



White Paper: Bold Impact

A Social Impact Network Framework Beyond Collective Impact

The "I Love U Guys" Foundation

October 10, 2025

Semantic Version: 1.1

Calendar Version: 2025-10-10

Contributors:

Garrett Collier

Pat Hamilton

John-Michael Keyes

Large Language Models used:

GPT-4o , ChatGPT 5





Mission

To restore and protect the joy of youth through educational programs and positive actions in collaboration with families, schools, communities, organizations and government entities.

Vision

Enhance school and community safety and preparedness.

“
**Collective Impact invites.
BOLD Impact activates.**
”

Executive Summary

BOLD Impact is a novel model for catalyzing multidisciplinary collaboration, born from the need to improve safety, preparedness, and resilience in schools and communities. Unlike Collective Impact, which relies on voluntary alignment around a shared agenda and activities, BOLD Impact starts from what is already required. It introduces a new role, Integrator, a single organization that acts as the initial data aggregator in identifying pre-existing organizations, roles, mandates, and operational structures to reveal relational dependencies and activities.

Rather than extending Collective Impact, BOLD Impact presents a fundamentally different framework, grounded in common obligations and predefined relationships.

Introduction: The Challenge of Operational Realities

Collective Impact emphasizes five core conditions: common agenda, shared measurement, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication, and backbone support. This model is powerful where participation is voluntary and alignment must be cultivated from scratch.

BOLD Impact addresses domains like school safety and community crisis response, where participation is often not optional. Statutes, policies, and public expectations already compel collaboration. The challenge is not to create a shared agenda but to organize and clarify the common obligations and relationships that already exist.

From Collective to BOLD: Key Differences

Collective Impact asserts five conditions, or pillars, and is typically sequenced with the first pillar being “Common Agenda.” BOLD Impact re-sequences, reframes, and extends these conditions.

Collective Impact

Common Agenda

Co-created over time

Measurement

Shared indicators of progress

Mutually Reinforcing Activities

Developed collaboratively

Communication

Continuous dialogue to align organization activities

Backbone

Neutral entity created to coordinate

Bold Impact

Sole Integrator

A single coordinating entity that defines the roles and orgs that should be working together, predefines core activities, and manages the platform

Core Obligations

Common Obligations already defined in law, operational practice, or community expectations

Measurement

Evidence-based measurement, with additional focus on relationship quality, multi-realm system impact, with local, regional, and national operational visibility

Pre-defined Activities

Mandated or declared, role based actions

Communication

Continuous, with communication activities included as a metric

Realm of Realms Hierarchy

Existing operational agencies that are already funded, populated, and often mandated

Operationalizing BOLD Impact

BOLD Impact begins with the recognition that many actors are already participating in community activity, crisis planning, or emergency response due to legal or policy requirements. These actors include districts, agencies, emergency management, tribal entities, commercial organizations, local and state government, and relevant nonprofits. BOLD Impact doesn't form these networks, it reveals them.

Key components include:

- **Realm and Role Mapping:** Organizing data from federal, state, local, and tribal systems to identify jurisdictions and actors with relevant responsibilities.
- **Hierarchy of Realms:** Emphasizing that multiple operational organizations, agencies, counties, states, regions, can serve as coordinated, simultaneous realms. Where a Collective Impact Backbone is often a separate organization, independently funded, BOLD Impact Realms are predefined, already-funded, already-mandated entities that reflect nested or overlapping responsibilities. Where a backbone might provide managerial or technical support, a realm fosters collaborative incentives revealing where technical support may already exist. A side effect allows for national or sector-wide trend visibility.

Theory of Change

BOLD Impact operates from the premise that collaboration is often not voluntary but mandated by law, policy, or institutional necessity. Its Theory of Change reflects this operational reality and emphasizes structured activation over consensus-building.

Inputs

- Statutory obligations and public expectations
- Mandated roles across schools, law enforcement, emergency management, public health, and other sectors
- Existing programs and frameworks (e.g., SRP, SRM)
- Platform infrastructure and data systems
- Funded and staffed operational agencies

Activities

- Role and realm mapping to identify who is already obligated to act
- Standardization and coordination of cross-sector activities
- Development and distribution of implementation tools (e.g., drills, plans, alerts)
- Integrator-led data management, measurement, and trust-building efforts
- Communication protocols as operational requirements, not just support functions

Outputs

- Clearly defined and visualized roles and relationships
- Predefined cross-sector coordination protocols
- Federated realm infrastructure enabling regional and national visibility
- Evidence of compliance with shared obligations
- Operational trust among sectors

Outcomes

- More consistent execution of crisis plans and collaborative activities
- Increased transparency and accountability across sectors
- Strengthened trust among community stakeholders
- Improved ability to monitor, measure, and improve performance at scale

Impact

- Safer, more resilient communities
- Scalable implementation across multiple sectors including public safety, public health, education, and infrastructure
- Reduced fragmentation of response and planning efforts
- Elevated capacity for data-driven, high-trust collaboration in environments where performance is non-negotiable

Logic Model

Element	Description
Inputs	• Statutory mandates and legal obligations • Common practices • Existing agency infrastructure and personnel • Trusted programs (e.g., SRP, SRM) • Digital platforms and data systems
Activities	• Realm and role mapping across jurisdictions • Development of predefined coordination protocols • Implementation of drills, training, and alert systems • Integrator-led data management and trust-building strategies
Outputs	• Clearly defined interagency roles and responsibilities • Operationalized coordination plans • Federated realm structures • Real-time visibility into participation and performance
Short-Term Outcomes	• Improved fidelity and consistency of collaborative actions • Measurable interagency trust and engagement • Enhanced regional and national situational awareness
Long-Term Impact	• Safer, more resilient communities • Scalable, replicable model across sectors • Increased institutional trust • Improved effectiveness and efficiency of public systems

Integrator as the First Pillar

A distinct coordinating entity serves as the Integrator, the foundational pillar of the BOLD model.

This entity:

- Identifies and defines the roles and organizations that must collaborate based on operational mandates, legal requirements, and community responsibilities;
- Predefines core activities necessary for cross-sector engagement (e.g., plan development, drills, alerts, reunification, reporting);
- Manages the data, platform, and relationship infrastructure needed for real-time visibility, alignment, and measurement;
- Ensures fidelity to the model while allowing for local and contextual adaptation;
- Acts as a visible, accountable steward of trust across operational realms.

The Integrator is not a neutral convener, it is an operational leader, already funded, already empowered, and already embedded in the system. This shifts the paradigm from invitation to activation, anchoring collaboration in authority and action. The Integrator defines which organizations must work together, predefines core activities, and manages the data and platform supporting the BOLD network. These shepherds provide alignment, activation, and clarity across operational realms.

- Infrastructure-First Philosophy: Prioritizing platforms that foster coordination, visibility, and engagement over consensus-based policy development.

Beyond Collective Impact's Organizational Model

Traditional Collective Impact efforts often model networks as a single backbone coordinating a loose network of participating organizations. While effective for consensus-building in mission-driven spaces, this model is less effective in representing the complexity of mandated operational systems.

BOLD Impact introduces a hierarchical and federated realm structure: school districts, counties, regional agencies, state, and federal entities are all simultaneously realms. Already funded. Already populated. Already operational. And already interacting, often by compulsion or mandate. This shift in data modeling changes everything. Instead of viewing collaboration as emergent, BOLD sees it as already partially formed. Simply awaiting coordination of actions, structure, visualization, and optimization.

Relationship Modeling and Rapid Discovery

This structural shift also enables advanced relationship modeling, including nested jurisdictions, intersecting roles, and role-based compulsion. BOLD's data architecture is designed to accommodate these nuances and enhance measurement. With multiple backbones participating, trends at regional, state, and national levels can surface and be measured in ways that Collective Impact models cannot, offering a powerful diagnostic and accountability tool for systemic change.

Public Safety: A Vital Relationship Across All Sectors

In every sector where BOLD can be applied, from public health to child welfare to critical infrastructure, law enforcement is a required, and often legally compelled, participant. Whether through emergency response, incident command, mandated reporting, or mutual aid, public safety agencies intersect with nearly every collaborative framework.

The challenge is that these intersections often carry trust deficits or cultural divides. BOLD Impact doesn't merely include law enforcement, it creates operational trust bridges through clear roles, mandates, and accountability. There are sectors where crisis response planning and associated programs, already demonstrate that trust-building is possible when collaboration is structured around shared obligation rather than voluntary alignment. This shared obligation transcends cultural divides.

Trust Through Visibility, Not Just Communication

In environments shaped by legal obligations and operational mandates, trust is accelerated through transparency: clearly defined roles, visible participation, and shared history of collaboration. BOLD Impact assumes that clarity creates trust more quickly than prolonged dialogue. The Integrator identifies programs and activities that deliver this outcome.

Potential Sectors for BOLD Impact Application

While initially developed for the school safety arena, the BOLD model holds potential across a wide range of sectors where collaboration is mandated by law, policy, or operational necessity. While its roots are in school safety, its structure and principles are transferable to other critical domains. Examples include:

- **School and Community Safety and Crisis Response:** Schools, districts, counties, regions, and states all have obligated or mandated roles and responsibilities.
- **Public Health Preparedness:** Agencies already mandated to coordinate during pandemics, natural disasters, and biohazard responses.
- **Transportation Safety and Emergency Management:** Interagency obligations between DOTs, public transit authorities, and emergency responders.
- **Disaster Recovery and Resilience:** FEMA coordination with state, tribal, and local governments, often following federally defined recovery frameworks.
- **Child Welfare and Protective Services:** Legally mandated interactions between schools, law enforcement, healthcare providers, and family services.
- **Critical Infrastructure Protection:** Public-private partnerships structured around DHS guidance for energy, water, telecommunications, and cybersecurity.

These domains share the same BOLD foundation: obligations exist, relationships are often predefined, and performance is not optional. Each represents a fertile ground for scaling the BOLD model.

Tradeoffs or Limitations

While BOLD Impact offers a powerful framework for mandated collaboration, it is essential to acknowledge its limitations and potential risks to guide responsible implementation and manage stakeholder expectations.

Where Could BOLD Fail?

- **Misapplication in Voluntary Contexts:** BOLD is designed for sectors where participation is compelled by law or policy. Applying it in purely voluntary or loosely coordinated environments may result in frustration, rigidity, or failure to achieve alignment.
- **Authoritarian Misuse:** Because BOLD centralizes coordination under an Integrator, misuse by a dominant or politically motivated actor could lead to exclusion, bias, or overreach-particularly if transparency and accountability safeguards are absent.
- **Local Context Blind Spots:** If the Integrator imposes one-size-fits-all protocols without adapting to local realities, cultural norms, or resource constraints, the model may fail to gain trust or produce effective outcomes.

Potential Integrator Misunderstandings

- **Misinterpreting BOLD as a traditional “collective” model** may lead to a lack of structure or failure to activate required stakeholders.
- **Treating the Integrator as a neutral convener** instead of an operational leader may weaken authority and execution fidelity.
- **Focusing solely on technology platforms** without investing in human relationships and training can reduce engagement and long-term effectiveness.

Implementation Considerations

- Safeguards should include visible, data-driven performance tracking; third-party auditing; and feedback loops to ensure adaptation to local needs.
- Preparation should emphasize onboarding for Integrators that includes legal literacy, systems thinking, and trust-building practices.
- Messaging must distinguish BOLD from consensus-based models while highlighting its strengths in operational clarity and mandatory collaboration.

By articulating these limitations, stakeholders can deploy BOLD with greater intentionality, avoid common pitfalls, and preserve the trust and integrity essential to high-stakes systems.

Implications for Policy and Funding

- Policy: States and agencies can adopt BOLD-aligned frameworks by building on existing mandates, reducing the time and effort to align stakeholders.
- Funding: Preparedness and resilience funding can support the data infrastructure and digital platforms necessary to operationalize BOLD Impact.

Conclusion

BOLD Impact is not a refinement of Collective Impact. It is a distinct model built for domains where participation is not optional and collaboration is already required. Rather than inviting organizations to the table, BOLD Impact begins with identifying the table, the chairs, and the names on each one. It transforms latent collaboration into visible, trackable, and optimized engagement—an evolution for sectors where time, trust, and safety are paramount.



Case Study: School Safety Planning as an Accelerant

The "I Love U Guys" Foundation as Integrator of a BOLD Impact Initiative

The "I Love U Guys" Foundation

October 10, 2025

Semantic Version: 1.1

Calendar Version: 2025-08-23

Contributors:

Garrett Collier

Pat Hamilton

John-Michael Keyes

Large Language Models used:

GPT-4o , ChatGPT 5



Case Study: School Safety Planning as an Accelerant

The “I Love U Guys” Foundation is uniquely positioned to act as the Integrator in a BOLD Impact initiative. The Standard Response Protocol (SRP) and Standard Reunification Method (SRM) are adopted by over 60,000 schools, districts, departments and agencies. These programs are mandated or recommended by policy or practice in multiple states.

These programs:

- Define clear responsibilities for each participating organization
- Require and standardize multidisciplinary collaboration
- Are grounded in statute or formal policy
- Foster community trust between agencies and schools

These nationally adopted programs function not just as procedural frameworks but as trusted interfaces for multi-agency engagement. In communities where law enforcement faces trust deficits, implementation of SRP and SRM has provided a neutral, school-centered approach that brings agencies to the table under a shared mission-protecting youth. This operational success exemplifies how BOLD Impact leverages existing programs to reveal and reinforce trust, creating meaningful alignment in environments that demand both accountability and compassion.

Leveraging the Footprint

The “I Love U Guys” Foundation has been working in this space for over 15 years and is a trusted player with a proven track record. Relationships at Federal, Tribal, State, County and Local levels exist that could accelerate discovery and adoption of the platform.

Program Adopters

Program Adopters are large umbrella organizations, either state agencies or insurance pools, having formalized Memorandums of Understanding that include customized programs, curriculum, and ongoing training engagements in the programs. These include Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Virginia.

State Practitioners

State Practitioners are agencies that provide ongoing training and recommend consideration or implementation of the programs. These include Arkansas, Delaware, Indiana, Minnesota, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Commercial Partners

Seeding the commercial side would be accelerated by leveraging the relationships the Foundation currently has with licensees and other private sector organizations.

Training

Additionally, the Foundation conducts 300 to 400 direct training engagements a year to audiences comprised of school and district administrators (59%), law enforcement (19%), and emergency management professionals (17%).

The combination of relationships and direct training offer an opportunity for rapid introduction of the BOLD Impact concept and platform to the very specific stakeholders that would find the platform useful.

This makes school safety and crisis response an ideal proving ground for BOLD Impact’s methodology-and underscores why the “I Love U Guys” Foundation is uniquely suited to lead its implementation.

Implementation Ecosystem

Research Partner The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV), University of Colorado, Boulder. CSPV leads the way in studying and identifying what works to prevent violence, as well as championing the use of evidence-based programs, practices and policies with the highest scientific standards.

Platform Partner: Metaimpact equips leaders with the intelligence infrastructure to align strategy, accelerate collaboration, and measure impact, across every stakeholder, department, and partner ecosystem.

Integrated Realms

Essential to BOLD Impact are related realms. Realms contain one or more organizations related at certain levels. Included for context are some representative data sets. Record counts indicate number of entities. Data sets often include multiple records per entity.

Sample Map

National Realm

- Federal agencies
- National NGOs
- Corporations operating across state lines

State Realm

- State governments
- State-level agencies
- Statewide organizations

County Realm

- County governments
- County-level agencies
- Regional planning
- Commissioners
- School districts

Local Realm

- Municipalities (cities, towns, villages)
- Schools
- Community organizations
- Hospitals
- Higher Education
- Headstart

Initial Data Sets	Source	Records
Public K12 Schools	DOE / NCES	102,274
Public K12 Districts	DOE / NCES	19,637
Private Schools	DOE / NCES	22,889
Higher Education	DOE / NCES	6,731
Law Enforcement	DOJ	23,486
Fire and EMS	HIFLD	26,477
Headstarts	Headstart	21,637
Emergency Operations Centers	HIFLD	5,895
Public Health	HIFLD	3,699
Hospitals	HIFLD	7,581
State Safety Centers	Internally sourced	51
State DOE	Internally sourced	51
Total Records		240,408

Comparatives

1. Collective Impact (Most Comparable but Fundamentally Different)

Similarity: A cross-sector collaboration framework with “common agenda, shared measurement, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication, and a backbone organization.”

Difference: Collective Impact is voluntary and consensus-driven. It doesn’t start from mandated obligations or statutory roles. BOLD Impact’s innovation is to start with what’s already required and activate predefined activities through an Integrator.

Nothing in Collective Impact directly maps to BOLD’s Integrator or realm-of-realms stack.

2. Incident Command System & National Incident Management System

Similarity: Defines roles, responsibilities, and reporting structures across agencies for emergencies. Predefined activities (command, operations, logistics, etc.) are mandated by federal/state statute.

Difference: ICS/NIMS is incident-based and primarily about response. It does not function as an ongoing social impact/relationship platform measuring trust and collaboration outside of incidents.

BOLD Impact borrows the clarity of ICS but applies it before, during, and after crises, with metrics for relationship quality and program fidelity.

3. Public Health Preparedness Coalitions

Similarity: Bring together hospitals, EMS, public health, and emergency management with funded requirements and predefined deliverables (exercises, reporting).

Difference: They are sector-specific (healthcare/emergency care). BOLD Impact proposes a multi-realm, multi-sector system (education, law enforcement, public safety, etc.), not just one domain.

4. State School Safety Centers / Offices

Similarity: Some state-level school safety offices (Colorado, Texas, Florida) already coordinate mandated trainings, drills, and protocols across districts.

Difference: They usually act within one state system, and do not create a federated, data-driven, multi-realm structure that connects county, state, and national organizations.

They could be natural Integrators in BOLD’s model.

5. Data & Measurement Platforms

Similarity: Provide shared data dashboards, cross-organization collaboration, and impact measurement.

Difference: Typically voluntary participation; dashboards are “opt-in.” They don’t activate statutory obligations or predefined activities across roles.

Bottom Line

There are adjacent systems (Collective Impact, ICS/NIMS, health preparedness coalitions, state school safety centers, StriveTogether-type networks). But nothing combines:

- Mandatory realm/role relationships
- Predefined activities derived from statute, policy, or protocol
- An Integrator with accountability for mapping, activating, and measuring
- Federated data visibility across district–county–state–national scales

That unique combination is what makes BOLD Impact not just “like Collective Impact with teeth,” but something that doesn’t currently exist.

Dimension	BOLD Impact	Collective Impact	ICS / NIMS	Preparedness Coalitions	State School Safety Offices
Participation Basis	Mandated + Required (laws, policies, protocols)	Voluntary, consensus-driven	Required (for emergency response funding)	Required for grant compliance	Required in some states by statute
Integrator / Backbone	Integrator (accountable org, operational leader, defines realms/roles)	Backbone org (neutral convener, facilitator)	Incident Commander (per incident)	Lead Agency (varies: health dept, hospital)	State Office (school safety)
Scope of Activity	Multi-realm, multi-sector (education, LE, EMS, PH, gov, NGOs, vendors)	Any social issue (equity, health, poverty)	Incident-focused (command, response, recovery)	Health sector (hospital surge, epidemiology)	Education + school safety (state scope)
Activities	Predefined + role-based (drills, reunification, notification, reporting, AARs)	Mutually reinforcing activities (co-designed)	Standardized ICS functions (Ops, Planning, Logistics, Finance)	Drills, exercises, reporting (health-specific)	Trainings, drills, policy compliance
Measurement	Fidelity + relationship quality + cross-realm visibility	Shared measures (self-reported, consensus)	Performance during incident, AARs	Grant compliance, healthcare metrics	Program adoption, compliance metrics
Time Horizon	Before, During, After crises (continuous readiness)	Continuous but voluntary	During incidents + recovery phase	Ongoing readiness (grant cycles)	Ongoing, but education-focused
Scale / Stack	District → County → State → National	Flexible; local → regional networks	Incident scene → jurisdiction → state/federal	County/region/state (healthcare networks)	State jurisdiction
Core Strength	Activation of existing obligations + trust building	Collaborative alignment & broad buy-in	Clear chain of command during crises	Healthcare surge + preparedness funding	Policy enforcement + program adoption
Core Limitation	Risk of authoritarian misuse (requires guardrails)	Slow, fragile, voluntary	Not a social impact framework; only response	Sector-specific; siloed	Limited to state + education sector