Designing Collective Impact for Peacebuilding

A mildly coherent rant by Frank Fredericks
World Faith
Why does the world suck so much?
It doesn’t.

Share of deaths by cause, World, 2016

Data refers to the specific cause of death, which is distinguished from risk factors for death, such as air pollution, diet and other lifestyle factors. This is shown by cause of death as the percentage of total deaths.

Cardiovascular diseases 32.26%
Cancers 16.32%
Respiratory diseases 6.48%
Diabetes 5.83%
Dementia 4.36%
Lower respiratory infections 4.35%
Neonatal deaths 3.16%
Diarrheal diseases 3.03%
Road incidents 2.45%
Liver disease 2.3%
Tuberculosis 2.22%
Kidney disease 2.17%
Digestive diseases 2%
HIV/AIDS 1.89%
Suicide 1.49%
Malaria 1.32%
Homicide 0.71%
Nutritional deficiencies 0.67%
Meningitis 0.58%
Protein-energy malnutrition 0.56%
Drowning 0.55%
Maternal deaths 0.42%
Parkinson disease 0.39%
Alcohol disorders 0.32%
Intestinal infectious diseases 0.28%
Drug disorders 0.26%
Hepatitis 0.25%
Fire 0.24%
Conflict 0.21%
Heat-related (hot and cold exposure) 0.1%
Terrorism 0.06%
Natural disasters 0.01%

Source: IHME, Global Burden of Disease

CC BY-SA
So why it feel like we’re not making progress?
Because we’re not. (ish)

I believe we have three barriers to progress:

- The Challenge of Low Probability Occurrences
- Self-Reporting Issues
- Generalizability
Low Probabilities & False Negatives/Positives

**Challenge:** If 1% of a population has contracted Disease A, and the test to identify Disease A has a 1% false-positive rate, and a 1% false-negative rate, then what percent of those who test positive for Disease A actually have it?

**Hint:** Use Bayes Theorem
Answer:

Bayes Theorem:

\[ P(w \mid m) = \frac{P(m \mid w)P(w)}{P(m)} \]

Or in this case more simply:

\[ .01(.99)/[.01(.99)+.99(.01)] = 50\% \]

The Point: Low Probability Occurrences are Most Susceptible to False Positives.

Nerd Talk: If 10% have the disease, the accuracy jumps to 91.7% (correct positives), but if you drop it to one per thousand, your accuracy drops to 0.01%, or 99.99% false positives. For context, conflict deaths are anywhere between 1-in-500 to 1-in-200,000, depending on definition. You do the math.
Self Reporting Issues

- The Sociability Effect
- The Hawthorne Effect
- Remembering Self v. Experiencing Self
- Conjunction Fallacy
- Loss Aversion

TL;DR: WHAT WE SAY WE’RE GOING TO DO AND WHAT WE DO HAS LOW CORRELATION.
Conflict Findings may not be Generalizable

- The endless variables present in individual conflicts may quell the possibility that findings in one conflict may be applicable in solving another.

- The methodologies used to study conflict over the past 70 years are largely qualitative, and based in psychology and sociology, which have both lower standards of proof than other fields, and are not designed to identify generalizability.

- Practitioners tend to have adverse responses to proposals for generalizable findings.

**In Short:** It’s hard to find generalizable data, we’re not using generalizable methods, and our field isn’t receptive to generalizable findings.
Possible Solution: Collective Impact Assessment

What is it? It’s an impact strategy in which various organizations in a problem space come together to identify common metrics (output, outcome, and impact) to track progress across the field.

It Requires:
- A Common Agenda
- Shared Measurement Systems
- Mutually Reinforcing Activities
- Continuous Communication
- Backbone Support Organizations
Collective Impact: A Case Study

Strive, an educational nonprofit in Cincinnati

Problem: Students leaving high school not prepared for college or careers.

Approach: Developed the Strive Partnership, which collaborated in developing the Student Roadmap to Success, which outlined a series of systemic interventions.

Results: 10% increase in graduation rates in Cincinnati since 2003; 16% increase in college enrollment rate in Covington, KY, since 2004.
How we can bring Collective Impact to Peacebuilding

1. Gather M&E practitioners to gather to identify the best existing indicators, or collaborate with researchers to identify new behavioral measures.

1. Commit to implementing shared metrics in programs and projects over an agreed period of time.

1. Use open data policies to share and gather data, opening opportunities to evaluate interventions based on geography, tactics, and programs.

1. Gather periodically to evaluate and reiterate.
What’s Needed?  Catalytic Philanthropy

Where could we begin?

Build an academic partnership to conduct field research with the intention of identifying a behavioral indicator for violence, or a heuristic therein, which is both scientifically rigorous, and easily replicable by practitioners.