**COLLECTIVE IMPACT AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: WHAT SHOULD NNIP’S ROLE BE?**

8:45–10:30 – Thursday morning

**Background**

Civic leaders (and funders) in all cities are giving more and more attention to data driven decision making, increasingly emphasizing the use of indicators to monitor, and thereby motivate, improved performance by social institutions. Hopes are high (see, for example, Morino, 2011)

Since we had an introductory session on this topic in our Detroit meetings, we have heard back from a number of you. In most cases, you said you see important opportunities for NNIP partners to play a growing role in this field. But an even stronger message was that you felt a need for more clarity. Differing approaches are being pushed in different places. There is uncertainty about what really works and concerns about unrealistic expectations being set in some areas.

The Results-Based Accountability approach (Friedman, 2005) offers a helpful distinction by recognizing the difference between “performance accountability” (focusing on results that one organization can achieve) and “population accountability” (focusing on broader results, like “all children ready to succeed in school,” that requires the collaboration of a number of institutions to achieve). “Population accountability” would seem to suggest roles most appropriate for NNIP partners (outside experts have pointed to NNIP’s own School Readiness project a couple of years ago as a promising example of progress in that category). However, it is becoming clearer that success at that level requires strong links to good “performance accountability” management inside the collaborating organizations and there is little guidance out there on how to implement those links effectively.

In the Detroit session, the “collective impact” concept was introduced - a forceful approach on the population accountability side, exemplified by the Strive initiative in Cincinnati (see Kania and Kramer, 2011). This concept has caught on in the funding community but, as defined, it is demanding. Some communities seem to be looking for a way to gain some its benefits, but revise the specifications in ways they think better fit their own circumstances and stage in development.

**This Session**

We will open with four speakers who will explore elements of approaches that are out there and give us their take on lessons for directions NNIP should take. (about 10 minutes each)

* Alaina Harkness (MacArthur Foundation) will offer a framing of the issues, giving special emphasis to her views about what funders are looking for.
* Lisa Pitman (Children’s Trust, Miami), will review the Trust’s application of the Results-Based Accountability framework (they have been using it for several years) but also discuss their steps toward implementing a collective impact model in two areas.
* Tim Bray (University of Texas at Dallas) will discuss two broad performance oriented projects his Institute has been asked to work on (for the United Way and the Promising Youth Alliance) and discuss implications of what he has learned so far for NNIP practice.
* Sarah Rankin (Local Initiatives Support Corporation) will discuss efforts LISC has been making to think through what a viable performance management approach would look like in the context of a comprehensive community development program: LISC’s Building Sustainable Communities Initiative.

Alaina will then lead a discussion among the presenters to further explore and clarify the potential roles for individual NNIP partners and for the partnership overall (10 minutes). This will be followed by conversations at individual tables responding to four questions (25 minutes).

1. What has your organization done in the field of performance management to date?
2. Given what you have heard about the interests of civic leaders and funders in your community, what new efforts in this field relevant to your interests are underway now or seem likely to be initiated?
3. What role do you think your organization can best play in this environment? What do you need to do position yourself to make the most useful contribution?
4. What should the NNIP partnership overall do to make a contribution in this field – national action and supporting local action?

Following this, one representative from each table will report out on the most important conclusion that emerged from the discussion. (20 minutes)

**References**

Friedman, Mark. 2005. *Trying Hard is Not Good Enough*. Victoria BC Canada: Trafford Publishing

Kania, John, and Mark Kramer. 2011. “Collective Impact,” in *Stanford Social Innovation Review,* Winter 2011.

Morino, Mario. 2011. *Leap of Reason: Managing to Outcomes in an Era of Scarcity*. Washington DC: Venture Philanthropy Partners