



Showing up differently

A collective approach to complex issues

The LinC Project Case Study:

A multi-stakeholder partnership focused on community capacity building in a post-disaster context

www.lincproject.org.nz

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors

Dr Chris Jansen : Leadership Lab

Dr Jane Higgins : The Collaborative Trust for Research and Training in Youth Health and Development

Editors

Dr Ria Schroder : The Collaborative Trust for Research and Training in Youth Health and Development

Tim Pidsley : Leadership Lab

Anna Russell : Leadership Lab

Sooze Harris : Leadership Lab

Design

Marty Anderson : Outside the Square



2 SUPPORTERS



FACILITATORS





INTRODUCTION

Many major social challenges, such as building resilient communities; addressing family violence; and creating social attitudes supportive of mental health etc, involve issues that seem highly resistant to any straightforward resolution. Traditional approaches to the design and implementation of services and programmes in support of families and communities have often struggled to address these challenges effectively.

Comprehensive and systemic understanding of complex social issues and many examples of exceptional health and social services do exist. However, the current mechanisms to enable and connect these approaches systemically often limit the outcomes. New forms of engagement are needed between funders, facilitators and community members.

This document explores one such approach based on multi-stakeholder collaboration in the co-design, funding, governance and implementation of a city-wide project.

The intended audience is a wide range of stakeholders including community led initiatives, providers, and both government and philanthropic funders.



Showing up differently

SECTION 1-4

This contains all the key approaches, case study, reflections and print ready diagrams.

You can view and download at www.lincproject.org.nz/publications

01

TRANSACTIONAL VS COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES

Addressing complex challenges begins before solutions have been defined. In fact, it begins with the engagement of stakeholders around problem definition and funding.

This compares traditional 'transactional' grant-making and procurement with more collaborative funder-provider-community relationships and explores the ways in which this can lead to the co-design of effective approaches to address complex challenges.

02

WHAT IS THE LINC PROJECT AND WHAT HAS BEEN ITS IMPACT

The LinC (Leadership in Communities) Project was developed in Christchurch following the major earthquakes of 2011 and 2012. It focused specifically on the extensive community-level leadership that emerged post-quake and aimed to support and encourage communities to shape and lead their own recovery.

This section provides a case study of the collaborative approach outlined in Section 1 and includes the key components of LinC, its implementation during 2014–2016 and its re-design towards LinC 2018–2020. The results of the developmental evaluation of LinC indicate its high level of success in achieving the outcomes sought by its stakeholders.

03

COLLECTIVE APPROACHES TO COMPLEX ISSUES

Lessons from the LinC Project Case Study, together with emergent international good practice, shed light on the benefits and opportunities as well as the limitations and risks inherent in collaborative forms of governance, funding and facilitation.


These reflections are offered with a view to their being useful in addressing a range of other complex challenges. The reflections are based around these four key factors identified as we evaluated the project:

- Determined collaboration around a compelling purpose ignites possibilities
- Co-creation and co-design enables both innovation and ownership
- Relationships are the currency that create a sustainable platform
- Solutions are innovative, influential and exponential due to ripple effects

04

DISCUSSION DIAGRAMS

- Fig. 1: Transactional vs Collaborative Approaches
- Fig. 2: LinC Collaborative Process
- Reference Sheet: Questions for Discussion
- Fig. 3: LinC Logic Model
- Fig. 4: Collective Approaches to Complex Issues



ICON INDICATES
PRINT READY DIAGRAM
AT BACK OF
DOCUMENT

Showing up differently

APPENDIX : SECTION 5 & 6

This includes extensive reporting and analysis, along with useful links to supplementary material.

You can view and download at www.lincproject.org.nz/publications

05

HOW HAS THE LINC PROJECT MODELLED COLLABORATION

The 'story' of the LinC Project is told from the perspectives of significant stakeholders (funders, facilitators and members of the LinC governance group). Key features are identified in relation to the co-design of collaborative forms of governance, funding and facilitation and include review and reflection on the importance of communication, and being clear about the 'why' and 'how'.

Clearly defining the purpose around issues and values helps, along with the importance of relationships of trust. Involving everyone in areas of strength and harnessing stakeholder capacity has been documented, balanced by the critical need for having a driver or catalyst for the project.

The section is rounded out with information about the importance of sharing the ownership and accountability of such a project.

06

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The section provides background material on the LinC Project and in particular focuses on the manner in which the LinC Project has been communicated to other audiences beyond those directly involved in the project.

Useful links take you to further information and details of the project not included in this document, along with ongoing developments.



What people have said...

We strongly support proactive initiatives like LinC that intentionally facilitate local leaders learning, sharing and working together. Growing collaborative local leadership is essential to sustaining community-led change efforts. Leadership in communities is collective work. In bringing diverse people and perspectives together to plan, create and deliver a range of capability building opportunities, LinC has modelled this. It's great to see funders being part of overall co-design and co-governance – with all partners prepared to learn from doing together.

Megan Courtney
Inspiring Communities



Whānau are frequently asked to tackle big, tough problems, to confront the challenges that face them and find a way forward. **This resource, 'Showing up differently: a collective approach to complex issues', helps to reframe issues as an opportunity; recognising the possibility and building the foundations for change.** If we believe that leadership is critical in enabling whānau, groups and the community to move towards their core purpose we need to work by design not by default. The case study and frameworks described in this resource will help to add value to the capacity building project, and in that respect we are pleased to endorse it.

Helen Leahy
Pouārahi / Chief Executive
Te Pūtahitanga o Te Waipounamu
(Whānau Ora Commissioning agency for the South Island)



Creating and delivering solutions often hinges on how much social capital we've built through networks of trust and willingness to cooperate. **I've never met an individual, community or leader in a social innovation context who was happy to have a well-developed decision neatly packaged up and ready for their investment and implementation without having walked alongside it through development and iteration.** Bearing that in mind, we must move from transactional grant-making and procurement to collaborative processes as outlined in 'Showing up differently'.

Kelly Ann McKenchen
Principal
The Australian Centre for Social Innovation
tacsi.org.au



SHOWING UP DIFFERENTLY

01

TRANSACTIONAL VS COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES



This section compares traditional 'transactional' grant-making procurement with a more collaborative approach. It explores why traditional approaches have struggled to address some complex social challenges and examines the ways in which a more collaborative approach can lead to the co-design and implementation of more effective solutions.

TECHNICAL VS ADAPTIVE CHALLENGES

Many of New Zealand's major social challenges (such as building resilient communities, overcoming family violence and creating social attitudes that support mental health, etc.) have been difficult to address for a number of reasons:

- The problems involved are hard to define.
- The challenges are multi-causal and dynamic, involving complex and unpredictable interdependencies.
- Solutions are not obvious, and any proposed solution is risky in so far as it may throw up unintended consequences that are almost impossible to foresee.
- A diverse range of stakeholders are involved.

This means that these challenges are not readily solved through traditional technical 'fixes'. Indeed, even if ways can be found to apply such fixes better, or for longer, or with more resources, it is unlikely that these will lead to lasting solutions. In such cases, what is likely to happen is in keeping with that well-known adage, 'Do what you've always done and you'll get what you've always got'.

Technical challenges are linear, stable and predictable in nature. Solutions to technical challenges are (with the right expertise) knowable, based and proven in past experience, and can (given sufficient resourcing and skill) be readily applied. In contrast, social challenges are now recognised as systemic, complex, interconnected, context-dependent, often ambiguous and unpredictable in the ways they become manifest. Often called adaptive challenges, creating widespread and sustainable solutions in these contexts requires innovation as well as both collective and individual behaviour change across a wide range of critical stakeholders.

Specifically, in this context:

- Approaches need to transcend traditional roles and boundaries, both individual and organisational.
- Robust and trusting relationships among those tasked with addressing these issues are vital in order to enable this crossing of organisational and role boundaries.

Addressing such challenges calls for new forms of engagement with multiple stakeholders across organisational boundaries in a comprehensive collaborative approach.



Figure 1 : Transactional vs Collaborative Approaches

TRANSACTIONAL

A transactional grant-making or procurement process is extremely common and is well suited to simple and complicated challenges where proven solutions are well known from the outset.

FEATURES

Funders and providers each have separate roles at certain stages with little ongoing interaction

Assessment of fit does not involve co-design or negotiation, but is based on prior experience against a pre-defined set of criteria

Emphasis on clear roles to avoid conflicts of interest

A formal application and allocation process is used to initiate these types of projects

PROS

Clear scope and definition of solution

Strong clarity of process with clear accountability

Transparency at initial procurement stage

CONS

Difficult to innovate or develop new and alternative solutions once project begins

Difficult to adapt and respond to changing environment

Decision making power retained by the funder

Potential for duplication and multiple small projects doing similar things with similar outcomes

This process excludes community voice in most cases

FUNDERS

IDENTIFY

Funders clarify outcomes based on perception

DEFINE

Project scope and allocate resources/assets

APPLICATION

Process applications, assess best fit and select preferred provider

IMPLEMENTATION

Project tasks implemented by the selected provider

EVALUATION

Project assessed against initial pre-determined outcomes


IMPACT

On particular issue and outcome

COMMUNITY PROVIDERS

COLLABORATIVE

A collaborative grant making or procurement approach is less common, but is extremely well suited to complex challenges where solutions need to be innovative and multi-dimensional.



FEATURES

Funders, providers and community all participate in identifying key issues, then co-designing, implementing and evaluating a range of solutions

This process supports community led development, allowing community engagement throughout the process

Design based project – customised to meet a specific need or address an issue with no pre-set solution

Authentic consultation with potential recipients and partners

Built on partnership – multiple parties engaged on an equal footing

Multi agency – approach based around collaboration, collective impact and partnership

PROS

Opportunity for all parties to influence the direction of development

Meets a complex need in a complex environment by creating a unique solution

Possibility of collaboration between communities, funders and providers

Synergies – outcome is exponential, whole is bigger than the sum of the parts

Emphasis on sustainably – the partnership relationships are negotiated and practiced which are very likely to outlast the project

Uses a strength based approach – collective intelligence

CONS

Time intensive for all parties


Complex governance roles – role definition takes more discussion and negotiation

Potential conflicts of interests, conflicts of personality, ego, power, etc.

Results take a lot longer to emerge – not a quick fix

Figure 2 : LinC Collaborative Process

This diagram summarises the process of collaboration that LinC embraced; clearly identifying the involvement of communities, funders and providers throughout. Each of these six components are based on our shared reflections and are explored in detail in Showing up differently : Appendix at www.lincproject/publications



02



WHAT IS THE LINC PROJECT? WHAT HAS BEEN ITS IMPACT?

BACKGROUND

In the post-quake context of Christchurch communities worked extremely hard to support those affected by the quakes. As a result, communities often became close-knit and creative, but many people also became exhausted. When the draft report of the Greater Christchurch Strategic Psycho-Social Plan was released for consultation in 2012 it recognised that a combination of centralised specialist support, grass-roots community engagement and self-organised interaction would have a vital role to play in people's recovery. The plan identified two groups in need of assistance: those severely affected by the quakes and those moderately affected.

Through a range of conversations that gathered momentum over time, the LinC approach emerged focusing on assisting those moderately affected and specifically on fostering the extensive community-level leadership that was emerging. That leadership was recognised as being vulnerable because of its reliance on the energy and goodwill of individuals. These conversations identified the following needs:

1. Supporting and encouraging communities to shape and lead their own recovery
2. Building on capacity, knowledge and skills within the community
3. Providing accessible leadership development opportunities for community leaders as well as service providers


VISION AND OUTCOMES

LinC aimed to continue to grow and sustain community leaders throughout Greater Christchurch through connecting existing networks of community leaders and providing both experienced and new leaders with the opportunity to develop their skills and the skills of others. Geographical communities and communities of interest were included in the scope.

The key principle on which LinC was based can be summarised as follows:
People thrive in communities, which thrive with leadership, who thrive with support.

Consequently, LinC's vision is: Thriving leaders active in their communities.
LinC contributes to this vision by focusing on the following outcomes:

1. Community leaders are active, confident and well supported by their peers
2. Diverse communities and agencies are inter-connected and sharing with each other
3. Council staff, community boards and local leaders are empowered to work together to strengthen local decision making
4. Interconnections are established between initiatives with a similar vision in Christchurch and New Zealand.



PROGRAMME DESIGN


A range of people became involved in LinC's development and then in its delivery between 2015 and the present. Those involved included philanthropic funders, territorial authorities, government agencies, local communities and tertiary institutions. Members of Leadership Lab (a local leadership consultancy) played a key role in the development and delivery of LinC.

As the nature of LinC became clearer, members of these different groups took on roles either in the LinC Steering Group, to oversee the governance of the project, or in the LinC Facilitation Team, to undertake the delivery of the project. The LinC Project is governed by a Leadership Steering Group (LSG). Current LSG members are the New Zealand Red Cross, Rata Foundation, Wayne Francis Charitable Trust, Christchurch City Council, Waimakariri District Council, Ministry of Social Development, Te Putahitanga, University of Canterbury and Leadership Lab. This group has actively contributed to the project's design, funding, resourcing, delivery and evaluation.

PHASE ONE: 2015 / 2016

Phase One of the LinC Project comprised two 10 month leadership programmes (LinC Cohort #1 and #2) which were delivered in 2015 and 2016 respectively. During this time, 95 leaders from Greater Christchurch communities were involved (both geographical and communities of interest). Each cohort consisted of approximately 40 people chosen through an application process; 30 from local communities and 10 from government agencies involved in service provision. Over the course of a year each cohort came together in a variety of gatherings, all of which were designed to offer leadership development, opportunities for networking and a chance to build on community projects (either new or already underway) in collaborative contexts. This included forum, action learning groups, strength finder coaching and match funded community projects.

The project gained local, national and international interest and recognition for its unique multi-stakeholder co-design principles (see Appendix).



The schedule planner for the 2016 LinC programme shows the key components that defined inputs and resourcing for participants.

“As soon as you make it hard to understand—a bit fluffy—you’re already working with sceptics, you’re just giving them ammunition.”

"I've found the Strengths Finder profile and coaching very helpful... as well as meeting so many 'like minds' from various groups and organisations across Christchurch"

ANDY HEARN
CDHB STAFF WELLBEING COORDINATOR
& WESTMINSTER SPORTS INC



IMPACT

An independent developmental evaluation was undertaken throughout each . The final evaluation summary reports for [LinC 2015](#), [LinC 2016](#) and [LinC 2018](#) can be found at www.lincproject.org.nz/publications. The following outcomes were the focus of the evaluation.

For participants:

Positive development in knowledge, skills behaviours and/or attitude and evidence of how this has been applied
 Increased personal confidence, networks and relationships.

For participants' organisations:

Increased leadership capacity at an organisational level.

For participants' communities:

Increased/strengthened positive collaborations and partnerships at a community level.

Community projects that have a positive community impact.

The evaluation across both cohorts found clear evidence that LinC achieved its intended outcomes for the majority of those who took part. For these leaders, LinC had been worthwhile and in quite a few cases, transformative. Clear evidence emerged to indicate that there had been development for many in their leadership capacity (knowledge, skills, attitudes) at an organisational level, and that forms of collaboration and partnership emerged at community level as a result of individuals' involvement in LinC.



A sample of a number of infographic posters produced to showcase the LinC projects to funders, supporters and communities. These are also found in Appendix and on our website.

PHASE TWO : 2018 / 2019

During 2017 the LSG and Leadership Lab used principles of co-design and co-governance to collectively explore the future of the LinC programme. Relying on evaluations from previous cohorts and wide community feedback, the LSG believed that the LinC Project needed to shift towards local community leaders supporting leaders within their own communities rather than just a city-wide model of delivery. Leveraging and supporting this active citizenship at a local level will enable a wider spread of influence and create a more sustainable and flexible delivery model that can be integrated with other regional initiatives within Greater Christchurch.

The current phase two of the LinC Project builds on the success of LinC Cohorts #1 and #2. This new phase continues to grow and sustain community leaders throughout Greater Christchurch but, in keeping with the developmental nature of LinC, it has broadened its approach.

Incubator, Cultivator and Activator

The Incubator continues to provide support for community leaders themselves and the Cultivator provides the opportunity for other more experienced leaders to develop a wide range of leaders in their communities. The third component, the Activator, is open to all community members and aims to stimulate and connect individuals as part of a wider network across Greater Christchurch.

A logic model has been developed which outlines in detail how each of the three components contributes to the overall LinC vision of 'Thriving Leaders active in their communities' (see Fig. 3 on next page).

The diagram below also outlines the interconnected nature of the three aspects of LinC 2018 and 2019.



Intentional focus evolving... and under pinning our approach

In 2018 and moving into 2019, the LinC project has looked at defining and bringing greater clarity to our approach to leadership and engagement with communities. This has led to us outlining the basis of that within the following model.


LinC creates space where our individual and collective journeys can be woven together to benefit our communities. Based on the tikanga of the powhiri process – we move into the ātea/space for conversation, listening, debating and growing common understanding as people of Aotearoa and our respective whānau and communities.



The LinC Project will continue to reflect, review and modify its approach and programmes as it seeks to continue to support thriving leaders in flourishing communities.


What is the LinC Project? What has been its impact?

Figure 3:
LinC Logic Model



What is the LinC Project? What has been it's impact?





SHOWING UP DIFFERENTLY

What people are saying...

'Showing up differently' provides a useful blueprint for those working on systems change issues in Aotearoa. It advocates for processes that lean into context, complexity, and cross-sector collaborations, strengthening relationships and therefore efficacy. As an organisation that has been working in this space for some time, it's great to see the experiences and learnings of LinC laid out in an approachable and replicable manner. While there are no magic bullets, 'Showing up differently' demonstrates that there are tested approaches that can provide us with guidance, using iterative, human-centred approaches to build thriving leadership and create better results for communities.

Lani Evans
Foundation Manager
Vodafone New Zealand Foundation
<https://foundation.vodafone.co.nz>



I had the good fortune to observe first hand and participate in the LinC Project and was impressed with what I saw. I am therefore very pleased to see that the essential philosophy, the core design processes and the community impact of the project are documented so concisely yet compelling in this report.

Professor Brad Jackson
Director of the Policy Innovation Hub
Griffith University
b.jackson@griffith.edu.au



*A useful blueprint
for those working on
systems change
issues in Aotearoa...*

*Human centred
approaches build
thriving leadership
and create better
results for our
communities...*

The currency of collaboration is always trust and relationships. LinC's approach to building cohorts of inspired and well-equipped change makers ensures they not only have the tools but also the networks to effect and sustain change. These communities of change are vital if we are to truly tackle the large-scale complex issues of today and design for the challenges of tomorrow.

Dr Eruera Tarena | Executive Director
Tokona Te Raki
www.maorifutures.co.nz



03

COLLECTIVE APPROACHES TO COMPLEX ISSUES

Lessons from the LinC Project Case Study, together with emergent international good practice, shed light on the benefits and opportunities as well as the limitations and risks inherent in collaborative forms of governance, funding and facilitation. This section presents some reflections based on the LinC experience which are offered with a view to their being useful in addressing a range of other complex challenges.




Figure 4 :
Collective Approaches to Complex Issues



DETERMINED COLLABORATION

Around a compelling purpose
ignites possibilities

REFLECTION 1

An issue, concern or compelling need can become a catalyst or ignition point for a growing conversation between those that are concerned about that issue.

The challenge to address this issue or shared interest becomes a powerful 'attractor' which allows 'emergence' to occur.

In this case the LinC Project grew from nothing more than a shared concern and question in June 2013 to a comprehensive multi-year project in 2018 – working with close to 200 communities across Greater Canterbury, a governance/facilitation and evaluation team of 30+ people and collaborative funding of over \$600k in three years.

This multi-partner collaboration around one central compelling need and vision that all parties can commit to allows the opportunity for negotiation through differences of approach, power dynamics, personalities and familiar frames of reference.

Collaborative funding, governance and delivery have been essential. Funders have been integrally involved in the ongoing development of the LinC Project alongside the facilitation team.

In a country of 5 million people we have the potential to cross divides – to bring together very disparate organisations from different sectors, iwi, community, public, private, not for profit, and actually cross those divides. That to me is an act of leadership – those who are willing to get outside their comfort zones, to be able to inhabit other people's worlds and find areas of common purpose.

PROFESSOR BRAD JACKSON, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY — SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT



REFLECTION 2

CO-CREATED DESIGN

Enables both innovation and ownership

The two most significant positive outcomes for co-designed programmes are better solutions and a higher level of ownership and commitment by participants. A co-designed approach is appropriate where the challenges are beyond the capability of any individual or organisation.

While it is recognised that many components of the solution may already exist, these are often spread, disconnected or isolated. There is no overarching strategic or systems overview available.

Co-design creates the opportunity to grow collective wisdom and expertise by enabling networks of leaders to work collaboratively and transform their own system or sector. We define co-design as creating innovative solutions through intentional processes that foster interaction, shared learning and leverage the collective intelligence of all stakeholders.

Collaborative approaches often use co-design principles to change the relationship and power dynamic between:

- Government and community
- Funders and providers
- Formal and informal
- More powerful and less powerful.

This has the potential to unlock the resourcefulness and desire of both those in government who are constrained by form and those in communities who are constrained by resources. The key to this is the creation of opportunities and the conditions for these people to connect and develop solutions.

In summary the collaborative approach allows a group of people to:

- Identify an issue
- Engage stakeholders
- Co-design solutions.

Key to this is the creation of opportunities and conditions for these people to connect and develop solutions.

The challenge now is to build an ‘innovation infrastructure’ for our state services, including enhanced systemic incentives (demand, mandate and expectations to innovate) and support (guidance on capability and methodologies) to move from ‘random innovation’ or innovation by necessity to a new state of ‘innovation by design’.

STATE SERVICES COMMISSION (2013)
DESIGNING AND GROWING INNOVATION CAPACITY: A CASE STUDY



INTENTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Are the currency that create a sustainable platform

REFLECTION 3

Partners have been prepared to negotiate, compromise and put aside normal ways of doing things because the shared purpose has been compelling, urgent and engaging.

High levels of trust among partners are essential, as are clear commitments to accountability and transparency.

This has required tenacious determination at times with high degrees of negotiation, compromise and strategic relationship building.

Our values and objectives are modelled and 'lived' in every part of the programme. These create the backbone or touchstones for all partnership relationships and design decisions. However, we didn't write these in advance – they are emerging as a way of being.

The way the communities, funders, facilitators and evaluators interact and relate throughout the project is critical and contagious. This has the potential to create a working example of collaboration. This lived experience of reciprocal, trusting and power sharing relationships allows everyone involved in the LinC Project to see, feel, experience rather than just talk about ideals and hypothetical outcomes.

A common lesson is that although structures and processes matter greatly, cultures matter more. This is often a blind spot for the more technocratic, or mechanistic, approaches to collaboration. So, in one view the best collaborations are grown more as movements than as coordinated performance management; the main focus of work is on relationships and trust-building

MULGAN. G COLLABORATION AND COLLECTIVE IMPACT: HOW CAN FUNDER, NGOS AND GOVERNMENTS ACHIEVE MORE TOGETHER



REFLECTION 4

COLLABORATIVE SOLUTIONS

Are innovative influential and exponential due to ripple effect

Developmental evaluation has allowed LinC to maximise ongoing strategic learning. The shape of LinC was the product of many people's best ideas and LinC has continued to morph into a more responsive approach at every step.

LinC has focused on cascading benefit – i.e. 'We are focussing on impacting communities through leaders ... these leaders have colleagues and networks that we are leveraging through to impact a wider group'.

Ripple effects allow change to be sustained and multiplied. By having multiple groups over multiple years allows community members to grow into roles from one project to the next. For example, LinC #2 was facilitated by some of the participants in LinC #1 and so on.

The long-term collaborative governance, funding, design and facilitation has also begun to have influence in systems beyond LinC. In effect LinC has opened up the possibility of other innovations such as:

- New funding collaborations
- New government collaborations
- New facilitator collaborations
- Potential to create a 'living/working example' of powerful collaboration and cross-system partnerships
- Re-envision new models/ways of leading

Being an effective partner in collective impact requires flexibility, long-term commitment, and a willingness to share power and decision-making with others.

STANFORD SOCIAL INNOVATION REVIEW. COLLECTIVE INSIGHTS ON COLLECTIVE IMPACT

For anyone interested in thriving communities and curious to explore the possibilities of working in a new way...



We've found the LinC project to be nurturing, encouraging and supportive... it's made a big difference in our lives and our communities

LinC team members



IN SUMMARY

We've learnt that the only real option when addressing complex issues is the collaborative approach.

Our hope is that you have not only found this inspiring, but that you feel optimistic about weaving some of the learnings into your own journeys."

The LinC Project team





04

DISCUSSION DIAGRAMS




Figure 1 :
Transactional vs Collaborative Approaches

Figure 2 :
LinC Collaborative Process


Reference Sheet
Questions for Discussion

Figure 3 :
LinC Logic Model

Figure 4 :
Collective Approaches to Complex Issues



Figure 1 : Transactional vs Collaborative Approaches



TRANSACTIONAL

Figure 1 : Transactional vs Collaborative Approaches

A transactional grant-making or procurement process is extremely common and is well suited to simple and complicated challenges where proven solutions are well known from the outset.

FEATURES

Funders and providers each have separate roles at certain stages with little ongoing interaction
 Assessment of fit does not involve co-design or negotiation, but is based on prior experience against a pre-defined set of criteria
 Emphasis on clear roles to avoid conflicts of interest
 A formal application and allocation process is used to initiate these types of projects


PROS

Clear scope and definition of solution
 Strong clarity of process with clear accountability
 Transparency at initial procurement stage

CONS

Difficult to innovate or develop new and alternative solutions once project begins
 Difficult to adapt and respond to changing environment
 Decision making power retained by the funder
 Potential for duplication and multiple small projects doing similar things with similar outcomes
 This process excludes community voice in most cases

FUNDERS



COLLABORATIVE

A collaborative grant making or procurement approach is less common, but is extremely well suited to complex challenges where solutions need to be innovative and multi-dimensional.

FEATURES

Funders, providers and community all participate in identifying key issues, then co-designing, implementing and evaluating a range of solutions
 This process supports community led development, allowing community engagement throughout the process
 Design based project – customised to meet a specific need or address an issue with no pre-set solution
 Authentic consultation with potential recipients and partners
 Built on partnership – multiple parties engaged on an equal footing
 Multi agency – approach based around collaboration, collective impact and partnership

PROS

Opportunity for all parties to influence the direction of development
 Meets a complex need in a complex environment by creating a unique solution
 Possibility of collaboration between funders/providers/communities
 Synergies – outcome is exponential, whole is bigger than the sum of the parts
 Emphasis on sustainably—the partnership relationships are negotiated and practiced which are very likely to outlast the project
 Uses a strength based approach – collective intelligence

CONS

Time intensive for all parties
 Complex governance roles – role definition takes more discussion and negotiation
 Potential conflicts of interests, conflicts of personality, ego, power, etc.
 Results take a lot longer to emerge – not a quick fix





Figure 2 :
LinC Collaborative Process



LinC Collaborative Process: Questions for Discussion

The features discussed in this section arose from the development of a particular project. They do not necessarily map neatly onto other projects and are provided here as discussion points about the possibilities of working collaboratively in other contexts. As such, each of these features raises questions that might usefully be discussed when potential projects in other contexts are being considered.

1 Connecting and Conversing

- 1.1 Is there value in living with ambiguity and complexity while exploring possibilities? Is there a risk of 'getting there too quickly, that is, making things tidy and gaining clarity before the complexities have been understood?
- 1.2 Given the significant time investment required to participate in the process, who has the resources to be involved and conversely, who might be excluded because they lack these resources?
- 1.3 How can a balance be struck that allows conversations that satisfy the abstract thinkers as well as the pragmatists; the big picture thinkers as well as the details people?

2 Clarifying and Focusing

- 2.1 How can an issue that is urgent but of long-standing nature, such as family violence or child poverty, be framed with the same immediacy as one that is urgent and acute, such as disaster recovery, so that an environment of innovation can be created around it?
- 2.2 What is the best way to select issues appropriate to this way of working?
- 2.3 How can a compelling issue bring together diverse and sometimes uncomfortable collaborative partners?

3 Building Trust and Relating

- 3.1 If existing relationships of trust are not present can these be built or should this kind of process not be attempted in such a context?
- 3.2 What makes it possible to work flexibly within systemic constraints? What motivates those within government or philanthropics to work creatively within organisational constraints?
- 3.3 What makes it possible for people to 'show up differently'?

4 Engaging and Embracing

- 4.1 What is the best way to address tension or trade-offs between taking time to be inclusive and being pragmatic about maintaining momentum?
- 4.2 Given that there is no single 'community voice', how can the community be included – for example, how can developers of a project target people who might not traditionally be around the table?
- 4.3 If certain groups want to be involved but lack adequate resourcing to do this, is there some responsibility among those who are involved to assist them to take part?

5 Driving and Implementing

- 5.1 How far should the team driving the idea go forward with design before putting something on the table for others?
- 5.2 How do the power dynamics change once an idea is turned into a proposal that needs to be funded?
- 5.3 How can joint ownership of an idea/project be fostered?

6 Responsibility and Sharing the Risk

- 6.1 How can tools for accountability and due diligence be developed that do not exclude the significant voices of groups that might not meet traditional standards but that do have key forms of knowledge, voice and contacts in the areas of interest?
- 6.2 How can different interests be defined and resolved within this way of working?
- 6.3 What processes enable conversations about working differently to take place?

Figure 3 :
LinC Logic Model





Figure 4 :
Collective Approaches to Complex Issues





www.lincproject.org.nz