

Nonprofits & NGOs

Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact: Part 1

An in-depth review of what it takes to be a backbone organization, and how to evaluate and support its work.

By [Shiloh Turner](#), [Kathy Merchant](#), [John Kania](#) & [Ellen Martin](#) | Jul. 17, 2012

The Greater Cincinnati Foundation (<http://www.gcfdn.org/>) (GCF) and the nonprofit consulting firm *FSG* (<http://www.fsg.org/>) have partnered to understand and evaluate the role of backbone organizations in collective impact efforts. The first in a four-part series, this blog post describes the foundation's motivations for funding backbone organizations, and for GCF and FSG's work.

Sign In
Subscribe

Making a Commitment to Strengthen Backbone Organizations

Communities and organizations around the world are adopting a different mindset to achieve large-scale systemic change through collective impact, a concept that was first introduced in the [winter 2011 issue of *Stanford Social Innovation Review*](#)

(http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact) and more recently discussed on the [Stanford Social Innovation Review](#) blog

(http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/channeling_change_making_collective_impact_work) . As cross-sector groups engage more deeply in this practice, funders and practitioners alike find ourselves probing for answers to the question: How do you do this work well?

Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact

An in-depth review of what it takes to be a backbone organization, and how to evaluate and support its work.

[Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact) (3)

[Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact) (1)

[Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact) (7)

[Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact) (7)

In Cincinnati, the collective impact model is a living, breathing—and evolving—practice. The community has embraced this approach to accelerating change across systems. And the community’s leaders are committing to making this ambitious work succeed.

GCF is leading the way for collective impact in the region. As a funder, GCF believes that providing “backbone support” (see chart) which propels collective impact efforts is critically important. The foundation has taken a bold, **if not “sexy** (<http://blog.impact.upenn.edu/2012/06/20/is-unsexy-in/>),” step by investing in the support

infrastructure of collective impact—the backbone organization itself—to accelerate change. If the Foundation is to succeed, everyone must understand what backbone organizations are and how they can be most effective.

In January 2012, GCF and FSG began exploring four big questions with a cohort of the region’s backbone organizations:

1. How and to what extent are backbone organizations **effective catalysts** for achieving community-level progress?
2. How and to what extent do backbone organizations **contribute** to improved social outcomes?
3. How is **success** best measured for backbone organizations?
4. What **common challenges and best practices** can be shared across backbone organizations?

In this series of posts, we share our experience to help funders see backbone support as a strategy to advance collective impact initiatives. We hope to build a common language and understanding for the role and value of backbone organizations so that all partners in a collective impact effort

Achieving Large-Scale Change through Collective Impact Involves Five Key Conditions For Shared Success

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

Shared Measurement: **Collecting data and measuring results consistently** across all participants ensures efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable

Mutually Reinforcing Activities: Participant activities must be **differentiated while still being coordinated** through a mutually reinforcing plan of action

Continuous Communication: **Consistent and open communication** is needed across the many players to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and appreciate common motivation

Backbone Support: Creating and managing collective impact requires a separate organization(s) with staff and a specific set of skills to **serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and coordinate participating organizations and agencies**

Sign In
Subscribe

can articulate the need for and the importance of this vital element, and ensure the overall success of an initiative.

Cincinnati's "New Normal"

In Cincinnati, collaboration is the "new normal," but this was not always the case. Like many regions, individual organizations and initiatives were doing important and effective work. But the overall economy still lagged behind its peers around the country. For this community, the collective impact model developed, almost organically, as organizations convened collaboratives and coalitions to invent more effective methods for creating powerful and lasting social change. Over the last 10 years or so, many strong backbone organizations were created to coordinate community initiatives and accelerate change. GCF played an important role in funding, incubating, or otherwise supporting many of these initiatives.

As an anchor institution, GCF has taken the long view on complex social problems when few others could; it has evidence that progress can be made when the community sticks with large-scale initiatives. Supporting **collective impact** (<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Collective+Impact>) has been a natural evolution in GCF's community leadership. The Foundation believes that, by providing change capital to a group of backbone organizations, it will be able to accelerate progress toward social change in the region.

GCF and FSG's Work Together

In addition to a leveraged, multi-year funding strategy, GCF chose to invest in evaluating the work of a cohort of backbone organizations and in creating a community of practice among them. Using this approach, regardless of sector or issue, these organizations would learn from each other, continuously improve their practice, and encourage greater collaboration across overlapping initiatives. GCF engaged FSG to assist in this work. As a nonprofit strategy, evaluation, and research consulting firm, FSG believes evaluation is a powerful way to inform strategy and help organizations learn. The firm's strategic learning and evaluation practice helps individual organizations and groups design and implement program evaluations, shared **measurement** (<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Measurement+&+Evaluation>) systems, and organizational evaluation systems.

In early 2012, GCF and FSG began a partnership built around evaluating backbone effectiveness and

answering the above four questions. GCF selected six backbone organizations (see text box) to participate that are all beyond the initial “start-up” phase of forming their collective impact initiatives, and are refining and sustaining their initiatives. They all have at least one full-time staff person, but operate using a lean staffing model and mobilize many partners to help further their work. While the issue areas they address have some overlap, there are clear differences in the breadth and depth of the initiatives, the scope of the backbone organizations’ role, and the context in which they do their work.

GCF’s Challenge


The work of a backbone organization is complex. The roles played in accelerating change can be challenging to articulate as, by design, their work is largely behind the scenes. Therefore, GCF’s new approach to community leadership means that evaluating and communicating the *value* of backbone organizations has become all the more important. In addition, defining and communicating what “effectiveness” really means is another driver of the Foundation’s work. The backbone organization is an emerging concept necessary to the collective impact approach. GCF needs to paint a clear picture for stakeholders—board members, staff, donors, volunteers, current and potential grant recipients—of what success looks like and why this strategy is ultimately worth pursuing. This is the challenge and task before us.

Follow our story over the next three posts, as we share our process, results, and next steps for tackling this work.

The Greater Cincinnati Foundation's Cohort of Backbone Organizations


- **Agenda 360** advances regional economic competitiveness as a program of the Cincinnati USA Chamber of Commerce
- **LISC's Place Matters** supports comprehensive community development in Greater Cincinnati neighborhoods with investment from a consortium of philanthropic funders and the national organization LISC
- **Partners for a Competitive Workforce** improves regional workforce development efforts, housed by United Way of Greater Cincinnati
- **The Strive Partnership** is a cradle to career initiative that focuses on improving outcomes for children and students in the urban core
- **Success By 6** focuses on improving early childhood education and kindergarten readiness, also housed by United Way
- **Vision 2015** supports economic competitiveness in Northern Kentucky and is closely aligned with Agenda 360 across the river

Sign In
Subscribe



Shiloh Turner is vice president for Community Investment at The Greater Cincinnati Foundation, and is responsible for all facets of its charitable investment. She was previously director of Health Data

Improvement with the Health Foundation of Greater Cincinnati and vice president of Programs at the Erie Community Foundation.



Kathy Merchant has been president/CEO of The Greater Cincinnati Foundation since 1997. She was previously director of The Pew Charitable Trusts' Neighborhood Preservation Initiative and a partner in the New Haven-based consulting firm Holt, Wexler & Merchant.



John Kania is a managing director at FSG, where he oversees the firm's consulting practice. Before joining FSG, he was a consultant at Mercer Management and Consulting and Corporate Decisions Inc.



Ellen Martin is a senior consultant at FSG, where she advises foundations, corporations, and nonprofits on strategy development, and strategic learning and evaluation. She also serves on the advisory board of the Global Social Venture Competition.

Sign In
Subscribe

If you like this article enough to print it, be sure to subscribe to SSIR!

Copyright © 2015 Stanford University.
Designed by Arsenal, developed by Hop Studios

Collaboration

Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact: Part 2

An in-depth review of what it takes to be a backbone organization, and how to evaluate and support its work.

By [Shiloh Turner](#), [Kathy Merchant](#), [John Kania](#) & [Ellen Martin](#) | Jul. 18, 2012

The Greater Cincinnati Foundation (<http://www.gcfdn.org/>) (GCF) and the nonprofit consulting firm [FSG](#) (<http://www.fsg.org/>) have partnered to understand and evaluate the role of backbone organizations in collective impact efforts. The second in a four-part series, this blog post defines key backbone activities and expected outcomes of that work.

Sign In
Subscribe

Key Learning: What Backbone Organizations Do

It is tempting to say (and our backbone organizations feel) that there are as many backbone models as there are **collective impact**

(<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Collective+Impact>) initiatives.

However, we found that there is, at some level, a common theory of change for backbone organizations that ultimately seeks to improve social outcomes by organizing cross-sector groups of partners to transform an often inefficient, fragmented system.

In order to fulfill this vision—regardless of their focus area—backbone organizations essentially pursue six common activities to support and facilitate collective impact which distinguish this work from other types of collaborative efforts. Over the lifecycle of an initiative, they:

Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact

An in-depth review of what it takes to be a backbone organization, and how to evaluate and support its work.

- [Understanding the Value of Backbone Or \(\[http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact\]\(http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact\)\)](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact)
- [Understanding the Value of Backbone Or \(\[http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact\]\(http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact\)\)](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact)
- [Understanding the Value of Backbone Or \(\[http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact\]\(http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact\)\)](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact)
- [Understanding the Value of Backbone Or \(\[http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact\]\(http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact\)\)](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact)

1. Guide vision and strategy
2. Support aligned activities
3. Establish shared measurement practices
4. Build public will
5. Advance policy
6. Mobilize funding

As a collective impact initiative initially launches and gets organized, a backbone organization is likely to prioritize *guiding vision and strategy* and *supporting aligned activities* as two key activities. For example, in 2006, the Strive Partnership established the first ever “Cradle to Career” vision for the region’s urban core, including a roadmap for student success with shared goals and measures of student achievement. For the past six years, the **Strive Partnership** (<http://www.strivetogether.org/>) has maintained an active and engaged executive committee comprised of cross-sector leadership from Cincinnati (OH), Covington, and Newport (KY) to ensure that the shared vision and strategy continues to guide the work of the partners.

Another example highlights two regional backbones working across state lines to address a large-scale issue. Recognizing a leadership gap in the area of environmental sustainability, **Vision 2015** (<http://vision2015.org/>) (KY) and **Agenda 360** (<http://agenda360.org/>) (OH) have played a critical role in organizing and incubating an intermediary organization, **Green Umbrella** (<http://www.greenumbrella.org/>). With their support, Green Umbrella has brought together several organizations—including many of the region’s businesses, education institutions, nonprofit organizations, and government agencies—to sustainably develop and grow the Greater Cincinnati area.

As backbone organizations mature, they often shift focus to *establish shared measurement* (<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Measurement+&+Evaluation>) practices on behalf of their collective impact partners. For example, **Partners for a Competitive Workforce** (<http://competitiveworkforce.com/>) (PCW), with its partners, has created a common, region-wide workforce data collection and reporting system to track results and improve performance for multiple agencies. To date, approximately 50 public and nonprofit agencies are utilizing the system, and a regional workforce

dashboard is being built to aggregate key measures. Agenda 360 and Vision 2015 have also begun to identify and **report on shared measures** (<http://www.agenda360.org/indicatorsreport/>) around several issues in the region as part of their regional indicators effort.

As backbone organizations seek to expand their impact and build a stronger community presence, they are likely to increase focus on other key external activities such as building public will, advancing policy, and mobilizing funding. For GCF's cohort, these activities are by and large still areas for continued development and improvement, though we are seeing some early successes.

In order to *build public will*, **LISC** (http://www.lisc.org/greater_cincinnati/index.php) works with its neighborhood partners to engage community members at the grassroots level. Its Place Matters neighborhoods have generated increased attention from the city's elected officials and policymakers. As an example, neighborhood leaders have taken on foreclosure as a policy issue, successfully bringing together diverse groups in the community to formulate a foreclosure response. Working with the city and courts, they have helped pass local legislation to mitigate the impact of foreclosure on their communities.

At the state level, **Success By 6** (<http://sb6uwgc.org/>) is *advancing policy* by using local best practices and outcomes to educate policymakers and elected officials in Ohio and Kentucky about effective strategies to improve kindergarten readiness. Through its focus on measuring progress and using data to inform their work, Success By 6 and its partners have influenced the states' thinking about measurement systems and the development of kindergarten readiness standards. Success By 6 is actively involved in efforts to create aligned early education and care systems, with membership on state committees such as the Early Childhood Advisory Council in Ohio and Kentucky. The work of Early Childhood Advisory Councils in both states created a comprehensive vision for early childhood which resulted in securing a \$70 million Race to the Top Early Challenge Grant in Ohio. Through its committee participation, Success By 6 has played a role in defining elements of the system, identifying gaps in service and making the case for investing more in the region's youngest children.

In order to *mobilize funding* for its partners, PCW is coordinating funds from diverse sources to support common priorities and strategies. Since 2008, PCW has leveraged more than \$25 million in public and private funds from local, state, and national sources toward shared goals and

strategies. This includes \$4.6 million in philanthropic funds, \$8.5 million in state and federal grants, and \$11.9 million in aligned training funds from the region's public workforce system.

The above examples illustrate how individual backbone organizations have approached these key activities. Yet, as we've learned by looking across the cohort, each organization engages in these activities to different degrees and in different ways, depending on the context and capacity of the organization and the scope and maturity of the initiative.

Why It Matters: Expected Backbone Support Outcomes

When asked how they know their work is making a difference, backbone leaders almost always talk about evidence of moving the needle on big community indicators, such as increasing the percentage of young people who enter kindergarten ready to learn. In fact, these six organizations already track progress on "big picture" indicators on behalf of their partners. But the focus of the GCF evaluation has been different.

Sign In
Subscribe

Individual interviews and group working sessions generated the short-term and intermediate outcomes that could demonstrate the influence of backbone organizations' activities on results of the collective impact *process*. Defining backbone process outcomes was an important step to tie the influence of their work to long-term initiative- and community-level outcomes. Some examples of expected outcomes generated by backbone organizations are listed below.

Based on the common activities and outcomes we defined, FSG asked external stakeholders and the backbone leaders themselves to assess their activities and contributions in each of the six areas, including the relative importance of each area, and to tell us what difference the backbone organizations had made in their respective collective impact efforts. Because assessing poses a significant challenge for many backbone organizations, FSG asked their stakeholders to complete the sentence, "If not for x backbone organization, y, z would not have happened in our community."

Through surveys and interviews, we gathered compelling data. And as we completed the baseline analyses this spring, we grew excited to

Activity	Short-term Outcomes (Illustrative)	Intermediate Outcomes (Illustrative)
1. Guide vision and strategy	Partners share a common understanding of the need and desired result	Partners' individual work is increasingly aligned with the initiative's common agenda
2. Support aligned activities	Partners increasingly communicate and coordinate their activities toward common goals	Partners collaboratively develop new approaches to advance the initiative
3. Establish shared measurement practices	Partners understand the value of sharing data	Partners increasingly use data to adapt and refine their strategies
4. Build public will	Community members are increasingly aware of the issue(s)	More community members feel empowered to take action on the issue(s)
5. Advance policy	Policymakers are more aware and supportive of the initiative's policy agenda	Policy changes increasingly occur in line with initiative goals
6. Mobilize funding	Funding is secured to support initiative activities	Philanthropic and public funds are increasingly aligned with initiative goals

share the illuminating perspectives of roughly 130 stakeholders with the backbone leaders.

We'll share some of these findings with you in tomorrow's post.



Shiloh Turner is vice president for Community Investment at The Greater Cincinnati Foundation, and is responsible for all facets of its charitable investment. She was previously director of Health Data Improvement with the Health Foundation of Greater Cincinnati and vice president of Programs at the Erie Community Foundation.



Kathy Merchant has been president/CEO of The Greater Cincinnati Foundation since 1997. She was previously director of The Pew Charitable Trusts' Neighborhood Preservation Initiative and a partner in the New Haven-based consulting firm Holt, Wexler & Merchant.



John Kania is a managing director at FSG, where he oversees the firm's consulting practice. Before joining FSG, he was a consultant at Mercer Management and Consulting and Corporate Decisions Inc.



Ellen Martin is a senior consultant at FSG, where she advises foundations, corporations, and nonprofits on strategy development, and strategic learning and evaluation. She also serves on the advisory board of the Global Social Venture Competition.

Sign In
Subscribe

If you like this article enough to print it, be sure to subscribe to SSIR!

Copyright © 2015 Stanford University.
Designed by Arsenal, developed by Hop Studios

Collaboration

Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact: Part 3

An in-depth review of what it takes to be a backbone organization, and how to evaluate and support its work.

By [Shiloh Turner](#), [Kathy Merchant](#), [John Kania](#) & [Ellen Martin](#) | Jul. 19, 2012

The Greater Cincinnati Foundation (<http://www.gcfdn.org/>) (GCF) and the nonprofit consulting firm [FSG](#) (<http://www.fsg.org/>) have partnered to understand and evaluate the role of backbone organizations in collective impact efforts. The third in a four-part series, this blog post shares highlights from our evaluation findings. In our first two posts, we defined the roles of backbone organizations in collective impact, laid out the parameters for this evaluation, and shared what we have learned thus far about specific value-added activities that backbone organizations share in common across sectors.

Results of Inquiry: What We Learned

The evaluation of six Cincinnati area backbone organizations was designed to answer the following questions:

- How and to what extent are backbone organizations **effective catalysts** for achieving community-level progress?

Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact

An in-depth review of what it takes to be a backbone organization, and how to evaluate and support its work.

[Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact) (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact)

[Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact) (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact)

[Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact) (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact)

[Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact](http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact) (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact)

- How and to what extent do backbone organizations **contribute** to improved social outcomes?
- How is **success** best measured for backbone organizations?
- What **common challenges and best practices** can be shared across backbone organizations?

As we described in the [previous post](#)

(http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact_2), we defined the key activities of backbone support as: guiding vision and strategy, supporting aligned activities, establishing shared measurement practices, building public will, advancing policy, and mobilizing funding.

With our common activities and outcomes for the backbone organizations in hand, FSG set out to collect the data to answer these questions. We heard many valuable perspectives on the backbone organizations' work from partners, funders, advisors, and community members.

1. **Their value is unmistakable.** If not for the backbone organizations' contributions, stakeholders believe that "even more decisions in our community would be made by a small group of folks," "communities would be simply in survival mode," "the public wouldn't have near the understanding of the challenges," and "there wouldn't be any coordinated program at all." As one stakeholder said, "If they weren't asking the right questions, we wouldn't be [where we are today.]" In essence, individual organizations could not do the work of collective impact without backbone support. These representative comments help the backbones articulate their value and purpose to stakeholders.
2. **GCF's backbone cohort shares strengths in *guiding vision and strategy* and *supporting aligned activities*.** All six backbone organizations received the highest marks for their effectiveness in these core areas. Interviewees said: "Prior to the establishment of [the backbone organization], our community lacked a collective direction for our region," and "[the backbone organizations] bring a lot of people together; they are out understanding what activities are going on and how to align them." The backbone leaders have been attentive to delivering value to their partners in these areas and are likely to continue to do so to maintain momentum. Furthermore, **some backbones were also recognized for *mobilizing funding***, as exemplified through their success winning a Social Innovation Fund grant and other national funding opportunities.
3. **Backbone organizations shift focus over time.** By and large, this cohort of six backbone organizations has not yet placed a great deal of emphasis on *building public will* or

advancing policy, but all expect to increase their time allocations and capacity in these areas in the future. Backbone organization leaders and their stakeholders alike feel that there is a natural progression from *guiding vision and strategy*, *supporting aligned activities*, and *establishing shared measurement practices*—all “inner circle,” partnership-focused activities—to gradually building toward broader externally-focused, community-level activities. For many, attention is beginning to shift to incorporating more external-facing activities into their work.


4. **Backbone organizations’ partners need ongoing assistance with data.** Although *establishing shared measurement practices* was seen broadly as a strength of many of the backbone organizations, building partners’ capacity to contribute and use data in a shared measurement system is a common area for improvement. As one partner described, “We do not have enough manpower to input data.” Backbones with limited staff capacity found it particularly challenging to consider taking on a greater technical assistance role in this area.
5. **External communications, *building public will*, and *advancing policy* are common backbone challenges.** We heard many stakeholders encourage the backbone organizations to improve communications about their own value and progress on the initiative. For example, we heard that “people don’t know what is being accomplished,” and “it’s hard to know how much progress they are making against their goals.” This mirrors the challenge we mentioned in [part 1](#) (http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact_1) around articulating the backbone organizations’ value. In addition, stakeholders spoke of the need to build a more intentional strategy around public will and advocacy: “Even if there is not a lot of money available, to shape the public mind as to what the issues are is terribly important.” Most of the backbone organizations recognized that these areas needed additional attention and capacity, though they were also reluctant to place too much emphasis on advocacy without a clear opportunity to advance policy in a specific, targeted area.

While evaluation findings revealed many commonalities across backbone organizations, there were also several organization-specific challenges. For example, one organization has been pulled in too many directions and is now likely spread too thin to be very effective in all areas. Another needs to enlist more partners representing a broader cross-section of the region in order to effectively tackle the scope of the initiative. As GCF and the backbone leaders considered the relative importance of the messages emerging from the data, we started to identify the contextual nuances that can affect backbone performance, such as:

- The **phase** of the **collective impact** (<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Collective+Impact>) initiative (for example, whether the backbone is helping to initiate action, organize for impact, or sustain action and impact)
- The **capacity** of the backbone organization (for example, headcount, areas of expertise, financial resources)
- The **geographic reach and scope** of the collective impact effort (for example, one neighborhood versus a three-state region, early childhood learning versus community development)
- **Structural** opportunities and constraints created by a parent organization (for example, independent **nonprofit** (<http://www.ssireview.org/topics/category/nonprofits>) versus program underneath a local chapter of a national network of organizations)

For many backbone organizations, the evaluation findings confirmed and clarified what they instinctively knew already about their work. FSG's independent work had the additional benefit of providing a vehicle and forum for sharing the backbone organizations' stories, raising awareness about common issues, and generating learning opportunities. The findings from our baseline assessment launched us into our hoped-for **community of practice** (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Community_of_practice), and a new set of opportunities for learning and technical assistance over the coming months.

We'll share our plans for next steps in tomorrow's post.



Shiloh Turner is vice president for Community Investment at The Greater Cincinnati Foundation, and is responsible for all facets of its charitable investment. She was previously director of Health Data Improvement with the Health Foundation of Greater Cincinnati and vice president of Programs at the Erie Community Foundation.



Kathy Merchant has been president/CEO of The Greater Cincinnati Foundation since 1997. She was previously director of The Pew Charitable Trusts' Neighborhood Preservation Initiative and a partner in the New Haven-based consulting firm Holt, Wexler & Merchant.





John Kania is a managing director at FSG, where he oversees the firm's consulting practice. Before joining FSG, he was a consultant at Mercer Management and Consulting and Corporate Decisions Inc.



Ellen Martin is a senior consultant at FSG, where she advises foundations, corporations, and nonprofits on strategy development, and strategic learning and evaluation. She also serves on the advisory board of the Global Social Venture Competition.

If you like this article enough to print it, be sure to subscribe to SSIR!

Copyright © 2015 Stanford University.
Designed by Arsenal, developed by Hop Studios

Subscribe Sign In

Collaboration

Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact: Part 4

By Shiloh Turner, Kathy Merchant, John Kania & Ellen Martin | Jul. 20, 2012

The Greater Cincinnati Foundation (<http://www.gcdfn.org/>) (GCF) and the nonprofit consulting firm FSG (<http://www.fsg.org/>) have partnered to understand and evaluate the role of backbone organizations in collective impact efforts. The final post in a four-part series describes what's next for our work. In our first three posts, we defined the roles of backbone organizations in collective impact, laid out the parameters for this evaluation, and shared what we have learned thus far about specific value-added activities that backbone organizations share in common across sectors.

What Next? Leading and Learning into the Future

When GCF invested in supporting the core budgets of six local backbone organizations over a period of five years, the Foundation also undertook a broader effort to support **evaluation** (<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Measurement+&+Evaluation>) and develop a community of practice for these grant recipients. Since January 2012, GCF and FSG have been focused on launching the latter effort.

A key question guiding our evaluation has been: How and to what extent are backbone organizations effective catalysts for achieving community-level progress? In FSG's previous work on collective impact, reported in "Channeling Change," **the "intangibles" of the work**

Understanding the Value of Backbone Organizations in Collective Impact

An in-depth review of what it takes to be a backbone organization, and how to evaluate and support its work.

Understanding the Value of Backbone Or (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_v | 3 (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value

Understanding the Value of Backbone Or (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_v | 1 (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value

Understanding the Value of Backbone Or (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_v | 7 (http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_the_value

Sign In
Subscribe

(http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/channeling_change_making_collective_impact_work) —a key one is *leadership* (<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Leadership>) *identification and development*—can be incredibly important in driving the progress of an initiative. In our baseline data collection, stakeholders shared with FSG their deep convictions and heartfelt sentiments about the backbone leaders they know best. In aggregate, the synthesized feedback confirmed a compelling picture of the importance of effective leadership among backbone organizations and the potential of collective impact overall. (See text box)

If you are considering how to undertake or support a **collective impact** (<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Collective+Impact>) initiative, one fundamental truth about backbone effectiveness is that its leader can make or break the organization’s success. This component of the evaluation captures some of the intangible “secret sauce” that helps us understand the backbone role going forward.

Subscribe Sign In

Common Characteristics of Effective Backbone Leadership

- **Visionary:** “In addition to setting the agenda items, she has a very clear vision of where we need to focus and has the ability to drive focus towards those.”
- **Results-Oriented:** “This is a really results-oriented staff, and they are constantly pushing the community and all of us to not just talk about something, but to act on it.”
- **Collaborative, Relationship Builder:** “[Her] style is a collaborator, consensus builder, she works very well with partners. We do a good job with making everyone feel like they’re important.”
- **Focused, but Adaptive:** “[There is a] combination of laser focus, a willingness to listen to almost any idea, [and an ability to] cut to the chase and not act on every idea. They are so focused on being sure that whatever is done is focused on the end goal.”
- **Charismatic and Influential Communicator:** “[She] is extraordinarily articulate and passionate about her work and...she is a true leader in the field.”
- **Politically Savvy:** “Probably a little political savvy, and more of an ability to filter what they say than I have. [He] understands when to listen.”
- **Humble:** “[He] sees himself as a ‘servant-leader.’”

“Someone who has a big picture perspective—[who] understands how the pieces fit together, is sensitive to the dynamics, and is energetic and passionate.”

Source: FSG interviews

As the GCF-FSG team looks back on our process, we heavily front-loaded the first six months of developing the evaluation and technical assistance aspect of GCF’s funding initiative in order to ensure that it was built on a solid foundation. We established a community of practice with the cohort of backbone organizations. We developed the common theory of change across backbone organizations, as well as individual logic models. We conducted the

baseline assessment of each backbone organization. And we established a shared learning agenda to provide ongoing technical assistance. Now we can step back, take a deep breath, and reflect on what’s next.

For GCF, the Foundation plans to continue to “**learn in public** (<http://www.bethkanter.org/learning-in-public/>)”, as Beth Kanter says, by sharing the lessons we learned with local funders and other community partners. One way GCF plans to do this is by convening a local community conversation around collective impact this fall. In Cincinnati, the community has been so busy doing collective impact that leaders haven’t actually stepped back to reflect on the mechanics or

importance of the work. The purpose of the community convening is to make sure that everyone is on the same page about what collective impact is, to share how GCF and the backbone organizations are using the model to drive change, and to discuss and solidify everyone's role in advancing the work. GCF will bring together the boards, volunteers, and partners of GCF and other funders, as well as the backbone organizations, to establish a common understanding of collective impact.

GCF also plans to share this learning with the field, initially via publications, such as *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, social media channels, conference presentations, and perhaps ultimately through a more formal white paper. Besides sharing what we have learned, GCF also needs to hone its communications and messaging about the approach. The foundation needs to succinctly answer the questions: What are we doing? Why are we doing it? What do we expect success to look like? GCF is off to a good start answering the first question through a slide presentation and [video](http://youtu.be/1ZZRvNXOozc) (<http://youtu.be/1ZZRvNXOozc>) that adopts a rowing metaphor to communicate what the model looks like, and specifically, to provide greater detail about each core tenet in the model. We found that this subject matter is complicated and tends to be very heavy on jargon, so the foundation will continue to make an effort to improve in its own communications. Together with FSG, GCF has also developed a reporting template and dashboard that will help easily communicate results of the funding initiative.

GCF's backbone grant recipients are already using what they've learned to inform and improve their work. Each has taken results back to their governing leadership, partners, and core supporters to discuss the implications their evaluation results have for their work. One backbone organization is challenging its current evaluation process and looking to collect more granular, neighborhood-level data. It has also researched best practices on effective communications strategies to show both quantitative and qualitative results, and has hired a communications team to develop a communications plan. Other backbone organizations are using the six core activities framework (see [part 2](#) (http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact_2)) to help align their organizational structure around each activity area, and ensure that key activities are otherwise properly resourced.

Less than six months into the development of the community of practice, we are already seeing synergy across groups. Vision 2015, Agenda 360, Partners for a Competitive Workforce, and the Strive Partnership are working together on a labor market study called “2020 Job Outlook.” Four backbone organizations will share resources—leadership, connections, and cash—to develop a dataset that can drive the region’s collective vision and goals on job training and educational attainment. This example shows true partnership with a common agenda, driving a high impact regional initiative together.

The role of GCF in supporting collective impact also continues to evolve and grow. GCF provides support primarily through its grantmaking and capacity building support of backbone organizations. It has also been a partner in mobilizing funding by aligning its **community investment framework** (<http://gcfndn.org/CommunityLeadership/Overview/tabid/230/Default.aspx>) with widely adopted community initiatives. And GCF has collaborated with **United Way of Greater Cincinnati** (<http://www.uwgc.org/index.cfm?>) to lead the community dialogue around further refinement of shared community outcomes and measures FSG plans to expand the depth of its support for those groups pursuing collective impact by further exploring what it means to be a backbone organization. FSG also has other research efforts underway to develop insights on shared **measurement** (<http://www.ssireview.org/tags/Measurement+%&+Evaluation>), the role of funders, and the role that collective impact plays in addressing the complexity of social change.

With this incredible cohort of backbone leaders fully engaged in a community of practice, we now embark upon our next phase of work. We hope that the rationale, process, and results of our experience to date will resonate with other funders and practitioners who are making similar investments and facing similar opportunities and challenges. Creating large-scale systemic change via collective impact is a long-term proposition. Both GCF and FSG are dedicated to providing continued knowledge and tools for Cincinnati and other communities to help speed progress along the way.

Finally, we are very interested in hearing your perspectives on the work in Cincinnati.

- If you consider yourself a **backbone organization**, does our articulation of the backbone role resonate?

- If you're a **funder** of a backbone organization, does our story help to give you more confidence in investing in backbone organizations?
- If you're a **collective impact partner or direct service provider**, do you see value in the backbone activities we've outlined?



Shiloh Turner is vice president for Community Investment at The Greater Cincinnati Foundation, and is responsible for all facets of its charitable investment. She was previously director of Health Data Improvement with the Health Foundation of Greater Cincinnati and vice president of Programs at the Erie Community Foundation.



Kathy Merchant has been president/CEO of The Greater Cincinnati Foundation since 1997. She was previously director of The Pew Charitable Trusts' Neighborhood Preservation Initiative and a partner in the New Haven-based consulting firm Holt, Wexler & Merchant.



John Kania is a managing director at FSG, where he oversees the firm's consulting practice. Before joining FSG, he was a consultant at Mercer Management and Consulting and Corporate Decisions Inc.



Ellen Martin is a senior consultant at FSG, where she advises foundations, corporations, and nonprofits on strategy development, and strategic learning and evaluation. She also serves on the advisory board of the Global Social Venture Competition.

Sign In
Subscribe

If you like this article enough to print it, be sure to subscribe to SSIR!

Copyright © 2015 Stanford University.
Designed by Arsenal, developed by Hop Studios