

10 Places Where Collective Impact Gets It Wrong

by Tom Wolff

While the collective impact framework has brought renewed interest and attention to collaboration and coalition building, it is also overly reductive and it promotes top-down decision making over grassroots voice, among other shortcomings. It's time to challenge the collective impact juggernaut and bring communities what they need and deserve.

Editors' note: This article is reprinted with permission. It was first published in March 2016 by the Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice (www.gjcpp.org/en/), and was published on NPQ's website as a *Voices from the Field* article on April 28, 2016. It has been lightly adapted for publication in this magazine.

IN 2011, JOHN KANIA AND MARK KRAMER published a five-page article called "Collective Impact" in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.¹ The article was a well-written summary of their views of large-scale social change efforts in communities. They suggested five conditions of collective impact:

1. Common agenda;
2. Shared measurement;
3. Mutually reinforcing activities;
4. Continuous communication; and
5. Backbone support.

In the original article and others that followed, Kania and Kramer were explicitly and implicitly critical of much of what came before them. In one chart, they compare isolated impact with collective impact as if those were the only two options, omitting the numerous

examples of community-wide coalitions that moved beyond isolated impact but were not explicitly labeled "collective impact."² (For one example, see the exhaustive survey of literature on healthy communities by Tyler Norris.³)

That short publication, extensive marketing by Kania and Kramer's consulting firm FSG, and a few follow-up articles have resulted in a remarkable revolution in government and foundation approaches to community coalition building and collaboration.⁴ Many of these funding organizations are now declaring that they are using a collective impact approach.

The upside of this is that attention has once again been brought to the need to promote multisector collaboration in communities. The downside of this is

that collective impact is based on only a few case studies that the authors themselves were not involved in creating and implementing but rather observed after their development. The articles include neither research nor reference to learning from all the previous research, studies, and community experiences in the field. Observing successful coalitions provides the observer with one basis for learning about community coalitions, but being involved in successfully—or unsuccessfully—developing coalitions provides a deeper and more nuanced understanding of coalitions that apparently was not available to Kania and Kramer. Thus, not surprisingly, collective impact gets much about collaboration wrong regarding both the goals and processes of community change collaboration.

In light of the uncritical, widespread adoption and funding of collective impact by government agencies and foundations, it is necessary to examine and assess collective impact much more critically and thoughtfully. In this article, I articulate ten important issues and concerns that collective impact fails to adequately acknowledge, understand, and address. These failings have serious consequences for the engaged communities. I welcome the community of activists and scholars who are engaged in coalitions, partnerships, and collaboratives to react, disagree, and/or add to the list of concerns.

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

Collective impact does not set a priority of engaging those most affected by the issues in their collaborative impact processes. The grassroots communities most affected are not necessarily consulted or do not meaningfully share in collective impact decision making. The result is to ignore and denigrate critical community knowledge, ownership, and support for sustainability. This can further result in creating solutions that may not be appropriate or compatible with the population being served. This is not surprising, because Kania and Kramer come from a top-down business-consulting model. Collective impact never explicitly states that you need to engage the people most affected by the issue(s) driving the coalition. Unfortunately, collective impact's approach is not unusual; in general, collaboration processes used by coalitions of all kinds do not meaningfully involve grassroots community members or other stakeholders directly affected by their work.⁵ This is a serious omission. Coalitions without grassroots voices are very likely to create solutions that do

not meet the needs of the people most affected by them, and treat people disrespectfully in their community change process.

Without engaging those most directly affected, collective impact can develop neither an adequate understanding of the root causes of the issues nor an appropriate vision for a transformed community. Instead, the process will likely reinforce the dominance of those with privilege and continue to support the existing non-profit organizations whose work does not create change based on meaningful community input and involvement.

2. Collective impact emerges from top-down business-consulting experience and is thus not a true community-development model.

The model of collective impact is mainly about engaging the most powerful organizations and partners in a community and getting them to agree on a common agenda. They explicitly state that collective impact is about bringing "CEO-level cross-sector leaders together."⁶ In reality, what community coalitions need to do is engage both the most powerful and least powerful people in a community, finding ways for them to talk and work together to address the community's priorities for action and the impediments to change in institutions and organizations serving the community. This is the heart and soul of community-development coalition work and seems absent in collective impact.

Coalitions across the country have years of experience in bringing a wide range of community stakeholders to the table, not just the most powerful. Often, this was not the case. Early in the history of substance abuse prevention work, partnerships made the top-down mistake. At the start (in 1989), the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Fighting Back substance abuse prevention coalitions required having the most powerful

people in the community at the table—the mayor, the police chief, and the school superintendent.⁷ As the community context of the substance abuse issue became clearer, we began to see that we needed all sectors of the community and the youth themselves at the table. At that point, the coalitions began to evolve and become more effective. Unfortunately, collective impact seems stuck in the old, less effective model, with CEO leadership central to the process.

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

Many coalitions in the United States are focused on creating public health outcomes (prevention of substance abuse, obesity, opioid addiction, health disparities, etc.). In recent years, led by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), these coalitions have moved in the direction of policy and systems change as their most powerful and desired outcomes.⁸ Certainly, in public health coalitions (which comprise many of the coalitions in the United States), following the CDC's lead and addressing policy change and systems change has become the gold standard of outcomes. Systems change is now recognized as a key priority and best practice in community change partnerships, so this is a serious omission in collective impact.

If we are not changing policies in order to change systems, we are continuing to do fragmented, isolated work. For years, community coalitions addressed specific, focused issues without asking about the ecological and historical factors that impact the outcomes. Smoking cessation coalitions taught us all this lesson dramatically as they went beyond smoking prevention education for young people to a focus on implementing antismoking policies in systems across the community—restaurants, schools, worksites,

public buildings. And it worked! Now, we better understand that policies are at the heart of the work of community coalitions. But where is the policy and system change in collective impact?

4. Collective impact misses the social justice core that exists in many coalitions.

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

For example, alternative partnership models, such as the REACH (Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Community Health) coalition funded by the CDC, are aimed at addressing systemic racism and create systems-level change. The REACH coalitions that emerged from the Public Health Commission were all required to do root-cause analyses of their community's issues.⁹ This led to understanding the racial health disparities in their communities in the context of social determinants of health (housing, economic inequality, education, etc.) and the institutional racism that is part of each of these determinants and their related systems. With this approach, addressing structural racism became not just a possibility but a necessity.

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

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

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

- Among the most acclaimed and used is Fran Butterfoss's comprehensive *Coalitions and Partnerships in Community Health*, which articulates her and Michelle Kegler's Community Coalition Action Theory (CCAT).¹⁰
- Other authors' significant scholarly writing about partnerships in public health include the previously mentioned Kegler, Meredith Minkler, and Nina Wallerstein.¹¹
- In community psychology, community-wide collaboration has a long history in the work of Seymour Sarason,¹² David Chavis,¹³ Stephen Fawcett,¹⁴ Bill Berkowitz,¹⁵ Pennie Foster-Fishman,¹⁶ Vincent Francisco,¹⁷ and my own writings.¹⁸
- There is an extensive literature and experience in the field of healthy communities, including two recent



Study on campus or online

Help those who help others with a career in the nonprofit sector.

MASTER OF ARTS IN

Public Policy and Administration

sps.northwestern.edu/ppaonline • 312-503-2579

Northwestern

**SCHOOL OF
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES**

volumes of the *National Civic Review* focused on the topic, and important writing about healthy communities by others such as Joan Twiss and Judith Kurland.¹⁹

- There are also extensive related contributions from other fields: political science (Arthur Himmelman);²⁰ collaborative leadership (David Chrislip and Carl Larsen);²¹ community development (William Potapchuk);²² and community organizing (Gillian Kaye).²³

This rich multidisciplinary literature teaches us that the process of communities working together to create collaborative change is very complex, and is impacted by multiple variables. The literature also identifies processes, methods, and models that have led to the creation of successful collaborations that create changes in programs, practices, and policies in communities. Collectively, we already know a great deal about the tools necessary to do this work. One of the most comprehensive and internationally acclaimed examples is the Community Tool Box. The Community Tool Box provides over seven thousand pages of free downloadable material on community health and development using collaborations and partnerships.²⁴

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

6. Collective impact mislabels its study of a few case examples as research.

The *Stanford* article cites a few successful examples of community coalitions

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

In my own work with hundreds of coalitions, I have found that there is much to be learned from the biggest, best-funded top-down coalitions that succeed and those that fail, as well as from the smallest that succeed and fail. I understand we draw our generalizations from the coalitions with which we work, and I have always done so myself; however, the fact that collective impact has become the gold standard for coalition building for government and foundations based on such a limited sample and such limited actual experience is deeply disconcerting. It is fascinating to note that many government agencies (federal, state, local) and foundations are now calling for all of us to follow collective impact as the model if we wish to be effective and funded. Yet this is an intervention with absolutely no evidence-based research. Aren't these the same government and foundation organizations that demand evidence-based research from us in all their program applications?

One has to wonder what makes funders so attracted to collective impact. Could it be that the five simple collective impact components allow funders to believe that coalition building can be simplified and that they finally have the key to success for these messy multivariable entities called coalitions? Or, could it be that collective impact's top-down approach is

most compatible with the foundations' approach to collaborative change? Or, could it be collective impact's avoidance of addressing policy or advocacy that makes collective impact coalitions a safer and less controversial funding bet?

7. Collective impact assumes that most coalitions are capable of finding the money to have a well-funded backbone organization.

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

Unfortunately, here, again, collective impact gets it wrong by asking for too much from the backbone organization. Collective impact experts push for a well-funded backbone organization with multiple functions that require considerable resources and staff. These functions include "providing overall strategic direction, facilitating dialogue between partners, managing data collection and analysis, handling communications, coordinating community outreach, and mobilizing funding."²⁵ By giving all those responsibilities to the backbone organization, collective impact inevitably creates a top-down organization versus a truly collaborative one where leadership and responsibility are dispersed. The collective impact concept of a backbone organization is predicated on coalitions with extensive resources; however, in the hundreds of coalitions I have created, consulted with, or trained, very few can even afford paid leadership, much less a \$100,000 backbone organization.

8. Collective impact also misses a key role of the backbone organization—building leadership.

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

Collective impact barely discusses the idea that leadership in a collaboration is different from ordinary organizational leadership. Again, there is excellent literature that provides a guide to democratic and collaborative governance. Almost twenty years before collective impact, David Chrislip and Carl Larsen's *Collaborative Leadership* helped distinguish the unique characteristics and practices of collaborative leadership in coalitions, including the skills and functions of a collaborative leader and how they differ from traditional hierarchical leadership.²⁶

Coalition leaders themselves often emerge from traditional, top-down nonprofit organizations and need to learn a new style of leadership that

facilitates ownership and leadership by the members. We have seen powerful, charismatic coalition leaders who can energize a coalition but who then fail when they cannot organize the energy that they stir up nor delegate the responsibility.

9. Community-wide, multisectoral collaboratives cannot be simplified into collective impact's five required conditions.

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

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

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

10. The early available research on collective impact is calling into question the contribution that it is making to coalition effectiveness.

"The Collective Impact Model and Its Potential for Health Promotion," by

Summary Table: 10 Places Where Collective Impact Gets It Wrong

1.	Collective impact does not address the essential requirement for meaningfully engaging those in the community most affected by the issues.
2.	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 misses the social justice core that exists in many coalitions.
5.	Collective impact, as described in John Kania and Mark 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.
6.	Collective impact mislabels its study of a few case examples as <i>research</i> .
7.	Collective impact assumes that most coalitions are capable of finding the money to have a well-funded backbone organization.
8.	Collective impact also misses a key role of the backbone organization—building leadership.
9.	Community-wide, multisectoral collaboratives cannot be simplified into collective impact's five required conditions.
10.	The early available research on collective impact is calling into question the contribution that it is making to coalition effectiveness.

Johnna Flood et al., is among the first published scholarly assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the collective impact approach.²⁷ The authors note the lack of resident involvement and the absence of policy and advocacy in the collective impact model, suggesting that: "Since many community coalitions are deeply concerned with advocacy and policy change, this omission can be problematic." The study indicates that seeking a common agenda "will not be successful if done through coercive compromise" and without a backbone organization that has a "point of view" and a "broader mission, vision and values."²⁸ The study also notes that the collective impact model does not provide detailed advice (nor tools) to help coalitions create the necessary continuous communication or common agendas. In its conclusion, the study states, "As our case study application suggests, collective impact appears to have utility as a conceptual framework in health promotion but one that may be usefully augmented by some 'tried-and-true' insights and strategies from CCAT (Community Coalition Action Theory)."²⁹ Additional thoughtful and insightful collective impact critiques are emerging in blogs and other online media from Mark Holmgren,³⁰ Vu Le,³¹ and others.

• • •

I would concur with the view that there are some helpful contributions in the writings of Kania and Kramer. They bring fresh eyes to the work of collaboration. They have certainly brought coalition building back to the forefront for grant-makers and many others with influence in the government and foundation/non-profit sectors. Now we have to make sure that collective impact does not proceed without addressing the ten points noted above. Let's work to improve collective impact so that it can take its place alongside many other valuable models and

resources designed to assist people and communities improve their well-being by engaging the grassroots communities themselves and creating a vision of transformative change. I am hopeful that, if communities using collective impact and funders promoting it address the ten shortcomings discussed in this article, we will see improved applications of collective impact emerge:

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

Let us hope that we can muster the courage to challenge the collective impact juggernaut and bring our communities what they need and deserve. I know we have the desire to do this, and now we need the will.

NOTES

1. John Kania and Mark Kramer, "Collective Impact," *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Winter 2011).
2. Fay Hanleybrown, John Kania, and Mark Kramer, "Channeling Change: Making Collective Impact Work," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, January 26, 2012.
3. Tyler Norris, "Healthy Communities at Twenty-Five: Participatory Democracy and the Prospect for American Renewal," *National Civic Review* 102, no. 4 (Winter 2013): 4-9.
4. Hanleybrown, Kania, and Kramer, "Channeling Change"; and John Kania and Mark

Kramer, "Embracing Emergence: How Collective Impact Addresses Complexity," *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, January 21, 2013.

5. Arthur T. Himmelman, "On Coalitions and the Transformation of Power Relations: Collaborative Betterment and Collaborative Empowerment," *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29, no. 2 (April 2001): 277-84.

6. Hanleybrown, Kania, and Kramer, "Channeling Change."

7. Irene Wielawski, "The Fighting Back Program," in *The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Anthology: To Improve Health and Health Care: Volume VII*, S. L. Isaacs and J. R. Knickman, eds. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003).

8. Thomas R. Frieden, "A Framework for Public Health Action: The Health Impact Pyramid," *American Journal of Public Health* 100, no. 4 (April 2010): 590-95.


9. Nashira Baril et al., "Building a Regional Health Equity Movement: The Grantmaking Model of a Local Health Department," *Family and Community Health* 34, no. S1 (January/March 2011): S23-S43.

10. Frances Dunn Butterfoss, *Coalitions and Partnerships in Community Health* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2007); and see Frances Dunn Butterfoss and Michelle C. Kegler, "Toward a Comprehensive Understanding of Community Coalitions: Moving from Practice to Theory," in *Emerging Theories in Health Promotion Practice and Research: Strategies for Improving Public Health*, Ralph J. DiClemente, Richard A. Crosby, and Michelle C. Kegler, eds. (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2002), 157-93.

11. Michelle C. Kegler et al., "Factors That Contribute to Effective Community Health Promotion Coalitions: A Study of 10 Project ASSIST Coalitions in North Carolina," *Health Education and Behavior* 25, no. 3 (June 1998): 338-53; Meredith Minkler, ed., *Community Organizing and Community Building for Health and Welfare*, 3rd ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University

The *Nonprofit Quarterly* Digital Books Collection


Gain access to the nonprofit resources you need at the swipe of a finger.
Visit npqmag.org to purchase these and other digital books.



Nonprofit Communications: Managing the Message in a 21st Century Environment

Does everyone understand your organization's mission and needs? This 71-page digital collection of writings from 13 experts discusses the theory and practice of modern nonprofit communications.


Price: \$39.00



Board with Care: Perspectives on Nonprofit Governance

Existing systems are seldom built to fit each organization; instead, we often "borrow" governance structures and bylaws from other organizations. *NPQ* delves into these problematic practices.


Price: \$24.95



Strange Accounts: Understanding Nonprofit Finance

This collection of articles selected from the *Nonprofit Quarterly* explores the strangeness of nonprofit finance, and provides best-practice approaches so that the reader may become as skillful a strategist—as manager or board member—as he or she should.

Price: \$24.95



NPQ's Reader on Executive Transitions

This reader on nonprofit executive transitions includes almost a decade's worth of well-researched and insightful articles on what can be a difficult and risky moment for many organizations. The sector has been blessed with a small but talented group of thinkers on this topic, and most of them are published here.

Price: \$24.95

- Press, 2012); and Meredith Minkler and Nina Wallerstein, "Improving Health through Community Organization and Community Building: Perspectives from Health Education and Social Work," in Minkler, *Community Organizing*, 37–58.
12. Seymour B. Sarason and Elizabeth Lorentz, *The Challenge of the Resource Exchange Network* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1979).
13. David M. Chavis, Paul Florin, and Michael R. J. Felix, "Nurturing Grassroots Initiatives for Community Development: The Role of Enabling Systems," in Terry Mizrahi and John D. Morrison, *Community Organization and Social Administration: Advances, Trends, and Emerging Principles* (Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press, 1993): 41–68; and David M. Chavis, "The Paradoxes and Promise of Community Coalitions," *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29, no. 2 (2001): 309–20.
14. Stephen B. Fawcett et al., "The Community Tool Box: A Web-Based Resource for Building Healthier Communities," *Public Health Reports* 115, no. 2–3 (March–June 2000): 274–78.
15. William R. Berkowitz and Tom Wolff, *The Spirit of the Coalition* (Washington, DC: American Public Health Association, 2000).
16. Pennie G. Foster-Fishman and Erin R. Watson, "Action Research as Systems Change," in *Handbook of Engaged Scholarship: Contemporary Landscapes, Future Directions: Volume Two: Community-Campus Partnerships*, Hiram E. Fitzgerald, Cathy Burack, and Sarena D. Seifer, eds. (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2010): 235–56; and Pennie G. Foster-Fishman and Erin R. Watson, "The ABLe Change Framework: A Conceptual and Methodological Tool for Promoting System Change," *American Journal of Community Psychology* 49, no. 3–4 (June 2012): 503–16.
17. Jerry Schultz, Vincent T. Francisco, and Adrienne Paine-Andrews, "A Model of Health Promotion and Community Development," in *Health Promotion in the Americas: Theory and Practice*, F. B. Balcazar, M. Montero, and J. R. Newbrough, eds. (Washington, DC: Pan American Health Organization, 2000), 17–34.
18. Thomas Wolff, "Healthy Communities Massachusetts: One vision of civic democracy," *Municipal Advocate* 14, no. 2 (Spring 1995): 22–24; Thomas Wolff, "Community Coalition Building—Contemporary Practice and Research: Introduction," *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29, no. 2 (April 2001): 165–72; Thomas Wolff, "The Healthy Communities Movement: A Time for Transformation," *National Civic Review* 92, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 95–111; and Thomas Wolff, *The Power of Collaborative Solutions: Six Principles and Effective Tools for Building Healthy Communities* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 2010).
19. Joan M. Twiss et al., "Twelve Years and Counting: California's Experience with a Statewide Healthy Cities and Community Program," *Public Health Reports* 115, no. 2–3 (March–June 2000): 125–33; Norris, "Healthy Communities at Twenty-Five;" and Judith Kurland, "Coalition-Building: The Promise of Government," *American Journal of Community Psychology* 29, no. 2 (2001): 285–91.
20. Himmelman, "On Coalitions and the Transformation of Power Relations."
21. David D. Chrislip and Carl E. Larsen, *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1994).
22. William R. Potapchuk, "Building an Infrastructure of Community Collaboration," *National Civic Review* 88, no. 3 (Autumn 1999): 165–70.
23. Gillian Kaye and Thomas Wolff, *From the Ground Up! A Workbook on Coalition Building & Community Development* (Amherst, MA: AHEC/Community Partners, 1996).
24. Fawcett et al., "The Community Tool Box."
25. Hanleybrown, Kania, and Kramer, "Channeling Change."
26. Chrislip and Larsen, *Collaborative Leadership*.
27. Johnna Flood et al., "The Collective Impact Model and Its Potential for Health Promotion: Overview and Case Study of a Healthy Retail Initiative in San Francisco," *Health Education and Behavior* 42, no. 5 (October 2015): 654–68.
28. Judith Bell, in Flood et al., "The Collective Impact Model and Its Potential for Health Promotion."
29. Butterfoss and Kegler, "Toward a Comprehensive Understanding of Community Coalitions"; and Flood et al., "The Collective Impact Model and Its Potential for Health Promotion."
30. Mark Holmgren, "Part One: Community at the Core of a Theory of Change," *Collective Impact: Watch Out for the Pendulum Swing and Other Challenges* (Waterloo, Ontario: Tamarack Institute, 2015).
31. Vu Le, "Collective Impact—Resistance is Futile (Point of Vu)," *Blue Avocado* (October 2012), blueavocado.org/content/collective-impact-resistance-futile-point-vu.

TOM WOLFF is a nationally recognized, award-winning consultant on coalition building and community development, with over thirty years' experience training and consulting with individuals, organizations, and communities across North America. His clients include federal, state, and local government agencies, foundations, hospitals, nonprofit organizations, professional associations, and grassroots groups. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, and has held academic appointments at the University of Massachusetts School of Public Health, the University of Massachusetts Medical School Department of Family Medicine, and Community Health and Wellesley College's Stone Center. His most recent publication is *The Power of Collaborative Solutions: Six Principles and Effective Tools for Building Healthy Communities*.

To comment on this article, write to us at feedback@npqmag.org. Order reprints from <http://store.nonprofitquarterly.org>, using code 230209.