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For decades, communities have struggled with implementing plans to achieve health improvement goals. Research published in the Stanford Social Innovation Review has identified five conditions of achieving “Collective Impact.” This assessment identifies different levels of accomplishment for each of those conditions. Identifying where your community is in each of these vital areas is an ideal way to being the process of moving to a higher level of practices and results. Rate your organization/community on a scale of 1.0 to 4.0 on the following scale for each of the five conditions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Point</th>
<th>Making Some Progress</th>
<th>Better Approaches</th>
<th>Best of Promising Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMON AGENDA: Developing and Managing a Shared Strategy for Change

1. **Starting Point:**
   - Organizations are each following their own agendas without shared priorities goals or strategies.
   - Efforts are fragmented, duplicated, and there is inconsistent use of language and concepts.

2. **Making Some Progress**
   - Working together on a Community Health Needs Assessment leads to agreement on priority health issues.
   - Community organizations come together to set goals, but there is still poor alignment and collaboration on the strategies to achieve the goals.
   - Individual organizations independently develop plans or logic models to justify their actions and get funding.

3. **Better Approaches:**
   - Organizations work together to identify the underlying causes and key strategies for addressing priority issues
   - Organizations seek to find and share proven and promising practices to improve efficiency and effectiveness.
   - Strategy Maps are collaboratively developed for each of the priority issues

4. **Best of Promising Practices:**
   - A “zoomable” Strategy Map framework helps align the efforts of many community partners around the jointly-developed strategy maps.
   - All Objectives have clear “From-To Gaps” and may identify barriers and/or Key Success Factors (KSFs).
   - Strategy Maps development is integrated with Quality Improvement practices and techniques.
   - Funders and cross-sector teams actively collaborate on strategy refinement and implementation.
   - The strategy is managed by a cross-section of community leaders using state-of-the-art techniques and tools.

SHARED MEASUREMENT: Deploying a Shared System of Strategic Measurement

1. **Starting Point:**
   - Measurement chaos. There is a lot of duplicated work developing measures and collecting data, and most organizations use different, inconsistent measure definitions.
   - The measurement that is being done produces limited value. Most measures are health status measures or highly-aggregated community statistics that do little to help manage strategy implementation.

2. **Making Some Progress**
   - High-level Outcome measures are tracked, and there is agreement to work toward specific goals (SMART Goals).
   - Individual programs are measured with operational measures like inputs, outputs, efficiency and effectiveness.
• Program measures are used primarily for evaluation at the end of a program.
• Data is increasingly used for decisions, and discussions look at how to move the measures.

3. Better Approaches:
• Balanced Scorecard concepts and practices (such as clarifying objectives, measures, targets and initiatives) are used for organizations to measure their strategy (both drivers and outcomes).
• There is improved standardization in how measures are defined and used among different groups, along with increased data sharing.
• There are common reports that include measures for a variety of organizations as well as agreed-upon community indicators.
• Measures are used as a catalyst to improve performance at each stage of strategy development and execution.

4. Best of Promising Practices:
• The Community Balanced Scorecard™ (CBSC) approach is used to measure multiple aspects of the strategy.
• Strategy management software makes strategy measurement easy and efficient. Presentation-ready formats minimize the time spent re-entering and re-packaging information for different audiences.
• Leading and Lagging indicators are used to continually improve alignment, resource allocation and strategy execution. Multiple funders monitor initiatives, strategic drivers, and project progress with a shared system.
• Data is efficiently shared, minimizing redundant data collection, and community organizations work to improve the quality of the data for the measures they are sharing.
• Operational systems allow information on individuals to be appropriately shared among organizations and efficiently aggregated for community-level measures.

MUTUALLY-REINFORCING ACTIVITIES: Working as a Team to Do More with Less

1. Starting Point:
• Projects are launched (and managed) by different organizations and are not part of a coordinated community strategy.
• Most organizations are not even aware of what other organizations are planning to do in similar areas.
• Many organizations work on similar things and duplicate work in many ways.
• Organizations striving to do similar things compete for resources rather than seeking ways to share their efforts to do more with less.

2. Making Some Progress
• Projects are tied to priority health issues, but with little emphasis on teamwork to improve effectiveness.
• Funders may encourage collaboration (in theory), but still use competitive ways of granting resources.
• Some progress is made in linking funding to project implementation to increases accountability.
• There are discussions of how to reinforce each other’s activities to achieve better Collective Impact.

3. Better Approaches:
• Multiple organizations align their efforts around shared Strategy Maps to so their unique strengths can be best used to accomplish specific objectives that together advance an overall strategy.
• Collaborative work on strategic objectives expands awareness of who is working on what, and increases sharing of ideas, practices, data, and tools that reduces the “re-inventing the wheel” on projects that are launched.
• Gaps are identified, and organizations that may fill those gaps are invited to collaborate to improve overall community effectiveness.
• An organized framework of community work enhances efforts to seek and win large grants.
4. Best of Promising Practices:

- Organizing Initiatives/Projects and programs around a “Zoomable” strategy map framework allows information on a large number of projects to be efficiently monitored and reported on.
- The shift from organization-centric planning to community strategy-centric planning brings groups together to determine how they can best combine their efforts to stretch scarce resources.
- Funders shift from rewarding projects based on individual success to rewarding collaboration and sharing.
- Projects are consistently woven together to create lasting, sustainable outcomes, optimizing community assets.
- Multiple organizations work with individuals based on coordinated care plans and shared information.

CONTINUOUS COMMUNICATION: Staying Informed, Learning, and Efficiently Collaborating

1. Starting Point:

- Very little communication among the many organizations working to improve health.
- Promising practices, materials, insights, data and expertise are rarely shared to help other organizations be more successful in achieving health improvement goals (due to both inward-focused mindsets and lack of good tools).
- People wanting information on community health issues need to seek it out from a variety of different sources.

2. Making Some Progress

- Community-wide meetings occur, but on-going information exchange is still rare and not in very useful formats.
- Cross-organization task teams are established, but they are not very effective, nor are they equipped with efficient tools to support efficient and effective collaboration.
- A variety of Websites have information that is shared, but it tends to be either overwhelming or fragmented so the use and value is limited.
- Attempts are made to use on-line tools, but those efforts are not based on best practices.

3. Better Approaches:

- Regular meetings and reports keep a wide range of stakeholders informed—and keep work from slipping.
- Action Teams work to learn from each other and from peers around the country to improve performance.
- There is reasonably good communication among the members—but it is time-intensive for staff and relies on E-mail, documents, PowerPoint, Excel and phone calls.
- Information is communicated to a variety of audiences in various ways—Website, reports, etc.

4. Best of Promising Practices:

- On-line tools with interactive, presentation-ready formats greatly reduce the time required to keep everyone informed.
- 24x7 access to centralized information optimized for different audiences keeps strategy execution top-of-mind and at people’s fingertips.
- A well-designed set of wikis support rapid access to the information people need to act effectively—measures, project status, intentions and plans are available for those who care about them.
- Many partners and individuals efficiently update centralized information to accelerate progress.
- People across the community can access the most current information (maintained in one place) on a variety of Websites.
- Care providers (clinical and social) have up-to-date information on patients, even across multiple organizations.
BACKBONE SUPPORT: Helping to Coordinate, Align, and Managed Successful Collective Impact

1. Starting Point:
   - No formal backbone organization exists.
   - Efforts to collaborate are difficult because there is no structure or leadership to help communicate, coordinate and align efforts.
   - There is little appreciation for the value of backbone support.

2. Making Some Progress
   - A "backbone organization" exists to serve as a mutual convener and help facilitate collaboration.
   - The backbone organization uses a people-based approach and basic technologies (documents, PowerPoint, Excel and E-mail) approach to support communication and collaboration.
   - Progress is slow because so much depends on a backbone organization that has insufficient staff and resources.

3. Better Approaches:
   - The backbone organization is reasonably well funded and has dedicated staff.
   - The community partners work together with the backbone organization to attempt to achieve all the conditions of Collective Impact.
   - The backbone support helps with community progress, but the constrained capacity of the backbone organization limits the scope of issues and organizations that can be involved.
   - The backbone staff may struggle with information overload, but they work hard to accomplish coordination and communication (using the limited tools that they have available).

4. Best of Promising Practices:
   - A backbone organization has staff along with the appropriate “digital backbone” infrastructure to allow the dedicated staff to be much more efficient and successful.
   - The on-line information management tools do much of the heavy lifting for communication, monitoring, and alignment.
   - The backbone organization is much more sustainable, because it can support more issues with fewer staff because it has the appropriate tools—which cost less than staff and scale more easily.
   - Community Partners are able to take on more of the workload (reducing the burden on the backbone organization) because they can leverage the ‘digital backbone” technologies.
   - A blend of person-based, strategic and operational tools allows flexible and efficient collaboration at many different levels: strategic, operational, and relational.
   - Organizations across the community see great value in how the backbone organization and on-line infrastructure saves them time and money—so they are willing to keep funding the backbone function.

For more information on improving on this Collective Impact Maturity Model, please contact Bill Barberg.

Bill.barberg@insightformation.com  763-331-8361