

ALIGNING ACROSS SECTORS: KEY CONSIDERATIONS FOR GOVERNANCE MEASUREMENT

September 2021



The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) recently partnered with the Georgia Health Policy Center (GHPC) and many other organizations from across the United States to find ways of improving alignment across health care, public health, and social services. The ultimate goal is to improve community well-being and reduce health disparities, especially racial health disparities.

At the core of this effort is the Framework for Aligning Sectors, which suggests that collaboration efforts will be more effective if they focus on lasting alignment in the four core areas of shared purpose, governance, data, and finance.¹ This brief takes a deep dive into governance

specifically. The ultimate objective is to provide a foundation for the conceptualization and measurement of governance for practitioners and researchers involved in, or interested in, aligning across sectors.

This brief builds on the existing literature in two ways. First, this brief reviews peer-reviewed research on governance in organizations in order to highlight fundamental governance dynamics and their implications. Second, this brief builds on an earlier scoping review of health-oriented cross-sector collaboratives to identify the ways that governance is normatively discussed in this context. The discussion weaves these two reviews together by drawing out key governance concepts that could be measured to support individual aligning efforts or to help researchers and practitioners identify best practices across aligning contexts.

METHODS

The first part of this brief is based on a scan of peer-reviewed research on organizational governance using ProQuest and Google Scholar. This scan was directed toward governance definitions, foundational governance theories, governance in nonprofit organizations, and governance in collaboratives. Additional sources were identified using references in publications identified in the initial literature scans. For the definitional search, we included a Google Scholar search to identify public sector white papers with definitions for the term governance” and reviewed the Merriam-Webster definition to ensure completeness.

The second part of this brief is based on an earlier scoping review of research on health-oriented cross-sector collaboration.² That scoping review brought together 179 papers on health collaboratives and identified 61 containing key considerations for governance in health collaboratives. This paper draws out the key considerations for governance and describes their relevance for assessing governance.

404.413.0314

ghpc.gsu.edu

ghpc@gsu.edu

 Georgia
Health Policy
Center

Support
provided by

Robert Wood Johnson
Foundation



The findings below are organized into five sections: governance definitions, foundational perspectives on organizational governance, governance in nonprofits, collaborative governance, and governance in research on health-oriented cross-sector collaboratives specifically.

FINDINGS

Governance Definitions

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines *governance* as “the act or process of governing or overseeing the control and direction of something (such as a country or an organization).”³ This definition emphasizes the processes of control. The Institute of Governance also emphasizes processes by defining governance as “a process whereby societies or organizations make their important decisions, determine whom they involve in the process and how they render account.” In an Institute of Governance policy brief, Graham et al. suggest that governance can also be understood in terms of the structures that support governance processes.⁴ These structures can include rules, policies, procedures, and conventions that “define who gets power, how decisions are taken, and how accountability is rendered.”

According to these basic definitions, governance can be understood in terms of control processes or in terms of the structures that shape control processes in each context. The extent of this control can vary, but several processes (and related structures) are explicitly described as elements of governance. These include rule-making, decision-making (presumably this refers specifically to bigger decisions), defining who is involved, defining what powers they have, and establishing accountability processes.

In peer-reviewed research on organizations, Cornforth and Brown define governance as “the systems and processes concerned with ensuring the overall direction, control, and accountability of an organization.”⁵ This definition includes structure (systems) and process but also emphasizes accountability and the establishment of objectives, or “overall direction.”

Klein et al. focus on governance structures and processes and then identify key areas of control.⁶ These are defined as, “the formal and informal rules and procedures that control resource accumulation, development, and allocation; the distribution of the organization’s production; and the resolution of the conflicts of interest associated with group behavior.” This definition emphasizes resource accumulation and development and, like the definition from Cornforth and Brown, identifies areas of control, including “the distribution of the organization’s production.”

Daily et al. define governance as “the determination of [1] the broad uses to which organizational resources will be deployed and [2] the resolution of conflicts among the myriad participants in organizations.”⁷ The Daily et al. definition thereby defines governance as a process to address areas of control similar to the Klein et al. definition, specifically identifying resource allocation and conflict resolution. It is important to note here the underlying assumption that collaboration will entail conflict. Like the Klein et al. and Cornforth and Brown definitions, Daily et al. also emphasize the establishment of objectives or goals for the organization.

In summary, governance can be understood in terms of the structures, formal and informal, that lay the groundwork for governance processes or in terms of the processes themselves. Governance processes are also important to understand because they may be unstructured, only loosely linked to governance structures, or linked to governance structures that are informal or difficult to observe. Key governance areas of control identified in the peer-reviewed research on organizations include accountability for resource accumulation and allocation, conflict resolution, and the establishment of goals.

Key Concepts to Consider for Measurement

- Structures that shape control processes (rules, policies, procedures, conventions)
- Control processes
- Decision-making
- Who is involved?
- Who has power?
- How accountability is accomplished?

Key Concepts to Consider for Measurement

- Formal governance structures and processes
- Informal governance structures and processes
- Resource development
- Resource allocation
- Conflict resolution
- Overall goals and direction

Foundational Perspectives on Organizational Governance

The governance definitions above include important concepts to consider when measuring governance, but these concepts must be understood in the context of different types of organizations. Research on organizations offers several theoretical perspectives that, first, help distinguish types of organizations and, second, highlight the implications of these organizational types for governance. These perspectives are summarized by Daily et al. and by Cornforth, with the latter focusing on cooperative and mutually owned organizations.^{7, 8} Lenz and Andersson provide an overview of the relevance of these theories to the nonprofit sector.⁹ Here we briefly summarize this work and draw out its relevance for thinking about governance while aligning across sectors. The utility of this exercise is in identifying the governance dynamics that collaboratives are experiencing and in clarifying the implications of those dynamics. With this information, collaboratives are better positioned to shape or reshape themselves and, ultimately, optimize their operations.

Before describing these theories in brief, a note is required on managers, owners, and boards. A theme running throughout research on organizations, much of which focuses on the for-profit sector, is that the incentives and objectives of these stakeholders affect governance structure, implementation, and evolution:

- Managers are those in charge of day-to-day operations in both nonprofit and for-profit organizations, but the alignment between managers and the organizational mission may be closer in the nonprofit or collaborative setting than in for-profit business.
- Owners in a for-profit setting are those who can claim a right to a share of the gains from operations. In the nonprofit sector, no such rights exist. Nevertheless, there are often investors in nonprofits whose investments in the organization translate to ownership-like veto power,* so those who exercise control through investments in an organization might function like owners.¹⁰ Investors in this sense could be interpreted quite broadly to include donors, those providing operating capital through loans or in-kind donations, or volunteers. Alternative definitions of ownership may be used in some settings, for example in the case of definitions focused on the owners of the consequences of an organization, including the community served. For the purposes of the section below, we will consider owners to be those providing resources, even if they do not stand to benefit themselves from operations.
- For-profit boards, especially for publicly traded companies, have legally binding structures and required processes. In the context of a nonprofit organization, the board may be a formal group established by charter or may be represented by a more informal steering committee. In the discussion below we refer to the board, but these might be the leaders without a formal designation as board members.

Agency Theory

Agency Theory is the most used framework in the academic literature around governance and corporate boards.¹¹ Management is seen as an agent of corporate owners and is tasked with making day-to-day decisions for the organization, but managers may have incentives that are not wholly aligned with the incentives of corporate owners. Therefore, boards elected by owners must provide oversight of and exert control over management on behalf of owners. This perspective implies that boards and management must be independent, and management must be subordinate to the board. This theory underpins the regulation of governance in the private, for-profit sector such as under Sarbanes-Oxley,¹² the federal regulatory legislation passed in the wake of the Enron scandal. Boards engage in auditing and other forms of due diligence to put boundaries around management's ability to co-opt the organization toward their own ends. In the nonprofit sector, Lenz and Andersson describe an additional agency problem.⁹ Where boards are defined by investors or parties with objectives not fully aligned with those of the served community, the board may prioritize the investors' interests or institutional sustainability over community interest.

* Some nonprofits may generate operating revenues entirely internally and would accordingly have different operational dynamics. Partners within health collaboratives such as hospitals may have this structure.

Agency Theory

- If ...
 - The owners are to have a say in the collaborative or get what they want and ...
 - Managers' incentives are not fully aligned with the owners' objectives ...
- Then ...
 - The owners may want to employ a management-independent board to direct the managers.
- If ...
 - Nonprofit boards are defined by owners with objectives not fully aligned with those of the served community ...
- Then ...
 - Nonprofit boards may favor owner interests over the interests of the served community.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- Owner
 - Who are the owners? (Funders, community members, partnership leaders?)
 - What are the owners' incentives and interests?
 - Are the owners' needs and wishes to be prioritized?
- Management
 - Who are the managers?
 - What are the managers' incentives and interests?
 - Are their incentives consistent with the owners' needs and wishes?
 - Who are the collaboration managers? (Funders, community, partner leaders, etc.?)
- Board/owner agent
 - Who is on the board?
 - What are the board members' incentives and interests? (Investors' interests, institutional sustainability, community interests, etc.)
 - Whose interests does the board represent?
 - Are the board members' interests consistent with the owners' needs and wishes?
 - Are the board members' interests consistent with the needs and wishes of the targeted community?
 - Is the board independent of management?
 - Does the board have control over management? In what way?

Stewardship Theory

Stewardship Theory provides a perspective for thinking about management in which managers may be highly motivated by values and by strong identification with their organization. From this perspective, managers may view themselves as stewards of the organization's resources and capabilities. The interests of owners, board members, and managers may be largely aligned. Thus, this theory provides reasoning for structures in which managers are also board members, or "insiders," and the board members are selected because of subject matter expertise that is directly applied to organizational governance.¹³

Stewardship Theory

- If ...
 - Managers' incentives are (wholly or strongly) aligned with the needs and wishes of the owners ...
- Then ...
 - Organizations may benefit from having active managers on the board.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- To what degree does the board include managers?
- To what degree are managers' interests aligned with owners' interests?
- To what degree are managers acting in the interest of the owners?

Resource Dependence Theory

Resource Dependence Theory posits that institutional survival requires the acquisition of expensive or rare resources for the organization.¹⁴ From this perspective, board composition becomes a tool to expand institutional resources. The implication is that governance roles, and board seats, can be, and often are, allocated to those who can or do contribute financial or human capital in order to support the work of the organization.

Resource Dependence Theory

- If ...
 - A collaborative is to be sustained over time, and ...
 - If resources are scarce (e.g., financial and human capital), and ...
 - Board members can provide resources that are otherwise scarce ...
- Then ...
 - Board members may be leveraged to help provide these resources, and ...
 - Low-resource parties may be excluded from board membership.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- To what degree is the continuation of the collaborative desired?
- What resources are required for sustainability?
 - To what degree are the required resources (financial or human) scarce?
 - Are all resources required for success fully identified and valued?
- To what degree are board members helpful sources of financial and human capital?
- To what degree are board members providing financial and human capital?
- To what degree are low-resource parties excluded from the board, though they may bring value to the organization that is difficult to quantify?

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder Theory recognizes that organizations comprise many different types of stakeholders. In addition to an organization's economic investors, examples include internal stakeholders like volunteers and employees as well as external stakeholders like community beneficiaries and collaborators.¹⁰ Creation of a board from a multistakeholder perspective requires either assuming the board reflects the full range of stakeholder interests or incentivizing board responsiveness to those interests.

Stakeholder Theory

- If ...
 - The collaboration is to be responsive to stakeholders other than owners ...
- Then ...
 - Measures must be taken to ensure the board represents all stakeholders and their interests, or ...
 - Measures must be taken to ensure the board is incentivized to respond to all stakeholders and their interests.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- Who are the internal and external stakeholders, besides the owners?
- To what extent does the board represent the full range of internal and external stakeholders?
- To what extent is the board incentivized to respond to the full range of internal and external stakeholders?
- To what extent is the board responsive to the full range of internal and external stakeholders?

Institutional Theory

Institutional Theory emphasizes the tendency of institutions to operate largely in the interest of institutional survival.¹⁵ Especially in the nonprofit sector, where market dynamics are relatively weak, institutions come to rely on external legitimacy for support, funding, and, ultimately, survival. Furthermore, Gaa and Acar suggest that organizations apply and demonstrate formal types of governance as an effective proxy for demonstrations of effectiveness, and this results in heightened external legitimacy.¹⁶

Institutional Theory

- If ...
 - Institutions have an interest in institutional survival, and ...
 - External legitimacy is important for funding or survival ...
- Then ...
 - Effectiveness will have to be demonstrated directly or by proxy, and ...
 - Organizations may be able to establish formal governance structures as a means of increasing external legitimacy.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- To what extent is institutional survival prioritized relative to other interests?
- To what extent is external legitimacy important for funding or survival?
- To what extent is effectiveness being demonstrated directly or indirectly?
- To what extent is governance used to increase external legitimacy?

From this brief summary we can see that the perspective taken on governance can lead to wide variations in the expectations for board structure, process, and how these are accountable for resource accumulation and distribution, conflict resolution, and strategic direction.

Governance in Collaboratives

Collaborative governance largely reflects governance in individual organizations. However, collaboratives do have unique dynamics. This section addresses collaborative partners with market activities (or social enterprises), formal and informal collaborative governance, and finally collaborative governance over time.

Collaborative Partners with Market Activities

Social enterprises are nonprofit organizations that derive at least some of their operating revenue from market-based activities.¹⁷ As such, social enterprises are challenged by the need to balance their mission focus with the performance goals for their business enterprise.

Nonprofit hospitals are an example of such social enterprises, and nonprofit hospitals and health systems are often the lead organizations when communities pursue an aligning strategy. The governance processes and structures of such social enterprises, or of collaboratives involving such social enterprises, likely shape how collaboratives balance mission activities and market activities.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- What is the mission of the collaborative?
- To what degree is the collaborative led by people balancing the mission of the collaborative with their revenue-building activities?
- Is the collaborative's leadership appropriately balancing (market-based) revenue-building activities with mission activities?

Formal and Informal Collaborative Governance

Collaboratives, coalitions, or networks span multiple organizations that include nonprofits, social enterprises, and the for-profit or public sectors.[†] Stone et al. define collaboratives as “entities that link or share information, resources, activities, and capabilities to achieve jointly what could not be achieved separately.”¹⁸ Collaborations can come together around a single project or activity or can work together, over time developing an enduring organizational infrastructure.[‡] Guo and Acar (2005) identify two distinct types of coalitions: informal and formal.¹⁶ Leadership in an informal coalition can be ambiguous. Stone et al. (2010) suggest that the horizontal nature of many collaboratives implies that hierarchical structures of governance may not always be optimal or relevant.¹⁹

Bryson, Crosby, and Stone discuss the progression from informal to formal governance in collaboratives.²² They suggest that the creation of formal governance structures depends upon factors such as network size and the degrees of trust between partner organizations. Small, high-trust collaboratives may have less need of formal governance structures compared to larger collaboratives where high levels of trust are difficult to establish between all partners. In a review of the literature a decade later, Bryson et al. elaborate by suggesting that several internal factors (network size, the nature of tasks, trust between members) and external factors (governmental policies, lead agency size, pre-existing relationships) all influence the extent to which formal governance structures are desirable and are established.²³

Provan and Kenis provide an informal-formal classification system specific to networked governance structures in collaboratives:

1. Coalitions may be informal organizations, lacking a corporate charter and formal governance structure. Members perform many of the decision-making and monitoring functions with little direction.
2. A lead organization will coordinate the network and lead the governance activities.
3. The network or coalition creates a separate organizational form with a formal governance structure and an administrative organization.²⁴

Considering such a classification system, and the progression from informal to more formalized governance structures it describes, may help organizations shed light on previously unobserved informal governance dynamics and help highlight the pitfalls and benefits of formalized governance systems.

[†] It is important to distinguish analyses of the governance structures and processes in multisector collaboratives from analyses of “collaborative governance” as a consensus-building approach to complex societal problems. Ansell and Gash provide an overview of the literature around the latter, which can be used to inform and guide public-sector work through consensus building with private and public stakeholders.¹⁹ Here however, we are focusing on the former: how cross-sector coalitions operationalize their governance structures and processes.

[‡] While some of the literature around collaboratives includes discussion of mergers, in this framework we are assuming that participating organizations retain legal autonomous structures.²⁰

Key Considerations for Measurement

- To what extent is collaborative governance informal or formal?
 - To what extent is there a dedicated and formal leadership structure?
 - To what extent is there a dedicated and formal administrative structure?
 - To what extent is there formal documentation describing governance structures and processes, such as a charter or organizational chart?
 - To what extent is decision-making guided by formal procedures?
 - To what extent are monitoring processes guided by formal procedures?
- To what extent is the level of informality/formality appropriate for the collaborative's size and tasks?
- To what extent is the level of informality/formality appropriate for the level of trust across the collaborative?
- To what extent is the level of informality/formality appropriate for responding to governmental policies?
- How appropriate is the degree to which pre-existing relationships are driving collaborative activities?

Collaborative Governance Over Time — Longevity, Adaptability, Stability, and Evolution

At the core of collaboration is the idea that a single organization cannot achieve a given objective as well as would be possible when combining capacities across organizations or systems. Therefore, collaboratives are likely to be composed of organizations whose primary missions differ. This plurality of objectives exerts a divisive pressure on collaboratives, creating barriers to sustainability. As aligning efforts increasingly focus on addressing persistent health and social problems that call for sustained collaboration, the dynamics of longevity, adaptability, stability, and evolution in the context of collaboration have been increasingly recognized as important. This section is intended to shed light on those dynamics.

Lober²⁵ and Takashi and Smutny²⁶ apply the policy window perspective to the formation of collaboratives. They suggest that coalition formation is time-dependent, occurring at the confluence of a problem, policy solutions, political forces, and organizational readiness for collaboration. When entrepreneurial leaders identify the “collaborative window” opening, a coalition may form.

The collaborative window model implies that coalitions are likely to be short-lived, lasting only as long as the collaboration window. However, Cornforth et al. suggest that the temporal nature of collaborative windows only implies the need for adaptability and resilience in collaborative governance.²⁰ Moreover, informal governance during formation implies a degree of adaptability. The creation of governance structures in the form of an independent administration has the potential to constrain adaptability in favor of stability, thereby threatening collaborative sustainability in an environment characterized by the need for adaptability. Taken together, such research suggests that neither informal nor formal collaborative governance systems are guaranteed to promote sustainability, but dynamic adaptable governance systems are likely to be helpful if collaboratives are to last.

Stone et al. and Bryson et al. identify several tensions likely to emerge as the environment and the collaborative itself change:

- Tensions between the pursuit of inclusiveness and the time and resource required for inclusiveness;
- Tensions from the need to balance internal and external legitimacy;
- Tensions from implementing representative decision-making processes when membership is ambiguous or evolving;
- Tensions between participants with different amounts of power;
- Tensions between coalition versus member organizational goals; and
- Tensions from balancing the pursuit of unity and the pursuit of diversity.^{13, 23}

The potential for tensions in each of these areas underscores the need for dynamic collaborative governance.

Whether formally or informally, all collaboratives must address the tensions inherent in collective action to address broad societal goals. Diverse stakeholders will have diverse goals, different perspectives on priorities and resource allocation, and differing perspectives on the urgency of the joint work. As aligned communities describe their respective approaches to such tensions, patterns will likely emerge to further our understanding of what works for whom and in what context.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- To what extent was the collaborative's formation and sustainability affected by —
 - The problem?
 - Relevant policy?
 - Political forces?
 - Readiness of the partnering organizations?
- To what extent is the collaborative prepared to adapt to —
 - Policy changes?
 - Changes in political forces?
 - Changes in the readiness of partnering organizations?
- How is the collaborative's balance between adaptability and stability/inertia affecting —
 - Effectiveness?
 - Sustainability?
- How effective is the collaborative's balance between —
 - Inclusiveness and time/resource constraints?
 - Building internal and external legitimacy?
 - Representation and evolving membership?
 - Different organizational goals?
 - Unity and diversity?

GOVERNANCE IN HEALTH-ORIENTED CROSS-SECTOR COLLABORATIVES

The information above is intended to help illuminate established and potentially helpful perspectives on organizational governance, especially in the nonprofit sector and within collaboratives. This section turns to research specifically on governance in the context of health-oriented cross-sector collaboratives. In an earlier study, GHPC conducted a scoping review of research on health-oriented cross-sector collaboration and identified factors described as important for governance in that literature.² This section draws on that work and identifies key considerations for assessing governance specifically in health collaboratives based on the important factors identified previously. The considerations identified here could be measured to the benefit of collaboratives and for the purpose of building and testing theory that is helpful across health collaborative contexts.[◊]

While the literature gives good reasons to consider these factors strategically, it is largely based on single-case evaluations. In different contexts, the same strategies might have different implications. Accordingly, these factors should be understood not necessarily as imperatives in themselves but as important items to consider while developing collaborative governance. Also, there may be important factors that were not identified prominently in this literature, and this should be kept in mind. However, these key considerations do reflect findings from a wide range of research born of theory-building, practice, and sometimes community expertise itself in the field of health collaboration.

[◊] For specific governance measures provided in research on health-oriented cross-sector collaboratives, please see the appendix.

Institution Building

Key considerations for health collaboratives are sorted into those regarding institution building and those regarding specific roles, including leadership roles. Considerations for institution building are split into four sections: planning, openness, human capital development, and timing.

Planning

In terms of planning for governance in health collaboratives, the earlier scoping review by GHPC identified strategy as a key consideration. Key factors here include scope definition; the specification of a model for action; whether the focus of the collaborative is narrow enough to yield short-term wins and sufficiently ambitious; whether structures, systems, and root causes are being addressed; and whether the targeted outcomes will have a visible impact on the community and help build legitimacy. Situational assessment was also highlighted as an important part of the planning process, and several papers in the GHPC review suggested assessing existing local systems and building learnings from such assessments into the collaborative's operations.

Balancing formal and quasi-formal agreements was also identified as an important element of planning. Contracts may be used depending on how they facilitate collaboration, the resources used to establish them, and whether they help build internal legitimacy or alienate partners not included in bilateral agreements. With or without contracts, several papers suggested using agreements to help define expectations, align incentives, and coordinate services.

Several papers also identified the structuring of work as an important part of planning. In large part, this literature considered the establishment of structure as being important for promoting the sustainability and efficacy of a collaborative. Structures discussed prominently included the establishment of work groups and task forces, the definition of standard procedures, and the elimination of barriers to data and information.

Openness

Many of the papers in the GHPC scoping review discussed openness, transparency, and inclusiveness. Transparency in agendas, budgets, and roles was specifically identified as an important consideration. Group problem-solving, decision-making, and consensus building were also discussed in several papers, as were benefits potentially flowing from the distribution of leadership across partners and participants.

Human Capital Development

Key human capital development considerations include relationship building and human capacity building. For relationship building, presence was repeatedly discussed. Regular meetings were often recommended, and the importance of user-friendly websites was highlighted. For the development of human capacity, considerations included training for staff and community participants, implementing professionalized leadership, and establishing administrative functions for the collaborative itself.

Timing

The GHPC review highlighted the importance of balancing time and other resource limitations against the imperative of building robust governance structures and processes. Besides this balancing act, time was also discussed in terms of continuous improvement processes and formal change-management processes.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- Planning
 - Strategy
 - To what extent is scope defined?
 - To what extent is an action model defined?
 - How narrow is the focus?
 - To what extent is there a focus on structures, systems, and root causes?
 - To what extent is there a focus on outcomes that have a visible impact on the community?

- Situational assessment
 - How well understood are local systems already in place?
 - How is the collaborative adapting to systems already in place?
- Formal and quasi-formal agreements
 - How are contracts being used or avoided?
 - To what extent are expectations defined?
 - To what extent are incentives aligned?
 - To what extent are services coordinated?
- Structured work
 - To what extent are work groups and task forces established?
 - To what extent are standard procedures defined?
 - To what extent have barriers to data and information been removed?
- Openness
 - How transparent are agendas?
 - How transparent is the budget?
 - How transparent are role definitions?
 - To what degree is leadership distributed across partners?
 - To what degree are problems solved as a group?
 - To what degree do the partners work from consensus?
- Human capital development
 - To what degree are existing relationships being leveraged?
 - To what degree are relationships being built?
 - To what degree have regular meetings been established?
 - How user-friendly is the website?
 - To what degree is the human capacity of participants being developed?
 - To what degree is leadership professionalized?
 - To what degree are dedicated administrative functions established?
- Time management
 - How are time constraints balanced with operational ambitions?
 - To what degree are continuous improvement processes established?
 - To what degree are change-management processes formalized?

Roles

In the GHPC review of key governance considerations, roles were organized by seven types: collaborators or partners; leadership committee members; funders; conveners, backbones, and catalyst organizations; implementers and data managers; community members and representatives; and individual leaders. For each role, the GHPC scoping review identified different governance considerations.

Key governance considerations for collaborator or partner organizations concerned whether leadership is being built within individual organizations, whether partners are receiving training on collaboration, whether experimentation is being encouraged, and whether partnership values are being fostered.

For leadership committees and boards, key considerations were whether these groups are effectively connecting partners, defining strategy, guiding work groups, and enforcing accountability measures.

Key considerations for funders concerned whether funding is being used to create the desired incentive structures and, in the case of external funders, whether initiatives are being synchronized across grantees.

Key considerations identified for conveners typically concerned their role as facilitators. Specifically, this included facilitating interaction, maintaining momentum, helping create a shared vision, helping develop a strategy, helping promote transparency, helping engage the target community, facilitating information and resource sharing, and helping develop human capacities and management skills.

The role of governance in relation to front-line implementers, care coordinators, and data managers was also discussed, especially in terms of avoiding overwork, providing training, and establishing strong incentives for collaboration to take advantage of colocation where possible. Front-line implementers may also inform, or participate in, governance themselves.

Community members and their representatives are widely understood to be important participants, and potentially leaders, in health collaboratives. The GHPC scoping review identified several key governance considerations regarding community members, including whether they are driving the collaborative's priorities, whether they are contributing to program design, what their role is during implementation, and how they are contributing to evaluations and continuous learning.

The role of the individual leader was discussed more than any other in research on health collaboratives. Key considerations for individual leaders included whether they are helping create a sense of shared purpose, whether they are promoting a big-picture focus, whether they are creating a climate of problem-solving, whether they are helping find resources and strategic partners, what their role is in change management, and how they balance directive versus facilitative leadership.

Key Considerations for Measurement

- Collaborator or partner organizations
 - To what extent is leadership being built within individual organizations?
 - To what extent are partners engaging in collaboration training?
 - To what extent are partners being encouraged to experiment?
 - To what extent are partnership values being fostered?
- Leadership committees and boards
 - To what extent is the board helping connect partners?
 - To what extent is the board setting a strategy?
 - To what extent is the board guiding group work?
 - To what extent is the board enforcing accountability measures?
- Funders
 - How are funders using investments to drive incentive structures?
 - To what degree are funders synchronizing efforts across their grantees?

- Conveners
 - To what extent are conveners facilitating interaction?
 - To what extent are conveners helping provide momentum?
 - To what extent are conveners helping create a shared vision?
 - To what extent are conveners helping develop a strategy?
 - To what extent are conveners promoting transparency?
 - To what extent are conveners helping engagement with the target community?
 - To what extent are conveners facilitating information and resource sharing?
 - To what extent are conveners facilitating the development of human capacities and management skills?
- Implementers, care coordinators, and data managers
 - How prevalent is overwork?
 - How sufficient is staff training?
 - How sufficient are incentives for collaboration?
- Community members and representatives
 - To what extent do community members define the priorities?
 - To what extent do community members contribute to program design?
 - To what extent are community members contributing to implementation?
 - To what extent do community members contributing to evaluation?
- Individual leaders
 - To what extent are leaders creating a sense of shared purpose?
 - To what extent are leaders promoting a big-picture focus?
 - To what extent are leaders creating a climate of problem-solving?
 - To what extent are leaders finding resources?
 - To what extent are leaders bringing in strategic partners?
 - To what extent do leaders implement or participate in change management, including themselves?
 - With what effect are leaders engaging in directive leadership or facilitative leadership?

DISCUSSION

Our review of the broad governance literature provides a grounded lens for viewing the narrower cross-sector collaboration literature. Early and ongoing decisions about structures, processes, and leadership are expected to have a significant impact on an aligning effort's institutions and participants and, ultimately, its impact and longevity.

This review identifies a series of factors to consider, and questions to ask, when establishing or assessing governance structures and processes. Several theories about governance were also outlined along with possible implications for different governance decisions. These theories can be used to guide expectations about the impact of different decisions made in regard to governance. These theories also speak specifically to challenges collaboratives often face, and sometimes succumb to, regarding changes over time and the need for lasting or adaptive solutions. The collaborative window model in particular raises questions around the durability of collaborative work. These questions about durability are linked to tensions that collaboratives will almost inevitably face. The table below relates these tensions to the institution-building dynamics identified specifically in the narrower health collaborative literature. The inner cells of this table identify potential resolutions to situations where tensions are likely to manifest in the process of institution building.

Institution Building				
Tensions	Planning	Timing	Openness	Human Capital
Stability versus agility/adaptability	Building change-management practices	Recognizing, proposing, and implementing change	Starting and stopping together	Encouraging responsive staff; getting staff input and buy-in for change
Inclusivity versus time and resource constraints	Anticipating course changes	Building in time for course corrections	Being honest about available resources	Planning to support community leadership
Representative decision-making versus ambiguous membership	Clarifying roles; anticipating growth and change	Sharing power with new parties	Absorbing new ideas	Clarifying roles and supporting growth
Goal incongruence between a coalition and its member organizations	Finding common ground; setting up effective accountability	Maintaining commitments; adapting to change	Clarifying commitments; encouraging good-faith agreements	Reconciling roles in different organizations and as individuals
Unity versus diversity	Planning for representative and diverse participation in governance up front	Maintaining participation commensurate with impact	Being honest about explicit and implicit limits to open-ness	Maintaining representative staff with a representative agenda

As coalitions explicitly recognize where tensions are likely to arise, strategies for their management can be developed to support the identification of best practices in the field. The table above serves as a starting point with ideas for implementing and testing practices to negotiate the denoted tensions.

Any strategy, structure, or practice must ultimately be implemented. While the Framework for Aligning Sectors specifies a number of systems to align, its adaptive factors also highlight the inherent human nature of cross-sector aligning. This review identified several governance considerations for participants with different roles. While it would be impossible to cover every consideration for every role, those identified here have already been identified as important in existing research and therefore deserve close attention as key considerations, and the impacts of decisions made about them continue to be identified in practice and research.

ALIGNING SYSTEMS FOR HEALTH

Health Care + Public Health + Social Services

55 Park Place NE, 8th Floor
 Atlanta, GA 30303
ghpc.gsu.edu/project/aligning

REFERENCES

1. Landers, G., Minyard, K., Lanford, D., & Heishman, H. (2020). A Theory of Change for Aligning Health Care, Public Health, and Social Services in a Time of COVID-19. *American Journal of Public Health*, 110(S2), S178-S180.
2. Lanford, D., Petiwala, A., Landers, G., & Minyard, K. (2021). Aligning healthcare, public health and social services: A scoping review of the role of purpose, governance, finance and data. *Health and Social Care in the Community*. 2021(May), 1-16.
3. Merriam-Webster. (2021). Governance. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/governance>. Accessed 2021.09.16.
4. Graham, J., Plumptre, T. W., & Amos, B. (2003). *Principles for good governance in the 21st century*. Ottawa, ON: Institute on Governance.
5. Cornforth, C., & Brown, W. A. (2014). *Non-profit governance innovative perspectives and approaches*. London; New York: Routledge. Routledge Contemporary Corporate Governance. Web.
6. Klein, P. G., Mahoney, J. T., McGahan, A. M., & Pitelis, C. N. (2019). Organizational governance adaptation: Who is in, who is out, and who gets what. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(1), 6-27.
7. Daily, C. M., Dalton, D. R., & Cannella, A. A., Jr. (2003). Corporate governance: Decades of dialogue and data. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(3), 371-382.
8. Cornforth, C. (2004). The governance of cooperatives and mutual associations: A paradox perspective. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 75(1), 11-32.
9. Lenz, D. O. & Andersson, F. in Cornforth, C., & Brown, W. A. (2014). *Non-profit governance innovative perspectives and approaches*. London; New York: Routledge.
10. Young, Dennis R. (2011). The prospective role of economic stakeholders in the governance of non-profit organizations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Non-Profit Organizations* 22(4), 566.
11. Keasey, K., Wright, M., & Wright, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Corporate governance: responsibilities, risks and remuneration*. New York: John Wiley & Son Limited.
12. GovTrack.us. (2021). H.R. 3763 — 107th Congress: Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. Retrieved from <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/107/hr3763>. Accessed 2021.09.16.
13. Muth, M., & Donaldson, L. (1998). Stewardship theory and board structure: A contingency approach. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 6(1), 5-28.
14. Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). Resource dependence theory. *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
15. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony, *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
16. Guo, C., & Acar, M. (2005). Understanding collaboration among non-profit organizations: Combining resource dependency, institutional, and network perspectives. *Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34(3), 340-361.
17. Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 34, 81-100.
18. Stone, M. M., Crosby, B. C., Bryson, J. M., Cornforth, C., & Brown, W. (2013). Adaptive governance in collaborations. *Non-profit governance: Innovative perspective and approaches*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
19. Stone, M. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). Governing public-non-profit collaborations: Understanding their complexity and the implications for research. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 1(3), 309-334.
20. Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571.
21. Cornforth, C., Hayes, J. P., & Vangen, S. (2018). Windows of collaborative opportunity: Consideration of governance. *The Non-Profit Quarterly*, 2018, Spring.
22. Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 44-55.
23. Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and implementing cross-sector collaborations: Needed and challenging. *Public Administration Review*, 75(5), 647-663.
24. Provan, K. G., & Kenis, P. (2008). Modes of network governance: Structure, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(2), 229-252.
25. Lober, D. K. (1997). Explaining the formation of business-environmentalist collaborations: Collaborative windows and the Paper Task Force. *Policy Sciences*, 30, 1-24.
26. Takahashi, L. M. and Smutny, G. (2002). Collaborative Windows and Organizational Governance: Exploring the Formation and Demise of Social Service Partnerships. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(2), 165-185.