

Join us on 



Global Journal of  
**Community Psychology Practice**

Promoting community practice for social benefit

Vol. 7 Issue 1 Mar 15,  
2016

*An exchange of Ideas,  
Information and  
Resources for  
Community  
Practitioners*

Search this site

[About GJCPP](#)

[Browse the Journal](#)

[Submissions](#)

[Subscribe for Free](#)

[Donate](#)

[Contact](#)

## Guest Editorial

### Ten Places Where Collective Impact Gets It Wrong



In 2011 Kania and Kramer published a five page article in the Stanford Social Innovation Review entitled “Collective Impact” (2011). The article was a well written summary of their views of large scale social change efforts in communities. They suggested five conditions of collective impact:

1. common agenda
2. shared measurement
3. mutually reinforcing activities
4. continuous communication
5. backbone support

In the original article, and those that followed, Kania and Kramer were explicitly and implicitly critical of much of what came before them. In one chart (Hanleybrown, Kania, & Kramer 2012), they compare Isolated Impact with Collective Impact as if those were the only two options,

## In this Issue

[This Issue's Homepage](#)

[Articles from Around the Globe](#)

[Guest Editorial](#)

[Editor's Note](#)

## About this Article

[Add Comment](#)

## Recent Comments

**Bernadette Wright** (Falls Church, VA) *July 28, 2016*

Interesting and important article for anyone considering this method. Shows why off-the-shelf research designs are often not the best design. Sometimes it's better to devise your own research strategies, customized to

[Add Comment](#)

omitting the numerous examples of community-wide coalitions that moved beyond Isolated Impact but were not explicitly labeled Collective Impact (for one example see the exhaustive literature on Healthy Communities, Norris , 2013).

As a result of that short publication and extensive marketing by Kania and Kramer's consulting firm FSG, and a few follow up articles (Hanleybrown, Kania, & Kramer, 2012; Kania and Kramer, 2013) they created a remarkable revolution in government and foundation approaches to community coalition building and collaboration. Many of these funding organizations are now declaring that they are using a 'Collective Impact' approach. The upside of this is that attention is once again brought to the need to promote multi-sector collaboration in communities.

The downside of this is that Collective Impact is based on only a few case studies that the authors themselves were not involved in creating and implementing but rather observed after their development. The articles included neither research nor reference to learning from all the previous research, studies, and community experiences in the field. Observing successful coalitions provides the observer one basis for learning about community coalitions, but being involved in successfully and unsuccessfully developing coalitions provides a deeper and more nuanced understanding of coalitions that apparently was not available for Kania and Kramer. Thus, not surprisingly, Collective Impact gets much about collaboration wrong, regarding both the goals and processes of community change collaboration. In light of the uncritical, widespread adoption and funding of Collective Impact by government agencies and foundations, it is necessary to examine and assess Collective Impact much more critically and thoughtfully.

In this article, I articulate ten important issues and concerns which Collective Impact fails to adequately acknowledge, understand, and address. These failings have serious consequences for the engaged communities. I welcome the community of activists and scholars who are engaged in coalitions, partnerships, and collaboratives to react, disagree and/or to add to the list of concerns.

### **1) Collective Impact does not address the essential requirement for meaningfully engaging those in the community most affected by the issues.**

Collective Impact does not set a priority of engaging those most affected by the issue in their collaborative impact processes. The grassroots communities most affected are not necessarily consulted or meaningfully share in Collective Impact decision making. The result is to ignore and denigrate critical community knowledge, ownership, and support for sustainability. This can further result in creating solutions that may not be appropriate or compatible with the population being served. This is not surprising because Kania and Kramer come from a top-down business consulting model. Collective Impact never explicitly

your unique situation and research needs.

**Ricardo Wilson-Grau** (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) *July 25, 2016*

I am intrigued that Kania and Kramer have not responded. So, I am forwarding to FSG this article and today's American Evaluation Association post by Brian Hoessler and encouraging them to engage.

**Blythe Butler** (Canada) *June 08, 2016*

Thank you for the thoughtful article and the thoughtful comments from those who've posted before me.

As someone who has been involved with implementing a 'collective impact' initiative for the last four years (actually, setting the pre-conditions for collective impact using an organic network model) I have often struggled to understand what the framework means in our context.

Having said that, the power and value of using the Collective Impact framework to guide our work is directly correlated with our ability to adapt it to our context, understand how it could function to

[Add Comment](#)

states that you need to engage the people most affected by the issue(s) driving the coalition. Unfortunately, Collective Impact's approach is not unusual; in general, collaboration processes used by coalitions of all kinds do not meaningfully involve grassroots community members or other stakeholders directly affected by their work (Himmelman, 2001). This is a serious omission. Coalitions without grassroots voices are very likely to create solutions that do not meet the needs of the people most affected by them and treat people disrespectfully in their community change process.

Without engaging those most directly affected, Collective Impact can develop neither an adequate understanding of the root causes of the issues nor an appropriate vision for a transformed community. Instead the process will likely reinforce the dominance of those with privilege and continue to support the existing nonprofit helping sector that works without creating changes based on meaningful community input and involvement.

**2) A corollary of the above is that Collective Impact emerges from a top-down business consulting experience and is thus not a community development model.**

The model of Collective Impact is mainly about engaging the most powerful organizations and partners in a community and getting them to agree on a common agenda. They explicitly state that Collective Impact is about bringing "CEO-level cross-sector leaders together" (Hanleybrown 2012). In reality, what community coalitions need is to engage both the most powerful and least powerful people in a community, finding ways for them to talk and work together to address the community's priorities for action and the impediments to change in institutions and organizations serving the community. This is the heart and soul of community development coalition work and seems absent in Collective Impact.

Coalitions across the country have years of experience in bringing a wide range of the community stakeholders to the table, not just the most powerful. Often this was not the case. Early in the history of substance abuse prevention work, partnerships made the top down mistake. At the start (in 1989), the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Fighting Back substance abuse prevention coalitions required having the most powerful people in the community at the table – the Mayor, the Police Chief and the School Superintendent (Wielawski, 2004). As the role and effects of the community environment surrounding substance abuse issue became clearer, we began to see that we needed all sectors of the community and the youth themselves at the table. At that point the coalitions began to evolve and become more effective. Unfortunately Collective Impact seems stuck in this old, less effective model with CEO leadership as central to their process.

**3) Collective Impact does not include policy change and systems change as essential and intentional outcomes of the partnership's work.**

support our work; and make judgements about where it can't.

Having a framework to follow is neither necessary nor sufficient for social change. There is a huge difference between knowing what constituent parts make up any framework, or approach, or model, or program, or initiative - and knowing how & why that framework functions, and to what end. I wonder if the problem is less with the collective impact framework - or the 10 things it could do better for that matter - as much as it is a problem with our attraction simplistic 'solutions'. We crave certainty. We want to have a simple way to know if we're making progress, and a simple way to map out what progress might look like: but progress doesn't work that way.

We often say in our work that complex-adaptive challenges require complex-adaptive solutions... Most people nod their heads at that statement: we recognize that on the surface, but have very little capacity – individually or collectively – to put that into practice. Everything in our society feeds our

Add Comment

Many coalitions in the US are focused on creating public health outcomes (prevention of substance abuse, obesity, opioid addiction, health disparities etc). In recent years, led by the CDC (Frieden, 2010), these coalitions have moved in the direction of policy and systems changes as their most powerful and desired outcomes. Certainly in Public Health coalitions (which comprise many of the coalitions in the US), following the CDC's lead and addressing policy change and systems change has become the gold standard of outcomes. Systems change is now recognized as a key priority and best practice in community change partnerships so this is a serious omission in Collective Impact.

If we are not changing policies in order to change systems, we are continuing to do fragmented, isolated work. For years community coalitions addressed specific focused issues without asking about the ecological and historical factors that impact the outcomes. Smoking cessation coalitions taught us all this lesson dramatically as they went beyond smoking prevention education for young people to a focus on implementing anti-smoking policies in systems across the community – restaurants, schools, work sites, public buildings. And it worked! So now we better understand that policies are at the heart of the work of community coalitions. But where is the policy and system change in Collective Impact?

#### **4) Collective Impact misses the social justice core that exists in many coalitions.**

Increasingly coalitions are applying “root cause” analyses to understanding their community issues. As they do this and understand the concept and ramifications of social determinants of health, critical social justice issues become clear and urgent such as: income inequality, systemic and structural racism, sexism, homophobia, etc. Collaborative efforts then must mobilize to address these issues which can be difficult to do in top-down collaboratives; those with the most power and privilege dominate and control top-down coalitions and often have interest in maintaining their privilege and the status quo. Collective Impact is a great tool for those who already have power, but it is less suitable and more challenging for those with relatively little power who are working to improve the lives of people and their communities.

For example, alternative partnership models such as the REACH (Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health) coalitions funded by the CDC are aimed to address systemic racism and create systems level change. The Boston REACH coalitions that emerged from the Boston Public Health Commission (Baril, et. al., 2011) were all required to do root cause analyses of their community's issues. This led to understanding the racial health disparities in their communities in the context of social determinants of health (housing, economic inequality, education, etc) and the institutional racism that is part of each of these determinants and their related systems. With this approach,

desire for things to be simple, and certainly antiquated funding models in the social sector continue to feed a misunderstanding of complexity and the types of adaptation required to support transformational change.

Why would we even assume that something presented as a framework would be the answer to all our problems? How can we support individuals, agencies, funders, communities, governments to have a greater tolerance for developing the capacity to assess, adapt, implement and learn from frameworks vs. assume they are the end-all-be-all? To me that's the most important question to be asking ourselves, and then striving toward building a culture that supports our ability to understand frameworks in an adaptive way.

Blythe Butler  
Atticus Insights & the First  
2000 Days Network  
**Dawn Henderson** (North  
Carolina) *May 07, 2016*

I thank Tom and the  
commentary and the  
question we continue to  
grapple with is how do  
we leverage our work to

[Add Comment](#)

addressing structural racism became not just a possibility but a necessity.

**5) Collective Impact, as described in Kania and Kramer's initial article, is not based on professional and practitioner literature or the experience of the thousands of coalitions that preceded their 2011 article.**

When dealing with an issue as complex as collective actions taken by the multiple sectors of a community, we need to be continually learning from those who came before us and from the communities themselves. When I first began working with coalitions almost 40 years ago, even then I found valuable resources from a wide range of fields, including community psychology, civic engagement, racial justice, public health, political science, and organizational development among others. Since then, the literature, experience, and tools for coalition building have grown exponentially and are utilized extensively by coalitions in a wide variety of circumstances.

Here are a small sample of comprehensive community-wide collaboration resources that are not cited or maybe even known by Kania and Kramer:

- Among the most acclaimed and utilized is Fran Butterfosses' comprehensive, Coalitions and Partnerships in Community Health (2007) that articulates her and Michelle Kegler's Community Coalition Action Theory (Butterfoss and Kegler, 2002).
- Others' significant scholarly writing about partnerships in Public Health include:
  - Michelle Kegler(1998)
  - Meredith Minkler (2012)
  - Nina Wallerstein(2005)
- In Community Psychology, this work has a long history in the work of:
  - Seymour Sarason (1979)
  - David Chavis(1992, 2001)
  - Steve Fawcett (2000)
  - Bill Berkowitz (2000)
  - Pennie Foster Fishman (2010,2011)
  - Vince Francisco (2000)
  - And my own writings (Wolff 1995, 2001, 2003,2010)
- There is an extensive literature and experience in the field of Healthy Communities, including two recent volumes of the National Civic Review focused on the topic (Norris, 2013) and important writing about healthy communities by others such as Twiss (2000), Kurland (2001).
- There are also extensive related contributions from other fields:
  - Political Science: Himmelman (2001)
  - Collaborative Leadership: Chrislip and Larsen (1994)
  - Community Development: Potapchuk (1999)
  - Community Organizing: Kaye (1996)

adoptive models used by funding agencies? This a great critique and we must always challenge approaches that do consider equitable inclusion and dissemination

**Lucyna MacDermott**  
(Australia) April 22, 2016

Hi Tom

So pleased that I stumbled on your post and through it a wealth of exchanges of knowledge and wisdom as well as a myriad of pragmatic tools.

I am currently doing a project on business- not-for-profit partnerships as part of my MBA which I am undertaking as a mature student with some 30 years of experience in community development, public policy and direct child and family services.

I was researching Collective Impact and had a sense of disquiet. I was very careful not to indulge in the 'been there,done that' stance but it immediately struck me that in looking at change makers in the community, the community was conspicuous by its absence. Yes, it is a messy, iterative process to build coalitions with the community but the

**Add Comment**

This rich multi-disciplinary literature teaches us that the process of communities working together to create collaborative change is very complex and is impacted by multiple variables. The literature also identifies processes, methods, and models that have led to the creation of successful collaborations that create changes in programs, practices, and policies in communities. Collectively, we already know a great deal about the tools necessary to do this work. One of the most comprehensive and internationally acclaimed examples is the Community Tool Box (ctb.ku.edu.). The Community Tool Box provides over 7000 pages of free downloadable material on community health and development using collaborations and partnerships (Fawcett, et al 2000 ).

Collective Impact flounders by failing to learn from all these wonderful contributions in the literature and the field from all the above disciplines. How can Collective Impact propose converting a whole field with a five-page article that has virtually no references to the concepts and findings of others? And how can government agencies and foundations uncritically adopt such a model that mislabels observations about a few examples of community collaboration as valid research?

#### 6) Collective Impact mislabels their study of a few case examples as “research.”

The Stanford article cites a few successful examples of community coalitions and draws their Collective Impact generalizations from them. This is a very limited sample and it seems that Kania and Kramer only observed these coalitions and drew conclusions rather than having actually been involved in the messy work of creating coalitions like the ones they note. It is actually stunning to realize that Kania and Kramer changed the world of coalition building simply by observing and distilling insights from a few successful coalitions, but never actually tried creating, implementing, and evaluating a coalition themselves.

In my own work with hundreds of coalitions, I have learned that there is much to be learned from the biggest best funded top down coalitions that succeed and those that fail, as well as from the smallest that also succeed and fail. I understand we draw our generalizations from the coalitions that we work with, and I have always done so myself.

However, seeing that Collective Impact has become the gold standard of coalition building for government and foundations on such a limited sample and such limited actual experience is deeply disconcerting. It is fascinating to note that many government agencies (Federal, state, local) and foundations are now calling for all of us to follow Collective Impact as the model if we wish to be effective and funded. Yet this is an intervention with absolutely no evidence-based research. Aren't these the same government and foundation organizations that demand evidence-based research from us in all their program applications?

One has to wonder what makes funders so attracted to Collective Impact. Could it be that the simple five Collective Impact components

Collective Impact five point agenda struck me as very 'hygenised'(is there such a word??)and while a useful framework it missed a lot of critical elements.

I was pleased to find some thinking to address the shortcomings of the proposed model. You may be interested in looking at the Collective Impact Forum which adds Collective Impact principles to the 5 point Kania approach

---

#### More...



Download the PDF version to access the complete

article.



Printer friendly version

**Keywords:** Collective Impact, collaboration, coalition, leadership, community

**Add Comment**

allows funders to believe that coalition building can be simplified, and that they finally have the key to success for these messy multi-variable entities called coalitions? Or could it be that Collective Impact's top down approach is most compatible with the collaboration change approach of foundations? Or could it be Collective Impact's avoidance of addressing policy or advocacy which makes Collective Impact coalitions a safer and less controversial funding bet?

**7) Collective Impact assumes that most coalitions are capable of finding the funds to have a well-funded backbone organization.**

Kania and Kramer's call for coalitions to have a Backbone Organization is welcome. Finding money for the staffing of coalitions has always been very difficult. Most funders want to fund the coalition's change mission, goals, and programs, but very few grant-makers want to fund coalition staffing and operating costs. It is great to see an emphasis for the requirement of support for these essential core elements of coalitions.

Unfortunately, here again Collective Impact gets it wrong by asking for too much from the Backbone Organization. Collective Impact experts push for a well-funded Backbone Organization with multiple functions that require a considerable resources and staff. These functions include, "providing overall strategic direction, facilitating dialogue between partners, managing data collection and analysis, handling communications, coordinating community outreach and mobilizing funding" (Hanleybrown, 2012). By giving all those responsibilities to the Backbone Organization, Collective Impact inevitably creates a top down organization versus a truly collaborative one where leadership and responsibility is dispersed. The Collective Impact concept of a Backbone Organization is predicated on coalitions with extensive resources. However, in the hundreds of coalitions I have created, consulted with, or trained, very few can even afford paid leadership much less a \$100,000 Backbone Organization.

**8) Collective Impact also misses a key role of the Backbone Organization – building leadership.**

In well run coalitions, the key role for the Backbone Organization needs to be to build coalition leadership as opposed to being the coalition leadership. This is based on the shared value of instituting collaborative leadership as well as democratic governance and decision-making for a coalition.

Collective Impact barely discusses the idea that leadership in a collaboration is different from ordinary organizational leadership. Again, there is excellent literature that provides a guide to democratic and collaborative governance. Almost twenty years before Collective Impact, David Chrislip and Carl Larsen's Collaborative Leadership (1994) helped distinguish the unique characteristics and practices of collaborative leadership in coalitions, including the skills and functions

**Add Comment**

of a collaborative leader and how they differ from traditional hierarchical leadership.

Coalition leaders themselves often emerge from traditional top-down non-profit organizations and need to learn a new style of leadership that facilitates ownership and leadership by the members. We have seen powerful charismatic coalition leaders who can energize a coalition but then fail when they cannot organize the energy that they stir up and delegate the responsibility.

**9) Community-wide, multi-sectoral collaboratives cannot be simplified into Collective Impact's five required conditions.**

Coalitions are complex, constantly changing, and influenced by multiple variables. Having worked with numerous coalitions, I cannot imagine any five conditions that could apply universally. In writing *The Power of Collaborative Solutions* in 2010, I identified six principles and effective tools for consideration rather than prescriptive conditions:

1. Engage a broad spectrum of the community
2. Encourage true collaboration as the form of exchange
3. Practice democracy
4. Employ an ecological approach that emphasizes the individual in his/her setting
5. Take action
6. Engage your spirituality as your compass for social change

For example, the first condition of Collective Impact is creating a common agenda, and this is highly desirable and necessary. When we assist community coalitions through visioning exercises, including root cause analysis, and provide guidance that helps members develop a shared common agenda, it is an important accomplishment. However, we need to acknowledge that in some communities the conflicting self-interests can be insurmountable and the common agenda is either not achievable or can require a long time to arrive at. Collective Impact can frustrate those led to believe that complex activities such as developing a common agenda (often called a mission statement) can be achieved simply and quickly. The difficulties in this kind of collaborative decision-making can be even more frustrating when Collective Impact does not supply the community stakeholders with the tools that we know work.

**10) The early available research on Collective Impact is calling into question the contribution that it is making to coalition effectiveness.**

“The Collective Impact Model and Its Potential for Health Promotion” (Flood, et. al., 2015) is among the first published scholarly assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the Collective Impact approach. They note the lack of resident involvement and the absence of policy and advocacy in the Collective Impact model, suggesting that: “Since many community coalitions are deeply concerned with advocacy and policy change this omission can be problematic.” The

**Add Comment**

study indicates that seeking a common agenda “will not be successful if done through coercive compromise” and without a backbone organization that has a “point of view” and a “broader mission, vision and values” (Bell in Flood et. al., 2015) . The study also notes that the Collective Impact model does not provide detailed advice (and tools) to help coalitions create the needed continuous communication or common agendas. In its conclusion, the study states, “As our case study application suggests, Collective Impact appears to have utility as a conceptual framework in health promotion but one that may be usefully be augmented by some ‘tried and true’ insights and strategies from CCAT (Community Coalition Action Theory; Butterfoss and Kegler 2009)” (Flood, et. al., 2015). Additional thoughtful and insightful Collective Impact critiques are emerging in blogs and online from Mark Holmgren (2015), Vu Le (2015), and others.

I would concur with the view that there are some helpful contributions in the writings of Kania and Kramer. They bring fresh eyes to the work of collaboration. They have certainly brought coalition building back to the forefront for grant-makers and many others with influence in the government and foundation/non-profit sectors. Now, we have to make sure that Collective Impact does not proceed without addressing the ten points noted above. Let’s work to improve Collective Impact so it can take its place along with many other valuable models and resources designed to assist people and communities improve their well-being by engaging the grassroots communities themselves and creating a vision of transformative change.

In sum, I am hopeful that, if communities using Collective Impact and funders promoting it address the ten shortcomings discussed in this article, we will see improved applications of Collective Impact emerge:

- where those most affected by the issues lead the effort and share the decision making and the power;
- where the collaborative action is based on an understanding of the social, political, and social justice context in which the issues of the community are embedded, and addresses these issues head on; and
- where the Collective Impact work is more thoroughly based on the existing fields of coalition building and community development, learning from the acquired knowledge, experience, and available tools.

Let’s hope that we can muster the courage to challenge the Collective Impact juggernaut and bring our communities what they need and deserve. I know we have the desire to do this and now we need the will.

**Summary Table: Ten Places Where Collective Impact Gets It Wrong**

1.	Collective Impact does not address the essential requirement for meaningfully engaging those in the community most affected by the issues.
----	--

**Add Comment**

2.	A corollary of the above is that Collective Impact emerges from top-down business consulting experience and is thus not a true community development model.
3.	Collective Impact does not include policy change and systems change as essential and intentional outcomes of the partnership’s work.
4.	Collective Impact as described in Kania and Kramer’s initial article is not based on professional and practitioner literature or the experience of the thousands of coalitions that preceded their 2011 article.
5.	Collective Impact misses the social justice core that exists in many coalitions.
6.	Collective Impact mislabels their study of a few case examples as “research.”
7.	Collective Impact assumes that most coalitions are capable of finding the funds to have a well- funded backbone organization.
8.	Collective Impact also misses a key role of the Backbone Organization – building leadership.
9.	Community wide, multi-sectoral collaboratives cannot be simplified into Collective Impact’s five required conditions.
10.	The early available research on Collective Impact is calling into question the contribution that Collective Impact is making to coalition effectiveness.

*Editor's Note: What do you think? We hope that this editorial is the beginning of an important conversation We welcome the community of activists and scholars who are engaged in coalitions, partnerships, and collaboratives to react, agree, disagree or add to the list of concerns. Please let us know your thoughts either by commenting below, emailing [editor@gjcpp.org](mailto:editor@gjcpp.org), or [visiting this post on Facebook](#) and commenting there.*

**References**

Baril, N., Patterson, M., Boen, C., Gowler, R., & Norman, N. (2011). The Grantmaking Model of a Local Health Department. *Family and Community Health*, 34 (18), 523-543.

Bell, J. Quoted in Flood,J, Minkler, M, Lavery,S., Estrada,J, & Falbe J (2015) in “The Collective Impact Model and Its Potential for Health Promotion: Overview and Case Study of a Healthy Retail Initiative in San Francisco ” *Health Education and Behavior* 42(5), 654-68.

**Add Comment**

- Berkowitz,W and Wolff,T. (2000).The Spirit of the Coalition, Washington D.C., American Public Health Association.
- Butterfoss,F. (2007) Coalitions and Partnerships in Community Health, San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Butterfoss, F and Kegler, M. (2002). Toward a comprehensive understanding of community coalitions: moving from practice to theory. In DiClementi, R. Crosby,L, & Kegler M (Eds) Emerging Theories in Health Promotion Practice and Research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 157-193
- Chavis. D. (2001). Paradoxes and promise of community coalitions. American Journal of Community Psychology 29(2), 309-320.
- Chavis ,D. Florin, P., & Felix, M.(1992). Nurturing grassroots initiatives for community development . The role of enabling systems. In T. Mizrahi and J. Morrison Community and social administration. Advances, trends, and emerging principles. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Chrislip, D., & Larsen, C. E. (1994). Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fawcett, S., Francisco, V., Schultz, J., Berkowitz, B., Wolff, T., & Nagy, G. (2000). The Community Tool Box: A web based resource for building healthy communities. Public Health Reports, 115 (2/3), 274–278.
- Flood. J, Minkler. M., Lavery, S., Estrada, J., & Falbe, J. (2015). The Collective Impact Model and its potential for health promotion: Overview and case study of a healthy retail initiative in San Francisco ” Health Education and Behavior 42(5):654-68.
- Foster-Fishman, P.G., & Watson, E.R. (2010). Action research as systems change. In H.E. Fitzgerald, D.L. Zimmerman, C. Burack, & S. Seifer(eds.) Handbook of Engaged Scholarship: The Contemporary Landscape. Volume Two: Community-Campus Partnerships. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Foster-Fishman,P. & Watson, E. (2011). The ABLe Change Framework: A conceptual and methodological tool for promoting system change. American Journal of Community Psychology 49(3-4), 503-516.
- Francisco,V, Fawcett, S. Schultz, J & Paine-Andrews .A. (2000), A model of health promotion and community development” In F.B.Balcazar, M Montero and J./R. Newbrough (eds) Health Promotion in the Americas: Theory and Practice, Washington DC.: Pan American Health Organization, pp 17-34.
- Frieden, T. (2010). A framework for public health action: The Health Impact Pyramid. American Journal of Public Health. April; 100(4): 590 –595.
- Hanleybrown, F., Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2012). Channeling Change: Making Collective Impact Work Stanford Social Innovation Review.

**Add Comment**

Retrieved from:

[http://ssir.org/articles/entry/channeling\\_change\\_making\\_collective\\_impact\\_work](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/channeling_change_making_collective_impact_work)

Himmelman, A.T. (2001). On coalitions and the transformation of power relations: collaborative betterment and collaborative empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29(2), pp.277 – 285.

Holmgren, M. (2015). Part One: Community at the core of a theory of change. *Collective Impact: Watch Out for the Pendulum Swing and Other Challenges*. Retrieved from:

[http://tamarackcci.ca/files/collective\\_impact\\_watch\\_out\\_for\\_the\\_pendulum\\_swing\\_and\\_other\\_challe](http://tamarackcci.ca/files/collective_impact_watch_out_for_the_pendulum_swing_and_other_challe)

Kania, J. and Kramer, M. (2011). *Collective Impact*. Stanford Social Innovation Review. Retrieved from:

[http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective\\_impact](http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact)

Kania, J. and Kramer, M. (2013). Embracing emergence: How Collective Impact addresses complexity. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.

Retrieved from:

[http://ssir.org/articles/entry/embracing\\_emergence\\_how\\_collective\\_impact\\_addresses\\_complexity](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/embracing_emergence_how_collective_impact_addresses_complexity)

Kaye, G. and Wolff, T. (1996) *From the Ground Up! A Workbook on Coalition Building and Community Development*. Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners., 1996

Kegler, M., Steckler, A., McElroy, K., and Malek, S. (1998). Factors that contribute to effective community health promotion coalitions: A study of 10 Project ASSIST coalitions in North Carolina. *Health Education and Behavior* 25(3), pp. 338-353.

Kurland, J. (2001). Coalition-Building: The promise of government. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29(2) 285-291

Le, V. (n.d.) “Collective Impact”: Resistance is futile. *Blue Avocado*.

Retrieved from: <http://www.blueavocado.org/content/collective-impact-resistance-futile-point-vu>

Minkler, M. and Wallerstein, N. (2005). Improving health through community organizing and community building: A health education perspective. in M. Minkler(Ed) *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Minkler, M. (Ed.) (2012). *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Norris, T. (2013). Healthy communities at twenty?five. *National Civic Review*, 102(4), pp. 4-9.

Potapchuk, W. (1999). Building an infrastructure of community collaboration. *National Civic Review* 88(3), pp. 165 - 170.

Sarason, S. (1979). *The Challenge of the Resource Exchange Network*. San Francisco CA.: Jossey Bass

**Add Comment**

- Turner, S., Merchant, K., Kania, J., & Martin, E. (2012). Understanding the value of backbone organizations in Collective Impact: Part 1. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved from: [http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/understanding\\_the\\_value\\_of\\_backbone\\_organizations\\_in\\_collect](http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collect)
- Twiss, J. M., Duma, S., Look, V., Shaffer, G. S., & Watkins, A. C. (2000). Twelve years and counting: California's experience with a statewide Healthy Cities and Community program. *Public health reports*, 115 (2-3), 125-133.
- Wielawski, I. M. (2004). The fighting back program. *The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Anthology: To Improve Health and Health Care*, 7.
- Wolff, T. (2001). Community coalition building—contemporary practice and research: introduction. *American journal of community psychology*, 29(2), 165-172.
- Wolff, T. (1995). Healthy Communities Massachusetts: one vision of civic democracy. *Municipal Advocate*, 14(2), 22-24.
- Wolff, T. (2003). The healthy communities movement: A time for transformation. *National Civic Review*, 92(2), 95-111.
- Wolff, T. (2010). *The Power of Collaborative Solutions: Six Principles and Effective Tools for Building Healthy Communities*. San Francisco CA: Jossey Bass.
- 

## Author



### Tom Wolff

**Tom Wolff**, Ph.D. is a nationally recognized consultant on coalition building and community development, with over 30 years' experience training and consulting with individuals, organizations and communities across North America. His clients include federal, state and local government agencies, foundations, hospitals, non-profit organizations, professional associations, and grassroots groups. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, which granted him its 1985 National Career Award for Distinguished Contributions to Practice in Community Psychology and its 1993 Henry V. McNeil Award for Innovation in Community Mental Health. In 2000, he received the For the People Against the Tide Award from Health Care for All for his "outstanding efforts to energize and educate local communities in areas of health care justice." He has held academic appointments at the University of Massachusetts School of Public Health, the University of Massachusetts Medical School Department of Family Medicine and Community Health and Wellesley College's Stone Center.

[Add Comment](#)

## Comments (19)

### Add Comment

1

2



**Bernadette Wright** (Falls Church, VA) *July 28, 2016*

Interesting and important article for anyone considering this method. Shows why off-the-shelf research designs are often not the best design. Sometimes it's better to devise your own research strategies, customized to your unique situation and research needs.



**Ricardo Wilson-Grau** (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) *July 25, 2016*

I am intrigued that Kania and Kramer have not responded. So, I am forwarding to FSG this article and today's American Evaluation Association post by Brian Hoessler and encouraging them to engage.



**Blythe Butler** (Canada) *June 08, 2016*

Thank you for the thoughtful article and the thoughtful comments from those who've posted before me.

As someone who has been involved with implementing a 'collective impact' initiative for the last four years (actually, setting the pre-conditions for collective impact using an organic network model) I have often struggled to understand what the framework means in our context.

Having said that, the power and value of using the Collective Impact framework to guide our work is directly correlated with our ability to adapt it to our context, understand how it could function to support our work; and make judgements about where it can't.

Having a framework to follow is neither necessary nor sufficient for social change. There is a huge difference between knowing what constituent parts make up any framework, or approach, or model, or program, or initiative - and knowing how & why that framework functions, and to what end. I wonder if the problem is less with the collective impact framework - or the 10 things it could do better for that matter - as much as it is a problem with our attraction simplistic 'solutions'. We crave certainty. We want to have a simple way to know if we're making progress, and a simple way to map out what progress might look like: but progress doesn't work that way.

**Add Comment**

We often say in our work that complex-adaptive challenges require

complex-adaptive solutions... Most people nod their heads at that statement: we recognize that on the surface, but have very little capacity – individually or collectively – to put that into practice. Everything in our society feeds our desire for things to be simple, and certainly antiquated funding models in the social sector continue to feed a misunderstanding of complexity and the types of adaptation required to support transformational change.

Why would we even assume that something presented as a framework would be the answer to all our problems? How can we support individuals, agencies, funders, communities, governments to have a greater tolerance for developing the capacity to assess, adapt, implement and learn from frameworks vs. assume they are the end-all-be-all? To me that's the most important question to be asking ourselves, and then striving toward building a culture that supports our ability to understand frameworks in an adaptive way.

Blythe Butler

Atticus Insights & the First 2000 Days Network



**Dawn Henderson** (North Carolina) *May 07, 2016*

I thank Tom and the commentary and the question we continue to grapple with is how do we leverage our work to adoptive models used by funding agencies? This a great critique and we must always challenge approaches that do consider equitable inclusion and dissemination



**Lucyna MacDermott** (Australia) *April 22, 2016*

Hi Tom

So pleased that I stumbled on your post and through it a wealth of exchanges of knowledge and wisdom as well as a myriad of pragmatic tools.

I am currently doing a project on business- not-for-profit partnerships as part of my MBA which I am undertaking as a mature student with some 30 years of experience in community development, public policy and direct child and family services.

I was researching Collective Impact and had a sense of disquiet. I was very careful not to indulge in the 'been there,done that' stance but it immediately struck me that in looking at change makers in the community, the community was conspicuous by its absence. Yes, it is a messy, iterative process to build coalitions with the community but the Collective Impact five point agenda struck me as very 'hygenised'(is there such a word??)and while a useful framework it missed a lot of critical elements.

**Add Comment**

I was pleased to find some thinking to address the shortcomings of the

proposed model. You may be interested in looking at the Collective Impact Forum which adds Collective Impact principles to the 5 point Kania approach



**Justin Piff** (Philadelphia) *April 04, 2016*

Thank you for this thoughtful piece, Tom. Many of your points resonate with me, while others don't reflect my experience evaluating and working with many types of communities - from urban to rural - implementing collective impact. Your critique draws heavily from the seminal 2011 "Collective Impact" article, but many new examples and thoughts about this model have emerged since then, and communities and funders around the country are continuing to determine what collective impact should look like in their communities. I've seen this model evolve and adapt to the nuances of different types of communities, and don't believe it was intended to be static or exhaustive. A few additional reactions:

-The need to "meaningfully engage those in the community most affected by the issues" is generally understood in CI circles - the absence of this mandate, along with the need to explicitly call out inequitable outcomes, in my opinion, are flaws of early collective impact discussions. Adding a sixth "condition" along these lines would be good for the field and for communities. Regardless, principles such as community engagement, inclusion, and equity have been embraced as non-negotiables by many communities and funders around the country.

-In my experience with dozens of communities engaged in collective impact or similarly structured initiatives, systems and policy change are at their core. As a social worker, I am encouraged by collective impact's focus on systems and its acknowledgement that health issues aren't just "health" issues, and that education issues aren't just "education" issues. The need to holistically address the needs within a community - both the seen and unseen phenomena you reference - is inherent in the model that I have seen communities across the country try to implement. As an example, this emphasis is reflected in the language many communities use to describe "opportunity gaps" rather than "achievement gaps." Partnerships and coalitions that have embraced collective impact are very clear in their goals of changing policies, practices, and systems.

-We have become a world of "experts by experience," and while there's value in experience, our ability to apply what's been learned through research and the experiences of those before us is essential to helping us make a better future. I fear that, in general, those interested in social change are moving away from reliance on the work that's come before

**Add Comment**

them, whether research, theory, or practice. I don't think this is unique to those engaged in community partnerships or coalitions. Thank you for encouraging us to reflect on the past; I hope you continue to help funders and communities engaged in this work build on and adapt the successes you've seen.

Lastly, let's give FSG some credit for getting the importance of community collaboration and, from what I see, systems thinking, on the national radar. We're all on the same team, and this is a step in the right direction.



**David Chavis** (Baltimore, MD) *March 30, 2016*

Great piece Tom. I think to get this out there its going to take presentation of this in the forums used by philanthropic and government leaders such as Stanford Social Innovation Review, Chronicle of Philanthropy, and Grantmakers for Effective Organizations as well as the Foundation review.

In regards to Doug Easterly comment, I agree in learning FSG's marketing and dissemination strategy, absolutely brilliant. However I challenge that CI advanced collaboration with or without funders, by 2011 collaboratives, coalitions, partnerships were a given in any social program. In 2007 we looked at the 736 communities receiving Drug Free Community grants. Nearly all of them had 3-5 community collaborations addressing substance abuse. Even in small rural communities. The CI forum is very well endowed and promoted one stop shop for people interested in collaboration. I think its an empirical question how many people or foundations actual got into collaborative strategies as a result of CI. That's just not a story I have heard. I have heard lots people into collaboration looking for more help and direction and have taken on CI because of its popularity and simplicity or their curiosity.

In the area of Place based and community change initiatives, where most of my research and evaluation practice is focused, I see very little influence and a lot of criticism of CI, especially among the larger efforts looking at equity and more complex changes.

I do think that CI has solidified the idea of a shared measurement system, but they have neither introduced it or mastered it.



**Tom Wolff** (Leverett Mass) *March 30, 2016*

Having read all the responses on Linked In and [www.gjcpp.com](http://www.gjcpp.com) I see that many of us are wondering about the role of funders in the spread of CI. It would be wonderful if the funders could read this and become more critical of their blind faith

**Add Comment**

in CI. So how do we get this article in front of funders?

Tom



**Tyler Norris** (Oakland, CA) *March 29, 2016*

Tom,

Thank you for this, and for your ongoing bold contributions to the 'field of fields' working for healthier people and places, and equitable prosperity. With all respect to the FSG team and their notable 'bundling and messaging' prowess, this as an excellent and productive critique of CI. You have made an important contribution to the field that is both respectful of the good work of so many for so long (oft missing from the CI/FSG frame), and matching my experience and observations where CI has played out (and not.) There is a quality of "of, by and for" in effective healthy community initiatives and meaningful resident engagement in our democracy, that is often lost in CI projects, even more in some efforts that frame 'shared value' for business in a narrow CSR frame. As we all work for increased positive impact in the communities we live in and serve, may the contributions of CI in recent years be edified by its maturation.



**Teri Behrens** (Grand Rapids, MI) *March 28, 2016*

Over the past seven years, The Foundation Review, has published 69 peer-reviewed articles that address collaboration and coalitions, and more specifically, the role of philanthropy in supporting them. These articles focus on everything from how evaluation supports collaboration to building leadership capacity for collaboration. While the Collective Impact framework has indeed taken on an outside role in discussions about community change, there are many foundations who "get" the complexity of this work and are doing difficult, nuanced work on the ground.

In addition to resurrecting interest in coalitions, one of the benefits of the CI framework has been to help build a common language. As the limitations of CI become clearer, there's an opportunity to expand the shared vocabulary rather than starting over. Rather than A backbone organization, for example, perhaps we need to focus on "backbone functions" and the different ways to ensure the critical ones are executed -- and for that matter, using research to clarify which functions ARE critical. There is certainly room to criticize the role of marketing vs. research in creating the CI buzz, but are there ways the field can capitalize on the traction it has created?



**Doug Easterling** (Winston-Salem, NC) *March 26, 2016*

I completely agree that this is a long overdue analysis and acknowledgement of the pioneering work that many creative and critical-thinking researchers and practitioners carried out in the decades prior to the "introduction" of CI in 2011.

**Add Comment**

At the same time, it's important to reiterate Tom's point that Kania and Kramer succeeded (mightily) in bringing coalition-building back into the consciousness and the strategies of foundations and government agencies. We should also recognize that this upsurge in interest occurred shortly after Anne Kubisch and her colleagues published *Voices from the Field III*, which observed that comprehensive community initiatives were waning within philanthropy as foundations recognized how challenging it actually is to achieve large-scale impact with grassroots, cross-sector collaborative problem-solving. The CI model and the associated communications strategy reversed that tide and created not just a renewed appetite for coalition-based work, but a profound hunger.

While we scientists might despair of FSG's ability to use sophisticated marketing techniques to build demand for CI, we should also be learning from this experience. Translation, dissemination and uptake are essential steps in the scientific process. We can't continue to publish our findings in journals and hope that we reach foundations and other audiences that are in a position to design and fund community health initiatives. Mechanisms such as "communities of practice" (e.g., the Collective Impact Forum) have proven instrumental in building interest in CI and in engaging funders and practitioners in the process of learning more deeply about what it takes to do effective CI work. Those of us who have been studying community-based collaboration for decades have an important role to play in those circles.



**William Geary** (Alexandria VA) *March 24, 2016*

Yes, Yes, Yes! Thank you Tom. Those of us who care about coalitions and believe in the power of research have been frustrated by CI's unquestioned growth, despite bringing nothing new to the table, raising nothing that has not already been addressed in the field, and giving absolutely NO credit to the years of research on both coalitions and social change that preceded it, and providing NO reliable research.



**Fran Butterfoss** (Yorktown, VA) *March 23, 2016*

Bravo to you, Tom, for having the courage, experience and commitment to collaboration and community building to write this commentary. It is clear, thoughtful and rings true with everything I've been thinking about and conveying to communities I work with for the past 4 years. collective impact has indeed struck a chord with grant makers and communities who are looking for quick wins. But, as you beautifully point out, coalition building is not as simple as the authors of CI make it. As Arthur Himmelman and I lamented a few months ago, our job is to 1) communicate that to those we work with, 2) illustrate how effective coalitions, indeed, must focus on those elements, as well as others 3) and help communities

**Add Comment**

appreciate that our work stands on the shoulders of many researchers and practitioners from varied disciplines who have actually done the hard work of building durable coalitions with and for those people affected by the issues we try to solve together! Thanks so much for your insights!



**kien lee** (Gaithersburg, MD) *March 22, 2016*

Thank you, Tom, for a way-overdue critique of Collective impact. Your write up has been so needed for so long and I want to express my appreciation for your having taken this on and articulating so well what so many of us have been thinking and saying. I have encountered many groups who embraced Collective Impact but have gotten stuck at how to do it, and when it came down to the nuts and bolts, I found myself repeatedly going back to the literature on coalition building that you cited. I also want to add that because of the "watered-down" principles of Collective Impact, the complexity of addressing power is never addressed and without dealing with this, we can't have real change. A big thank you.



**Bill Berkowitz** (Arlington, MA ) *March 22, 2016*

... Big kudos to Tom, and fully agreeing both with his article and with the comments of others. I think a key next task ahead lies in sharing this message with a wider constituency, far beyond GJCPP and SCRA. And while we may not have the marketing heft of FSG Kania and Kramer's consulting firm), I hope we might think together about a dissemination strategy for these important ideas.

- Home
- Management
- Structure
- Donations
- Past Issues
- Subscribe for Free
- About Us
- Sponsors
- Current Issue
- Submissions
- Contact

**Contact Info:**

Scott Wituk, PhD  
 Executive Director, Center for Community Support and Research  
 Wichita State University  
 voice: 316-978-3327  
 email: editor@gjcpp.org

**Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice**  
 ISSN 2163-8667

Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice by GJCPP Editorial Board is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License**.



Based on a work at [www.gjcpp.org](http://www.gjcpp.org). Permissions beyond the scope of this license may be available at <http://www.gjcpp.org/en/contact.php>

© 2009-2018 Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice  
 site by Gray's Web Design

**Add Comment**