Multi-Stakeholder Collaborations - A Diverse Set of Models for Diverse Contexts
Recommendations for Oversight and Coordination
For Detroit's Community Development Ecosystem

May 28, 2020

INTRODUCTION

Building the Engine of Community Development in Detroit (BECDD) is an initiative that seeks to engage neighborhood residents, community development professionals, funders and the City of Detroit in a process to change the trajectory of neighborhood revitalization by listening to and investing in the people who make this work possible. Supported by a variety of private foundations and corporations, the project was originally sponsored by three Core Partners (Community Development Advocates of Detroit, Lawrence Technological University and Michigan Nonprofit Association) and has involved a broad and diverse set of community members, nonprofit organizations, government, funders and universities. In its initial phases, participants engaged in a comprehensive planning and action process to foster a sustainable and impactful community development ecosystem to serve all Detroit neighborhoods for the benefit of Detroit's residents. Participants defined seven elements for a healthy community development system and five drivers that enable these elements.

Role of the BECDD Steering Committee

At the beginning of 2019, the initiative's Advisory Council and Core Partners called for the creation of a new decision-making and coordination group (expanding on the Core Partners) that would provide continued oversight and direction for the BECDD project as the seven elements continued to be built. The Core Partners also expressed interest in exploring the idea of a "collective impact" - type model (a multi-sector collaborative) to be used by the group as a way of providing needed support across the community development ecosystem in Detroit.

This new group, later named the Steering Committee, was charged with overseeing the initiative as it entered its final phase and deciding on a permanent oversight and coordination structure for the community development ecosystem in Detroit.

Commonwealth Consulting, in partnership with the 767 Group and Vantage Consulting Group, were tasked with researching Multi-Sector Collaborative Models, educating the Steering Committee on these models and assisting the Steering Committee in moving toward a permanent system oversight structure using a multi-sector collaborative model. This report provides an analysis of the governance methods used by various multi-stakeholder collaborative models for consideration by the Steering Committee.

BECDD's Goals and the Detroit Community Development Context

BECDD was launched in 2016 with the **goal of creating a citywide process to strengthen all Detroit neighborhoods by building a coordinated, equitable system for community development work in Detroit.** At the time, the revitalization of Detroit had begun to reach the downtown and midtown areas and there was a real risk that the City's' remaining neighborhoods would be left behind. The initiative was launched to bring greater resources, capacity, coordination, and equity to community development work in Detroit.

There are several contextual factors that could be considered when considering the strengths and weaknesses of various collaboration models.

The first factor to consider is the *presence of a variety of efforts now underway in Detroit intended to strengthen the City's neighborhoods*. Examples of these include the Strategic Neighborhood Fund and Affordable Housing Leverage Fund. Several Detroit stakeholder tables have also been convened by private foundations and corporations to foster greater coordination among funders and stakeholders. These include the Kresge-funded cohort of CDOs known as the Detroit 21, the Detroit Neighborhood Forum, the Residents First Fund, and others. The Steering Committee has recognized the importance of looking at how the collaborative oversight model they select will interact, if at all, with these tables. These efforts compete for the time and attention of community development leaders. A new collaborative model to coordinate and provide oversight will need to be able to connect to these disparate efforts without creating an unreasonable burden on community development leaders in Detroit.

Secondly, the oversight and coordination model will *need to be able to operate without diminishing funding for CDOs and other essential elements of community development in Detroit*. If the cost of the collaborative model is too great, it may draw resources away from other essential community development functions, especially operating support for the existing set of CDOs in Detroit. The BECDD System Capitalization Task Force found that many of Detroit's CDOs were struggling to maintain core operations and many neighborhoods in Detroit are not currently served by a CDO (Ziraldo 2019.)

The Steering Committee may also want to consider the *shifting role of the City of Detroit in community development in Detroit*. Notably, the City of Detroit has become a significant player in securing resources and in driving the agenda for development in Detroit. The City has played a leadership role in raising funding for the Strategic Neighborhood Fund and Affordable Housing Leverage Fund. Further, the City of Detroit will receive a large influx of new federal dollars as a result of the COVID-19 stimulus legislation and City officials have expressed interest in using a portion of these dollars to respond to the crisis and to sustain and strengthen community development activity. The collaboration model selected to provide coordination and oversight for community development will need to be able to effectively engage the City as a trusted partner with other stakeholders in the community development ecosystem.

The *Steering Committee has identified CDAD as the organization it would like to take up coordination* for many of the community development system components and pilot projects, serving as a "host" organization. CDAD is now completing a strategic planning process that will call for the organization to play a key role in building the capacity of Detroit GROs and CDOs, coordinating the work of diverse community development players in the City and serving as a strong advocate for effective community development in Detroit neighborhoods.

Finally, the *COVID-19 crisis* has placed new demands on the attention and resources of Detroit funders, intermediaries and CDOs. Most of these groups are still working to understand how the pandemic will affect their organizations and the communities they serve and to build the capacity they need to sustain and grow their work. The careful selection of a collaboration model could either make this process easier or more difficult.

Multi-Stakeholder Collaboratives - The Variety of Possible Approaches

For the past thirty years interest in collaborative approaches to solving complex social problems has grown in the nonprofit sector. This interest has been driven by the increased awareness that complex problems have multiple causes and these problems cannot be solved by one organization or one program. Diverse and disconnected approaches to addressing a common problem are also likely to be unsuccessful. The call for collaboration in the nonprofit sector among funders and service providers often arises from a frustration with the failures of individual organizations or systems to address complex problems. But collaborative work can be time-consuming and expensive. Some have referred to this shift as "failing into collaboration" because of the costs and inherent inefficiency of collaborative work.

Despite its inherent costs, there are multiple advantages of collaborative work. Collaborative partners are more likely to identify and fill gaps between existing organizations and draw on the diverse knowledge and skills of stakeholders. Successful collaborations are experiments in "just enough" togetherness. Organizations and agencies typically seek a degree of collaboration that will enable them to obtain resources and achieve goals and benefits, balanced against the concern for risks, costs, and conflicts engendered by collaboration (Henig, 2015). These challenges are magnified when participating groups must successfully navigate an imbalance of power and influence among the needed stakeholders at the table.

Given the complexity of creating sustaining multi-stakeholder collaboratives, it will be helpful to learn from a variety of collaboration models that each seek to address different kinds of challenges and opportunities. A variety of collaborative models (Kingston, 2016) have emerged in the nonprofit sector:

1. Single organization-led initiatives
2. Single organization taking a multi-sector approach
3. Coalition-led advocacy campaign
4. Loose consortium

Knowing that there are a variety of possible approaches to choose from, it is important to identify some criteria to be used in selecting a model of collaboration. Here are some questions the Steering Committee could carefully consider when evaluating potential collaborative oversight and coordination models for the future of a Detroit community development system.

- Which model best enables the kind of coordination envisioned by the BECDD goal?
- Which model is a good fit for Detroit's current community development context?
- Which model is within the capacity of Detroit community development stakeholders (CDOs, intermediaries, CDFIs, funders, developers, and City of Detroit?)
- Which model can be adequately resourced without diminishing support for the whole system including CDO work?

This report will examine the strengths and weaknesses of three of the four multi-stakeholder collaboration models mentioned above as a fit for Detroit's community development ecosystem: A loose consortium was not considered at it would not provide the level of coordination and alignment sought by the BECDD Steering Committee.

SINGLE ORGANIZATION TAKING A MULTI-SECTOR APPROACH: THE COLLECTIVE IMPACT "STRIVETOGETHER" MODEL

The Collective Impact model was first introduced in 2006 through the creation of the StrivePartnership in Cincinnati, Ohio and northern Kentucky in 2006 when a group of more than 300 organizations agreed to work together in a new way to improve education for the region's children. Since then, the effort has led to measurable improvements in six indicators along StrivePartnership's cradle-to-career continuum, including increased rates of kindergarten readiness, high school graduation and college enrollment. In 2010, StriveTogether was formed to enable groups across the country to successfully implement this model. Today, nearly 70 collective impact groups have been launched with the support of StriveTogether.

The collaborative model has identified three pre-conditions for Collective Impact:

- An influential champion - most important (CEO level cross sector champions)
- Adequate financial resources
- Sense of urgency for change (often a crisis)

Strive and other observers of the model have said that the presence of an influential champion is the most important of the three preconditions. This champion or group of cross sector champions are often CEO-level civic leaders who can galvanize public attention, bring resources and political capital to the collaboration process in a way that builds public will for the change process. New financial support is required to sustain the effort for at least three years and is often used to support the work of a backbone organization that staffs the collaboration process. Finally, the model requires a sense of urgency because the process ultimately calls for stakeholder groups to examine how they can use the resources they already have at their disposal to advance the Collective Impact common agenda.

Once launched, the Collective Impact model provides a structured approach to creating a strategy for achieving population-level or community wide improvement.   Participants work together to understand the landscape and baseline data, they develop common goals and shared measures and seek to align the efforts of key stakeholders around the achievement of these goals. Data is collected, shared widely, and analyzed to enable stakeholders to adapt and adjust their strategies to achieve their common goals over time.   Often the process requires five to ten years to fully develop a sustainable and impactful strategy, build sufficient public will, accomplish a high level of alignment among partners and achieve the common goals.

The governance of a Collective Impact project is led by a Steering Committee made up of cross-sector CEO-level leaders who serve to guide and oversee the process. These groups are often called on to use their influence and experience to build support for the effort. Many Collective Impact projects also have a series of Working Groups that focus on implementing one part of the strategy and are useful in helping individual organizations and leaders to work together.

The Collective Impact process is supported by a Backbone Organization that provides six essential functions: providing overall strategic direction, facilitating dialogue between partners, managing data collection and analysis, handling communications, coordinating community outreach, and mobilizing funding. Some Backbones are newly created organizations. Some are managed by an existing service organization, government agency, intermediary or funder. In some instances, the backbone function is shared across multiple organizations. The most effective Backbone Organizations provide a kind of "servant leadership" to the Collective Impact effort by enabling the leadership and commitment to the work of the stakeholder groups.

The Challenge of Collective Impact

While the Collective Impact model is straightforward in its design, implementation has proven difficult for many groups that have sought to replicate StrivePartnership's results. At one point more than 100 groups were part of the StriveTogether network and this number was reduced significantly as StriveTogether sought to refine the model and strengthen implementation using a variety of improvements, including the Results-Based Leadership Model (Edmonson, 2017.)

One challenge faced by groups seeking to implement the Collective Impact model is developing a Common Agenda with enough clarity to enable a shared measurement system that drives mutually reinforcing activities among the partners. The Common Agenda is enabled by the development of a Strategic Action Framework that is supported by solid research, an understanding of the barriers to progress and a set of strategies that can be faithfully implemented by the partners. This process requires Collective Impact stakeholders to carefully define the boundaries of their strategy (both geographic and programmatic) in order to achieve the desired impact. When a clear Common Agenda is defined and combined with the careful use of data, this can become a learning process that enables the stakeholders to modify their strategy over time in response to the outcomes that are achieved. However, some groups have

found it difficult to use data in this way due to competing priorities among stakeholders and the fear of being judged based on their performance (Weaver, 2014)

Some have criticized the Collective Impact model as too "top down" and as lacking a mechanism to enable sufficient voice and control from those it hopes to serve.   Several previous collaborative community change models have emphasized the importance of integrating the wisdom of community residents in the development of strategy and put a premium on efforts to redistribute power among stakeholder groups. It is important to note that not all Collective Impact efforts use the governance model developed by Strive and a variety of governance approaches have emerged, including some with deep involvement of community residents (Wolff, 2016).

Another concern raised about Collective Impact is that it has not always been effective at addressing issues of Equity.   Strive and other Collective Impact advocates have begun to emphasize the importance of carefully using data to address questions of Equity in solving complex social problems.   Collective Impact groups that have addressed Equity problems are able to disaggregate data to reveal disparities, conduct structural analysis of disparities to identify root causes, use data and analysis to shape local narratives, and develop strategies to address these differences.

Collective Impact stakeholders themselves may struggle with problems of bias, a preference for certain perspectives, and outright exclusion of new participants. In any collaborative effort the participants need to be sensitive to the tendency to avoid confronting conformity or a kind of "group-think" can develop. Efforts that require self-reflection and change can result in some groups holding back while others carry a disproportionate share of the work and a kind of cynicism may set in.   At the heart of any successful collaborative effort - including Collective Impact - is the importance of building trust among stakeholders and between the initiative and the broader community. This can be especially difficult in a multi-year process like Collective Impact if there is turn-over among key stakeholders and leaders (Henig, 2015.)

Finally, the evaluation of Collective Impact projects beyond Cincinnati's Strive has found the quality of implementation to be key in achieving the desired results.   A 2018 study of twenty-five Collective Impact projects in the US and Canada found that only eight of these projects had sufficiently implemented the model to enable the evaluators to examine population or community wide outcome data (Stachowiak, 2018). When there was a faithful replication of the model, the evaluators found evidence of contribution to positive impact in all eight projects. The evaluators also determined that a smaller number of these Collective Impact projects had taken a deliberate approach to addressing questions of equity and, as a result, had developed capacity, targeted actions, and authentically engaged and shifted power to communities.

Lessons for the BECDD Oversight and Coordination Model

1) The values that underlie the Collective Impact model are consistent with the values and many of the projects that have been launched by BECDD over the past three years. For

example, the engagement of diverse stakeholder groups and a desire to bring greater alignment of organizations is shared by both BECDD and the Collective Impact model.

2) The Collective Impact Model is designed to bring together all the key stakeholders who surround a particular social problem in a community. This may be difficult to accomplish in Detroit's community development ecosystem without strong buy-in from all of the existing community development efforts that are already underway in Detroit. A collective impact approach will struggle to succeed if it does not become the mechanism for uniting and redirecting the energies of current community development system building projects in Detroit toward a Common Agenda.

3) Collective Impact has been most successful when it is able to engage a diverse set of civic leaders who have significant political power and influence over financial resources. The Steering Committee membership may need to be expanded to include CEO-level civic leaders from the corporate community and government if the effort is to have the influence needed to make a Collective Impact approach successful in Detroit.

COALITION-LED ADVOCACY CAMPAIGN: COALITION FOR THE FUTURE OF DETROIT SCHOOLCHILDREN

The Coalition for the Future of Detroit Schoolchildren was convened in December 2014 after Tonya Allen, the Skillman Foundation President, met with Michigan's Governor Rick Snyder to discuss the status of the Detroit Public Schools. The District had been under the control of a state-appointed emergency manager for 15 years and, during this period, student enrollment, revenue from the per-pupil allowance and academic achievement had all fallen precipitously. The District was rumored to be on the edge of financial collapse and unable to make payroll for its employees. The Governor asked Ms. Allen to recommend a plan to save the failing school district.

The Coalition is an example of a coalition-led advocacy campaign. The effort was co-chaired by a politically diverse set of leaders including Ms. Allen, Reverend Wendell Anthony, President of the Detroit NAACP, John Rakolta, Chairman of Walbridge Aldinger, David Hecker, President of the Michigan Federation of Teachers and Angie Reyes, Executive Director of the Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation. In its first phase, the Co-Chairs recruited and convened a much larger Steering Committee made up of 31 corporate CEOs, non-profit executives, public school officials, school principals, teachers, community activists and political leaders. This group met weekly for more than three months to develop a set of recommendations to address the core issues at the heart of Detroit's extremely low levels of student achievement and fragile education ecosystem.

While the Co-Chairs provided direction and oversight for the effort, the politically, socially and racially diverse Steering Committee members were charged with supporting a series of working groups designed to gather data, examine root cause issues and develop a set of recommendations regarding school finance, academic achievement, special education, student transportation, support services and school siting and enrollment.

In its second phase, the Co-Chairs, with significant assistance from Steering Committee members, advocated for their recommendations with the Governor, Michigan Legislature, and state education officials for more than a year.   While not all of their recommendations were approved, the Coalition achieved significant gains for Detroit school children. The Republican-controlled Legislature and Governor agreed to

- Pay off $467 million in operating debt and provide $150 million in start-up funding for a new debt-free school district;
- Return control of the Detroit Community School District to an elected school board;
- Shut down the Education Achievement Authority that had been created to run Detroit lowest-performing schools and integrate some of these schools back into the District; and
- Create a new Community Education Commission as a mechanism to support and hold accountable all Detroit schools - both charter and traditional public schools.

Ultimately, these changes paved the way for the District to hire a highly regarded school superintendent and to stabilize student enrollment and the District's finances.

The Challenge of the Coalition for the Future of Detroit Schoolchildren

There has not been a formal evaluation of the Coalition's work and, when compared to other collaboration models, less has been written about the Coalition's process and its outcomes. However, Commonwealth Consulting (the author of this paper) was engaged to support the work of its Steering Committee and workgroups; and to subsequently oversee the current phase of the Coalition's work as Skillman Foundation's Vice President of Program and Strategy. This analysis is based on that experience, and feedback received from many participants in the process as well as news coverage.

This multi-stakeholder collaborative model placed an emphasis on relationships over process. It is important to note that few of the recommendations created by the workgroups were ever implemented.   The lasting benefit of the Coalition's intensive process in the first phase of its work was the development of a shared vision and strong working relationships among participants who previously did not share the same political views or social backgrounds.

The Steering Committee members represented a diversity of background, political viewpoints and influence that was unprecedented in Detroit's education reform history. The process enabled participants to look at data in an unbiased way and to form recommendations that reflected their collective wisdom. The Coalition was able to overcome significant partisan political opposition in Lansing because they were united in their advocacy voice and there was a shared sense of a looming crisis for the Detroit Public Schools that would ultimately be the responsibility of the State government if the District collapsed.   There may not be a shared adversary to help united diverse factions within the community development ecosystem in Detroit.

Decisions made by the Steering Committee, including the adoption of all of the group's final recommendations, were made by consensus. This approach to decision-making was time consuming and required all stakeholders to stay in discussions until a solution was found that everyone could live with. This process enabled stakeholders to look for and find new solutions and ideas not previously advocated for by differing education reform factions.

Staffing for the effort was provided by one of the Foundation's program officers, a small number of consultants and pro-bono staff support from many of the organizations represented on the Steering Committee. This required Steering Committee members to bring a higher level of commitment to the effort than if a more permanent operating structure had been in place. However, it was impossible to rely on this staffing model for the Coalition's work beyond a few months. Over the long-term, dedicated staff will be required to support and help drive the work of the BECDD oversight and coordination model.

Since its success in 2016, the Coalition's Co-chairs and some of the working groups have continued to meet to address the questions of teacher supply and quality, student absenteeism, student literacy and college and career pathways. It has not yet been able to recreate the energy or broad public support for sweeping changes made in the first phase of the Coalition's work.

At first glance the Coalition's work may seem quite different from the current environment faced by community development leaders in Detroit today. However, several parallels between these situations are worth considering. First, the nature of the problem faced by the Detroit Public Schools and Detroit's CDOs is similar in a few striking ways. Both the District in 2014 and Detroit CDOs are faced with an unsustainable financial situation, especially if the goal is to serve well all these organization's constituents. Detroit's CDOs struggle to adequately serve their current neighborhoods and many neighborhoods in the City are not served at all by a CDO. Secondly, the increased competition CDOs face from private developers and CDFIs is similar to the competition experienced by the District from charter schools. Finally, both the previous District and most CDO's today suffer from a significant lack of capacity due to declining funding over a period of many years. It can be argued that only a significant structural change in funding and capacity will enable CDOs to effectively address the community development needs that are present in Detroit neighborhoods today.

The Steering Committee should carefully assess whether there is sufficient public will or whether sufficient public will can be built, to support a new mechanism for funding and building the capacity of the community development ecosystem in Detroit. BECDD's 2017 visits to other cities found that healthy community development ecosystems had a reliable system of public and private funding to support the work of CDOs and other community development practitioners; for example, the Strategic Investment Fund at Cleveland Neighborhood Progress. These cities also had a strong intermediary to coordinate and support neighborhood level work.

Lessons for the BECDD Oversight and Coordination Model

1) The Coalition's successes were largely due to a shared sense of urgency and crisis regarding the future of the Detroit Public Schools. There currently is not a similar sense of urgency and crisis regarding community development in Detroit. The Steering Committee may want to consider whether this approach is a good fit for the current environment in Detroit.

2) The presence of a significant threat or opportunity has the ability to galvanize a diverse set of community leaders and to motivate them to work in new ways to achieve significant change. The Steering Committee could consider whether the barriers faced by Detroit's community development stakeholders require a bold effort to make large structural change.

3) While the Coalition approach can help to achieve a high level of shared vision and alignment among stakeholders, this model is not an appropriate strategy for sustaining work over the long haul. Under the right circumstances, coalition-led advocacy models can best be useful to achieve large scale changes over a shorter period of time.

SINGLE AGENCY-LED COLLABORATIVE – LISC INDIANAPOLIS "BUILDING SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES"

In 2007 the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) created the Building Sustainable Communities (BSC) initiative to develop and test a comprehensive strategy for the revitalizing of low-income neighborhoods through investments in housing, economic development, and resident support through community-based organizations. The BSC approach was ultimately launched in more than 100 neighborhoods across the country, including three in Detroit. While Detroit's experience with BSC was not unlike many other cities in the US, the LISC Indianapolis implementation of Building Sustainable Communities is a good example of a single agency-led collaborative model that provides helpful lessons for the Steering Committee to consider. It is also important to note that Indianapolis was one of the cities visited by a group of BECDD partners and their visit was hosted by the Indianapolis LISC team.

The BSC collaborative model is like other single agency-led collaborative models that operate under the umbrella of a shared intermediary and, in doing so, are able to use the majority of resources available for their work to provide services and supports to those they serve. Effective single agency-led collaboratives frequently operate by following these steps (Harold, 2017):
- Defining the community to be served
- Naming the weakness in the current system
- Identifying the Sherpa (the organization to guide the process)
- Making explicit the division of labor (roles for all collaborators)
- Demonstrating proof points
- Designing collective systems - for sharing knowledge, governance, and external communications
- Building the right incentives

Based on groundbreaking work in the South Bronx and, subsequently, in Chicago, Building Sustainable Communities operated within neighborhoods by creating a systemic framework for developing cohesive plans, leveraging new funds and implementing projects and programs that help raise standards of living among low-income residents and fuel sustainable, positive change in their communities. (Walker, 2010)

The LISC Indianapolis BSC initiative was called the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative (GINI) and launched in six neighborhoods in 2008.   With professional facilitation support and funding for a full-time neighborhood staff person, neighborhoods developed quality-of-life plans that were owned by neighborhood stakeholders and adopted by the City of Indianapolis. Seed grant money was provided to promote plan implementation. The process identified a lead agency for each neighborhood that was charged with engaging residents, other nonprofit partners, and local government leaders in developing implementing the plans.   These projects were supported with funding, technical assistance, and advocacy by the local LISC Executive Director and program officers.

The short- and long-term results experienced by all six neighborhoods provide a useful set of lessons for the Steering Committee to consider.   Some neighborhoods made significant and sustained progress through the BSC process and were able to secure new support from civic leaders and investments that went well beyond the initial quality-of-life plans. In other neighborhoods GINI staff had difficulty engaging residents and partners and implementation in these neighborhoods had little long-term effect. A comprehensive evaluation of GINI found that the following elements were key to successful implementation (Capraro, 2014):

- Skilled and trusted leadership at the intermediary level (*i.e.* LISC.)
- Neighborhood capacity in the form of commitments from a diverse set of local actors and the ability to get things done.
- Engagement that creates co-ownership of the effort for both nonprofit partners and neighborhood residents
- A unified, inspiring vision that assists partners to focus on the programs and projects that are strategic – those that will create the greatest impact.
- Neighborhood partnerships that form an infrastructure of partnerships and coalitions designed to implement the elements found within the quality-of-life plan.
- Incentives for action by providing tools and resources to produce results.

The most successful GINI neighborhoods were later "marketed" by Indianapolis LISC and received new commitments and support from the corporate community and city government. The lead agencies and their partners were able to sustain their initial successes and the quality of life plans were updated to include more ambitious goals and new projects.

Indianapolis LISC and its partners have been able to institutionalize GINI within some neighborhoods. For neighborhoods that fully embraced the process and set bold goals, the work

continued even after the GINI program itself has ended. Some participants have said that the more ambitious quality-of-life plans were the ones that most often had a lasting impact.

The Challenge of the Single Agency-led Collaborative

The most common criticism of the BSC initiative was that the process itself did not create the strong results achieved by some neighborhoods. It may be that the success of some neighborhoods came from the capacity and commitment already present in local leaders. However, it is fair to conclude that BSC provided an opportunity for these leaders to work together in new ways. BSC also created a mechanism to attract new attention and resources from outside the neighborhood that enabled the partners to sustain and scale their work.

Secondly, an inherent flaw in special initiatives that are created by an outside group, like LISC, is that they are difficult to sustain after the funding and technical assistance go away. This has been true in almost every BSC neighborhood across the country. The lasting benefit of short-term initiatives like BSC are the relationships between partners and capacities built within organizations through the process.

Finally, any "one size fits all" community change process is limited in its ability to adjust to the local context and to draw on the unique talents of community leaders and neighborhood assets. The Steering Committee will want to carefully match the elements of any collaboration model to the Detroit's current partners, community needs and aspirations.

Lessons for the BECDD Oversight and Coordination Model

1) A well-designed collaboration structure can enable neighborhoods and partners to achieve and sustain ambitious goals when the local conditions are ready for the process. The Steering Committee will be wise to assess the readiness of Detroit's community development stakeholders for a collaboration process that seeks to bring them together around a common goal.
2) Single agency-led collaboratives are more likely to succeed and be sustained if the lead agency is trusted by partners and utilizes a "servant leader" approach to the work.
3) Outside advocates with funding and political influence are key to enabling successful partnership to sustain themselves and grow.

CONCLUSION

Here again are questions that are worth considering when weighing the advantages and disadvantages of potential approaches to providing oversight and coordination to community development work in Detroit:

- Which model best enables the kind of coordination envisioned by the BECDD goal?
- Which model is a good fit for Detroit's current community development context?

- Which model is within the capacity of Detroit community development stakeholders (CDOs, intermediaries, CDFIs, funders, developers, and City of Detroit?)
- Which model can be adequately resourced without diminishing support for the whole system elements including CDO work?

BECDD is a multi-stakeholder collaborative process itself. Over the past four years the process has sowed the seeds of trust-building, capacity strengthening and greater communication across Detroit's community development ecosystem. One challenge that has been present since the beginning of the BECDD process has been distinguishing between the relative roles of the initiative and other community development intermediaries, especially CDAD. Many stakeholders have said that a healthy community development ecosystem requires an intermediary that can build the capacity of CDOs and GROs across the City, enable stronger coordination among CDOs, GROs, funders, City government and other neighborhood level organizations.   CDAD is the obvious choice for this role in Detroit.

The launch of any new (or relatively new) multi-stakeholder collaborative initiative brings with it the financial and human cost of the process itself. The Steering Committee should consider the capacity of CDAD and the capacity of its stakeholders to engage in an ongoing collaborative process.   Given the time that must be invested, the best choice of an approach to oversight and coordination will leverage the strengths of the Detroit's partners and maximize the benefits experienced by all stakeholders.   An advantage of asking CDAD to support the collaborative is that the learning and capacity built through this process will be in place for a long time to serve Detroit's community development ecosystem.

Collaboratives are like entrepreneurial start-ups. Once begun with some initial investment and goal, they often must iterate their way toward an implementation strategy that is useful for their participants and impactful in the world. The Steering Committee should begin this process by focusing on debating and defining a clear and compelling shared goal for Detroit's community development ecosystem. All the collaborative models examined in this report used the power of a clear vision or goal to focus their efforts on the work that would be most impactful.

Securing new financial support to build the capacity of CDAD to facilitate and support the collaborative work is essential, in addition to securing the resources necessary to all the "system elements" to be enabled.

REFERENCES

Capraro, J. & Bookman, J. (2014). Moving from Quality of Life Planning to Implementation. New York, NY: Institute for Comprehensive Community Development

The Choice is Ours. Coalition for the Future of Detroit Schoolchildren. (2015)

Crespin, R. & Moser, H. (2018). Six Proven Practices for Backbone Organizations *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/six_proven_practices_for_backbone_organizations

Edmondson. J. & Santhosh-Kumar, P. (2017). It's About Results at Scale, Not Collective Impact *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/its_about_results_at_scale_not_collective_impact

Hanleybrown, F., Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2012). Channeling change: Making collective impact work. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL URL: http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/channeling_change_making_collective_impact_work .

Harold, J. (2017). The Collaboration Game: Solving the Puzzle of Nonprofit Partnership. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_collaboration_game_solving_the_puzzle_of_nonprofit_partnership .

Henig, J. R., Riehl, C. J., Rebell, M. A., & Wolff, J. R. (2015). Putting collective impact in context: A review of the literature on local cross-sector collaboration to improve education. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University, Department of Education Policy and Social Analysis.

Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. Stanford Social Innovation Review. URL: http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact

Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2013). Embracing emergence: How collective impact addresses complexity. *Stanford Social Innovation Review.* URL: http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/embracing_emergence_how_collective_impact_addresses_complexity

Kingston, D., Stern, A. & Ke, J. (2016). Are You Sure You Should Be Launching Another Partnership? *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/are_you_sure_you_should_be_launching_another_partnership#

Panepento, P. (2017). Nonprofit Collaboration 2.0. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/nonprofit_collaboration_2.0

Stachowiak, S. & Gase, L. (2018). Does Collective Impact Really Make an Impact? *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. URL: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/does_collective_impact_really_make_an_impact

Stachowiak, S. & Lynn, J. (2018). When Collective Impact Has Impact: A Cross-site Study of 25 Collective Impact Initiatives. ORS Impact of Seattle, WA and Spark Policy Institute of Denver, CO.

Turner, S., Merchant, K., Kania, J., & Martin, E. (2012). Understanding the value of backbone organizations in collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review.* URL: http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/understanding_the_value_of_backbone_organizations_in_collective_impact_1

Walker, C. & Winston, F. (2014). Community Development Investments and Neighborhood Change: An Analysis of LISC's Building Sustainable Communities Neighborhoods. Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Washington, DC

Weaver, L. (2014). Promise and Peril of Collective Impact. *The Philanthropist.* Volume 26.1

Wolff, T. (2016). Ten Places Where Collective Impact Gets It Wrong. *Nonprofit Quarterly.* URL: https://nonprofitquarterly.org/voices-from-the-field-10-places-where-collective-impact-gets-it-wrong/

Ziraldo, J., Yates, G. & Wilson, L. (2020) Community Development System Capitalization Report For Detroit (Methods, Findings and Recommendations).