, agenda 	<p><i>Results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulated Shared Change Agenda for Collective Impact • Increased social, political capital, and insight • Infrastructure and Backbone Organization established, capacity increased • Increased capacity for Continuous Communication 	<p><i>Results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved services, collaboration • Performance monitored, insights shared • Increased social, political capital and insight for implementing priorities, vision
<i>Sept 2015 - March 2016</i>	<i>April 2016 - Nov 2016</i>	<i>December 2016+</i>

Phase 1: RCCI

After agreeing on a plan of action for the first year of learning, the funders jointly sent a letter to all government program leaders, nonprofit EDs, and faith community leaders asking each to meet with me for a 75-minute individual face-to-face interview. The letter acknowledged that service programs provide essential services to the community and that their health and efficiency are important. The interviews, they were told, were the first part of learning, mapping, and evaluating the service provider landscape while at the same time providing them information about RCCI, creating the environment for them to collaborate as partners in the work of improving the city. Given the significant leverage represented by the philanthropy partners

sponsoring this first year of research, there was excellent participation; after meeting with more than 80 of the aforementioned leaders, I found broad understanding and support for the vision of the initiative. Part of this is due to the fact that, within certain sectors of service provider community (mental health, juvenile justice, poverty), some strong collaborations are active.

During this first 7 months (Phase I in Figure 1) a number of activities occurred to create momentum and lay the groundwork for RCCI: interviewing leaders, creating allies of active service organizations, forming guiding groups, forming a cadre of emerging leaders, and sharing widely. The Mayor, Steve Allender, asked a pertinent question early in the process that gets to the heart of this first phase as well as a guiding principle of the initiative as a whole: “Can we effectively harness the talent and skill of our citizens, businesses, nonprofits, governments, and faith communities? If so, we can significantly improve the quality of life for all citizens of Rapid City.”

Three groups formed during phase I

Early in Phase I, the philanthropy group and I agreed that additional support for the multi-faceted nature of RCCI needed to be created. Of the original philanthropists, two were chosen to be part of a Guiding Council.

Philanthropy Group: This group serves as the high level Board. It works to catalyze philanthropic leadership across Rapid City. It seeks to increase investment in the common wealth and the priorities of the Collective Impact initiative.

- Sandy Diegel, Executive Director of John T. Vucurevich Foundation
- Chair, Brent Phillips, President and CEO of Regional Health
- Ray Hillenbrand, Businessman
- Jim Scull, Businessman

Guiding Council: RCCI’s Guiding Council provides cross-sector, cross-system guidance and insight to position the initiative for success. Not a decision-making body or a fiduciary, its primary purpose is as a steward to guide, connect, and influence.

- Mayor Steve Allender, Rapid City
- Sandy Diegel, Executive Director of John T. Vucurevich Foundation
- Liz Hamburg, Executive Director of Black Hills Community Foundation
- Lloyd LaCroix, Community Leader
- Chair, Albert Linderman, Director of Rapid City Collective Impact
- Brent Phillips, President and CEO of Regional Health
- Tiffany Smith, Senior Director of Community Relations at Regional Health
- Melissa Bloomberg, Executive Assistant to RCCI Director

Mapping Work Group: RCCI's Mapping Work Group helps stakeholders, leaders, and strategists visualize and understand the social, economic, and political landscape in Rapid City through innovative approaches to data collection and data visualization. Christine Capra of GreaterThanTheSum was hired to create a first of its kind network map of a city's social service programs (a link to this map can be found at RCCI's website—www.rccimpact.com). Using Kumu's state-of-the-art mapping capabilities (see kumu.io), the network of all service providers and their connections with one another within sectors (mental health, education, housing, and the like) and population groups (i.e., elderly, children, mothers, and so on) has been completed. The mapping work group oversaw and edited the map's structure. They then helped design the systems mapping project (see Phase II below that created maps and models in preparation of running simulations that will provide Rapid City with the best way to improve government and service providers' efficiencies and strategies.

- Chair - Albert Linderman, Ph.D., Director of Rapid City Collective Impact
- Harriet Brings, Central High School faculty and Lakota Elder
- Barry Tice, Director of Pennington County HHS
- Karrie Miller, Associate to Barry Tice
- Malcom Chapman, Bush Fellow
- Whitney Rencounter, Rural America Initiatives
- Heidi Bell-Gease, Helpline 211 Director

- Barb Garcia, Manager of Rapid City Development
- John Ligtenberg, Executive Director of Love, Inc
- Danita Simons, Community Outreach Coordinator for United Way of the Black Hills

Emerging leadership fellows (cadre)

The Emerging Leadership Fellows cultivate and inspire vision and engagement in the initiative and its projects, actively seeking to bring community voice to decision making. By connecting people, organizations, and insights, and by developing their own leadership capital, the Fellows elevate the collective function of the systems engaged and increase the resources needed to address the priorities of the initiative. The 50 Fellows, generally between the ages of 25 and 45, come from all walks of life, including 4 lawyers, 3 police officers, 2 teachers, 4 business owners, 4 EDs of nonprofits, 3 government workers, and several middle managers from a variety of settings. Several of the Fellows are Native American. The Fellows are funded for 18 months by a capacity-building grant from the John T. Vucurevich Foundation; they serve approximately 5 hours per month, conducting community-based focus groups, engaging in learning activities to support RCCI, and expanding their networks. They receive training in Collective Impact, systems thinking, and Sense-Making Interviewing¹.

One of the early supporters of Collective Impact was the Chamber of Commerce, which provided opportunity for their business members to be aware of RCCI and to encourage individuals in their organizations to apply for Fellowships.

Listening to citizen's experiences using Sense- Making

From the outset, RCCI determined to engage with a diverse, representative cross-section of community members, listening to their experiences and bringing their

¹ Sense-Making Interview comes from Brenda Dervin's Sense-Making Methodology and is capitalized when referring to it as a method. The lower case sense-making is used to indicate the activity of a human agent.

voices to the table. Ultimately, this initiative is about the current and future needs of the community. Some of the needs are greater than those being pursued by service providers, and these must be identified and understood to move forward. The Fellows received training in Sense-Making Interviewing (Dervin, 2010; Dervin, Foreman-Wernet, & Lauterbach, 2003; Linderman, Baker, & Bosacker, 2011; Linderman, Disch, & Pesut, 2015), conducted citizen focus groups, and interviewed groups and individuals seeking to understand how citizens navigate the service provider network. Insights from these interviews, combined with a network analysis, provided clarity in showing gaps in service, areas where service can be improved, and opportunities for collaborations where none exists. One example of a response to a need that has already occurred due to this move toward RCCI: This past year (2015) was the first in more than a dozen that the Rapid City JayCees did not provide a Toys for Tots campaign. With 25% of the population at or below the poverty line, this was a loss for many local kids and families who had come to rely on the program for Christmas presents. Currently, due to the efforts of Bush Foundation Fellow Malcom Chapman, a network weaver² who is part of RCCI, service organizations such as Kiwanis and Elks have agreed to collaborate on the Toys for Tots campaign for 2016, a collaboration that is unusual among these kinds of organizations.

Sense-Making has been chosen as the process for conducting focus groups and individual interviews due to its facility in getting at individuals' lived experience in a way that surfaces insights often not accessible through other interviewing means. Dervin, discussing the nature of knowledge, notes that, "all knowledge is inherently fallible and must be humbled to the time and place and procedurings of its origins"(2010, p. 995).The individual's ongoing knowledge construction is triggered from states of discontinuity, when one feels the need to get answers to the questions currently faced, and occurs because "reality is neither complete nor constant but filled with fundamental and pervasive gaps"(Dervin, Foreman-Wernet, & Lauterbach,

² Network weaving is a term coined by June Holley, describing the act of deliberately connecting others in an effort to strengthen social ties. A network weaver is one who "takes responsibility for making networks healthier; do so by connecting people, coordinating self-organized projects, facilitating networks, and being a network guardian" (Krebs & Holley, p. 8).

2003, p. 254). Accessing this “knowledge construction in the moment” requires a process that allows an individual to re-live as much as possible her or his experiences while providing probes to access and surface the sense-making experienced in the gaps, allowing multiple perspectives, mental models, and beliefs to become explicit. Dervin and colleagues have developed protocols for Sense-making interviews and focus groups, which I’ve adapted for the work in Rapid City.

Besides the insights gleaned from these focus groups and interviews, the process of the Fellows engaging in the community as representatives of RCCI is building a sense of grass roots ownership in the initiative. Significant energy is generated and able to be harnessed. Citizens are able to sign up for ongoing updates of RCCI, and some of their comments are included on the initiative’s website.

In my work of over 20 years using Sense-Making I have found several benefits in its use with focus groups.

- Mental models from stakeholders are presented in a way that is understood by themselves and others.
- It provides equity in use of time for all
- It creates a mood of respect and honoring of others’ views; people feel heard
- It allows for quicker alignment; best ways to proceed are clearer.
- Those tempted to control conversations are freed from feeling compelled to do so.

The Washington Post (2015) reported on a study that has been ongoing since 1968 that shows 4 in 5 Americans at one point in life in need of assistance from service provider programs. Many people who currently need services will end up volunteering, working for, or contributing to nonprofits at another time in their lives. These individuals carry with them not only the heart, but the intelligence and drive they will use in their contributions. We are discovering unexpected insight from our focus groups and interviews. One focus group with six local judges revealed a shared frustration each had with the state bar association, a revelation they had not shared with each other

previously and one that likely would not have surfaced otherwise. Steps are underway to correct the problem.

Collective impact and phases 2 and 3 of RCCI

Recent Collective Impact research shows that beyond the five conditions needed, three additional focal points are critical (Senge, Hamilton, & Kania, 2015).

- 1) Recognize that spontaneous connections between groups emerge slowly, or not at all (Krebs & Holley, 2002). Network weavers are needed. These individuals intentionally and informally create new interactions between groups and sectors, building the connective tissue for collaborative work.
- 2) Understand the process and set initial conditions—the time, trust, and relationships—that go into creating Collective Impact.
- 3) Look for collective intelligence to emerge through a disciplined stakeholder and community engagement process. The nature of this intelligence is unpredictable, but is crucial both for community ownership of the vision and insight into the systemic barriers that need attention.

These additional learnings from Collective Impact initiatives over the past few years inform our work in Rapid City. We are intentionally supporting the efforts of the natural network weavers in the city, while developing new weavers who can be mentored by the existing ones. We are informing the community about this important work. We continue to create and build the relationships and trust that will be needed in the coming years as RCCI moves into Phase 3 and beyond. Currently we are in Phase 2, which includes attention to creating and developing systems maps and models for the city.

SYSTEMS CHANGE AND SYSTEMS MAPPING IN RAPID CITY

Jay Forrester, the founder of the system dynamics approach to systems thinking that we are using, speaks of the “counterintuitive behavior” that complex non-linear systems exhibit. He illustrates this by citing the large number of government

interventions that go awry through aiming at short-term improvement in measurable problem symptoms but ultimately worsening the underlying problems—like increased urban policing that leads to short-term reductions in crime rates but does nothing to alter the sources of embedded poverty and worsens long-term incarceration rates (Forrester, 1975). Another systems thinking pioneer, Russell Ackoff, characterized wisdom as the ability to distinguish the short-term from the long-term effects of an intervention (Ackoff, 1989). The question is, How does the wisdom to transcend pressures for low-leverage symptomatic interventions arise in practice? (Senge et al., 2015; Forrester, 1975). RCCI recognizes this challenge and is taking the extended time to better understand the city's systems in order to make more effective long-term decisions. We are following the maxim that to go fast you first have to go slow.

Currently we are engaged in a process of mapping the interconnected systems of Rapid City. At the end of a ground breaking 3 day workshop in late May 2016 with more than 90 civic, business, nonprofit, faith, and government leaders, and a number of citizens, we created work streams to address closed loops³ within the systems. Over a series of iterative sessions, sector-knowledgeable stakeholders are co-creating maps and models of the sector under the direction of our two facilitators. We are creating systems maps of a number of sectors and their intersections and intend to run simulations for some. By doing this, the community can recognize the interconnections between sectors. The modelers' expertise comes into play at this point. There are only a few expert systems modelers in the world who have worked on community-based systems. This field is new, though growing rapidly.

Concurrently, the Emerging Leaders Fellowship is engaged with community members around a vision for Rapid City 2025. A vision statement with strategies to address Rapid City's basic issues will be collaboratively crafted at the end of Phase 2 and will serve as a guide for Phase 3 and beyond. Phase 3 will attend to:

³ Closed loop diagrams, created by the community under the directions of the systems dynamics facilitators allow for users to see the interconnections between variables in a given systems. These diagrams are central to the work of community based systems dynamics, the approach of our two facilitators. See page 16 for more on these facilitators.

- improving services by weaving the network
- long-term strategic planning
- aligning strategies into mutually reinforcing activities
- catalyzing additional networks and collaboration
- deepening community education and engagement
- establishing a shared measurement system
- engaging business leadership

BUSINESS INVOLVEMENT

While nonprofit leaders, philanthropic foundations, and even governments have rallied around the Collective Impact model, most corporations in other initiatives generally are not involved in these efforts. That can and should change. Corporations can play an important role in catalyzing Collective Impact efforts to address systemic social challenges that have an impact on their business. Nico Pronk of HealthPartners has developed a compelling business case for engaging businesses in Collective Impact efforts. Working with 50 leaders, including many CEOs, from Fortune 200 companies, the group identified the business case for investment in community health, and has created a website for business and communities to work together (Pronk, Baase, Noyce, & Stevens (2015)).

Corporations can play a substantial role in sharing human resources and/or lending their expertise in certain issue areas, as well as contributing to the overall strategic direction of an effort. Many companies are wrestling with how to adjust their business model to engage more effectively at the community level. Corporations need to have a better understanding of where social issues overlap with business needs and to what extent they are able to drive impact. For some needs, a company may be able to address business and social outcomes through proprietary products and services. But for many other complex social challenges that may be related to business objectives - for example, community health problems caused by increased sedentary behavior - it

will be difficult for a company to create impact alone. This is where opportunities exist for companies to take the bold step of catalyzing cross-sector initiatives, driving social and business impact.

Our approach in Rapid City is to engage with business leaders during Phases 1 and 2, communicating with transparency what we are doing and why. Our expectation is that as systems maps, models, and simulations begin to reveal better strategic directions for achieving more efficiencies and suggest ways to better leverage the community's resources to improve life in the city, businesses will gladly contribute to the efforts. Early indications are that this is the case. Several business leaders contributed to the May workshop. We expect as well that businesses will appreciate any efforts to improve the city and coordinate resources, including their own.

WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED FROM OTHER COLLECTIVE IMPACT INITIATIVES?

From reading broadly about other Collective Impact initiatives I have gleaned the following principles we are incorporating into RCCI:

1. Collective Impact efforts are most effective when they build from what already exists, honoring current efforts and engaging established organizations.
2. Collective Impact is not a straightforward process. One does not simply put the five conditions in place and follow a step-by-step process to achieve it. While each of the conditions is important, every Collective Impact initiative is unique in how these conditions are implemented.
3. Collective Impact is as much about the relationships and trust among the people and organizations involved as it is about the conditions. It is ultimately about enabling adaptive, collective problem solving, working from the often quoted maxim that progress proceeds at the speed of trust.
4. The backbone organization currently consists of myself; assistant Melissa Bloomberg; overseer Jonathan Bucki; mapper Christine Capra; advisors Michelle Heerey, Stephen C. Bosacker, and Dan Pesut; and systems dynamics experts Don

Greer and Megan Odenthal. We play facilitative, servant-leader roles—guiding the decisions of the collaborative, based on the expertise and input of a cross-sector steering committee and input from a broad range of partners and community members. We:

- provide overall strategic direction
- facilitate dialogue between partners
- manage data collection and analysis
- handle communications
- coordinate community outreach
- mobilize funding

WHY EVALUATION IS IMPORTANT

We believe measurements are crucial. We are gathering copious amounts of both quantitative and qualitative data, all of which are helping us understand the what, how, and why of the various initiatives that are undertaken in Phase 4 and beyond.

CONCLUSION

We are almost one year on our journey. We've come a long way and set a strong foundation for RCCI. Our experiences thus far support the plan we established and the ongoing involvement of individuals from every sector of our community.

References

- Ackoff, R. From data to wisdom. (1989). *Journal of Applied Systems Analysis*. 16, 5, 3-9.
- Badger, E, & Ingraham, C. *The Washington Post*. (2015). The High probability you will be poor at some point in your life, blog retrieved at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2015/07/24/the-remarkably-high-odds-youll-be-poor-at-some-point-in-your-life>.

- Dervin, B. (2010). Clear . . . unclear? Accurate . . . inaccurate? Objective . . . subjective? Research . . . practice? Why polarities impede the research, practice and design of information systems and how Sense-Making Methodology attempts to bridge the gaps, Part 1. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 16, 5, 994-997.
- Dervin, B., Foreman-Wernet, L., & Lauterbach, E. (eds.). (2003). *Sense-making methodology reader: Selected writings of Brenda Dervin*, Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Forrester, J. (1975). *Collected papers of Jay W. Forrester*. San Jose: Pegasus Communications.
- HanleyBrown, F., Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2012). Channeling change: Making collective impact work. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, retrieved from, http://ssir.org/articles/entry/channeling_change_making_collective_impact_work.
- Hovmand, P. (2014). *Community based systems dynamics*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Kania, J. & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Innovation Review*, Winter 2011, 9, 1, 35-41.
- Krebs, V., & Holley, J. (2002). *Building smart communities through network weaving*, retrieved from, <http://www.orgnet.com/BuildingNetworks.pdf>.
- Linderman, A., Baker, J., & Bosacker, S.C. (2011). Surfacing and transferring expert knowledge: The sense-making interview. *Human Resource Development International*, 14, 3, 353–362.
- Linderman, A., Disch, J., & Pesut, D. (2015). Sense making and knowledge transfer: Capturing the Knowledge and Wisdom of Nursing Leaders. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, July-August 2015, 31, 1, 290-297.
- Pronk, N., Baase, C., Noyce, J., & Stevens, D. (2015). Corporate America and community health: exploring the business case for investment. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*. 57(5):493-500, retrieved from, http://get-hwhc.org/why-invest-in-community-health/building_the_business-case/.
- Senge, P., Hamilton, H., & Kania, J. (2015). “The Dawn of system leadership,” by Peter Senge, Hal Hamilton, and John Kania, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2015, retrieved from, http://www.ssireview.org/pdf/Winter_2015_The_Dawn_of_System_Leadership.pdf.
- Sterman, J. *Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world*. (2000). New York: McGraw Hill.

Albert Linderman PhD is a cultural anthropologist and CEO of Sagis Corporation. His work with Sagis Corporation includes Collective Impact and major leadership and organizational transitions. For communities desiring common vision and collaboration Linderman provides expertise in establishing, nurturing, managing, and sustaining Collective Impact initiatives, with Sagis often serving as backbone

for the collaboration. Linderman is the author of the epistemology text, *Why the World Around You Isn't as it Appears* (SteinerBooks 2012).

Correspondence about this article should be addressed to Albert Linderman PhD at alinderman@sagiscorp.com