



Roundtable on Community Engagement and Collective Impact

Note to the reader: The following is a longer version of a discussion published in Stanford Social Innovation Review in the fall of 2014 as part of the compilation “[Collective Insights on Collective Impact](#).”

Overview

Collective impact efforts are often discussed in terms of organizations or sectors, such as business, nonprofit, government, and philanthropy. What is often left out of the discussion is the community itself, even though it is a critical factor in the long-term success of collective impact initiatives. The community includes the individuals, families, networks, and organizations who will be affected by the initiative and who participate in it, but who are not usually considered to have active leadership roles in creating community solutions. It includes, for example, people directly affected by the problem, as well as social service organizations that may not be initially represented on steering committees or working groups.

To advance the conversation about how to engage the community in collective impact, the [Aspen Institute Forum for Community Solutions](#) gathered scholars and practitioners for an honest discussion. In this roundtable, the participants discuss why it is important to involve the community actively, how it can be done within a collective impact initiative, and the challenges and pitfalls of engaging the community.



List of Participants

MODERATOR	ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS				
					
<p>Melody Barnes, chair of the Aspen Institute Forum for Community Solutions</p>	<p>Paul Born, president and cofounder, Tamarack Institute</p>	<p>Richard Harwood, founder and president, The Harwood Institute for Public Innovation</p>	<p>Steve Savner, director of public policy, Center for Community Change</p>	<p>Stacey Stewart, US president, United Way Worldwide</p>	<p>Martin Zanghi, director of youth and community engagement, University of Southern Maine Muskie School of Public Service</p>

Moderator: Melody Barnes, Chair of the Aspen Institute Forum for Community Solutions

Participants:

- Paul Born, President and Co-Founder, [Tamarack Institute](#)
- Richard Harwood, Founder and President, [The Harwood Institute for Public Innovation](#)
- Steve Savner, Director of Public Policy, [Center for Community Change](#)
- Stacey Stewart, US President, [United Way Worldwide](#)
- Martin Zanghi, Director of Youth and Community Engagement, [University of Southern Maine School of Public Service](#)

Transcript

Thursday, April 10, 2014

MELODY BARNES: *I want to start out by asking what community engagement is. It's one of those things you think you know when you see it, but let's get specific. How do you define community engagement?*

STEVE SAVNER: From our perspective, community engagement needs to include people in the community—the people who are trying to be helped by the various services. They should be involved in a very genuine way in identifying community needs, developing ideas about solutions, and then helping to oversee and continuously improve the program. It's all about the constituency having a real role and an actual seat at the table.

MARTIN ZANGHI: It's a method, a strategy, a way of creating relationships for people who have been affected by poverty, social and economic injustice, and racism. It's about providing people who haven't had a voice the opportunity to share leadership and develop their skills to get practitioners and policymakers to actually listen. The most powerful voices that I've experienced over the last 20 years are youths who have changed policy, changed practices, and changed our belief systems so that we're actually doing better by the people that we're trying to serve.



RICHARD HARWOOD: Community engagement is an orientation. It's about who you believe is part of the community and whom you're willing to see. It means engaging people who have things that only they know and only they can teach us. For instance, only community citizens can tell us their shared aspirations and the challenges to reaching those aspirations.

Only they can tell us about their lived experiences with certain challenges, and what kinds of tradeoffs they're willing to make in their lives. This helps us develop the public will to move forward.

STACEY STEWART: For United Way, it's a continuous process of listening, understanding, hearing, and acting on reaching those aspirations. I think the tendency is often to do engagement through town halls or meetings at the rec center and then say, "Well, we've engaged the community, so now we can go off and do our work for the next three years and never listen to anyone again." That's not the kind of engagement that will produce any kind of community-level change.

BARNES: How do you think community engagement fits inside the collective impact approach, which brings together so many different sectors across the community?

PAUL BORN: On a practical level, community engagement in collective impact is particularly relevant when putting together a common agenda. It starts by identifying the system that we want to engage.

For example, if we're working on poverty issues, we may bring together government leaders, people from civil society organizations, and corporate leaders who care about the issue. In addition, there is a fourth sector—people who will most benefit from the success of our initiative. We bring them together for a series of experiences that allow them to enter into the issue deeply.

In the process of working and talking across sectors, new ideas are shaped and old ideas are let go. The common agenda is not just a strategic plan. It's also a commitment to the work moving forward. Community engagement is the process of building a common vision that binds us together.

ZANGHI: It's also about emergent learning — about providing the time and space for the relationships and the processes to develop. It allows learning to come from the people who aren't normally part of the conversation, by listening to people with rich life experiences.

It's not an easy practice to let people have that space. People have practiced elements of collective impact over the years, but the piece that's not clear to everyone is the process—the time, the trust, and the relationships that go into creating the five conditions of collective impact.

HARWOOD: I agree with that, Marty. Fundamentally this is a question of civic culture that we need to think about. There needs to be a community first perspective. For a common agenda to work in a community needs there needs to be community ownership of it.

When people look out into the public square, they don't see themselves, they don't hear themselves, and they don't believe their reality is reflected in what's happening. I tell folks who are doing collective impact and other work in communities that there is a simple test to pass if you really want community ownership. You ought to be able to pull 300 people from the community



who you don't know, but who will be affected by what you are doing, and be able to stand up in front of them – without notice, without talking to them about your programs, your collective impact strategy, or any of that, beforehand – and reflect back to them their shared community aspirations.

Can you reflect back some of the challenges that they are facing in their lives? The things that keep them awake at night? The things that they struggle with? In this community conversation can you reflect back the direction that people really want to move in? If you can't do those things, what I find is that, more times than not, you probably don't have a deep enough knowledge of your community so that the people there can really see and hear themselves and believe that their reality counts for something. If you are after a common agenda, by definition at some point it has to be a *community* agenda.

SAVNER: One of the issues that we need to pay attention to is the difficulties that communities experience with the engagement process. It's important to think about what organizations are in the community that are run by low-income people and to be sure to have those organizations at the table. It is important that there is an organization whose mission is to work with low-income folks and that really represents their views. It's also important because it helps empower low income people and develop them into leaders.

STEWART: The nonprofit sector has always tried to solve challenges in a community by looking at the services that could be provided. When things don't seem to work, nonprofit leaders wonder what happened and realize that they don't have the perfect solution. Nonprofits have a lot of data and perspective, but other perspectives are just as valuable. We have found that, when we do the kind of listening and engaging with people that is required to drive systemic change, people step up to lead the change with us.

HARWOOD: Stacey raises an interesting point. What is the basic frame we're using to do collective impact? Is it serving people or is it building something? What Americans want more than anything else right now is to return to being builders. It's part of our DNA, part of the founding of the country, and part of how we built communities over the years. Many people feel that we've gotten away from that by being served all the time, by taking on a mindset that we're consumers and that we can make unlimited demands on limited resources.

What I hear from folks in communities more than anything is: "Let's build something that has meaning and purpose, and let's demonstrate that we can come together and do things." We don't want to revert to the old paradigm that said: "What's your problem? I have a program for that and you don't have to do anything, even though you want to help create your own future."

STEWART: If you look back at history, things have changed at large scale in this country and around the world when some critical mass of organizations come together and agree that there is something important to work on. But this happens only when everyday people believe the issue is really important and are willing to change their own behavior. Not because someone tells them to, but because they want to. They see it as a priority for themselves, their communities, and their lives.

Then there is the issue of creating real change in the community so that things actually get better. That's where this whole idea of engaging people and making them feel a part of the process comes in. Even if they didn't come to the community conversation to share their voice, they see their



aspirations echoed by others around them and they feel a part of it. They feel like it's something they want to adopt in their whole life. This is an interesting cultural shift in the community that changes behavior.

HARWOOD: The question is - how do you design collective impact efforts upfront so that we're both moving needle on an issue, and at the same time shifting the civic culture. That way we can be successful on that particular issue, while also believing in ourselves and having the capacity and relationships to move on other things as well.

BARNES: What are some of the biggest pitfalls when trying to take a collective impact approach that is in harmony with the community?

ZANGHI: I want to go back to the process piece. It is important that we take the time to build up the community - to be that diplomat for change and develop leadership skills in the people we are working with. We need to take the time and learn how to work with people outside of meetings to develop these relationships - to create shared understanding and common strategies. That way when we come together in a meeting we're being as effective as we can, and having deep conversations about change.

This is about balancing all the different types of expertise, resources and knowledge that everybody brings to the table - including the totally disconnected kid who is a high school dropout. It's about balancing that process, that relationship building, to get to those results. It's about valuing everybody who has rich life experience and expertise in all its forms.

BORN: I find our biggest pitfall is being able to listen to each other. We create environments where we are thinking about the solution we want to implement rather than listening to what is going on.

Collective impact is very action oriented. But Peter Senge has this lovely saying "Sometimes we have to go slow to go fast." If we don't go slowly in this work, we can very quickly come to solutions that don't engage people.

HARWOOD: The biggest obstacle that I see is when we are overrun by the very process we created. Suddenly the goal is to implement timelines to meet deliverables and funding requirements. We lose sight of the community because the project is so heavy that we spend all our time feeding it. Despite our best intentions, we are oriented inward toward our own organization and process. We have to make a commitment to turn outward toward the community and shift our orientation, individually as well as collectively.

A danger with collective impact is that it becomes like a social erector set. We think that if we just put the right pieces together and get the right nuts and bolts in the correct order, then somehow this organic system we call community will go along our nice linear path. We need the humility to confront the actual conditions in communities and begin where the community is, not with our erector set. If we don't get this right, all the stuff that follows will not matter.

BARNES: How do you align the competing demands of building trust and relationships, wanting to keep momentum going, and needing results?



BORN: This is something that we struggle with in all processes, and it's particularly trying when moving from process to outcomes. It's not as big an issue as we make it, and we at Tamarack have a simple solution – we ask the partners in the collective impact approach to share with us what are they doing, what are they doing differently, and how might they work together on issues. As we identify issues through these questions we create quick working groups.

So, even as we're doing the engagement piece, even as we're coming to the common agenda, there are ideas that we ask people to act on right away.

For example, during our work in the city of Hamilton we generated nearly three pages of outcomes, redirected \$5 million in funding – which helped out 1,800 families out of poverty. This all happened *before* we wrote our community plan. The work doesn't start when the planning has ended. Often the common agenda work is ongoing, the shared measurement work is ongoing, and the outcomes work needs to start on day one. And this is something that we emphasize over and over again.

SAVNER: There are some real-world external things that we need to deal with. One of those is the desire of very concrete measurable outcomes by elected officials, funders and others. Part of the challenge is managing expectations and being clear from the beginning about what can reasonably be accomplished in a given period of time so we don't setup unrealistic expectations. It is challenging because elected officials have their own people who they're accountable to as well, but part of the process is being realistic about what's really going to be accomplished, what it's going to take, and when.

If you want to keep people engaged you also have to deliver results for them. Those results have to be aspirational, but we also have to be optimistic that we're going to achieve something. Celebrate results; explain what it means to be making progress. Own not only the progress, but also the areas where we're not doing as well as we should be.

HARWOOD: Communities are not looking to solve everything tomorrow, what they want to know is whether or not they're on the right trajectory. So, the question for collective impact becomes – what does it takes to put a community on the right trajectory?

When I work with communities, one of the questions I ask is “what do you want to win?” The second thing I say is let's look at the conditions in our community - what's the level of trust, what are the relationships that we have, how much capacity organizationally do we have, what's the nature of the leadership and how deep is it, how broad is it in our community? This is how you develop strategies that fit the local context.

Right now one of the dilemmas we face is that we think we have to solve everything right away. We need to give ourselves permission to let go of that, but make ourselves much more accountable for delivering on that new trajectory.

BARNES: What are the key elements needed to develop meaningful community engagement and collective impact?

ZANGHI: One thing that we are trying to do less of is invite people to meetings. There is this conversation going around about collaborative fatigue and how people are tired of coming to



meetings and finding the same cast of characters. I don't know the solution to this yet, but we have to find a different way. This is particularly true in communities where the funders, strategists, policy makers, and lead community based organizations are constantly the ones showing up. The question arises: “why do we keep showing up at meetings and what can we do differently?”

SAVNER: A key element is real listening. It is critical to building trust, to building relationships, and to having people understand that they are being heard and understood. Both listening and respect are an important part of the building relationships piece that people talk about as being critical.

STEWART: At the end of the day, the whole idea of collective action is how do you get more people connected to a bigger level of change? This means you always have to figure out – “what are the right tools and tactics to use so people continue to feel excited and not burned out?”

HARWOOD: In our work what has become the great hidden factor that determines whether communities move forward or whether people become fatigued is the ingrained narrative in the community. In a lot of communities the ingrained narrative is: “We tried that. We can't change anything here.” These narratives permeate communities; they drive the community's mindset, attitudes, actions, behaviors and ultimately whether people are willing to step forward.

If we want to combat fatigue in a community – and more importantly if we want to create a sense of possibility and momentum – we need replace the old and ingrained negative narrative with a new can-do narrative.

One way of doing this is learning how to tell what I call “civic parables.” All parables have an implicit lesson or moral to them, and all parables are a journey. And all the real good parables always implicate the listener or the reader, right? That's because the journey is never over, and you – the listener – could be this person at the center of the story.

We find that when you string these parables together, they begin to look like a narrative. People actually start to share this narrative with each other in the community; they begin to believe that change is possible, they begin to see a different trajectory because there is evidence, and they are willing to stay in the game and keep fighting. That's one of the things that we have to give a lot more attention to.

BARNES: For those who are new to this work, what tools can we give them?

BORN: One of the things that we try to do is teach about strategic engagement. We provide communities with the tools and help them to think “who are the people that need to be involved?” We have this exercise called the Top 100, a brainstorm process where we ask communities to think about the top 100 people that if they were involved things would change.

We hope that they are going to run out of formal leaders at around number 30 or 40, and then they are going to start thinking about people from all walks of life. We are particularly interested in people from those four sectors, business, government, the voluntary sector and the people who are going to benefit the most if we're successful.



Once we've identified who they might be, we host gatherings that have all four of our sectors involved – particularly people with little experience being present at every gathering. We document what happens at those gatherings: what are people committed to, what are the ideas that they are generating? We then put that in a database so that the database becomes a central electronic organizer for the collective.

In many ways the database helps make collective impact work possible because it helps with continuous communication.

ZANGHI: I have a much more on-the-ground example with youth leaders. My primary experience has been youth in the child welfare system – kids in foster care.

If you give young people the opportunity to enter in to the practice, debate and design of policy; and if you give them the support, training, and opportunity to intern or do participatory research or a have some chance to practice – and the key term is "practice" – they become some of the most influential people around policy change and reform.

It's about bringing any population in, welcoming them in a low barrier way, and providing them with the training, the support, and the opportunities to practice leadership in a way that changes their lives and ultimately changes policy and practice. Young people, given the opportunity, have the potential to dramatically influence policymakers – sometimes more than anyone else – and we've seen that at a national and local level.

SAVNER: I've seen this in our work with DREAM students. This goes to Rich's point about the narrative. Providing settings and opportunities where people can develop their story and learn to share it in a meaningful way is important. The narrative has to grow out of people's own stories about their community. Hearing people share their personal and community stories is powerful.

STEWART: I want to add one other thing, which comes out of our practical experience on how some communities have come together to engage around an issue. Our experience is that it has been very opportunistic versus organic. Using our work in Milwaukee as an example, it wasn't as if Milwaukee just woke up one day and everyone decided that teen pregnancy was an issue. Milwaukee ended up being at the top of the list of worst cities in the national for teen pregnancy. It elevated the public consciousness to the point that people were compelled to care and act. People that didn't know about the issue obviously started finding out and wanted to know more about it.

This goes to the very nature of how an issue gets inside a public consciousness. What causes people to want to act, come together, engage and really understand how to work together on things? A lot of us don't want to hear a bad news stories, but out of the bad some good can happen. There are times when these kinds of calls to action compel people to act and move people into the different place of awareness and engagement that otherwise wouldn't have happened if these issues had not come to light.

That's actually what's happening in some communities on a day-to-day basis – people are being called to a way of behaving and working together. That would not have happened had those issues not been brought to light.

HARWOOD: I have lots of tools I'd like to mention. You can have all the tools you want, but if your orientation isn't right it does not matter what techniques and tools we use



Collective Impact, and the work we're trying to do in communities, is about making a series of choices. The dilemma with collective action approaches is, as I said earlier, we get locked into a process. We think we're building an erector set and we think if we just read the instructions, everything will work out. Well, it doesn't.

It only works out when we make courageous choices. What issue is right for us to pick and start to create momentum around? Who do we really need at the table in order to do this? How do the issues need to be framed so that people can see themselves in the work? What kinds of strategies do we pick that will actually allow us to make progress so we can win at this? How can we tell our story over time so that people can believe they can step forward and be a part of something larger than themselves?

These are a series of choices that we have to trust somebody to make. And so for me, for those folks who are thinking about doing collective impact, for those folks who want to win a collective impact – what I would say to them is get ready to make some choices.

BORN: You know, I actually do think we need to talk about technique. We need to talk to technique a lot. This is primarily because we've identified that there are thousands of organizations in the United States and Canada who are very, very good at collaboration. The reason that this collective impact work is resonating with people is not because communities are broken. It's because we have such high level of thinking and absolute brilliance that is emerging.

Collective impact is an evolved way of thinking. We resonate so quickly with it. It just makes sense – we have to bring people into a solid common agenda and to the place where they agree on a shared measurement system. That in itself is not a technique. It's something that we have come to full understanding in working together. Getting to those two conditions, once we have mutually reinforcing activities, is actually quite simple. However, if we don't have those two, it's very difficult to get outcomes. We don't all benefit if we don't all have the shared outcome.

They have spent years and years listening to folks like Rich (HARWOOD) and others. They understand. Collective impact is their tool because they are saying: “We get this and we want large scale change. We want systemic change. We don't just want to keep doing this transactional work. We're tired of better poor. We want less poor. You know, we're tired of better communities. We want to transformed communities. We want communities that promote life.”

I am so excited by this. That's why we have to come down and talk about technique, because we're ready. We're ready as a sector to change things. We want to get into the meat of this and to learn how to work differently at a really advanced level.

The backbone organization is the one thing collective impact is bringing to this work that we have not seen in quite the same way in almost any other kind of community development theory. This idea of the central role of the backbone organization to keep the collective working together - working together in a highly functional and very smart way – is new. We've been training with FSG across North America and it's unbelievable how awed I am by the skill of our community workers.

ZANGHI: I appreciate what you're saying. Technique is important and I couldn't agree with you more. I'm often reminded of this work when I hear the story in the news about the successful



couple who has been married for 82 years. Then you hear why they are successful – they have unconditional love. But then you dig deeper. They have open communication - they listen. They have trust, and they have fun, and they have faith.

When working with communities, and working with people who are disconnected, those elements aren't necessarily in their life. We as community organizers and change agents are trying to bring that to our world. I would love to be able to have that - those components in the work that I'm doing: that love, that communication, that trust, that fun. When you have that kind of faith in one another, you're going to get the kind of outcomes, results and impact that we want. And if you look at any of the major reform efforts, they are going to have those key components in that work.

BORN: And Marty, that's what we're calling technique - how do we actually bring those things into our work? That's part of the evolved state, right; it's the simplicity of it.

HARWOOD: This is interesting, but there's a difference between techniques and practices, and in our work with public innovators, it's all about the orientation and practices. Techniques can help support that with tools and other things, but I find that practices transform. We've talked about not being transactional and if we're not being transactional, what we want to be is transformational.

To transform things, it's not a matter of techniques per se, but a matter of practices that change how we show up, how we engage with one another, the questions we ask, the filters we use, and how we make sense of things. It changes, not just how we're working in this particular moment, but how we work all the time in different ways with different people so that we can create a different kind of culture in our community to get things done together.

Those things happen when we shift our orientation and shift our practices. What I find oftentimes with techniques is that people use them in the moment, leave them on the table, and then go back to their regular life. That's transactional, and that may be helpful in the moment, but that's not going to get us Paul's excitement, which is what is contagious about collective impact - I don't think that's going to allow Paul's contagious excitement to spread in itself.

BARNES: I've heard from people around the country about perceived challenges when we engage communities and try to ensure that the community voice is a part of our work. But are there also real challenges that we need to address?

BORN: I'm going to go to the one that is named almost 100 percent of the time by backbone leaders: There is not enough time. The perception of time is in an old frame. We have gotten so busy that it is a challenge to convince people to slow down. We somehow have to put the clutter away, which means that boards have to tell their leaders, "We need you to spend time on this."

So we're approaching people who don't necessarily want to lead a collective impact approach but want to be part of one, and we throw out the challenge: "You've got to set aside a minimum of 10 percent of your time to work in this process." That might mean four hours a week, but more important, it sets up a thinking pattern. We're in so many meetings and we move from thing to thing, so we've stopped looking at the larger reason we exist. I think that's by far the biggest challenge in collective impact work: to get people to rethink and slow down.



SAVNER: Whether it's collective impact or any other kind of work that requires building relationships and trust, the biggest barrier is frequently the risk to people in the organizations. And that's real: Your organization and your people have certain needs, and there is always a risk that the process will not come out to your greatest benefit.

People have legitimate concerns and interests. If you're running an agency, or if you're an elected official or a community resident, the thing you can do is build trust and relationships. But it seems to me that risks and a lack of trust in the process are the biggest barrier.

STEWART: Whenever there's a collective impact exercise, it's always in the context of what's happened before. There is baggage in communities. There are things that have happened that didn't work and relationships that are not going well. It takes patience and understanding to realize how to deal with that context.

From a backbone organization's perspective, it's important to understand that being the backbone doesn't mean you are in control. At some level, if you want to have the community engaged in a process, it has to be the community's process, not the backbone's. That is often difficult for people to accept because they might assume they can take control and move the process according to their timetable, and that's not the case.

Last, a piece of this engagement puzzle is both an opportunity and a challenge for some folks. There is a whole new world of engagement that we haven't fully adopted or seen the full potential of—digital and mobile space, and online engagement. So we may think about engagement in the classic, in-person sense, but in reality there are huge numbers of people in society right now for whom engaging online is perfectly comfortable. They feel completely engaged on an issue even if they haven't met everyone physically. There's an exciting opportunity to think about how virtual engagement can lead to collective change.

HARWOOD: We say we want to put community in collective impact, but we don't do it. That may be because we are afraid, we don't want to lose control, or we don't want to create certain risks, but there are two results. One is that we increase the likelihood that our collective impact will not succeed because there won't be true community ownership and we won't be able to mobilize the energies and the public will of our large communities. The other is that we will miss an opportunity. People are looking to be part of something larger than themselves. They want to come back into public life to build something together. Collective impact initiatives are the golden opportunity for that to happen.

BARNES: Picking up on that idea, do you think that the fear that sometimes leads us not to include community creates a perception that collective impact is really for the grasstops and not for the grassroots?

STEWART: I think that's really what we're talking about. As we begin to understand collective impact, it feels very much like a grasstops effort. And I think that we all agree that it is both grasstops and grassroots. It involves

Everybody — everyday people, involved leaders. The more people you have engaged, the better. And the sooner we understand that collective action must include collective involvement, the sooner we will be able to solidify some real examples of moving the needle and involving people in



something bigger than themselves.

ZANGHI: My concern about the pitfall question is not related to any particular method, whether it's collective impact or another. It is that we still fall back on some of our old models of power, authority, and perceived expertise. That affects the ability to bring different people to the table and shapes the process and the outcomes for a likely change. It can get in the way of the kind of change that we are all fighting for.

HARWOOD: I think the danger of grasstop power is that, for a lot of folks, the efforts that come out of collective impact can look nice but not necessary. People see a group of professionals in their community who have dreamed something up, put a nice label on it, and created a four-color brochure and maybe a jingle. Then they promote it as though it's the new sliced bread.

This does not address the things that I'm concerned about and it doesn't give me the sense of possibility that we're building something together and changing the way our community operates. Instead, it feels like we're just creating another program.

BORN: What I'm finding is that we in the sector know that we can't work at the grasstop level, and that collective impact does not work if it stays there. This, again, is part of how I perceive the evolved state of our community sector – people know this intuitively. United Ways across North America deeply understand the role of citizen engagement and not just working at the grasstops.

In the early days of a collective impact approach, we often find that one of two mistakes is made. One is that we gather only the grasstops. That is, we think somehow it's about shifting power. So we bring the powerful players into the room. The other mistake, almost as common, is that we don't engage any of the power players because we're afraid that it will be perceived as a grasstops initiative.

So people are overcorrecting. They are either going grassroots or going grasstops. We're encouraging people to trust their instincts and bring the grasstops together with the grassroots. The actual process of bringing the power and the grassroots together is what changes the conversation.

BARNES: What is the one piece of advice that you would give to a person who comes to you and says, "I'm in community X and we are using a collective impact approach. We really want to work with the community. How should we go about doing our work?"

ZANGHI: A theme I've heard in our conversation is the power of storytelling. Train and support people to tell their stories and to listen better.

SAVNER: Look for organizations that are actually led by the people in the community who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of whatever changes you're trying to achieve.

STEWART: I would say be patient, listen and involve broadly.

BORN: We often say that the change that is required is really the change within ourselves. First it's very important to know your heart, the second is to open your heart, and the third is to trust your heart.



It's "know," "open" and "trust," because it is in this new relationship of becoming fully human together that we're going to find that transformation and be deeply honest with one another. If we can bring the right people into the room together, and have that deep honest conversation – open ourselves to each other - we're going to find a new way.

HARWOOD: Get clear on your urge to do good, because you're going to need that as you face adversity. But in order to create change, you need to turn outward and make the community— not your conference room — your reference point.

BARNES: Those are great pieces of advice. I want to thank you all for your time this afternoon. I found the conversation to be interesting and thought-provoking. We appreciate your expertise and your time. Thank you so much.

And for those who want to learn more about collective impact, and the work that we're all doing as we link arms together, please go to www.collectiveimpactforum.org.