Developing A Common Agenda: Three Helpful Tools
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Key Ideas

1. The Collective Impact in the approach is clear on why developing a common agenda is a condition for collective impact.

2. There is little attention in the Collective Impact field about how to create a common agenda.

3. There is a large body of practice from the much older fields of multi-stakeholder, community development, and community engagement on practices.

4. The team at SAS2 Dialogue (www.sas2.net) had developed one of the best handbooks with techniques that would be useful in any Collective Impact process.

5. There are three easy to use/useful techniques - only a sample of the nearly 40 in the SAS2 Handbook - I will share with you today.
The Resource

SAS²
Social Analysis Systems

www.sas2.net
Highlighted Tools

Stakeholder Rainbow

Values, Interests & Positions

Level of Support
The Process

1. I present each tool, one at a time.

2. I offer a few examples of its use.

3. We experiment with the tool using a mini-case study.

4. We reflect on the usefulness of the tools and other tools that might be helpful.
Simulation

Context

• You are a leadership group that is tasked with managing a “Housing First” approach to reducing homelessness in a major Canadian City.

Stakeholders

• A prospective participant of a housing placement with complex needs (e.g. poor physical health, substance abuse, diabetes), many years living on the streets and temporary shelters.

• The Executive Director of an organization with twenty years experience provides transitional housing to vulnerable individuals and families and with $20 million

• Three members of the local Chamber of Commerce who lead a task group on revitalizing downtown and have made a priority to address social issues in the area.

• The private owner of an apartment building that has been identified as possible candidate for

• The Executive Director of a Social Service agency that has just established a new center with co-located services that offer clients with complex needs with ‘one-stop’ services.

• A local United Way manager who is feeling pressure to find ways to not increase the volume of money invested in homelessness work as a way
Housing First

A relatively recent innovation in human service programs and social policy regarding treatment of the homeless and is an alternative to a system of emergency shelter/transitional housing progressions. Rather than moving homeless individuals through different "levels" of housing, whereby each level moves them closer to "independent housing" (for example: from the streets to a public shelter, and from a public shelter to a transitional housing program, and from there to their own apartment in the community) Housing First moves the homeless individual or household immediately from the streets or homeless shelters into their own apartments.

Housing First approaches are based on the concept that a homeless individual or household's first and primary need is to obtain stable housing, and that other issues that may affect the household can and should be addressed once housing is obtained. In contrast, many other programs operate from a model of "housing readiness" — that is, that an individual or household must address other issues that may have led to the episode of homelessness prior to entering housing.
Stakeholders

1. A **prospective participant** of a housing placement with complex needs (e.g. poor physical health, substance abuse, diabetes), many years living on the streets and temporary shelters.

2. The Executive Director of an organization with twenty years experience provides **transitional housing** to vulnerable individuals and families and with $20 million

3. Three members of the local **Chamber of Commerce** who lead a task group on revitalizing downtown and have made a priority to address social issues in the area.

4. The **private owner of a market-rent apartment building** that has been identified as possible candidate for accepting housing placement.

5. The Executive Director of a Social Service agency that has just established a new center with co-located services that offer clients with complex needs with ‘**one-stop**’ services.

6. A **local United Way manager** who is feeling pressure to find ways to not increase the volume of money invested in homelessness work as a way to manage in a poor fundraising environment.
Tool 1: Stakeholder Rainbow

• **The Challenge**: who really is a stakeholder? How do we engage them in agenda building?

• **The Technique**: Rate possible stakeholders by (a) the degree of influence they have on the issue and (b) the extent to which they are affected by the issue.

• **When to Use**: Whenever the question, “Who are the stakeholders of this issue?” emerges.
1. Rate each stakeholder on the degree to which they influence this issue:
   1 -- Least Influential
   2 – Moderately Influential
   3 – Very Influential

2. Rate each stakeholder on the degree to which they are affected by this issue:
   1 – Not Affected
   2 – Somewhat Affected
   3 – Very Affected

3. Plot each stakeholder on the rainbow.
Analysis

Do they need to be directly involved?

How can we ensure that their voice is heard and respected?

How do keep them authentically engaged and grounded in the issue?
Tools: Values, Interest, Positions

• **The Challenge**: To understand someone’s position on agenda, we need to understand their interests and values.

• **The Technique**: Rate stakeholder response to an agenda or strategy by their degree to which they gain/lose and the extent to aligns or conflicts with their values.

• **When to Use**: Whenever it is important to gauge stakeholder position on an issue.
Process

1. Rate each stakeholder on the degree to which they influence this issue on a twenty point scale – and clarify why.
   -10 – Stakeholder loses a great deal
   “0” – Stakeholder neither gains or loses
   +10 – Stakeholder gains a great deal

2. Rate each stakeholder on the degree to which the strategy is likely to align with their values or not – and clarify why:
   -10 – Conflicts with stakeholder values a Great Deal
   “0” – Stakeholder neither gains or loses
   +10 – Aligns perfectly with stakeholder values

3. Plot each stakeholder on the grid.
Analysis

What can we do to reshape the agenda/strategy – or transitional measures – to soften the loss?
Tool #2: Level of Support

• **The Challenge**: To get a sense of the level of support – for and against – for a particular way of framing the agenda or particular strategies.

• **The Technique**: Ask key stakeholders to rate their level of support for something on a spectrum that ranges from resistance to support.

• **When to Use**: Before you are preparing to make a formal decision on agenda, goals, targets or strategies, and need to take a temperature of the room.
Process

1. Ask each stakeholder on the degree to which they influence this issue on a twenty point scale – and clarify why.
   -10 – Stakeholder Loses a Great Deal
   “0” – Stakeholder neither gains or loses
   + 10 – Stakeholder Gains a Great Deal

2. If possible, ask each stakeholder to describe ‘why’ they rate they way they do:
   -10 – Conflicts with stakeholder Values a great deal
   “0” – Does not align nor conflict with stakeholder values
   + 10 – Aligns perfectly with stakeholder values

3. Review patterns:
   • Great deal of support
   • Great deal of resistance
   • Some support, some resistance
   • Ambiguity
Exercise: Analysis

1. Whole-hearted endorsement
   “I really like it”

2. Agreement with minor point of contention
   “No perfect but it’s good enough”

3. Support with reservations
   “I can live with it”

4. Abstain
   “This issue does not affect me”

5. More discussion needed
   “This issue does not affect me”

6. Don’t like but will support
   “It’s not great but I don’t want to hold up the group”

7. Serious disagreement
   “I am not on board with this – don’t count on me”

8. Veto
   “I block this proposal”
Three Techniques: Just a Few from SAS2!

www.sas2.net
What technique do you think might be useful in your work? Why?

What technique do you think will be least useful? Why?

What other techniques or tool kits for agenda building do you recommend to your peers?