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ABSTRACT

Introduction: The Wisconsin Early Childhood Obesity Prevention Initiative (Initiative), established in 2007, seeks to address and prevent obesity in the early care and education system through nutrition and physical activity environmental and policy changes. The collaborative includes professionals from 3 state of Wisconsin Departments, the University of Wisconsin-Extension, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and public health and early care and education organizations. This paper explores the efforts of the Initiative to advance our understanding of collective impact in practice and its value to health promotion efforts.

Methods: Evaluators conducted a mixed methods case study to evaluate the application of collective impact principles by the Initiative. This included a survey of Initiative partners, review of archival documents, and qualitative interviews with Initiative leaders.

Results: Initiative partners noted progress in establishing the conditions for collective impact. Archival documents and interviews describe both formal and informal practices that helped set a common agenda, align and coordinate partner activities, and promote communication among Initiative leaders. Results also detail the important current and potential roles of “backbone” staff from healthTIDE to support the Initiative. Additionally, results suggest particularly challenging aspects of the Initiative’s impact model related to shared measurement and broader stakeholder communication. While the Initiative is still setting in place the conditions for collective impact, it has achieved significant policy, systems, and environment changes since its formation. Inclusion of nutrition and physical activity criteria in the state’s quality rating improvement system for child care centers is one of its outcomes.

Conclusions: This case study offers several important insights about the application of collective impact in health promotion efforts, particularly in relation to the transition from previous collaborative activities, the value of establishing a clear common agenda among partners, the roles of backbone staff, and time and partner relationships in collective impact.

INTRODUCTION

Childhood obesity is a complex issue requiring a multisystem approach. Systems affecting children include early care and education, schools, health care, and communities. Collective impact has been introduced as a framework for broad-sector collaboration across systems as a means for addressing complex social issues. The early care and education system, specifically childcare centers, reach large numbers of children for prolonged periods of time each day. More than 50% of children under age 5 with a mother working full-time spend over 35 hours per week in childcare. Additionally, childcare providers have existing infrastructure for meeting the nutritional and activity needs of children. This system, which may be enhanced to more effectively impact obesity, offers points for intervention as well. Implementing wellness policies and training caregivers in best practices for physical activity and nutrition can promote healthy weight for young children in childcare settings.

With 32% of 2- to 4-year-old children overweight or obese in Wisconsin, representatives from multiple sectors have come together since 2008 to seize the opportunity for preventing childhood obesity presented by the early care and education system. This collaborative, the Wisconsin Early Childhood Obesity Prevention Initiative (Initiative), works to develop and implement interventions to improve nutrition and levels of physical activity among 0 to 5 year olds in Wisconsin, especially children served in childcare settings. Key partners in the collaborative include 3 state agencies (the Wisconsin Departments of Health Services, Public Instruction, and Children and Families); nonprofit organizations that support and advocate for early care providers and educators such as the Wisconsin Early Childhood Association and...
Supporting Families Together Association; and the University of Wisconsin-Extension and University of Wisconsin-Madison. The Initiative is supported by staff from healthTIDE, a “backbone” organization that supports efforts of several statewide groups seeking to address obesity and promote healthy living in multiple settings (eg, schools, food systems) through the use of collective impact.8 The figure depicts the Initiative’s historical evolution and notable impacts.

While the Initiative has always practiced shared leadership and governance, leaders saw the possibility for the collective impact approach1 to build upon its existing practices in advantageous ways. In 2013, the Initiative began to take steps to integrate the conditions of collective impact into their work. These 5 conditions are a common agenda, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication, shared measurement systems, and backbone staff support. See Table 1 and Christens, et al, this issue for additional information on collective impact and its application to health promotion.9

Although collective impact has become an increasingly popular and utilized approach in health promotion,10-12 there continues to be relatively few empirical studies of the application of the collective impact approach to coalition action, including the on-the-ground efforts required and implementation challenges. To this end, a case study of the Initiative was conducted to examine the utilization of the collective impact framework and consider how it may have influenced progress. Challenges experienced implementing the collective impact approach also are described.

METHODS

A case study was developed to understand evolution from a collaborative to a coalition using the collective impact framework and to measure qualitatively and quantitatively the impact of this change on the members and the function of the group. To develop this case study, evaluators from the Obesity Prevention Initiative (OPI) used a mixed methods design.13 Case study research is valuable for answering questions of “how” and “why” and when understanding of real-life context is necessary for understanding a complex social phenomenon. To enhance empirical inquiry, case studies often draw upon multiple sources of evidence, including qualitative and quantitative data. As a well-established collaborative actively utilizing the collective impact framework and having experienced notable achievements (Figure 1), the Initiative was selected as a case for examining collective impact practices.

Qualitative data for the case study were drawn from the Initiative’s archival documents,14 emphasizing meeting minutes and participation records, both before and after the col-
analyses. Results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Definitions of each of the 5 conditions also are provided in Table 1.

**Common Agenda**

Data show that the condition of common agenda, which requires all partners to develop a shared vision for change, has been achieved. Interviewees consistently described a common agenda for the Initiative’s work, broadly describing a focus on preventing obesity and promoting health in early childhood and especially through intervention with early care and education providers. (See Box for information on the Initiative’s priority areas.) Interviewees reported that the Initiative had achieved this condition for collective impact through a process that was both deliberate and naturally emerging. In the survey, a high number of respondents (88%) also agreed to committing to a common agenda. A clearly stated and well understood common agenda assisted the Initiative in making decisions about new activities or grant opportunities to pursue, as well as in engaging other efforts and recruiting potential new members.

**Mutually Reinforcing Activities**

A majority of survey respondents (68%) agreed that partners engaged in mutually reinforcing activities. Evidence of mutually reinforcing activities was explicitly utilized. Evaluators also sampled a small group of active leaders, representing a range of roles, affiliations, and years of involvement, and conducted in-depth, semistructured individual interviews (n = 7). These interviews were designed to elicit further qualitative data about the utilization of the conditions for collective impact and associated results. Quantitative data were drawn from respondents who noted involvement in the Initiative (n = 25) in a 2015 survey of healthTIDE stakeholders (n = 310). A set of 5 items asked respondents to rate their level of agreement (Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, or Disagree) with statements about collective impact practices. These data contribute the perspectives of the broader membership regarding the Initiative’s progress toward its goals.

Qualitative data from the archival documents and interviews were analyzed deductively and inductively to identify themes and patterns. Survey data were analyzed primarily with descriptive statistics. These quantitative and qualitative results were then analyzed in an integrated manner to look for triangulation and complementarity in the data sets, to expand on the understanding offered by either set alone, and to assure the legitimacy of the findings.

**RESULTS**

Results are organized according to the 5 conditions of collective impact, integrating the results from qualitative and quantitative analyses. Results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. Definitions of each of the 5 conditions also are provided in Table 1.

### Table 1. Examples of Collective Impact Practices in the Wisconsin Early Childhood Prevention Initiative (WECOPI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective Impact Condition</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example from WECOPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common agenda</td>
<td>Partners have a shared vision for change, including a common understanding</td>
<td>Partners orient around a shared vision to prevent obesity and promote health in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the problem and approach for solving it.</td>
<td>early childhood and develop four specific priority areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually reinforcing</td>
<td>Alignment and coordination of partners’ differentiated efforts</td>
<td>Partners utilize a strategic planning process to detail activities and respective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>towards achieving the common agenda.</td>
<td>roles for each of the priority areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous communication</td>
<td>Practices to insure regular and 2-way communication among partners</td>
<td>Partners hold regular meetings and leaders communicate often through various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that support shared understanding and trust.</td>
<td>means, including e-mails, telephone calls, and text messages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared measurement systems</td>
<td>Collecting data and measuring progress consistently across partnering</td>
<td>Partners discuss possible indicators for tracking progress, as well as potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizations on agreed upon indicators.</td>
<td>challenges to address in developing a shared measurement system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backbone support</td>
<td>Staff outside of the collective impact partners that provide</td>
<td>Backbone staff from healthTIDE work to schedule meetings, facilitate group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordination, facilitation, and other logistical and administrative</td>
<td>processes, provide collective impact resources, and assist in communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>support.</td>
<td>practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Survey Responses of Partners Regarding Collective Impact Practices in the Wisconsin Early Childhood Prevention Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The convened group is committed to a common agenda. (Common agenda)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The convened group engages in mutually reinforcing and complementary</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities. (Mutually reinforcing activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The convened group engages in continuous and effective communication.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Continuous communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The convened group uses shared measures to document and examine progress.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shared measurement systems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The convened group has the structural support to ensure effective collective</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work. (Backbone support)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reinforcing activities encouraged partners to recognize and apply their diverse strengths in coordination with one another towards achieving a common agenda. In particular, asset mapping and formative assessment conducted early in the Initiative's work was cited as helpful to build shared understanding of engaged stakeholders and their respective skills, resources, and connections (Figure).

Additionally, the process of writing, applying for, and implementing grants has encouraged clear definition of roles and responsibilities among partners. The diversity of the group with respect to both “big thinkers” and the “detail people” has helped to develop plans to achieve the common agenda that take advantage of “our knowledge and skill sets and who can do what.”

Continuous Communication
From the archival documents and the accounts of interviewees, data show a strong commitment to the tenet of continuous communication, especially among the Initiative’s core team. This team includes about 25 members who guide and carry out strategies to achieve the common agenda. As described for the 2 previous collective impact conditions, this was facilitated by both formal efforts and informal practices. The Initiative has established routines of preparing and distributing meeting agendas and notes and makes use of a cloud-based file sharing system to facilitate partners’ access to a growing body of materials. Additionally, partners have committed to meeting regularly (every other month as a core team and 3 times a year for the full collaborative), using distance technology to facilitate virtual participation from partners across the state, and utilizing a portion of each meeting time to communicate updates on current activities and to discuss opportunities or challenges. Interviewees reported that the relationships and trust developed over the years among leaders support and complement this high level of communication.

Most survey respondents (68%) agreed that partners practiced continuous and effective communication. However, several interviewees noted that communication with the broader group’s members (approximately 50 additional individuals) has been more challenging and needs improvement. Communication with the full membership has been less frequent and more one-way in the form of sending announcements or other updates. One interviewee spoke to their aspirations and challenges:

“We’re trying to be transparent. We’re trying to let everybody in the state know what’s going on, but it’s just tough to do and people can’t be on all these [communications]. It just gets overwhelming.”

Interviewees expressed hope that the backbone support offered may help achieve continuous communication with the full membership. Additionally, interviewees identified needed assistance in communicating with stakeholders beyond the collaborative, especially the families served by the early care and education system.

Shared Measurement Systems
Data indicate progress has been slow and challenging in establishing a shared measurement system. These systems identify progress indicators for collaborative work and consistently collect and review this data across partnering organizations to track progress, make adjustments as necessary, and hold partners accountable. Based on archival documents and interviews, focused work to develop shared measurement systems has begun only recently and interviewees noted this to be the most challenging of the conditions of collective impact to establish in their efforts. In comparison to the other collective impact conditions, fewer survey respondents (60%) agreed that the Initiative used shared measures to document and examine progress. Interviewees noted that partners individually collected and used data to support their own efforts, but coordination and sharing has generally occurred only when required by particular grants. In these cases, shared measurement was shaped around these grant requirements and not sustained afterwards. Additionally, the data often focused on deliverables and participant reach numbers rather than outcomes, limiting its utility.

While interviewees spoke of the value of shared measurement systems to their efforts today, they expressed uncertainty about which indicators would be most valuable to track and how to consistently collect and analyze data in a way that will be feasible and useful for the Initiative.

Support Staff from a Backbone Organization
The Initiative had a long history of shared leadership and distributed effort to support its operations, especially among core leaders. Since 2013 however, healthTIDE staff have provided explicit backbone support and eased some of the burdens of logistical coordination and process facilitation from the leaders. As mentioned previously, backbone staff have helped guide the Initiative through the process of agreeing on a common agenda and started a strategic planning process that includes efforts to detail mutually reinforcing activities, communicate more effectively to the network of partners and stakeholders, and make steps towards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority 1</th>
<th>Priority 2</th>
<th>Priority 3</th>
<th>Priority 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale up efforts to provide training and technical assistance on how to create more supportive environments for nutrition and physical activity.</td>
<td>Strengthen nutrition, physical activity, and breastfeeding licensing and regulation standards for childcare programs.</td>
<td>Strengthen nutrition and physical activity criteria in YoungSTAR, a quality rating improvement system.</td>
<td>Create and align resources that support childcare centers in implementing family engagement strategies around breastfeeding, physical activity, and nutrition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shared measurement systems. Additionally, backbone staff provide general administrative support and seek out and connect new potential partners to the Initiative.

Interviewees described the backbone staff’s efforts as highly valuable and they anticipate future benefits from their work going forward. Similarly, almost three-quarters of survey respondents (72%) agreed that the Initiative had well established structural support. One interviewee noted backbone staff “providing significant leadership to this group in terms of our vision work and our outcomes and measurements.” Additionally, interviewees described other desires they thought the backbone staff could help meet, including assistance in conducting needs assessments and program evaluations, providing trainings in best practices for coalition action, facilitating grant writing processes, and advocacy and public messaging support.

DISCUSSION
This case study offers insights into long-term statewide coalition formation and the use of the collective impact framework. First, results demonstrate that a collaborative or an initiative does not need to start out operating under an explicit collective impact framework to achieve many of the conditions for collective impact and reap their benefits. The Initiative had successfully functioned for many years prior to formal utilization of the collective impact framework and demonstrated skill in shared leadership, role definition, resource and effort coordination, and internal communication, which carried over well in its shift towards the collective impact framework. Activities such as grant writing and partner relationship building may offer beneficial byproducts to developing the conditions for collective impact. Because many of these capacities had been developed prior to the Initiative’s utilization of the collective impact framework, it is not possible to disentangle the specific effects of seeking to achieve those conditions. Furthermore, because the current analysis is organized around these 5 conditions of collective impact, many other facets of coalition functioning and success are not addressed in this report.

Nevertheless, the Initiative’s case suggests that coming to an agreed upon and equally upheld common agenda is a valuable early focus in the process. Having consensus around a common agenda seems to ease the work of planning and implementing mutually reinforcing activities that will move towards shared goals, determining effective communication strategies for different subgroups of the collaborative, and helping the collaborative decide how best to respond to new opportunities or unanticipated challenges.

From this case study, insights were gained into the importance of “backbone” support to coalition initiatives. While the Initiative functioned well under a shared leadership model, the backbone support introduced by healthTIDE eased much of the burden from leaders around logistical coordination and group facilitation and guidance. Moving forward, backbone staff may provide support in additional areas of need or particular challenge, including broad communication strategies, advocacy and public messaging, continuing to leverage funding for identified priorities, and shared measurement.

Finally, this case reminds us that any successful collaborative effort requires time to develop and depends on trusting relationships among partners (Figure). This is consistent with research on effective coalitions and collaborations.18-20 While the collective impact framework does not speak directly to timelines or relationship development, it is clear that these are key ingredients to a worthwhile collective impact effort. Collaboratives seeking to build coalition capacity, regardless of the particular models they are using, should reserve time for the development of work and build in efforts to explicitly develop relationships among partners.

CONCLUSION
In this case study, the Initiative’s implementation of the collective impact framework and impressions of progress within that implementation were examined. Partners in this work generally recognized progress in the Initiative’s establishment of the conditions for collective impact. Data from interviewees and archival documents offered detail of how this progress has been made, including formal and informal efforts that have helped to establish these conditions. From the case study, important insights have been gained as to how coalition capacity is developed on the ground, including how prior efforts can beneficially carry over into the adoption of new frameworks, the importance of common agenda setting, and the varied catalyzing roles of a backbone staff. These findings will inform the Initiative’s next steps as well as those of other collaboratives supported by healthTIDE. Additionally, these findings can inform future multisystem work.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the partners in the Wisconsin Early Childhood Obesity Prevention Initiative who shared their experiences and reflections to shape the study presented here; Paul Moberg, Suzanne Gaulocher, and Jan Liebhart for their work on the original Wisconsin Obesity Prevention Network survey (2013); and Jianchao Lai for assistance in reviewing and summarizing literature referenced here.

Funding/Support: Funding for this study was provided by the University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health through the Wisconsin Partnership Program.

Financial Disclosures: None declared.

REFERENCES


The mission of *WMJ* is to provide a vehicle for professional communication and continuing education for Midwest physicians and other health professionals.

*WMJ* (ISSN 1098-1861) is published by the Wisconsin Medical Society and is devoted to the interests of the medical profession and health care in the Midwest. The managing editor is responsible for overseeing the production, business operation and contents of the *WMJ*. The editorial board, chaired by the medical editor, solicits and peer reviews all scientific articles; it does not screen public health, socioeconomic, or organizational articles. Although letters to the editor are reviewed by the medical editor, all signed expressions of opinion belong to the author(s) for which neither *WMJ* nor the Wisconsin Medical Society take responsibility. *WMJ* is indexed in Index Medicus, Hospital Literature Index, and Cambridge Scientific Abstracts.

For reprints of this article, contact the *WMJ* at 866.442.3800 or e-mail wmj@wismed.org.

© 2016 Wisconsin Medical Society