


Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact

03



Supplement: Sample Questions, Outcomes, and Indicators

Hallie Preskill
Marcie Parkhurst
Jennifer Splansky Juster



**COLLECTIVE
IMPACT FORUM**





About the Collective Impact Forum

The Collective Impact Forum, an initiative of FSG and the Aspen Institute Forum for Community Solutions, is a resource for people and organizations using the collective impact approach to address large-scale social and environmental problems. We aim to increase the effectiveness and adoption of collective impact by providing practitioners with access to the tools, training opportunities, and peer networks they need to be successful in their work. The Collective Impact Forum includes communities of practice, in-person convenings, and an online community and resource center launching in early 2014.

Learn more at collectiveimpactforum.org

About FSG

FSG is a nonprofit consulting firm specializing in strategy, evaluation, and research. Our international teams work across all sectors by partnering with corporations, foundations, school systems, nonprofits, and governments in every region of the globe. Our goal is to help companies and organizations—individually and collectively—achieve greater social change.

Working with many of the world's leading corporations, nonprofit organizations, and charitable foundations, FSG has completed more than 600 consulting engagements around the world, produced dozens of research reports, published influential articles in *Harvard Business Review* and *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, and has been featured in *The New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Economist*, *Financial Times*, *BusinessWeek*, *Fast Company*, *Forbes*, and on NPR, amongst others. Learn more about FSG at www.fsg.org.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 02

Supplement: Sample Questions, Outcomes, & Indicators	08	Sample Strategic Questions
	09	Sample Outcomes and Indicators
	10	Common Agenda
	11	Backbone Infrastructure
	13	Mutually Reinforcing Activities
	14	Shared Measurement
	16	Continuous Communication
	17	Collective Impact Learning Culture
	18	Collective Impact Capacity
	19	Behavior Change: Professional Practice
	20	Behavior Change: Individual Behavior
	21	Systems Change: Funding Flows
	22	Systems Change: Cultural Norms
23	Systems Change: Advocacy and Public Policy	

References 24

Executive Summary

Overview of the Contents

As collective impact has gained traction across the globe, demand has grown for an effective approach to evaluating collective impact initiatives that meets the needs of various interested parties. Collective impact practitioners seek timely, high-quality data that enables reflection and informs strategic and tactical decision making. Funders and other supporters require an approach to performance measurement and evaluation that can offer

evidence of progress toward the initiative's goals at different points along the collective impact journey.

The *Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact* responds to these needs by offering practitioners, funders, and evaluators a way to think about, plan for, and implement different performance measurement and evaluation activities.

This guide's three goals are to:

- Discuss the role of continuous learning and adaptation in the collective impact context.
- Present a framework for how to approach performance measurement and evaluation.
- Offer practical guidance on how to plan for and implement a variety of performance measurement and evaluation activities at the initiative level, at different points in the initiative's lifetime.

The guide does not focus on evaluating individual organizations' programs.

Each part of the guide is available as a free download on the **Collective Impact Forum** (collectiveimpactforum.org), an online community and centralized set of resources on collective impact. We encourage all interested users to share their feedback and experiences with the guide in the Collective Impact Forum's online community. We are particularly interested in readers' reflections about how they have used

the guide, as well as their suggestions for additional questions, outcomes, or indicators that other practitioners may wish to consider. We also encourage readers to upload their own performance measurement and evaluation documents (e.g., findings, reports, presentations) to share with the field.



01

Learning and Evaluation in the Collective Impact Context

This section describes the importance of continuous learning and presents an evaluation framework to guide the design of different performance measurement, evaluation, and learning activities. The purpose of the framework is to help readers conceptualize an effective approach to performance measurement and evaluation, given their initiative's stage of development and maturity.



02

Assessing Progress and Impact

This section offers guidance on how to plan for and implement a variety of performance measurement and evaluation activities aimed at assessing an initiative's progress, effectiveness, and impact. It includes sample performance indicators, evaluation questions, and outcomes for collective impact initiatives in different stages of development, as well as advice on how to gather, make sense of, and use data to inform strategic decision making, how to communicate evaluation findings, how to choose and work with evaluators (when desired), and how to budget for evaluation.

This part of the guide also includes four mini-case studies.



03

Supplement: Sample Questions, Outcomes, and Indicators


The final section includes a larger set of sample evaluation questions, outcomes, and indicators.



The guide is divided into three parts:

About Collective Impact

Collective impact (CI) occurs when a group of actors from different sectors commit to a common agenda for solving a complex social or environmental problem. More than simply a new way of collaborating, collective impact is a structured approach to problem solving that includes [five core conditions](#):



Once these conditions are in place, a CI initiative's work is organized through what we have termed "[cascading levels of collaboration](#)." As described in a recent post on the *Stanford Social Innovation Review* blog,¹ this loose structure typically includes the following:

An oversight group, often called a Steering Committee or Executive Committee, which consists of cross-sector CEO-level individuals from key organizations engaged with the issue, as well as representatives of the individuals touched by the issue. This group meets regularly to oversee the progress of the entire initiative.

Working groups focused on the initiative's primary strategies. (More complicated initiatives may have subgroups that take on specific objectives within the prioritized strategies.) Working groups typically develop their own plans for action organized around "moving the needle" on specific shared measures. Once plans are developed, the working groups come together on a regular basis to share data and stories about progress, as well as challenges and opportunities, and to communicate their activities to other partners affected by the issue, so that the circle

of alignment can grow. Although each working group meets separately, effective coordination by the backbone can ensure coordinated action among hundreds of organizations that simultaneously tackle many different dimensions of a complex issue.

The backbone function (as defined above) provides periodic and systematic assessments of progress attained by the various working groups and then synthesizes the results and presents them back to the oversight committee that carries the sustaining flame of the common agenda.

For more information about the collective impact change process, please visit the Collective Impact Forum at www.collectiveimpactforum.org.

Key Takeaways from Parts One and Two

Parts One and Two of this guide describe the importance of continuous learning in the context of collective impact and offer practical advice on how to plan for and implement a variety of performance measurement and evaluation activities aimed at assessing an initiative's progress, effectiveness, and impact over time. Key takeaways from Parts One and Two include the following.

1. Continuous learning is critical to collective impact success.

In order for CI initiatives to be successful, their leaders must understand that collective impact is not a solution, but rather a problem-solving *process*. This process requires leaders to remain keenly aware of changes in context, conditions, and circumstances; to embrace curiosity and seek opportunities for learning; to openly share

information and observations with others; and, most importantly, to willingly adapt their strategies quickly in response to the ever-evolving environment. This is what it means to embrace continuous learning, which we believe is critical to CI success.

2. Collective impact partners should adopt a two-part approach to measuring progress and evaluating effectiveness and impact.

To understand *what progress an initiative is making*, CI partners can develop a **performance measurement system** that tracks a set of early performance indicators and incorporates data from the initiative's shared measurement system.

To understand *how and why the initiative is making progress*, CI practitioners and funders can use **different approaches to evaluation**, depending on their initiative's stage of development.

3. The collective impact change process typically involves three stages of development, each of which requires a different approach to performance measurement and evaluation.

The Framework for Designing and Conducting Performance Measurement and Evaluation of Collective Impact Efforts (Figure 1 on page 7) illustrates, at a conceptual level, a sequence of stages that CI initiatives typically pass through in their pursuit of social or environmental change. We refer to these stages as the initiative's early, middle, and late years.

The initiative's **early years** are typically focused on understanding context and designing and implementing the initiative. This includes establishing the five core conditions of collective impact, as well as the coordinated implementation of multiple programs, activities, and campaigns, according to the initiative's overarching strategy or theory of change.

- **Recommended approach to performance measurement:** CI partners should agree on a set of **early performance indicators** to track their progress in establishing key elements of the initiative's infrastructure.
- **Recommended approach to evaluation:** CI partners should consider using **developmental evaluation** to better understand their initiative's context and learn more about how the initiative is developing.

The work of evaluating a CI initiative's context and carefully assessing the quality of its design and implementation in its early years is critically important and should not be dismissed as mere focus on process. The successful reorganization and alignment of the system of actors that are addressing a problem is itself an important outcome of the CI change process.

In an initiative's **middle years**, CI partners should expect to achieve some significant changes in patterns of behavior (e.g., changes in professional practice, changes in individual behavior) and in the way systems operate (e.g., changes in cultural norms, funding flows, public policy). These changes serve as the gateway to the initiative's ultimate population-level outcomes and are thus an important area of focus for both performance measurement and evaluation.

- **Recommended approach to performance measurement:** CI partners should use data from their initiative's **shared measurement system** to determine if, where, and for whom the initiative is making progress.
- **Recommended approach to evaluation:** CI partners can use **formative evaluation** to help refine, improve, and fine-tune this work, as well as developmental evaluation to explore newer aspects of the initiative.

In an initiative's **later years**, CI partners should expect to achieve meaningful, measurable change with regard to the initiative's ultimate goal(s). At this time, CI partners may seek to take stock of the initiative's accomplishments and understand its long-term impact on targeted issues or populations.

- **Recommended approach to evaluation:** Information from the shared measurement system can contribute longitudinal data on the initiative's achievements and challenges. To better understand how and to what extent the initiative's ultimate outcomes have been achieved, and to what extent the CI effort contributed to these outcomes, CI partners may wish to commission a **summative evaluation**.

Part Two of the guide provides mini-case studies of how four CI initiatives have used performance measurement and evaluation to assess progress, inform decision making, and evaluate impact.

4. Performance measurement and evaluation bring indisputable value to a collective impact initiative and should be given sufficient financial and logistical support.

We strongly encourage CI partners to carefully plan for how performance measurement and evaluation can support their work, and we urge all funders to embed support for evaluation into every CI initiative's budget from the very beginning.

Part Two of the guide offers a short list of sample strategic questions, outcomes, and indicators that


CI partners can consider using to define the scope and focus of their performance measurement and evaluation activities.

This Supplement offers a longer list of sample strategic questions, outcomes, and indicators.

We strongly encourage CI partners to carefully plan for how performance measurement and evaluation can support their work, and we urge all funders to embed support for evaluation into every CI initiative's budget from the very beginning.

Figure 1:

A Framework for Designing and Conducting Performance Measurement and Evaluation of Collective Impact Efforts



For an expanded view of the “What’s happening?” section of the framework above, please refer to Figure 1 on page 12 of Part One of the Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact.

Supplement:

Sample Questions, Outcomes, and Indicators

THIS SECTION: Offers guidance on selecting the questions, outcomes, and indicators that an initiative's evaluation may focus on.

Provides a set of sample evaluation questions, outcomes, and indicators that CI partners may wish to consider when selecting early indicators of progress or planning for an evaluation.

Sample Strategic Questions

Questions about a collective impact initiative's context

- What cultural, socioeconomic, and political factors influence the design and implementation of the initiative? How and why do these factors influence progress?
- What systems is the CI initiative attempting to affect and what factors may influence changes in those systems?
- To what extent is there a sense of urgency around the issue, champions who are willing to make a commitment to addressing the issue through a collective impact approach, and funding to support the work?
- To what extent and in what ways does the CI initiative tap into the strengths and assets of the community(ies)?

Questions about a collective impact initiative's design and implementation

- To what extent and in what ways is the CI initiative designed to incorporate all five of the core conditions?
- Which conditions are gaining the most momentum, and where is the initiative experiencing significant challenges?
- To what extent and in what ways are learning processes and structures embedded in the ongoing work/activities of the CI initiative?
- To what extent and in what ways is the CI initiative evolving in response to progress or challenges in achieving outcomes? Why is it responding and adapting in specific ways?
- What else is needed to continue supporting the initiative's progress?

Questions about a collective impact initiative's outcomes and impact

- To what extent and in what ways are the various systems (e.g., education, health) making different decisions about policies, programs, and the use of resources as they relate to the goals of the CI initiative?
- To what extent and in what ways are social and cultural norms evolving in ways that support the goals of the CI initiative?
- To what extent has the initiative achieved its ultimate outcomes? How and why have these occurred?
- What has contributed to or hindered the achievement of the CI initiative's goals?
- What aspects of the work had the greatest impact on the initiative's success (or failure)?
- What difference has the initiative made on its stakeholders and their capacity to address complex problems?
- What are key lessons learned for the field about engaging in collective impact?

Sample Outcomes and Indicators

Once CI partners have identified the strategic questions that will guide their evaluation, the **next step** is to determine the **outcomes and associated indicators** that will be used to evaluate progress. These outcomes and indicators are tied to specific learning questions, as described below. For purposes of this discussion, we use the following definitions:

Outcomes are “Changes or benefits resulting from activities and outputs. Short-term outcomes produce changes in learning, knowledge, attitude, skills, or understanding. Intermediate outcomes generate changes in behavior, practice, or decisions. Long-term outcomes produce changes in condition.”²

Indicators “provide evidence that a certain condition exists or certain results have or have not been achieved. Indicators enable decision-makers to assess progress toward the achievement of intended outputs, outcomes, goals, and objectives.”³

Typically, each outcome is linked to multiple indicators, providing evaluators with the flexibility to choose the most relevant and cost-effective indicators and enabling CI partners to develop a robust understanding of their progress toward achieving each outcome.

The following pages offer a set of sample outcomes and indicators that CI partners may wish to consider when selecting early indicators of progress or planning for an evaluation. **Bolded indicators** are identified as **early performance indicators** that CI partners may wish to focus on during the initiative's early years.

Common Agenda

All participants have a shared vision for change, including a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed upon actions.



To what extent do CI partners and other relevant stakeholders have a shared vision for change, including a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed upon actions?

OUTCOMES

The development of the common agenda has included a diverse set of voices and perspectives from multiple sectors

Partners have achieved a common understanding of the problem

Partners have come to consensus on the initiative's ultimate goal and committed to a shared vision for change

Partners have committed to solving the problem using an adaptive approach with clearly articulated strategies and agreed upon actions

INDICATORS

- **The initiative's Steering Committee (or other leadership structure) includes voices from all relevant sectors and constituencies**
- **Members of the target population help shape the common agenda**
- Community members are aware of the CI initiative's goals and activities
- The group's understanding of the problem is informed by data
- **Partners and the broader community understand and can articulate the problem**
- **Geographical boundaries and population targets are clear for all partners**
- Partners accurately describe the goals of the initiative
- **Partners use data (qualitative and quantitative) to inform selection of strategies and actions**
- Partners show commitment to the elements of the common agenda
- Partners demonstrate flexibility and willingness to adapt strategies and tactics in the face of new information, successes, or challenges

NOTE: **BOLDED** INDICATORS ARE IDENTIFIED AS EARLY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.

Backbone Infrastructure*

Creating and managing collective impact requires dedicated staff and strong leaders who possess a specific set of skills to serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and coordinate participating organizations and agencies.

Has the CI initiative established an effective backbone infrastructure and governance structure?



OUTCOMES

INDICATORS

The initiative's steering committee (SC) or other leadership structure has been established

- **SC includes a diverse set of voices and perspectives from multiple relevant sectors and constituencies**

An effective backbone function has been identified or established

- Backbone (BB) staff effectively manage complex relationships
- BB staff demonstrate commitment to the CI's vision
- BB staff are both neutral and inclusive
- **BB staff are respected by important partners and external stakeholders**

To what extent and in what ways does the backbone infrastructure provide the leadership, support, and guidance partners need to do their work as planned?



OUTCOMES

INDICATORS

The backbone infrastructure (BBI) effectively guides the CI initiative's vision and strategy

- BBI effectively engages SC members in issues of strategic importance
- BBI and SC build a common understanding of the problem that needs to be addressed
- The SC makes clear and timely decisions on matters of strategic importance
- BBI and SC serve as thought leaders/standard bearers for the initiative
- BBI builds and maintains hope and motivation to achieve the initiative's goals
- BBI celebrates and disseminates achievements of CI partners internally and externally
- **Partners look to the BBI and SC for initiative support, strategic guidance, and leadership**

* The term "backbone infrastructure" refers to staff members who perform backbone functions, members of the initiative's Steering Committee (or other leadership structure), and influential champions.

Backbone Infrastructure (continued)

OUTCOMES

The backbone infrastructure ensures alignment of existing activities and pursuit of new opportunities toward the initiative's goal

INDICATORS

- **BBI provides project management support, including monitoring progress toward goals and connecting partners to discuss opportunities, challenges, gaps, and overlaps**
- **BBI convenes partners and key external stakeholders to ensure alignment of activities and pursue new opportunities**
- BBI creates paths for and recruits new partners so they become involved
- BBI seeks out opportunities for alignment with other efforts

The backbone infrastructure supports the collection and use of data to promote accountability, learning, and improvement

- **SC regularly reviews data from the shared measurement system (SMS) on progress toward goals and uses it to inform strategic decision making**
- BBI aggregates SMS data across the CI initiative and shares progress reports, lessons, and trends with partners and relevant external stakeholders
- BBI visibly and vocally communicates the importance of the shared measurement system for the CI

When relevant, the backbone infrastructure supports the development of policy goals and ways to achieve them

- BBI has developed a policy/advocacy agenda in collaboration with CI partners
- BBI equips partners for effective advocacy (e.g., providing talking points, identifying windows of opportunity)
- BBI reaches out to policymakers and builds relationships

The backbone infrastructure is helping to align sufficient funding to support the CI initiative's goals

- New resources from public and private sources are contributed to the CI initiative



To what extent and in what ways does the backbone infrastructure engage community members and other key stakeholders to ensure broad-based support for the initiative?

OUTCOMES

The backbone infrastructure has built public will, consensus, and commitment to the goals of the CI initiative

INDICATORS

- There is a perceived sense of urgency and a call to action among targeted audiences
- Community members are engaged in CI-related activities
- A variety of communications are used to increase awareness and garner support for the CI initiative

NOTE: **BOLDED** INDICATORS ARE IDENTIFIED AS EARLY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.

Mutually Reinforcing Activities

Participant activities must be differentiated while still coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action.

To what extent and in what ways are partners' activities differentiated, while still coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action?



OUTCOMES

Partners have developed and are using a collective plan of action

Partners are coordinating their activities to align with the plan of action

Partners have filled gaps and reduced duplication of efforts

Partners have (re)allocated resources to their highest and best use in support of the CI initiative

INDICATORS

- **An action plan clearly specifies the activities that different partners have committed to implementing**
- The plan evolves over time in response to learning about the CI's successes, challenges, and opportunities
- **Working groups (or other collaborative structures) are established to coordinate activities in alignment with the plan of action**
- **Partners have clear approaches/goals for their own contribution to their working group**
- Partners understand each other's work and how it supports the common agenda
- **Partners understand the roles of other working groups and how these support the common agenda**
- Partners collaborate within and across working groups
- Partners hold each other accountable for implementing activities as planned
- Partners identify and implement new strategies or activities to address gaps or duplication
- **Partners' individual activities are changing to better align with the plan of action**
- Funders of partner organizations align their resources to support the plan of action

Shared Measurement

Collecting data and measuring results consistently across all participants ensures that efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable.



To what extent and in what ways are partners engaged in using the shared measurement system (SMS)?

OUTCOMES

Partners understand the value of the shared measurement system

The process of designing and managing the shared measurement system is participatory and transparent

INDICATORS

- **Partners understand the value of the shared measurement system**
- **Partners understand how they will participate in the shared measurement system**
- Partners feel a collective accountability for results
- **A participatory process is used to determine a common set of indicators and data collection methods**
- Partners continually re-assess indicators, data collection methods, and approaches to sharing findings as needed
- **Partners agree to a data sharing agreement that supports ongoing collaboration**



To what extent and in what ways does the shared measurement system's design and implementation support learning? (e.g., enable CI partners to collect data and measure results consistently, to ensure that efforts remained aligned and to enable partners to hold each other accountable)?

OUTCOMES

The shared measurement system has been designed to track progress toward the CI's outcomes

The shared measurement system is well-designed and user friendly

INDICATORS

- **The system includes a common set of indicators and data collection methods that can provide timely evidence of (a lack of) progress toward the CI initiative's outcomes**
- The system provides a sufficient range of useful and timely reports
- Partners find the system's interface to be intuitive and user friendly
- The system allows users to customize fields as appropriate
- The system can adapt to changes in measurement priorities and approaches as the initiative evolves

NOTE: **BOLDED** INDICATORS ARE IDENTIFIED AS EARLY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.

Shared Measurement (continued)

OUTCOMES

Quality data on a set of meaningful indicators is available to partners in a timely manner

INDICATORS

- Partners commit to collecting the data as defined in the data plan
- Partners have the capacity to collect and input quality data
- Partners know how to use the SMS
- Partners contribute quality data on a common set of indicators in a timely and consistent manner

Partners use data from the shared measurement system to make decisions

- Partners have confidence in the quality of the data
- Partners regularly analyze and interpret data, synthesize findings, and refine plans as a collective
- Partners use data to guide their own organizations' decision-making processes
- Partners share lessons learned and how these lessons inform their practice

To what extent does the SMS have the resources and capacity needed to operate as planned?



OUTCOMES

Sufficient funding and resources are available to support the technology platform, training, and technical support

INDICATORS

- The SMS platform functions reliably
- The SMS platform ensures appropriate confidentiality
- Partners know how to use the SMS
- High-quality technical support is provided to users when they need it

Continuous Communication

Consistent and open communication is needed across the many players and among external stakeholders to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation.



To what extent and in what ways does cross-initiative communication help to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation?

OUTCOMES

Structures and processes are in place to engage CI partners, keeping them informed and inspired

Structures and processes are in place to engage the CI initiative's external stakeholders, keeping them informed and inspired

INDICATORS

- **Working groups (or other collaborative structures) hold regular meetings**
 - **Members of working groups or other collaborative structures attend and participate actively in meetings**
 - **Partners communicate and coordinate efforts regularly (with and independently of backbone staff)**
 - Partners regularly seek feedback and advice from one another
 - Timely and appropriate information flows throughout the cascading levels of linked collaboration
 - Partners publicly discuss and advocate for the goals of the initiative
-
- **The CI initiative engages external stakeholders in regular meetings and integrates their feedback into the overall strategy**
 - The CI initiative regularly communicates key activities and progress with external stakeholders

NOTE: **BOLDED** INDICATORS ARE IDENTIFIED AS EARLY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.

Collective Impact Learning Culture

Collective impact learning culture refers to the ways in which learning is embedded in the CI initiative.

To what extent and in what ways does the CI initiative's context support learning, experimentation, dialogue, and reflection?



OUTCOMES	INDICATORS
The CI initiative has established a culture of experimentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Partners are open to exploring new ideas and approaches• Partners design and implement new approaches to advance their shared goals• Partners adapt best practices from other fields/geographies to advance their shared goals
The CI initiative has established structures and processes to support ongoing learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning structures and processes are embedded in the work of the CI initiative• Partners regularly make time for group reflection and discussion• Partners openly and regularly share observations, lessons, setbacks, challenges, failures, and best practices with one another• Partners raise questions and clarify assumptions and beliefs
The CI initiative has established a culture of openness, transparency, and inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Decision-making processes are open and transparent• Partners feel included in major decision-making processes• The CI initiative actively solicits and acts on feedback from community members and other external partners
The CI initiative has established a culture of trust, respect, and humility among partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• CI meetings provide participants with a sense of psychological safety• Partners openly share their setbacks, challenges, and failures with one another• Partners regularly seek feedback and advice from one another• Partners trust each other• People of different cultures and backgrounds feel respected and heard within the CI initiative• Partners collaborate with each other• Partners feel supported and recognized in their CI related work

Collective Impact Capacity

Collective impact capacity refers to the interstitial elements that keep the CI process moving forward (e.g., funding, human resources).



To what extent does the CI initiative have the resources and capacity it needs to implement its work as planned?

OUTCOMES

The CI initiative has sufficient financial resources to do its work as planned

The CI initiative has sufficient people and skills to do its work as planned

The CI initiative has the partnerships and support it needs to do its work as planned

The skills and capacities of participating organizations have improved

INDICATORS

- **Sufficient funding is available over a multi-year period to support the CI initiative's work**
- Sufficient operating support is available to enable backbone staff and the initiative's leadership to fulfill their responsibilities
- Funding received by the CI initiative is responsive to the strategies and approaches used by the CI initiative (e.g., innovative/experimental programs may require more flexible funding streams)⁴
- Backbone staff and initiative leadership are skilled in strategic visioning
- Backbone staff and initiative leadership are skilled in problem solving
- **CI initiative has influencers and champions that command the respect of a broader set of stakeholders and can bring stakeholders to the table**
- **CI initiative has supporters who can champion the strategy with the broader community**
- **Leadership of the CI initiative comes from multiple sectors with the ability to shift both public and private funds⁵**
- Participating organizations report greater technical expertise related to the CI initiative's goals
- Participating organizations' constituents report improvements in performance or effectiveness
- Participating organizations report improved management and administrative capacity

NOTE: **BOLDED** INDICATORS ARE IDENTIFIED AS EARLY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.

Behavior Change: Professional Practice

To what extent and in what ways are formal actors and organizations/institutions making changes in their work as it relates to the goals of the CI initiative?



OUTCOMES

INDICATORS

Professional education and standards are evolving to support the goals of the CI initiative

- Professional education/training are more aligned with the goals of CI initiative
- Professional standards are more aligned with the goals of CI initiative

Formal actors and organizations demonstrate increased responsiveness to community needs

- Formal actors/organizations better understand the population they serve and are better able to address their needs
- The population or issue(s) targeted by the CI initiative are viewed as a priority among system actors
- The population or issue(s) targeted by the CI initiative receive greater attention from system actors

Formal actors and organizations have improved service delivery capacity

- Formal actors/organizations adopt practices prioritized by the CI initiative
- Formal actors/organizations have increased knowledge related to the goals of the CI initiative
- Formal actors/organizations have increased skills related to the goals of the CI initiative
- Formal actors/organizations have increased capacity to use data to drive decision-making and program improvement
- Formal actors/organizations serving the target population report increase in staff motivation

Organizational and institutional policies evolve to support the goals of the CI initiative

- Formal and informal policies within organizations change or are adopted to support goals of the CI initiative
- Individual/organizational/institutional performance incentives are more aligned with the goals of CI initiative

Behavior Change: Individual Behavior



To what extent and in what ways are individuals changing their behavior as it relates to the goals of the CI initiative?

OUTCOMES

INDICATORS

The CI initiative is influencing changes in awareness/knowledge related to the desired behavior change

- Individuals report increased awareness of the issues surrounding the desired behavior change
- Individuals report improved knowledge around the desired behavior change

The CI initiative is influencing changes in attitudes/beliefs towards the desired behavior change

- Individuals view the issues/goals of the CI initiative with increased importance, relevance, and/or a sense of urgency
- Individuals express attitudes or beliefs that support the desired behavior change

The CI initiative is influencing changes in individuals' willingness to engage in the desired behavior change

- Individuals report increased willingness/intention to engage in the desired behavior change
- Individuals report increased belief that they have the ability to make a change in their behavior/situation

The CI initiative is influencing changes in individual behavior

- Individuals demonstrate or report engaging in the desired action or behavior (can be a one-time, e.g. enrolling in a program, or sustained change in behavior, e.g. recycling)

Systems Change: Funding Flows

To what extent and in what ways are the flows of philanthropic and public funding shifting to support the goals of the CI initiative?



OUTCOMES

Philanthropic funding in the targeted issue area/system is increasingly aligned with the goals of the CI initiative

INDICATORS

- Overall philanthropic funding for the targeted issue area or system has increased
- Existing philanthropic resources are directed toward evidence-based strategies in the targeted issue area/system
- New philanthropic resources are committed to evidence-based strategies in the targeted issue area/system
- Philanthropic funding is increasingly designed to allow for program innovation and experimentation in the targeted issue area/system

Public funding in the targeted issue area/system targeted by the CI initiative is increasingly aligned with the goals of the CI initiative

- Overall public funding (federal, state, or local government) for the targeted issue area or system has increased
- Existing public resources are directed toward evidence-based strategies in the targeted issue area/system
- New public resources are directed toward evidence-based strategies in the target issue area/system
- Public funding is increasingly designed to allow for program innovation and experimentation in the targeted issue area/system

Philanthropic and public funders leverage funding for the targeted issue area/system through partnerships and collaborative funding efforts

- Grantmakers participate in funding collaboratives to leverage resources toward the targeted issue area/system (as relevant)
- Philanthropic and public funders engage in public-private partnerships to direct resources toward the targeted issue area/system

Systems Change: Cultural Norms



To what extent and in what ways are social and cultural norms evolving in ways that support the goals of the CI initiative?

OUTCOMES

Social and cultural norms that govern individual behaviors are evolving to support the behavior change goals of the CI initiative

INDICATORS

- Media messages support desired behavior targeted by the CI initiative (e.g., PSAs, television/radio/newspaper messages, blogs)
- Social media messages support desired behavior targeted by the CI initiative (e.g., messages, conversations, or campaigns on social networking sites such as Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, or Pinterest)
- Entertainment media references or models desired behavior targeted by the CI initiative (e.g., television or movie characters model desired behavior)
- The public narrative surrounding the targeted issue area/system includes language and messaging that support the goals of the CI initiative

Systems Change: Advocacy and Public Policy

What progress is being made on the CI initiative's advocacy and public policy goals?



OUTCOMES	INDICATORS
The CI initiative is strengthening alliances around CI policy goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased number of partners supporting an issue • Improved alignment of partnership efforts • Stronger or more effective alliances
The CI initiative is strengthening the base of support for CI policy goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased public involvement in an issue • Increased action taken by champions of an issue • Increased breadth of partners in support of an issue • Increased media coverage • Increased awareness of the CI's messages among public and key policy stakeholders • Changes in public will in support of CI messages/goals
Progress is being made toward the development of policy in alignment with the CI initiative's policy goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy proposals are developed, informed, or vetted by CI initiative stakeholders • Relationships with policy developers (decision-makers/legislators) are strengthened
Public policy or components of the CI initiative's policy agenda have been adopted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public policy is passed that supports CI initiative's goals at the local, state, or national levels (e.g. ordinance, ballot-measure, legislation)
Policy/policies are implemented in alignment with the CI initiative's policy goals and principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies have adequate funding to be implemented • Policies are implemented equitably for the CI initiative's target population
Policy/policies are being enforced and/or maintained in alignment with the CI initiative's goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies are upheld or maintained by government institutions (judicial, executive, or legislative branches) • Efforts to erode or eliminate policy/policies are blocked
Policies are blocked that are not in alignment with the CI initiative's goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision-makers and key policy stakeholders are aware of negative consequence or impacts of targeted policy • Policy/policies are kept off the policy agenda of key policy stakeholders • Policy/policies are not adopted

References

1. Kania, John, Fay Hanleybrown, and Mark Kramer. "Channeling Change: Making Collective Impact Work." *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, January 26, 2012.
2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. "Program Evaluation Glossary." (November 1, 2007). http://ofmpub.epa.gov/sor_internet/registry/termreg/searchandretrieve/glossariesandkeywordlists/search.do?details=&glossaryName=Program%20Evaluation%20Glossary (accessed December 18, 2013).
3. Horsch, Karen. "Indicators: Definition and Use in a Results-Based Accountability System." (1997) Harvard Family Research Project. <http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/indicators-definition-and-use-in-a-results-based-accountability-system> (accessed December 18, 2013).
4. Parkes, Rhae et al. "Opportunity Chicago: 2006–2010. Improving Access to Employment for Public Housing Residents in Chicago." Evaluation report. Chicago: Opportunity Chicago, 2012.
5. Parkes. "Opportunity Chicago," IX.

Notes

A series of 20 horizontal dotted lines for writing notes.

Authors

Hallie Preskill
Managing Director

Hallie.Preskill@fsg.org

Marcie Parkhurst
Senior Consultant

Marcie.Parkhurst@fsg.org

Jennifer Splansky Juster
Director, Collective Impact Forum

Jennifer.Juster@collectiveimpactforum.org

Acknowledgements

FSG gratefully acknowledges the support of The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation in the research, writing, and publication of this report. We are also grateful to members of our review panel for their insight, guidance, and comments on early drafts of this paper. Finally, we are inspired by the work of the collective impact initiatives profiled in this paper and are truly grateful to their leaders for sharing their experiences and insights with us, and for allowing us to share their stories with you, our readers.

Members of the Review Panel

- Tanya Beer, Center for Evaluation Innovation
- Forum for Youth Investment (Merita Irby, Bryce Jones, Larry Pasti, and Karen Pittman)
- Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (Heather Peeler and Emily Wexler)
- Jane Hodgdon, Department of Education
- Meg Long, OMG Center for Collaborative Learning
- Shiloh Turner, The Greater Cincinnati Foundation

Case Study Contributors

- Mark Cabaj, Associate of the Tamarack Institute
- Kathleen Holmes, Program Director, Missouri Foundation for Health
- Christopher Mazzeo, Director of Evidence Use and Policy, Education Northwest
- Lynda Peterson, Associate Director, Community Center for Education Results
- Mary Jean Ryan, Executive Director, Community Center for Education Results
- Ken Thompson, Program Officer, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- Janice Urbanik, Executive Director, Partners for a Competitive Workforce



The Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact by FSG is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution—NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. Permissions beyond the scope of this license may be available at www.fsg.org.

Join the Collective Impact Forum

The Collective Impact Forum exists to meet the demands of those who are practicing collective impact in the field. While the rewards of collective impact can be great, the work is often demanding. Those who practice it must keep themselves and their teams motivated and moving forward.

The Collective Impact Forum is the place they can find the tools and training that can help them to be successful. It's an expanding network of like-minded individuals coming together from across sectors to share useful experience and knowledge and thereby accelerating the effectiveness, and further adoption, of the collective impact approach as a whole.

Join us at collectiveimpactforum.org