



# TURF, TRUST, CO-CREATION AND COLLECTIVE IMPACT

LIZ WEAVER

Authentic community change moves at the speed of trust. And yet, we spend so little time and focus on intentionally building trust amongst partners. This paper explores the intricacies of trust, how to build it and what to do when trust is broken.

## TURF IN A TIME OF COMMUNITY CHANGE

*Several years ago, I was the Director of the Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction, a collective impact initiative designed to decrease poverty in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. My first meeting as the senior backbone staff person was a tense one.*

*The leadership table had been meeting for a year to develop their community plan. But this was a different meeting. This was the first meeting which included community leaders with the lived experience of poverty at the table. Previously, these individuals were an advisory group. The Roundtable had come to realize that this voice at their table was vitally important to be able to understand the multi-faceted dimension of poverty and how it impacted the city.*

*While inviting citizen advocates was a step in the right direction, the individuals with lived experience were angry. They questioned why they had not been included from the start. They believed their knowledge and experiences were pivotal in changing systems. The room we met in was small, tight and filled with tension. However, everyone around the table spoke and listened respectfully. There was an acknowledgment of the error that had been made. This acknowledgement did not solve the problem, but it was the necessary first step to re-building trust.*

*It took the Roundtable more than a year to fully come together as a leadership team, to fully build trust. There was tension as we moved forward but over time everyone recognized how vitally important it was for the people with lived experience to identify the challenges they face daily and to be actively engaged in solving poverty. Indeed, the Roundtable came to understand that we wouldn't be able to solve any complex problem without those impacted by that problem at the table. But to do this, we must develop approaches that decrease turf, build trust and*

*move toward co-creation and collective impact.*

We are facing a dilemma. Our cities are trying to solve increasingly complex issues. These complex issues require us to collaborate across sectors with people that we have not collaborated with before. At the same time, levels of trust between citizens and groups in society are declining. There are multiple studies that illustrate this decline. Citizens are expressing a lack of trust in leaders, institutions and systems. Peter Block, in the foreword to Adam Kahane's latest book *Collaborating with the Enemy* describes the current challenges facing cities:



*We live in a complicated time. It is a divisive and polarizing era in which we respond by constantly seeking like-mindedness. We have a growing number of ways to meet up with people similar to ourselves. We are drawn to people with the same interests, same tastes, same politics. Every time I buy something online, I am told what other people like me also bought. And it works. As a larger society, cities are resegregating into neighbourhoods of people like us. As nations, we are voting for politicians who want to keep out strangers and reclaim our country as if someone has taken it away. We live in a time of growing alienation and isolation. We are losing trust in our institutions and our governments to act in our interests. Most of our elections are variations of a 'no' vote. We have growing economic divisions, ideological divisions, contests, over values.*

Collaborating with the Enemy. Page ix.



It is in this context of growing alienation and isolation, that requires community change agents to consider the connected elements of turf, trust, co-creation and collective impact, so that they can successfully work together with others to listen, understand and achieve shared outcomes.

One of the forces that Peter Block notes, is the movement toward sameness. As citizens, we find neighbourhoods that suit our needs and avoid neighbourhoods that are different from us. We watch news that speaks to our ideology and we connect online with people that are similar to us. While access and travel around the planet has become easier, our lives and connected circles have become smaller. Opportunities to be exposed to others whose thoughts and ideas are different from our own are rarer and more infrequent.

Instead of creating trust, this sameness creates turf. We become advocates for what we want and what we believe but are often unaware of other points of view and perspectives. Many of us travel through our communities following the same daily patterns that make it easy to avoid the issues and challenges within our community that we don't want to see. In our pursuit of sameness, we have lost the ability to have empathy for, and therefore trust, the other.

Adam Kahane calls this the 'enemyfying syndrome'. If someone does not agree with my point of

view or my perspective, they become ‘my enemy’. The enemy is viewed as a person who might be the cause of our problems or hurting our position. There are many different words that we use to characterize the enemy, including calling them rivals, competitors, adversaries or the other. Identifying someone as an enemy is seductive, Kahane writes, because it validates our own position and reassures us that we are okay (at least in our own thinking). Creating enemies does not lead to co-creating communities. It leads to increased turf, isolation, alienation and a blindness to the needs, challenges and aspirations of others. Kahane urges us to embrace our enemies. To embrace enemies, we must understand how to foster trust.

## THE NEUROSCIENCE OF TRUST

Trust is a human emotion, it is connected to the chemistry of the brain. In an article in the Harvard Business Review (January 2017), Paul Zak discussed the neuroscience behind trust. The research showed that trust varies across individuals and situations. In situations where people have high levels of trust with colleagues, neighbours, and friends, there are higher levels of oxytocin. Oxytocin was found to increase a person’s empathy which is a helpful trait when trying to work with others. The research also showed that in situations where individuals feel a great deal of stress, oxytocin levels are significantly inhibited.

In his research about brains and trust, Zak found that building an engaging work environment leads to greater productivity and results. A high engagement work environment includes strong connections with the work and with colleagues; feeling like you are a real contributor to the company and enjoying opportunities to learn.



*Building a culture of trust is what makes a meaningful difference. Employees in high-trust organizations are more productive, have more energy at work, collaborate better with colleagues, and stay with their employers longer than people working at low-trust companies. They also suffer less chronic stress and are happier with their lives, and these factors fuel stronger performance.*

Zak. The Neuroscience of Trust.



Understanding that there is a neuroscientific connection between trust and performance is important for work environments but equally relevant to community change efforts. If the individuals around collaborative tables are not connected and do not build trust, they are less likely to be effective or to bond as a team.

The connection of the brain to trust is important. Dr. David Rock and his team at the [NeuroLeadership Institute](#) developed a model which includes five domains of human social experience called (SCARF):

1. **Status** - relative importance to others.
2. **Certainty** - being able to predict the future.
3. **Autonomy** - a sense of control over events.
4. **Relatedness** - a sense of safety with others, of friend rather than foe.
5. **Fairness** - a perception of fair exchanges between people.

Rock's SCARF model is built on the idea that the brain treats social threats and rewards with the same intensity as physical threats. Our capacity to make decisions, solve problems or collaborate effectively is connected to our perception of the threats or rewards embedded in these processes. If we feel low levels of these five domains, we are likely to feel threatened and experience a reduced working memory, a reduced field of view and err on the side of pessimism. So, to increase trust and to effectively collaborate, we need to develop strategies that minimize threats.

Building on the notions of neuroscience and the visceral reactions we have to threats, Charles Feltman in the *Thin Book of Trust* describes trust as "choosing to risk making something you value vulnerable to the other person's actions". There is a reciprocal relationship in trust. We have to risk vulnerability in order to gain trust. An individual's willingness to risk is based on their assessment of the probability that the other person will support you.

Feltman identifies four 'distinctions' that come into play when an individual considers risk: sincerity; reliability; competence and care. For both partners in the relationship, they are assessing the other on these distinctions:

**Sincerity** – is the assessment that you are honest, that you say what you mean and mean what you say, and that you can be believed and taken seriously. It also means when you express an opinion, that it is valid, useful and is backed up by social thinking and evidence. Finally, it means that your actions will align with your words.

**Reliability** – is the assessment that you meet the commitments you make, that you keep your promises.

**Competence** – is the assessment that you have the ability to do what you are doing or propose to do. In the workplace, this usually means the other person believes you have the requisite capacity, skill, knowledge, and resources to do a particular task or job.

**Care** – is the assessment that you have the other person’s interests in mind as well as your own when you make decisions and take actions. Of the four assessments of trustworthiness, care is in some ways the most important for building lasting trust. When people believe you are only concerned with your self-interest and don’t consider their interests as well, they may trust your sincerity, reliability and competence, but they will tend to limit their trust of you to specific situations or transactions. On the other hand, when people believe you hold their interest in mind, they will extend their trust more broadly to you.

*The Thin Book of Trust. Page 14.*

Understanding the neuroscience behind building trusting relationships is only the first step. Zak, Rock and Feltman provide insights into the connections between building trust, human decision making, our perceptions of connectedness and engagement, how much stress we feel about the situation we are in and our resulting behaviour. This deeper understanding of trust is useful as it offers insights about how we can intentionally cultivate and sustain the necessary trust to work collaboratively with others on shared issues and opportunities.

## TRUSTING OURSELVES, TRUSTING OTHERS

Earlier this year, I explored the theme of trust and its role in building community in a series of posts on [www.tamarackcommunity.ca](http://www.tamarackcommunity.ca). Pivotal to my research, was Stephen M.R. Covey’s book *The Speed of Trust*.

Covey describes trust as occurring in waves and observes that there is connection across these waves of trust. He specifically identifies five waves of trust: self trust; relationship trust; organizational trust; market trust and societal trust.

It was an a-ha moment for me as I considered **self trust** and the implications for building trust with others. Given what has been written about the neuroscience of trust, self trust makes sense. We are in a relationship with ourselves as much as we are in relationship with others. It also speaks to the degree in which we feel safe or vulnerable, empowered or powerless; cared for or despised. Developing self trust requires serious self-reflection. Can we trust others if we cannot trust ourselves to achieve goals and manage commitments?

The second wave of trust is **relationship trust**. This is about our relationship with others. Covey describes the need to build ‘trust accounts’ with others. We cannot expect to build relationship trust immediately. Rather, there is intentionality behind relationship trust. This is particularly important when we work with individuals who are different from us or those that we consider as ‘enemies’. Relationship trust calls for an investment in the interpersonal. To develop strategies that create safe spaces for exchange, and mitigate feelings of risk and fear.

The third wave of trust is **organizational trust**. This is where leaders work to generate trust in their organizations and institutions. If the leader is trustworthy, the perception of the organization is better. If the leader is not, the organization could be tarnished with the same

brush. Covey suggests that organizational trust is garnered through the intentional alignment through the vision, mission and values of the organization, and the actions of its leaders and the organization in delivering services and programs. Alignment is key to building and maintaining organizational trust.

The fourth wave of trust is **market trust**. This is about reputation and brand. It is the degree to which others in the market believe that the organization will fulfill its promises. When there is high market trust, partners will invest more deeply in the efforts; when market trust is low, it will be more difficult to recruit and maintain partners.

The final and fifth wave of trust is **societal trust** which includes creating value for others and for the society at large. To tackle the complex issues facing our communities, we have to work toward this wave of trust; to create the conditions where citizens can come together in meaningful dialogue bringing their views and perspectives forward.

Covey's five waves of trust, moving from inner self through relationships, organizations and then to society are important when considering co-creating cities and communities. If, as Peter Block explains, we are now living in a context of growing isolation and alienation in communities, working on the interconnectedness of the waves of trust can create a path forward to co-creation and collective impact.

## TRUST AND TIME

In the Spring 2017, the Suncor Energy Foundation convened a gathering of social innovators from the energy, social and indigenous sectors at the Banff Centre for the Arts. Over three days, the participants explored the intersection points of trust and time. Building trust is relational and begins with introspection and learning to trust ourselves. Building trust takes time.

The barrier we seem to have is time scarcity. Our busyness holds us back from investing in processes that, on the surface, seem to have limited impact and reward. We rush to solutions hoping for impact and, too often, these solutions are short term and small scale. This thinking needs to change and Zak's research on the neuroscience of trust provides evidence that the investment of time into building trusting relationships reaps significant benefits in the work environment.

### The importance of listening more than talking:

"When I taught social work on an Aboriginal reserve I could not come in and just deliver my curriculum. I had to understand their reality, their experiences, and their stories and adapt what I was teaching to the context. In the same class was one student who had just had her children removed by the Aboriginal child welfare authorities, another student who was the foster mother for those children and a third student who was the child welfare worker who removed the children. I built trust by respecting their reality and talking about some ground rules about what was too uncomfortable to discuss."

Karen Schwartz, Carleton University

**Time and honesty in building trust:**

“In the development of TRIEC (Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council) we had a number of trust building hurdles that took time to get over. And I would say that time is a big part of it. You can collapse timelines on all kinds of things, but trust in relationships, particularly those with power dynamics (and I think they all have some degree of that), takes time and proof. The other key element is honesty. I can recall examples where partners in the collaboration felt able to call us on actions that we were taking to say that we were creeping into their space. The fact that they could and did make the call I think demonstrated trust (that we would listen and respond). And the fact that we did listen, hear their point of view and change course advanced the degree of trust in our relationship. We proved ourselves. I believe that it is making it through moments of conflict that you come out stronger. And all of this requires both parties to be focused on the shared goal and not individual gain or organizational ego.”

Elizabeth Mclsaac, President, Maytree

“

*The effect of trust on self-reported work performance was powerful. Respondents whose companies were in the top quartile indicated that they had 106% more energy and were 76% more engaged at work than respondents whose firms were in the bottom quartile.*

Zak. *The Neuroscience of Trust.*”

The participants at the Suncor Energy Foundation gathering identified that time is a human construct. How much or how little time we have is a decision that each of us makes when entering into a relationship or a collaboration. The Indigenous leaders attending reminded us to consider time from a seven-generation perspective. If we had seven generations, would our perspectives on building trust change?

**PRACTICING TRUST BUILDING**

To effectively move the needle on the complex issues facing our cities, energy and engagement of diverse partners is required. To engage across sectors, we must practice building trust.

There are lessons that can be learned about how to build trust and, when trust has been broken, how to repair it. Many of these lessons come from human resources management and customer service. One of the unfortunate paradoxes here is that, while the building of trust takes time, the loss of trust can often occur suddenly.

So how do we authentically build trust? Covey identifies 13 behaviours, that if practiced, will build trust and trustworthiness. These behaviours are simple but powerful.

**13 BEHAVIOURS TO BUILD TRUST**

1. Talk straight
2. Demonstrate respect
3. Create transparency
4. Right wrongs
5. Show loyalty
6. Deliver results
7. Get better
8. Confront reality
9. Clarify expectations
10. Practice accountability
11. Listen first
12. Keep commitments
13. Extend trust

*The Speed of Trust, page 127*

They are particularly useful when reflecting on self-trust but also can be helpful in building trust with others. At their core, they create safe spaces when interacting with others, and are aligned with Feltman's four distinctions: sincerity; reliability; competence and care.

Paul Zak also provides insights into how to manage others to build trust. He has identified management strategies that are linked to neuroscience and brain chemistry. These strategies provide interesting and useful insights for community collaborative processes. How often do we build these management strategies into our collaborative and community change efforts?

### HOW TO MANAGE FOR TRUST

- **Recognize excellence** – most effective to do this immediately after a goal is met, when it comes from peers, and when it's tangible, unexpected, personal and public
- **Induce 'challenge' stress** – focus on a difficult but achievable task – this releases neurochemicals including oxytocin and adrenocorticotropin
- **Give people discretion in how they do their work** – being trusted to figure things out is a big motivator
- **Enable job crafting** – trust employees to choose which projects they will work on but with clear expectations
- **Share information broadly** – the uncertainty about the company's direction leads to chronic stress, which inhibits the release of oxytocin and undermines teamwork
- **Intentionally build relationships** – when people intentionally build social ties, their performance improves
- **Facilitate whole person growth** – set clear goals, but give employees autonomy to reach them and provide consistent feedback
- **Show vulnerability** – ask for help from colleagues instead of just telling them what to do

Covey and Zak provide useful tactics and strategies for managing trust within communities. In situations where trust has already been broken, we tend to look at those who disagree with us as the enemy. We walk away from situations which we feel might be too difficult to resolve. So how do we deal with building trust when trust has been broken? Feltman, in the *Thin Book of Trust*, provides some helpful strategies to confront distrust. Again, the strategies are simple and powerful. They move from self-reflection and assessment to identifying the specific actions and behaviours needed to resolve the situation of broken trust. These strategies include:

1. **Decide if you are willing** to talk to the person about the distrust by asking yourself the following questions:
  - a. What might I lose by having this conversation?
  - b. What will I lose by continuing to distrust this person?



- c. How will it benefit me, my team and my company to work this out so I can trust this person?
2. **Identify the areas(s)** you are concerned with: sincerity, reliability, competence; care
3. **Define the standard** you are using: The point of this step is to realize that the other person may well have different standards than you. If this is so, then you can focus your conversation to arrive at a shared understanding.
4. **Identify the specific actions or behaviours** that have led to your assessment of distrust: This is a critical step. Telling the person specifically what they do and/or say (or don't do or say) that you interpret as untrustworthy can help them understand how to rebuild trust with you.
5. **Determine what you need from them in order for them to regain your trust:** What can they do that will address your concerns and reassure you that you can begin or resume trusting them? Think it through from the other person's perspective. Is this something they have the capacity to do? Can they do it in the context of their work environment? How can you help them regain your trust?
6. **Ask the other person** if he/she would be willing to have a conversation with you about something that concerns you. Agree on a time and place that are mutually convenient and private. Avoid blindsiding them by bringing this up as part of a conversation about something else. You want the other person to be thoughtful, and open to listening to your concern and not defensive.

*The Thin Book of Trust*, page 49.

## CO-CREATING TOGETHER – APPLYING A TRUST LENS

As Covey writes, trust is personal, relational, organizational and societal. If we want to co-create better futures for our cities, we must embed a lens of trust into our collaborative efforts. Ignoring the importance of building trust across people, organizations and systems is to our detriment.

Richard Harwood, of The Harwood Institute has spent many years considering how to connect communities and citizens today. His 2015 article, *Getting Real about Building Trust*, tackles head on the challenge of building trust within communities in these divisive times.

Harwood writes, that to build trust, we must acknowledge and embrace the reality of our communities and reflect this reality in what we do and say. The Harwood Institute calls this approach to community change as 'turning outward' from our own goals and ambitions to engaging with community to determine their individual and shared goals and ambitions.

Equally important according to Harwood, is to build trust through focusing on relationships, building a track record of results, involving citizens as the builders, and working collectively toward a common good. The work of collaboration and co-creation cannot be inward facing. It needs to be built on the energy and wisdom of citizens in the community. Harwood, Rock and Feltman all consider trust-building as rooted in both relationship and in results.

Harwood's words about creating trust in community change efforts are a call to action for community change leaders:

“*Our actions, over time, are the ingredients for trust. And trust is the glue that enables communities to work. So what actions will we take? And will we be turned inward, or outward toward our community? That is a choice we get to make.*

*Trust is a fragile commodity. It dissipates much faster than it is formed, and it takes time and concerted effort to create. There are no easy answers, but we can start down the path of rebuilding trust today. We can, and we must.*

Source: Harwood. Getting Real about Building Trust. ”

In a recent article in the Stanford Social Innovation Review, David Sawyer and David Ehrlichman identify the following tactics and tools that they have found to be useful in building trust in a community change context:

- **Shift the context:** bring people to a location that is distinct from their current environment
- **Understand the system:** people need to have a holistic understanding of the system they want to shift (Tools your collaborative can use: Network Briefings, Community Empathy)
- **Tell your story:** share the *why* behind why people are there, their actions, experiences, and their mental models and views of the world (Tools your collaborative can use: 3 Minute Speeches, Life Stories)
- **Diversity and dialogue:** build diversity into the design (Tools your collaborative can use: Authentic Conversations (M. Scott Peck))

Source: *The Tactics of Trust*

Adam Kahane also describes a strategy for dealing with co-creating futures called ‘stretch collaboration’. He notes that communities are dealing with a need to tackle complex issues in a different way. Kahane draws on his experience across the globe bringing diverse groups together. His book contains stories about these experiences as well as personal reflections.

Stretch collaboration, according to Kahane, is about abandoning the illusion of control. If we are building trust and co-creating together, we must be present and engage with one another. This is also about embracing, not trying to manage, the complexity of the context in which we are working. Complexity means that situations adapt and change over time. In co-creating futures and in collective impact efforts, embracing these shifts allows leaders to leverage new opportunities that may emerge through working together.

As we bring people with different perspectives together, we also learn, as I did as Director of the Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction, that there are many versions of the truth. What we each believe is shaped by our own experiences and perspectives. Because there are multiple truths, Kahane argues, there may be multiple pathways to a solution. When collaborating in complexity, the act of co-creation is also not static and evolves over time.

*“When we collaborate, we exercise love and power alternatively. First we engage with others. As our engaging continues and intensifies, eventually it produces in them an uncomfortable feeling of fusing and capitulating: of having to subordinate or compromise what matters to them in order to maintain the engagement. This reaction or feeling of discomfort is a signal that they need to switch to asserting or pushing for what matters to them. But then, as their asserting continues and intensifies, eventually it produces in us an impulse to block or push back or resist. This reaction or feeling is a signal that we need to return to engaging. (In this simple example, I have given each party only one role, but in fact both parties can play both roles.*

Kahane. Collaborating with the Enemy. Page 62.

In co-creating the future of our cities, Kahane describes experimentation as the way forward. It is useful to have a plan but the plan must be held lightly so that leaders can be ready to embrace possibilities as they emerge. Leaders need to be alert and listen for possibilities rather than certainty. In *Collaborating with the Enemy*, Kahane provides insight into dealing with complex and changing times. To build trust in complexity requires that everyone feels comfortable and agrees to the ‘rules of the game’.

We cannot assume that everyone has the same level of comfort with change. That is why understanding and building trust is critical in co-creation and collective impact efforts. A high degree of trust will help navigate those times when we are not certain of the future and have to rely on the wisdom of others on the team.

“Unless both parties are willing to forgive and move toward repairing the trust, then it cannot be rebuilt. It can be feigned, of course, but not truly repaired. Trust is built as the result of a continuous, consistent pattern of acting with honesty and integrity toward one another. Broken trust does immediate and severe damage that is not always repairable except as the parties are willing to invest even more effort, even more time, and even more good will in re-establishing it. What I tend to see is that people and groups, because of the expectation of a professional relationship, once trust has been broken, will “put on a happy face” and feign trust of the other but, in fact, the trust is only “skin deep.” Such pseudo-trust is not really trust at all, of course. Honestly, I have seen few times in my career when trust has been repaired to the same deep, original level the parties experienced before the break. Sorry for such a discouraging analysis!”

Dr. Tom Klaus, Tom Klaus & Associates

## THE PATH FORWARD: FROM TURF TO TRUST TO CO-CREATION AND COLLECTIVE IMPACT

The path forward from turf to trust to co-creation and collective impact is daunting. Our cities and communities have set up so many barriers, both physical and emotional. Equally daunting are the challenges facing our cities and communities. These challenges are complex and solving them requires new ways of thinking, being and acting. We must tear down the walls of turf that we have created. We must move beyond simple collaboration to co-creation and collective impact.

Building trusting relationships is challenging, especially when we authentically engage with individuals who are different from us. There are ways to navigate through these challenges: Understanding the neuroscience of how the brain responds to trust, and employing techniques and strategies to build trust and relationship are two important steps. But we also need to recognize the challenge of working with ‘the other’. Their perspectives will be different and will enrich our thinking.

A colleague of mine and an outstanding business leader, Mark Chamberlain once said, “to create change, we first have to acknowledge that we are all part of the problem and only then, we can become part of the solution”. This requires both personal reflection but also the ability to be vulnerable in a safe space. If citizens can’t acknowledge how they are contributing to problems, our cities and communities will not be able to resolve complex problems. Instead, we will keep doing what we have always done and the problems will exacerbate.

Russ Gaskin, Co-Creative Consulting, shared the following 12 factors to consider when working collaboratively or working toward co-creation and collective impact. Gaskin writes, “We could also think of these as potential ‘forces’ that, depending on the answers to the questions below, are either forces against me having trust in the work or forces for me having trust in the work. If the forces for outweighs the forces against, then I’ll continue to support the work, and the greater that difference, the more actively my support of the work.”

The following factors and their associated questions are important pause points for building collaborative relationships. They are useful for leadership teams advancing collective impact efforts. How many of them can your team answer honestly?

1. **Intent:** Do we agree on what we are trying to make happen?
2. **Interests:** Do we share the same basic interests?
3. **Values:** Do we share the same values? Where our values appear to be in conflict, can we see how they are actually complementary and both necessary to success?
4. **Analysis:** Do our various analyses of what’s going on with this issue complement one another, or compete in fundamental ways? Are my views and experiences meaningfully reflected in that analysis?

5. **Need:** Why should we work together? What will that accomplish that I can't accomplish alone?
6. **Empathy:** Do we really understand the needs and experiences of those we're trying to help?
7. **Belonging:** Can I trust you? Will you look out for me and my needs and interests in this work together?
8. **Contribution:** Can I contribute meaningfully to this work?
9. **Capability:** Are we up to meeting this challenge?
10. **Plans:** How will we do this? Are the plans enough to make this happen? Will we use my and others' time effectively?
11. **Commitment:** Are we all truly committed to making this happen?
12. **Momentum:** Does what we're doing seem to be working? Are we attracting the other people and resources we need to be successful?

### A FINAL STORY ABOUT TRUST BUILDING FOR COLLECTIVE IMPACT:

*At the Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction, it took us time and attention to the principles of trust building to create a safe space where every voice was heard and respected. One pivotal moment occurred at a gathering of 250 community leaders. Our first speaker that morning was an individual with the lived experience of poverty. Her story preceded the mayor and other politicians. It was an impactful story that needed to be told. By putting her first on the agenda, everyone, including elected officials, heard her story. This story led to a policy change that we could never have anticipated. We had built trust, created the space and through this, had an impact on the future of children in our community and across the province.*

Co-creating the future and building collective impact efforts is a path that can only be walked 'at the speed of trust'. It takes time. It takes skills. It takes the creation of safe spaces. It needs to be rooted in our current reality. Perhaps most importantly, it takes our personal commitment.

Are you up for the challenge?

---

## A FEW PRACTICAL TOOLS FOR PRACTICING BUILDING TRUST

Below are links to practical tools used to build relationships, a key to building trust. These tools create clarity which is essential to building trust.

**Building Trust: Giving and Receiving Feedback.** CoCreative Consulting.

[http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/7c2b0e\\_edf9d9f46d4c4af09d6d124a95ee205f.pdf](http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/7c2b0e_edf9d9f46d4c4af09d6d124a95ee205f.pdf)

**The Four Voices of Collaborative Innovation.** CoCreative Consulting.

[http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/7c2b0e\\_ecc7ed3627ad4f41838bda5347c51945.pdf](http://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/7c2b0e_ecc7ed3627ad4f41838bda5347c51945.pdf)

**The Collaboration Spectrum.** Tamarack Institute.

<http://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/library/collaboration-spectrum-tool>

**Building a Journey Map.** Tamarack Institute.

<http://www.tamarackcommunity.ca/library/journey-map>

## CO-CREATING THIS PAPER – MY THANKS!

There were many people who contributed to this paper by sharing their perspectives and stories of building and repairing trust. Thanks are extended to: Kirsti Battista; Sylvia Cheuy; Erica Dyson, Russ Gaskin; Deb Halliday; Max Hardy; Tom Klaus; Elizabeth McIsaac; Jennifer Roynon; Karen Schwartz, Ido Shalem; Jennifer Splansky Juster, and Chris Thompson. All of you contributed to this paper by sharing your thoughts and perspectives. I am grateful.

## ABOUT LIZ WEAVER

Liz is passionate about the power and potential of communities getting to impact on complex issues. Liz is Tamarack's Vice President and Director of Operations. In this role she provides strategic direction to the organization and leads many of its key learning activities including collective impact capacity building services for the Ontario Trillium Foundation. Liz is one of Tamarack's highly regarded trainers and has developed and delivered curriculum on a variety of workshop topics including collaborative governance, leadership, collective impact, community innovation, influencing policy change and social media for impact and engagement.



Prior to this role, Liz led the Vibrant Communities Canada team and assisted place-based collaborative tables to develop their frameworks of change, supported and guided their projects and helped connect them to Vibrant Communities and other comprehensive community collaborations.

Liz was the Director for the Hamilton Roundtable on Poverty Reduction, which was recognized with the Canadian Urban Institute's David Crombie Leadership Award in 2009 and was a collective impact initiative. In her career, Liz has held leadership positions with YWCA Hamilton, Volunteer Hamilton and Volunteer Canada. In 2002, Liz completed a Masters of Management for National Voluntary Sector Leaders through McGill University. Liz was awarded a Queen's Jubilee Medal in 2002 for her leadership in the voluntary sector, was an Athena Award finalist and in 2004 was awarded the Women in the Workplace award from the City of Hamilton.

## SOURCES:

Appelo, Jurgen. **Managing for Happiness**. Wiley. 2016

Berry, Leonard. **How Service Companies Can Earn Customer Trust and Keep It**. Harvard Business Review. April 19, 2017. <https://hbr.org/2017/04/how-service-companies-can-earn-customer-trust-and-keep-it>

Covey, Stephen M.R. **The Speed of Trust**. Free Press. 2006.

Fabiano, Alice Lin. **To Reach Scale, You Need to Build Trust**. Stanford Social Innovation Review. February 20, 2013. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/to\\_reach\\_scale\\_you\\_need\\_to\\_build\\_trust1](https://ssir.org/articles/entry/to_reach_scale_you_need_to_build_trust1)

Feltman, Charles. **The Thin Book of Trust**. Thin Book Publishing Company. 2009  
Harwood, Richard. **Getting Real about Building Trust**. The Harwood Institute. February 2015.

Insight Coaching. **Does Diversity Power Performance or Kill It?** March 2015.  
<https://insightcoaching.com/diversity-power-performance-kill/>

Kahane, Adam. **Collaborating with the Enemy. How to Work with People You Don't Agree with or Like or Trust**. Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc. 2017.  
Tamarack Institute Webinar - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GloVzauh7AM>

Priestley, Cara. **At the Speed of Trust – Part 2**. Collective Impact Forum. December 15, 2014.

Sawyer, David and Ehrlichman, David. **The Tactics of Trust**. Stanford Social Innovation Review. Winter 2016. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the\\_tactics\\_of\\_trust](https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_tactics_of_trust)

Thompson, Chris. **Collaboration. A Handbook from the Fund for Our Economic Future.** October 2016.

Zak, Paul J. **The Neuroscience of Trust.** Harvard Business Review. January-February 2017.  
<https://hbr.org/2017/01/the-neuroscience-of-trust>

---