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Abstract

Collective impact is the new wave of collaborative work that is to bring about large scale social change. Since its introduction in 2011, there have been many initiatives using collective impact, its structures, and building up to the five conditions needed for a successful collective impact initiatives. The framework for collective impact may be a new way to look at collaborative work, but many collaborative initiatives were already using many of the concepts and reaching the five conditions prior to collective impact’s introduction. Could collective impact concepts work with a smaller group of nonprofit organizations?

This project aims to look at collective impact, its structure, and the pros and cons to using this as a collaborative body of work. This paper will also examine the critiques of collective impact. With this knowledge, this project hopes to recommend structure options for Neighborhoods Owning Power, Action and Leadership (N.O.P.A.L.), a collective of community based, nonprofit organizations representing Central California working to build the leadership and civic engagement of young adults through trauma informed, healing centered, civic engagement to support equity and social justice in the partner organization’s local community and together as a collective on a regional and statewide scale.
Acknowledgments

I would like to thank all the people who helped me with this project. You are all an inspiration to me and am blessed to have such wonderful people to share this work with and to have as a part of my life.

Thank You to:

- N.O.P.A.L Community Partners and their staff: Father’s & Families of San Joaquin, MILPA, Centro Binacional Para el Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueña, Faith in Merced.
- N.O.P.A.L. Consultant: Alivia Shorter
- U.C. Davis Center for Regional Change: Nancy Erbstien, Ph.D, and Caroline Abrhams
- Staff and Faculty of the University of San Francisco School of Management: Dr. Marco Tavanti, Dr. Richard Watters, Dr. Richard Callahan, Adele James and Lyn Corbett
- The Part-time Master in Nonprofit Administration 2017 Cohort
- USF MNA Student Council
- My wife April Cuellar and all my family and friends.
# Table of Contents

List of Tables .................................................................................................................. ii

List of Figures .................................................................................................................. iii

Section 1. Introduction (You may customize these headings) ................................................. 1

   APA Level 2 Heading ...................................................................................................... Error! Bookmark not defined.

Section 2: Methods and Approaches .................................................................................. 8

Section 3: Literature Review .............................................................................................. 10

Section 4: Data Analysis ................................................................................................... 26

Section 5: Conclusions and recommendations .................................................................. 50

List of References ............................................................................................................. 56

Appendix A: Title of Appendix ......................................................................................... 8

Author’s Bio ....................................................................................................................... 58
List of Tables

Table 1  Types of Collaboration  pg. 12
Table 2  Types of Backbone supports  pg. 18
Table 3  Essential Mindset Shifts  pg. 22
Table 4  Principles of Equity and Justice  pg. 25
Table 5  Ideal vs Real results  pg. 45
Table 6  Ideal vs Real Key Questions  pg. 48
Section 1. About This Project and Neighborhoods Owning Power, Action and Leadership

This Capstone project was done in partnership with a nonprofit collaborative, Neighborhoods Owning Power, Action, and Leadership (N.O.P.A.L.). This project was done as a consulting project and utilizes models of Strategic Planning and Organizational Development. The goal of this project is to provide consultation to N.O.P.A.L. in supporting the development of a collaborative structure that will: A) Support the collaborative’s framework, mission and vision, B) Support fund development, and management of grants and programs, and C) support N.O.P.A.L. member organizations to fully participate in the collaborative.

This project will also seek to answer the following question: Could a collective impact model work for a small scale, single sector group of nonprofit organizations working regionally to impact policy change, build leadership of young adults, and work towards equity and social justice in rural, under resourced communities in Central California?

Neighborhoods Owning Power, Action, and Leadership (N.O.P.A.L.)

Neighborhoods Owning Power Action and Leadership (N.O.P.A.L.) is a nonprofit collaborative of grassroots, 501(c)3 organizations, and fiscally sponsored programs from Central California working together to build the leadership of young adults and adults in...
the region through cultural organizing, trauma informed healing and civic engagement. N.O.P.A.L. has been in existence for four years as a collaborative, but individually, N.O.P.A.L. partner organizations have been at the table doing policy advocacy and systems change work around issues of prison and criminal justice reform, and juvenile justice for decades. This is a foundation for new and innovative approaches moving forward. All N.O.P.A.L. partner organizations bring locally driven expertise vital to this work.

N.O.P.A.L. member organizations include: Fathers & Families of San Joaquin, FFSJ (Stockton, CA), Faith in Merced, FIM (Merced, CA) Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indegenoa Oaxaeño, CBDIO (Fresno/Madeira, CA) and Motivating Individual Leadership for Public Advancement, MILPA (Salinas, CA). Supporting the collaborative are three University of California partners, the Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California (CCREC), UC Santa Cruz, the Center for Regional Change (CRC), UC Davis, and the Resource Center for Community Engaged Scholarship (RECCES), UC Merced.

- **Fathers & Families of San Joaquin** has been at the forefront of dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline through policy change and supporting local residents through culturally-informed programs and supports.

- **Faith in Merced** is a driver of cultural organizing as a strategy to increase civic engagement for health and policy advancement efforts.
• **Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indegenas Oaxacena** has served one of the most socially and economically marginalized populations, indigenous Oaxaqueño and immigrant populations for over two decades.

• **MILPA** brings youth-led programs and healing-informed approaches to leadership development and has developed local leaders, a majority of which are formally incarcerated or system-impacted.

• **U.C. Davis Center for Regional Change** lead by Nancy Erbstein, Ph.D, is one of the leading scholars and academic institutions engaging in participatory action research.

• **U.C. Merced Resource Center for Community Engaged Scholarship (ReCCES)** lead by Dr. Robin DeLugan, has a goal to support faculty, students and community partners to collaborate in research that is mutually beneficial to academic and community participants.

• **U.C. Santa Cruz Center for Collaborative Research for an Equitable California** Lead by Dr. Ron Glass, is a University of California multicampus research program and initiative that links inter/trans-disciplinary university researchers, community-based organizations, and policymakers in Equity-Oriented Collaborative, Community-Based Research projects to achieve creative solutions to the interrelated
challenges in the economy, education, employment, environment, food systems, housing, and public health. CCREC is committed to incubating and supporting ethically informed collaborative research, preparing a new generation of engaged scholars and community leaders, and creating institutional capacity to build this emergent field.

**The N.O.P.A.L. Framework.** According to the N.O.P.A.L. Framework Document, the N.O.P.A.L. framework suggests that joining civic engagement with historically-culturally-trauma informed support for young adult well-being both promotes health and strengthens our communities. Four Central California community-based organizations, in collaboration with university partners, developed this framework to describe shared promising local praxes reflective of geographic realities and organizational approaches.¹

**N.O.P.A.L. Member Organizations aim to foster healthier and more equitable communities.** Utilizing Participatory Action Research (PAR) N.O.P.A.L. looks to identify root causes of inequities and address those root causes by engaging in individual and

---

¹ Framework developers and authors are: Nancy Erbstein (UC Davis), Samuel Nuñez (Fathers and Families of San Joaquin), Juan Gomez (MILPA), Nomsia Xiong (Merced Organizing Project), Leoncio Vasquez (CBDIO), Emily Borg (UCSC/FFSJ), Robin DeLugan (UC Merced), Ron Glass (UCSC). Please note that within each partner CBO additional staff-members have also contributed to developing the ideas presented here.
collective actions that “are grounded in cultural traditions and healing practices.” (Borg, DeLugan, Erbstein, Glass, Gomez, Nunez, Vasquez, Xiong, 2016).

**Healing-Centered Young Adult Civic Engagement.** Healing Centered Young Adult Civic Engagement integrates civic engagement, well-being practices and strategies to build on the strengths on young adults and marginalized communities who struggle from impacts of social, economic, and political inequalities. This approach addresses multiple traumas while supporting young adults to be healthy civic leaders and change agents, building strong sustainable and socially just communities.

*This approach will be showcased as part of the N.O.P.A.L. Fellowship Program.*

The N.O.P.A.L. fellowship program is the collaborative’s only program. The fellowship program will support two young adults from each of the member organizations to learn and apply a cultural healing and culturally relevant orientation that is focused on asset
based frameworks for developing and encouraging community leadership, organizing and civic participation. This fellowship is aimed to increase capacity amongst the member organizations to enhance and share results of existing local efforts to support the building of a multi-regional network of healing-centered civic engagement organizations, building the field of healing centered civic engagement, and strengthening their advocacy, policy and systems change efforts regionally, state and nationwide.

**N.O.P.A.L. is looking to implement a better structure to maximize deeper collective impact.** The current structure for N.O.P.A.L. can be described as a social sector network. N.O.P.A.L. uses a flat infrastructure where all member organizations and university partners share decision-making, leadership and fund development responsibilities. Through the life of the collaborative, N.O.P.A.L. has been looking to work on building a structure that supports member organizations to fully participate, share leadership, support the development of the collaborative and maximize their collective impact. There have been many issues within the collaborative and the way that partners work together. Some of the growing pains have been sharing the workload to develop the collaborative, member organization attendance, punctuality and accountability. These issues stem from a combination of the collaborative’s lack of resources, and the tremendous amount of work that each member organization is responsible for in their local community.
Can N.O.P.A.L. utilize a collective impact model and structure to meet collaborative goals and support the collaborative’s development and programs?

Collective Impact has become the new buzz model when it comes to multi-sector driven community and systems change work since its introduction in 2011 in the Stanford Social Innovation Review, Winter Edition by John Kania and Mark Kramer. Though collective impact models are geared to multi-sector approaches to systems-change, there are structural and conceptual components that may support the development and growth of a nonprofit sector, regional collaborative like N.O.P.A.L. This project seeks to find how this model can support N.O.P.A.L., recommend steps for N.O.P.A.L. to take towards a new and improved structure and layout a plan to prioritize moving towards a new structure model.
Section 2: Methods and Approaches

This project is being done as a consulting project for Neighborhoods Owning Power, Action, and Leadership (N.O.P.A.L.). The project type falls under an Organizational Development Model Specifically Strategic Planning.

For this project, the following methods were utilized:

1. **Stakeholder Discovery Interviews:** In conjunction with Alivia Shorter, N.O.P.A.L. Consultant, interviews were conducted of the collaborative partner organization. The interviews looked to pull information about the collaborative for the purposes of:
   - Understanding the partner’s role in the collaborative.
   - Identifying needs for N.O.P.A.L. to improve effectiveness and communication
   - Identifying supports needed for the organization to fully participate in the collaborative.

2. **Archival Data Collection and Analysis:** I gained access to N.O.P.A.L. documents from the beginning of the collaborative. I looked through these documents in
search of any language that may speak to how the coalition would
work together, or structure itself.

3. **Collaborative Visioning Activity:** On February 10, 2017, I led an activity based
visioning session, Ideal vs Real, adapted from the Ideal vs Real activity from
Youth in Focus, 2009. This activity will help identify what partner organizations
feel would be N.O.P.A.L.’s “IDEAL” operating structure, and to get a sense of
what they feel the “REAL” operating structure currently is and how that impacts
the work for partner organization groups.

4. **Collaborative Sustainability Assessment:** I created a survey based on the
Nonprofit Sustainability Assessment to see where N.O.P.A.L. members see the
collaborative is at in terms of sustainability. This tool was adapted from the
Building Sustainability for Nonprofit Organizations, Community Foundation of
Jackson Hole.

5. **Literature Review:** Literature Review of the Collective Impact Model, its
structure, the 5 conditions to success, and collective impact has worked in rural
settings.
Section 3: Literature Review

In the nonprofit sector, organizations have been looking for ways to solve societal issues through their programmatic efforts and many times fall far from reaching the type of systems change needed to reach their vision. The philanthropic sector has also approached funding programs and organizations that create a competitive platform where they fund a few applicants from a pool of many based on which program and/or organization they feel will make the greatest contribution toward solving a social problem. This pushes organizations to move away from collaborative work and into thinking of how to make their programs different from others working on the same issue.

This review will look at the literature surrounding Collective Impact and how it differentiates from other collaborative models in the social sectors. It will look at collective impact model structures, understand it’s components and concepts and the pros and cons to using such models. This review will also consider literature that speaks to how well or not collective impact models move the dial on social justice and equity issues.

In 2011 John Kania and Mark Kramer introduced Collective Impact as a new collaborative model that brings together important committed actors from different

---

2 Most funders, faced with the task of choosing a few grantees from many applicants try to ascertain which organizations make the greatest contribution toward solving a social problem (Kania, Kramer, Collective Impact, Stanford Social Innovation Review, Winter Edition, 2011)
sectors under a common agenda for solving an identified social problem.³

There is a vast amount of literature that support collective impact and speak to detail on how it differentiates from other collaborative models, and there have also been a few critiques of collective impact models and the impacts that this relatively new model is having on equity and social justice issues.

Kania and Kramer argued that collective impact models were unlike other collaborative models, especially in how they are structured. “collective impact initiatives involve a centralized infrastructure, a dedicated staff, and a structured process that leads to a common agenda, shared measurement, continuous communication, and mutually reinforcing activities among all participants.” (Kania, Kramer 2011).

Other collaborative models include funder collaboratives, public-private partnerships, multi-stakeholder initiatives, and Social Sector Networks. These models have all looked to make large scale impacts but fall short of doing so due to the way they are structured and operate. Literature suggests that these models lack elements that collective impact models must have in place to be successful. The elements missing from older collaborative models include, a lack of overarching evidence based plans of action, inability to support engaging a full set of stakeholders impacted by the issue or

hold actors accountable for results. Table 1 compares the many types of collaboration and how collective impact differs.

Table 1: Types of Collaborations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Collaborations</th>
<th>Model Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funder Collaboratives</td>
<td>• Groups of funders pooling their resources to support the same issue&lt;br&gt;• Lacks Evidence Based Action Plan&lt;br&gt;• Lacks Share Measurement&lt;br&gt;• Lack Mutually Reinforcing Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Private Partnerships</td>
<td>• Partnerships between government and private sector&lt;br&gt;• Deliver services and benefits&lt;br&gt;• Doesn’t engage all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives</td>
<td>• Voluntary activities by Stakeholders from different sectors around a common issue/theme&lt;br&gt;• Lack Shared Measurements&lt;br&gt;• Lack backbone Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sector Networks</td>
<td>• Groups of individuals and/or organizations connected by purposeful relationships&lt;br&gt;• Emphasis on information sharing and short term actions&lt;br&gt;• Lack backbone structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Impact Initiatives</td>
<td>• Long term commitments from important actors from multi-sectors&lt;br&gt;• Based on a Common Agenda, Shared Measurements, Mutually Reinforcing Activities, Ongoing Communications, and having backbone support structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collective Impact:

As previously mentioned, collective impact, as introduced by Kania and Kramer (2011), works differently than other models of collaboration. In an article in the Stanford Social Innovation Review, *Embracing Emergence: How Collective Impact addresses complexity*, Kania and Kramer argued that “collective impact is not merely a new process that supports the same social sector solutions, but an entirely different model of social progress." The collective impact model relies on 5 conditions of collective success. Kania and Kramer argued that these 5 conditions help to produce true alignment amongst partners in the collaborative and produce more impactful results.

The five conditions of collective success are:

- A common agenda
- Shared measurements
- Mutually reinforcing activities
- Continuous communication
- Backbone Support

---


Kania and Kramer (2011) broke down the roles that these five conditions play in producing the deeper collective impacts compared to other traditional collaborative efforts.

**Common Agenda:** A common agenda is critical to aligning collaborative partners to a common vision, a common understanding of the problem and common solutions to the issue. This is different from other models of collaborative efforts such as funder collaboratives, isolated impact models and social networks. Though they may be working on the same issues these models have varied visions for moving the issue, different understanding to the root causes to an issue and ideas to solve different aspects of the issue. In collaborative efforts, these slight differences create distractions for greater and deeper impacts.

**Shared Measurements:** Kania and Kramer (2011) argued that Shared Measurement Systems played an essential role for collective impact. Identifying how a collaborative will measure success, report on it, and document lessons learned is critical to identifying and agreeing on a common agenda. Shared measurement will also help produce better accountability and fidelity to the collaborative’s common agenda.

**Mutually Reinforcing Activities:** Kania and Kramer (2011) discussed that, “The power of collective action comes not from the sheer numbers of participants or the uniformity of their efforts, but from the coordination of their differentiated activities through a mutually reinforcing plan of action. This condition of collective impact success
requires that all partners not do the same work, but take on work that is
needed by the collaborative and that builds off their organizational strengths.
Sometimes that means that organization do their everyday work because its seen as a
need for the end goals of the collaborative, and sometimes it means organizations will
be moving away from what they will do, to take on needs of the collaborative using their
skill sets.

**Continuous Communication:** Many failed attempts at collaboration work within
the nonprofit sector have been caused by a lack of communication and trust. Building
trust in an environment where organizations are conditioned to compete for grants and
resources, makes collaboration difficult. Kania and Kramer (2011) argued that
developing trust amongst participants is a monumental challenge, and that participants
need to feel that their work is being reflected in the collaborative and that decision
made are not favoring one organization over others. They later argued that “consistent
and open communication is needed across the many players to build trust, assure
mutual objectives and create common motivation” (Kania, Kramer, 2013). Without
communication and trust, it will be nearly impossible to come to agreements on a
common agenda, shared measurements, and a collective action plan.

**Backbone Support:** Another common issue with collaborative work is the
administration of the collaborative. This includes facilitating trust and relationship
building, building a common agenda, visioning, resource development and
management, and sharing leadership. Kania and Kramer (2013) articulated that “creating and managing collective impact requires a separate organization(s) with staff and a specific set of skills to serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and coordinate participating organizations and agencies.” Kania and Kramer (2011) built the case for separate entities playing the backbone organization for the collaborative saying that “backbone organizations embody the principles of adaptive leadership, the ability to focus on people’s attention and create a sense of urgency, the skill to apply pressure to stakeholders, without overwhelming them, the competence to frame issues in a way that presents opportunities as well as difficulties and the strength to mediate conflict among stakeholders.”

Hanleybrown, Kania and Kramer (2012) in their article Channeling Change: Making Collective Impact Work, published in the Stanford Social Innovation Review, discussed the functions that Backbone Organizations serve. There are six essential functions that a backbone organization is responsible for:

- Providing overall strategic direction
- Facilitating dialogue between partners,
- Managing data collection and analysis
- Handling communications
- Coordinating community outreach
- Mobilize funding.
This body of work has been difficult for many collaborative efforts especially in the nonprofit sector. For many collaborative efforts, participating organizations usually share the responsibilities of what backbone organizations do. Because they also must juggle their organizations day to day work outside of the collaborative, sharing the role of backbone support puts more strain on the participating organizations and doesn’t allow them to fully participate in the collaborative. This strain on organizations is a reason Kania and Kramer (2011) felt this work called for new organizations to specify in holding these pieces for collective work. They go on to state, “And it requires the creation of a new set of nonprofit management organizations that have the skills and resources to assemble and coordinate the specific element necessary for collective action to succeed.” (Kania & Kramer, 2011)

Though the ideal situation would be to have a backbone organization, Hanleybrown, Kania and Kramer (2013) made the argument that backbone support doesn’t have to sit solely with one organization, as some of the early literature suggests. They showed that there are multiple ways that backbone support can take place. Table 2 shows the different make ups of backbone support and what the pros and cons are for each version. Types of Backbone support structures include:

- Funder-Based
- New Nonprofit
- Existing Nonprofit
- Government
- Shared Across Multiple Organizations
- Steering Committee Driven

Table 2: Types of backbone supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Backbones</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funder-Based</strong></td>
<td>One funder initiates CI strategy as planner, financier, and convener</td>
<td>Calgary Homeless Foundation</td>
<td>Ability to secure start-up funding and recurring resources</td>
<td>Lack of broad buy-in if CI effort seen as driven by one funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to bring others to the table and leverage other funders</td>
<td>Lack of perceived neutrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Nonprofit</strong></td>
<td>New entity is created, often by private funding, to serve as backbone</td>
<td>Community Center for Education Results</td>
<td>Perceived neutrality as facilitator and convener</td>
<td>Lack of sustainable funding stream and potential questions about funding priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential lack of baggage</td>
<td>Potential competition with local nonprofits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Nonprofit</strong></td>
<td>Established nonprofit takes the lead in coordinating CI strategy</td>
<td>Opportunity Chicago</td>
<td>Credibility, clear ownership, and strong understanding of issue</td>
<td>Potential “baggage” and lack of perceived neutrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing infrastructure in place if properly resourced</td>
<td>Lack of attention if poorly funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td>Government entity, either at local or state level, drives CI effort</td>
<td>Shape Up Somerville</td>
<td>Public sector “seal of approval”</td>
<td>Bureaucracy may slow progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing infrastructure in place if properly resourced</td>
<td>Public funding may not be dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Across Multiple Organizations</strong></td>
<td>Numerous organizations take ownership of CI wins</td>
<td>Magnolia Place</td>
<td>Lower resource requirements if shared across multiple organizations</td>
<td>Lack of clear accountability with multiple voices at the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broad buy-in expertise</td>
<td>Coordination challenges, leading to potential inefficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee Driven</strong></td>
<td>Senior-level committees with ultimate decision-making power</td>
<td>Memphis Fast Forward</td>
<td>Broad buy-in from senior leaders across public, private, and nonprofit sector</td>
<td>Lack of clear accountability with multiple voices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shifting our thinking of Collective Work

Collective Impact models require organizations and funders to shift the way they think about collective work. Both are required to move away from the isolated impact model approach to change, which identifies and funds a solution to the issue that runs through one organization and its programs (Kania & Kramer, 2011). “It requires a systemic approach to social impact that focuses on the relationships between organizations and the progress toward shared objectives.” The shift is required from both funders and organizations doing the collective work.
For collective impact to be successful, funders must shift the way they fund collaborative work. Kania and Kramer (2011) argued that foundations needed to shift the way they supported change work. They argued that funders should stop using the isolated impact model of funding, and move to a support of efforts that spanned the long-term process of social change. This shift also calls for allowing their grantees to drive the change without funders prescribing a solution for them. Given the fact that change doesn’t happen overnight Kania and Kramer (2011) argued that this type of shift “requires a fundamental change in how funders see their role, from funding organizations to leading a long-term process of social change”.

Along with the shift in roles, Kania and Kramer (2011) recommended that funders also follow four practices to support large scale change. Those efforts include: Taking responsibility for assembling the elements of a solution, create a movement for change, include solutions from outside the nonprofit sector and use actionable knowledge to influence behavior and improve performance.

As the ask to shift mindsets in this work is laid out for the funders, the shift for collective impact success also falls on the organizations that will be involved in the collective impact initiative. In the 2014 article, *Essential Mindset Shifts for Collective Impact*, Kania, Hanleybrown, and Juster argued that pushing to meet the five conditions

for collective impact success was not enough. They noted that there were some key shifts that had to happen that would require some hard work to implement for many organizations. The shifts require partners to answer the questions of: 1) Who is involved, 2) How people work together, and 3) How progress happens.

When thinking of Who is involved, the literature speaks to making sure to have the right people at the table, having the right eyes on the problem and agree to work together towards a common goal. According Kania, Hanelybrown, and Juster (2014) this is the part that many failed collaborative efforts get it wrong. These efforts many times leave out critical partners in Government, the nonprofit sector, corporate and philanthropic sectors. More importantly they leave out people with lived experience in the subject.  

In thinking how people work together, mindset shifts must occur in how organizations work together. The authors argued that organizations need to look at building relationships to based on our common goals more so than building rational for why they are at the table. The literature also speaks to the need to focus on structure and not just strategy (Kania, Kramer, Juster, 2014) Strategy is important, but without a solid structure driving the work, you could end up with organizations doing work independently and taking away from the shared intent of the initiative. Lastly on how

people work together, is the ability to share credit. Being that organizations are conditioned to compete for limited funds to solve issues, the mindset is usually how do we keep our doors open, as opposed to how do we work together to create a larger impact. Kania, Hanleybrown and Juster (2014) stated that “organizations should think about their decisions in the context of others.” For this shift to happen, it should be supported by the funders as mentioned above, where funders must also recognize what contributions the individual organizations are making towards the collaborative and not solely on the grantees work.

The final mindset addressed is How progress happens. The authors addressed this question pushing organizations involved in collective impact initiatives “to pay attention to adaptive work not just technical solutions” (Kania, Hanleybrown, and Juster, 2014). The authors suggest that even though successful collective impact models strive to have a common agenda and vision for the work, that this shouldn’t include a predetermined outcome. Instead the collective needs to approach solving issues by being adaptive. In collective impact this can happen by supporting organizations to get innovative in their approaches and really rely on the mutually reinforcing activities and shared measurements to move the work forward.

Table 3 describes the shifts that need to be made for a successful collective impact model.

**Table 3: Essential Mindset Shifts for Collective Impact**
### Mindset Shifts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who is involved</strong></td>
<td>- Getting the right eyes on the problem and agree to work towards a common goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **How they work together** | - Relational is as important as strategy  
- Structure is as important as Strategy  
- Sharing credit is more important than taking credit |
| **How progress happens** | - Pay attention to adaptive work not just technical solutions  
- Look for silver buck shots instead of a silver bullet  
- Identify innovative solutions |


Now that we have learned about collective impact, the structure and the five conditions for success, the role of backbone supports and the mindset shifts needed, let’s take a look at some of the critiques of collective impact.

In March of 2016, Tom Wolff published a blog post in the Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice named *Ten Places Where Collective Impact Gets It Wrong*. In this blog post, Wolff describes some of the places where collective impact misses creating the real change that is needed in many community settings. The first of these ten critiques is a very important one. “Collective impact does not address the essential requirement for meaningfully engaging those in the community most affected by the issues. As Kania and Kramer stated in 2011 the concept of collective impact is to bring together important multi-sector actors to create a collective approach to solving a
problem. This already suggests a top down approach to the work, meaning that organizational leaders from multi-sectors will be putting their heads together to decide on how to best address the issue, create a common agenda around the issue and lay out a collective action plan before bringing in the community stakeholders who are dealing with issue head on. This issue with collective impact was also highlighted in a 2016 article in the Nonprofit Quarterly, Collaborating for Equity and Justice: Moving Beyond Collective Impact. In describing the need for collaborative multi-sector approaches to social problems, the authors made the argument that “For maximum effectiveness, these approaches must include and prioritize leadership by those most affected by injustice and inequality in order to effect structural and system change...”(Wolff, Minkler, Wolfe, Berkowitz, Bowen, Butterfoss, Christens, Francisco, Himmelmen and Lee, 2016).

Other critiques of the collective impact, argued that collective impact misses the most important part of addressing the issues of social and economic injustice and structural racism. This is part of the six Principles of Collaborating for Equity and Justice toolkit, introduced by Wolff and company. To this point, Wolff takes it further in that collective impact misses the element of social justice and equity that live within many coalitions. This also speaks to the critique laid out in the Principles for Equity and Justice

---

that spoke to collective impact not building upon the multitude of research and community engaged scholarship to show what is working.

The following is the list of Places Wolff said Collective Impact gets it wrong.⁹

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

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.


9. Community wide, multi-sectoral collaboratives cannot be simplified into CI’s five required conditions.

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

Table 4 describes the Six Principles of Collaborating for Equity and Justice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Collaborating for Equity and Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly addresses issues of social and economic injustice and structural racism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ community organizing as an intentional strategy and as part of the process. Work to build resident leadership and power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build on the extensive community-engaged scholarship and research over the last 4 decades that show what works, that acknowledge the complexities, and that evaluate appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4. Data Analysis

**Archived Document Review:** In the review of the archived N.O.P.A.L. documents, not much was documented about how the collaborative would work together. In the documents there was a Young Adult Civic Engagement (YACE), the former name of the N.O.P.A.L. collaborative, diagram which spoke to what the work would look like from the collaborative stand point. In the early stages of the collaborative, there was also a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that was created to exist between the university partners and the community partner organization. This document represents the closest language to how the collaborative would work together.

The MOU had external goals, and more importantly an internal goal to “develop a transparent, democratic, and accountable approach to university-community partnerships focusing on youth and young adult mobilization and to pilot and institutionalize strategy of collaboration”. Ultimately the MOU was to really come to agreements and lay out a body of work that would be the pilot program for the N.O.P.A.L. Fellowship. Aside from the language to support the fellows, the document asked both community organizations and university partners to “attend meetings with other YACE (N.O.P.A.L.) organizations or at participating UC campuses as needed”. This very loose criteria for collaboration speaks loudly to being what is described in the literature as a Social Sector Network. A social sector network as described in the literature as groups of individuals and/or organizations connected by purposeful
relationships with an emphasis on information sharing and short term actions. Social Sector networks lack a backbone structure and the collaboration is for the most part an informal structured group. Understanding the how N.O.P.A.L. is now structured it makes sense how some of the issues that have been raised are present. We will look at those issues later in this section.

Sustainability Assessment: The Nonprofit Collaborative Sustainability Assessment is a tool that allows organizations to assess how sustainable a collaborative is in relation to the 5 elements of nonprofit sustainability. This tool was adapted from the Building Sustainability for Nonprofit Organizations, Community Foundation of Jackson Hole. The assessment asks partner organization leadership and stakeholders to rate the collaborative’s state based on questions that speak to the 5 elements of nonprofit sustainability. Those Elements are:

1. Passionate and engaged Leaders
2. Strong Collaborative Brand
3. Clear and Compelling Strategy
4. Strategic Fund development
5. Demonstrated Value

---

Each Category has 5 questions, each question can be answered with a score of 1-3. A score of 1 equals “No, the collaborative does not have that”, a score of 2 equals that “The Collaborative is working on it”, and a score of 3 equals “Yes, we have this”. The Scores for each category are added up and each category is given a total score. If the subtotal score lands between 5-7, this signifies that the collaborative has work to do to move towards sustainability, if the scores land between 8-11, this signifies that the collaborative is moving in the right direction but has room for improvement, and if the scores land between 12-15 this signifies that the collaborative is well on its way to sustainability.
N.O.P.A.L. Results:

The following is how the respondents scored each question in each category:

Under the section for Passionate and Engaged Leaders here are the results:

**Connected and Engaged Advisory Board or Executive Body?**

- 80% of respondents scored this category.
- 20% of respondents scored this category.

**Network of Key Influencers**

- 60% of respondents scored this category.
- 40% of respondents scored this category.
Shared Leadership
5 responses

A commitment to Collaborative and Organizational Members Development
5 responses
The average Total score for N.O.P.A.L. in the Passionate and Engaged Leaders Section is an **11.2**. The respondents felt that they had a good network of Key Influencers with 80% of them scoring it a 3. While the rest of the questions a majority answer that they are working on getting commitment of member organization staff dedicated to the collaborative (60% scored this a 2). 80% of the respondents scored a 2 for a connected and engaged advisory board, shared leadership, and a commitment to collaborative and organizational member’s development.
Under the section for A Strong collaborative brand, the results were:

Clear Mission and Vision?
5 responses

- No, we don’t have this: 20%
- Yes, we have this: 80%

Statement of Core Values
5 responses

- No, we don’t have this: 40%
- Yes, we have this: 60%
Strategic Marketing Plan
5 responses

- No we don't have this: 40%
- We're working on it?: 60%

Strong Content Rich Online Presence
5 responses

- No we don't have this: 80%
- We're working on it?: 20%
The average total score for N.O.P.A.L. under the Strong Collaborative Brand section is a 10.4. 100% of the respondents scored N.O.P.A.L. a 3 under the Strong Engagement and Presence in Communities question, meaning that they are doing a great job. 80% of the respondents felt that N.O.P.A.L. doesn’t have a strong content rich online presence, while 60% felt that N.O.P.A.L. was working on a strategic marketing plan and a statement of core values. Finally, 80% of the respondents felt that N.O.P.A.L. is working on clear and vision and mission.
Under the category of Clear and Compelling Strategy the results were:

**A living strategic plan?**
5 responses

- No we don't have this? 40%
- We're working on it? 60%

**Unique Programming?**
5 responses

- No we don't have this? 60%
- We're working on it? 40%
Delivery of High Quality Services (Collaborative not your own organization)

5 responses

- No we don't have this: 80%
- We're working on it: 20%
- Yes, we have this: 20%

Adaptive Capacity?

5 responses

- No we don't have this: 80%
- We're working on it: 20%
- Yes, we have this: 20%
Respondents scored N.O.P.A.L. in the Clear and Compelling Strategy category at a

10.2. 60% of the respondents felt that N.O.P.A.L. has no living strategic plan, while 60% of the respondents felt that N.O.P.A.L. was working towards delivering high quality services, and creating an adaptive capacity for the collaborative. 80% of the respondents also felt that the collaborative is working towards building partnerships.
Under the category of Strategic Fund Development, the results were:

**Fundraising Plan?**
5 responses

- 80%
- 20%

**Balanced Portfolio of Funding Sources?**
5 responses

- 100%
Member organization’s leadership support and participation?
5 responses

Endowment and Reserve Funds?
5 responses
Under the category of Strategic Fund Development respondents scored N.O.P.A.L. at an **8.8**. 100% of the respondents felt that N.O.P.A.L. doesn’t have a balanced portfolio of funding sources nor does the collaborative have an endowment and/or reserve funding. 80% of the respondents said that N.O.P.A.L. is working towards a fundraising plan. 60% of the respondents stated that N.O.P.A.L. has an expanded definition of resources and that they have member organization leadership and support in fundraising.
Under the category for Demonstrated Value the results were:

**Defined Measure of Success?**
5 responses

- 80%:
  
- 20%:

**Collection of Relevant and Reliable Data**
5 responses

- 60%:

- 40%:
Evaluation Design and Implementation Process?
5 responses

Clarity of Performance Expectations?
5 responses
Under the category of Demonstrated Value respondents scored N.O.P.A.L. at an 8.8.

100% of the respondents felt that N.O.P.A.L. is working on an evaluation and development plan. 80% of the respondents felt that N.O.P.A.L. is working on a defined measure of success and on a community assessment and feedback process. 60% of the respondents feel that N.O.P.A.L. is working on getting clear on performance expectations for the collaborative and the partner organizations as well as collecting relevant and reliable data.
Overall N.O.P.A.L. Averages

Overall N.O.P.A.L. had a Sustainability score of **9.88**. This signifies that N.O.P.A.L. is working towards sustainability but has some work to do. According to the data, N.O.P.A.L. is doing the best in the category of Passionate and Engaged leaders with a score of 11.2 followed by having a strong collaborative brand scoring a 10.4. Where N.O.P.A.L. should focus their efforts is in creating a strategic fund development plan and showcasing their demonstrated value both scoring the lowest for the collaborative at an 8.8
**Ideal vs Real:** As part of a N.O.P.A.L. face-to-face meeting in February I conducted an activity based visioning exercise that creates spaces for participants to vision their ideal structure for N.O.P.A.L. and to talk about what the real structure looks like and feels like, and how the current structure is impacting the member organization’s involvement and the collaborative work. Table 5 shows the collective results of the activity.

**Table 6: Collective Results for Ideal vs Real**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th><strong>IDEAL</strong></th>
<th><strong>REAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>• Very independent and meets as needed (can disrupt consistency and keeping momentum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○ Stakeholders, fellows, supporters, sponsors</td>
<td>• Strong outreach and programs (circle, healing, empowerment, leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clearly detailed plan and outline (templates, materials)</td>
<td>• Unidentified plan of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing healing circles</td>
<td>• Little ongoing research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordinated fellows program supported</td>
<td>• Cultural grounding, organic, alignment in values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ongoing collaborative research</td>
<td>• Loose, unclear roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular action (regional) tied to fellows</td>
<td>• Not utilizing the expertise of UC, or partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong relationship with universities</td>
<td>• Drafted but did not finalize MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Different levels of participation and expectations, of different staff levels</td>
<td>• Unclear onboarding of staff, and who is responsible for overseeing fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-cursor to research studies, but not implemented or shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fund development        | • Lead grant writer—fund development coordinator                         | • Very little grant writing and development                                                    |
|                         | • Develop MOUs                                                            | • LCF Foundation, Strong relationships with current funders                                  |
|                         | • Identify future funders (sustainability)                                | • Reactive to fund development, as opposed to proactive                                       |
|                         | • Funders who are already familiar with us                                |   ○ “bend” to foundation needs                                                               |
|                         | • Evaluation metrics                                                      | • CBOs have little funds, and campuses have no current resources (grant funding reliant)     |
|                         | • Target budgets                                                          | •                                                                            |
|                         | • Committees to leads fund development                                   | •                                                                            |
| **Funds Management** | - One umbrella organization with subcontractors  
- Grant administration, oversight  
- Under fiscal sponsorship, or funds are run through different organizations as appropriate with oversight committee  
- Lead fiscal agency  
- Overall budget | - No sample template (budget, outcomes)  
- Some CBOs have taken leadership  
- No overall budget |
| **Overall Coordination** | - Designate each org’s capacity and expertise  
- Trainings for coordination (logistics)  
- Cross cultural learning exchanges  
- Project Coordinator (funded) to drive project forward  
- More consistency from everyone; formal committees | - Works mostly by email, with little in-person meetings  
- Scattered communication (calls, emails)  
- Haven’t made “leap” into community engagement or field engagement (as N.O.P.A.L.)  
- No MOUs – built on relationships currently  
- No clear timeline; cancel events and convenings  
- No current work plan |
| **Communication** | - Clear understanding of roles, agreements, how we communicate to funders  
- Respond to emails within 24-48 hours  
- Regular meetings (in-person)  
- Community friendly, regional events  
- Engaging, compelling communication materials | - Uneven communication  
- Missing input from some  
- Lacking materials for all target pops  
- No online presence  
- Lack of external visibility (of the collaborative, not just the partners at the table) |
| **Accountability** | - Fellows are accountable to one another, as well as partners  
- Follow through | - No measures or practices in place to ensure accountability  
- Lots of multi-tasking |
The next steps taken with this data was to think about what questions we would need to ask to make sure we addressed what folks were saying and that we listed out what the ideal suggestions would look like in terms of work. And thinking through what structure models would best fit. Table 6 shows the ideal structure, what the bodies of work would like and what questions need to be asked to prioritize and shift to an ideal structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th>TASKS TO BE PERFORMED</th>
<th>Key Questions for moving forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **FUND DEVELOPMENT/MANAGEMENT** | • Lead Grant Writer/ Fund Developer  
• Fiscal Agent/ Umbrella Organization | • Develop Funding Strategy  
• Create Budgets  
  o Program  
  o Overall Collaborative  
  o Targets  
• Create Evaluation Metrics  
• Coordinate Fundraising Committee  
• Grant Administration/Oversight  
• Fiscal Sponsorship, Funds Management and Distribution | o Is this an internal partner organization or external organization/fiscal sponsor?  
 o How will fund development be shared amongst the partner orgs in a committee structure and/or organizational lead? |
| **COMMUNICATIONS** | • Internal:  
  o Regular Communications  
  o Response system  
  o Healing Practices (circulos)  
• External:  
  o Engaging, compelling communication materials | • Internal:  
  o Email  
  o In-person meetings  
  o Conference Calls  
  o Respond to communications w/in 24-48 hrs.  
• External:  
  o 1pgs  
  o Website  
  o Social Media  
  o Multi-media | o How does this look in an outside coordinator structure vs Internal lead organization structure?  
 o What will be the roles of partner organizations? |
| **ACCOUNTABILITY** | ▪ Accountability of Partner Organizations  
▪ Follow Through  
▪ Evaluation for Growth | ▪ Create MOU for Partner Organizations  
▪ Create Accountability Mechanisms  
▪ Create a collaborative evaluation system to evaluate processes and find ways to improve processes and operating structures | o How does this look in an outside coordinator structure vs Internal lead organization structure?  
 o What will be the roles of partner organizations? |
| **INFRASTRUCTURE/COORDINATION** | ▪ Overall Coordinator  
▪ Coordinating Committees  
▪ Clear Roles for Partners | ▪ Coordination of:  
  o Strategic Direction  
  o Meetings/Gatherings | o Is there a partner organization who feels they can take this on? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Based on capacity and expertise.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan (logic model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trainings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinate Committees for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program (fellowship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive (Partner Org Directors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationship Building:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Between Partner Orgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Community Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research/Evaluation Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What would be the steps it takes to bring on a coordinator or to have a partner organization lead?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After presenting this information to the collaborative, the group decided to move towards working on the multiple pieces of this work. The consultant Alivia shorter worked on a N.O.P.A.L. Agreement document that is to guide the collaborative in moving towards an ideal structure.

**N.O.P.A.L.: Collaborative Agreements**

1. Identify and hold a standing, bi-weekly call, attended by all partners.
2. Answer/respond to all emails within 24-48 hours.
3. Develop an agenda for all calls and meetings, and provide at least 48 hours in advance.
4. Share all documents, resources, and materials so that we can build on existing progress
5. Respect the time of the meetings by being on time, staying through the end if possible, and being present and engaged.
6. Identify appropriate staff members from our organizations who can attend and be fully present (expectation of approximately 5 hours per week of time to N.O.P.A.L. meetings and/or collaborative projects).
7. Hold monthly in-person meetings; if you cannot join live be available to join virtually (conference line/video conferencing). RSVP for all staff so meetings can be planned accordingly.
8. Be conscious and aware of the differing levels of capacity of all partners -- staffing, funding, time
Section 5: Conclusions and recommendations

After consideration of the data presented in the Ideal vs Real activity, site interviews, sustainability assessment and the literature review. I recommend the following for N.O.P.A.L..

Recommendation #1: It is recommended that N.O.P.A.L. utilize a mix of the collective impact model structure and concepts while weaving in the Principles of Equity and Justice.

The literature spoke to the key concepts of collective impact and the 5 conditions of collective impact. The critiques of Collective Impact call for a deeper thinking of how not only to create large scale change, but how we assure that we are changing systems, policies and structures to assure that we tackle these social issues.

It is recommended that in creating a common agenda that N.O.P.A.L. assure that this common agenda include Principles 1 and 4 of the Principles of Collaborating for Equity and Justice. Principle 1 speaks to explicitly address issues of social and economic injustices and structural racism. Principle 4 suggests that the focus of the common agenda include policy, systems, and structural change.

Under shared management for collective impact, Principle five should be incorporated with in. Outside of collecting data and measuring results, it’s important to build also on extensive research that show what works in collaboratives, helps the collaborative adjust to complexities and evaluate appropriately.
The 3 condition of collective impact is mutually reinforcing activities. In working to set up this condition, principles three and six should be worked on.

Principle 3 speaks to the types activities that should be part of condition. PCEJ states these activities should include community organizing. And the building up of leadership within the community. Principle six suggests that core functions should include a focus on equity and justice, and should build up member ownership and leadership.

The condition of continuous communication speaks to building trust and having systems in place for consistent and open communication. This should also include Principle 2 of the PCEJ which suggests the need to build enough trust with not only the participating organizations but also with the community being served by the collaborative giving them equal power in decision making and agenda setting.

Recommendation #2: To complete the 5 condition of collective impact, it is recommended that N.O.P.A.L. employ a collaborative structure for a shared backbone support mixed with a steering committee driven model.

N.O.P.A.L. doesn’t have a lot of resources to bring on an outside organization to play the backbone support role. With this restraint, N.O.P.A.L. needs to share some of the key roles of backbone support. Looking at the different types of backbone support laid out in the literature review, I recommend that they create a structure that used the already existing Executive Committee as the decision-making body of the collaborative.
They would provide the vision for the collaborative and will direct a part-time coordinator move that vision and get the collaborative moving in the right direction.

The N.O.P.A.L. Coordinator would be responsible to take the vision and decisions from executive committee, delegate the work to the sub-committees. The coordinator will lead under the direction of the fundraising committee and oversee from the steering committee, the creation a sustainable funding strategy. The coordinator will also be responsible for collecting the necessary information needed to manage grants and reporting back to foundations.

The Sub-committees will consist of partner organization staff and fellows. The committees will be responsible for parts of the collective work of N.O.P.A.L. The Committees are as follows:

- Fund Development
- Outreach
- Policy
- Evaluation
- N.O.P.A.L. Fellowship
Recommendation #3: It is recommended that a N.O.P.A.L. partner organization take on the role of Fiscal Sponsorship.

Again, due to the lack of resources for the collaborative, N.O.P.A.L. cannot afford to utilize an outside sponsorship for the collaborative. Given that a big piece of work that needs the most attention is how monies will flow through the collaborative, it is recommended that a partner organization who has the capacity for this type of leadership, take on the role of fiscal sponsorship. The role of fiscal sponsorship would include managing and reporting on collaborative grants, disburse checks as needed for the collaborative, and house the N.O.P.A.L. coordinator.

Recommendation #4: It is recommended that N.O.P.A.L. create a Strategic Plan

N.O.P.A.L. needs to create a strategic plan that will help them meet the 5 conditions of collective impact and incorporate the principles for collaborating for equity and justice. This plan will help them create a common agenda, create shared measurements, action plans and build in structures to support continuous communication practices. This plan will also help N.O.P.A.L. think through the structure, create a plan to move into their ideal structure if this recommended structure doesn’t fit, and move the dial on the collaborative’s sustainability.

Next Steps: to conclude this project, I will be presenting this body of work to N.O.P.A.L. at their next executive committee meeting as well as the general meeting. I will be working with N.O.P.A.L. consultant, Alivia Shorter, to start to move these
recommendations into action. As these recommendations become reality I
will support N.O.P.A.L. in documenting the progress and evaluate the structure.
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