Aligning Across Sectors:
Key Considerations for Governance Measurement

Draft

Pat Ketsche, Ph.D.
Daniel Lanford, Ph.D.
Christina Bernhardt, Ph.D.
Georgia Health Policy Center
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
Georgia State University

2021.05.02

Introduction

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 reducing health disparities, especially racial health disparities.

At the core of this effort is the Framework for Aligning Sectors (henceforth the Framework), 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 on health-oriented cross-sector collaboratives to identify the ways that governance is normatively discussed in this context and subsequently to identify governance concepts that could productively be measured to the benefit of individual aligning efforts as well as researchers and practitioners wishes to 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 non-profit 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 (Lanford et al. forthcoming). 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

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

<div align="center">Findings</div>

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)."[1] This definition emphasizes 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." However, in an Institute of Governance policy brief, Graham et al. (2003) suggest that governance can also be understood in terms of the structures that support governance processes. 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. By these definitions, how far and to what level this control extends 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.

Key Concepts to Consider for Measurement
- Control
- Control processes
- Structures that shape control processes
- Decision making
- Who is involved
- Who has power
- How accountability is accomplished

---

[1] https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/governance accessed February 12, 2021

- Rules
- Policies
- Procedures
- Conventions

In peer-reviewed research on organizations, Cornworth and Brown (2014) also consider structures, processes, and control when they define governance as "the systems and processes concerned with ensuring the overall direction, control, and accountability of an organization." However, this definition also emphasizes accountability and the establishment of objectives, or "overall direction."

Klein et al., (2019) focus specifically on governance structures. 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 is unique in emphasizing resource accumulation and development. However, it is similar to the Cornworth and Brown definition in that it emphasizes the establishment of desired outcomes, or "the distribution of the organization's production."

Daily et al. (2003) 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." The Daily et al. definition thereby defines governance as a decision process and, similar to the Klein et al. definition, specifically identifies resource allocation and conflict resolution as important governance processes (it is important to note here the underlying assumption that collaboration *will* entail conflict). Like the Klein et al. and Cornworth and Brown definitions, Daily et al. also emphasizes the establishment of objectives, or 'uses,' for the organization.

In summary, governance can be understood in terms of the structures that lay the groundwork for governance processes or in terms of the processes themselves. Governance structures, both formal and informal, are important to understand because they help lay governance groundwork. 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 processes uniquely identified in the peer-reviewed research on organizations include the direction of resource accumulation and allocation, conflict resolution, and the establishment of objectives.

Key Concepts to Consider for Measurement
- Overall direction
- Formal governance
- Informal governance
- Resource development
- Resource allocation
- Conflict resolution
- Overall objectives

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. (2003) and by Cornforth (2004), with the latter focusing on cooperative and mutually owned organizations. Lenz and Andersson (2014) then provide an overview of the relevance of these theories to the nonprofit sector. 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 which collaboratives are experiencing and in clarifying the implications of those dynamics. With this information, collaboratives are better positioned to shape or reshape themselves optimally and, ultimately, optimize their operations.

Before describing these theories in brief, a note is required on owners, boards, and managers. A theme running throughout research on organizations is that much can be understood by examining the people involved in governance and understanding their individual incentives and objectives, since this will affect how governance is structured at the beginning and how it is subsequently implemented, restructured, etc. Key individuals from this perspective include owners, board members, and managers. In the context of a non-profit organization, the board is the steering committee and managers are those in charge of operations, just as in for-profit organizations. However, the word "owner" may have different meanings in the non-profit context. In that context, there is no formal monetary "profit" to which an "owner" can claim rights as a function of their investments, as would be the case in a for-profit setting. Often, non-profit charters define a board which operates without an owner in the for-profit sense, with benefits intended to accrue to the community and with the board itself accepting liability for operations. Nevertheless, there are generally still investors in non-profits whose investments in the organization translate to ownership-like veto power,[2] so those who exercise control through investments in an organization might still be considered "owners" effectively, if not in name (Young 2011). Investments in this sense could of course be interpreted quite broadly, so ownership by this logic could still potentially encompass a wide range of stakeholders. Alternative definitions of ownership could also be used, for example definitions focused on the ownership of the *consequences* of an organization. For reasons such as this, the meaning of the word "owner" in organizational theories can cause confusion when the subject is non-profit organizations. In such cases, if the term owner is to be used, the term should be defined for the case in question. For the purposes of the section below, owners can be understood as the major financial investors, even if in practice they exert little control and do not stand to benefit themselves from operations.

Agency Theory is the most used framework in the academic literature around governance and corporate boards (e.g., Keasey et al, 1997). Management is seen as an agent of corporate owners

---

[2] Some non-profits may generate operating revenues entirely internally and would accordingly have different operational dynamics, but these are understood to be rare in the context of health collaboratives.

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 (2002), 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 towards their own ends. In the nonprofit sector, Lenz and Andersson (2014) describe an additional agency problem. 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.

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…
  - …non-profit boards are defined by owners with objectives not fully aligned with those of the served community…
- Then…
  - …non-profit 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 / 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' incentivizes and interests? (e.g. 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?

> o Are the board members' interests consistent with the needs and wishes of the targeted community?
> o Is the board independent of management?
> o Does the board have control over management? In what way?

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 situations in which managers are also board members, or "insiders," and the board may have expertise that is directly applied to organizational governance (Muth & Donaldson, 1998).

> Stewardship Theory
> - If
>   - …managers' incentives *are* (wholly / 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 (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) posits that institutional survival requires the acquisition of expensive or rare resources for the organization. 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…
>   - …and if resources are scarce (e.g. financial and human capital), and…
>   - …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/human) scarce?

> - 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 otherwise be helpful board members?

Stakeholder Theory recognizes that organizations are comprised of 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 collaborators and community beneficiaries and collaborators (Young 2011). Creation of a board from a multi-stakeholder 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 the 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 (Meyer and Rowan, 1977) emphasizes the tendency of institutions to operate largely in the interest of institutional survival. Especially in the non-profit sector where market dynamics are relatively weak, institutions come to rely on external legitimacy for support, funding, and, ultimately, survival. Furthermore, Gua and Acar (2005) 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.

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 outcomes. In the table below we refer to the board, but in informal structures, these might be the leaders without a formal designation as board members.

> 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?

Governance in Non-Profits – Market Activities and Formality

While the theories above may be applied non-profits as well as for-profits, non-profits have unique qualities that justify an examination of their dynamics in particular. This section describes two factors that can have a large impact on governance in non-profit organizations in particular: social enterprise activities and the level of formality in governance.

Social Enterprises
Social enterprises are nonprofit organizations that derive at least some of their operating revenue from market-based activities (Ebrahim et al, 2014). 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/or the for-profit or public sectors.[3] Stone et al. (2013) define collaboratives as

---

[3] It is important to distinguish between analysis of the structures, processes, and targeted outcomes of governance models in coalition work, especially multi-sector coalition work, from "collaborative governance" as a consensus

"entities that link or share information, resources, activities, and capabilities to achieve jointly what could not be achieved separately." Collaborations can come together around a single project or activity or can work together, over time developing an enduring organizational infrastructure.[4] Guo and Acar (2005) identify two distinct types of coalitions: informal and formal. Informal leadership may involve leadership that is relatively 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 (Stone et al., 2010).

Bryson, Crosby and Stone (2006) discuss the progression from informal to formal governance in collaboratives. 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 (2015) elaborate by suggesting that several internal factors (network size, the nature of tasks, trust between members) and external factors (governmental policies, lead agency size, preexisting relationships) all influence the extent to which formal governance structures are desirable and/or are established.

Provan and Kenis (2008) 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 forms a separate organizational form with a formal governance structure with an administrative organization.

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.

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?

---

building approach to complex societal problems. Ansell and Gash (2008) 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. Here however, we are focusing on the former: how cross-sector coalitions operationalize the governance structures, processes, and outcomes.

[4] While some of the literature around collaboratives includes discussion of mergers, in this framework we are assuming that participating organizations retain legal autonomous structures (Cornworth et. al, 2018).

- 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 – Longevity, Adaptability, Stability, and Evolution

As was the case with non-profits, the theories on organizational governance discussed at the top of the findings section generally apply to collaborative organizations, but again as was the case with non-profits, collaboratives have unique features that call for an examination of that unique environment. At the core of the 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. By this logic, collaboratives may share an objective but are likely to be composed of organizations whose primary mission is not necessarily the same as that of other partners. This plurality of objectives exerts a divisive pressure on collaboratives, creating stumbling blocks in the way of collaboration sustainability. As aligning efforts increasingly focus on addressing wicked 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.

Lober (1997) and Takashi and Smutny (2002) apply the Kingdon (1984) 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, Cornworth et al. (2018) suggest that the temporal nature of collaborative windows only implies the need for adaptability and resilience in collaborative governance. They go on to suggest that informal governance implies a degree of adaptability itself, and they suggest that 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.

The tension between flexibility and stability is only one of several that Stone et al (2013) identify as potentially emerging as the environment and the collaborative itself change. Other tensions may emerge between inclusiveness versus time constraints, the need for internal versus external legitimacy, the need for representation versus ambiguous or evolving organizational

membership, and between members with different amounts of power. To this list Bryson et al. (2015) add the potential for tensions between conflicting organizational goals and between unity and diversity. The potential for tension in each of these areas underscores the need for dynamics in 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 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, governance in non-profit organizations in particular, and governance in collaboratives. This section turns to research specifically on governance in the context of health-oriented cross-sector collaboratives. In an earlier study, the Georgia Health Policy Center conducted a scoping review of research on health oriented cross-sector collaboration and identified factors described as important for governance in that literature. 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.[5]

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.

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 themselves split into four sections: planning, openness, human capital development, and time management.

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 whether the focus is ambitious enough; 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.

Many of the papers in the GHPC scoping review discussed openness, transparency, and inclusiveness. Transparency in agendas, budgets, and roles were specifically identified as important considerations. Group problem solving, decision-making, and consensus building were

---

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

also discussed in several papers, as were benefits potentially flowing from the distribution of leadership across partners and participants.

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.

The GHPC review highlighted the importance of balancing time and other resources with the suggestions offered in the research. 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 to 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, key governance considerations for roles were organized by seven role types: collaborators or partners; leadership committee members; funders; conveners, backbones, and catalyst organizations; implementers and data managers, community members and representatives, and individual leaders.

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 identified in the GHPC scoping review 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 incentive structures and 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 front-line implementers, care coordinators, and data managers was also discussed, especially in terms of avoiding over-work, providing training, and establishing strong incentives for collaboration to take advantage of co-location where possible.

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 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 over-work?
  - How sufficient is staff training?
  - How sufficient are incentives for collaboration?
- Community members and representatives
  - To what extent do community members define the priorities?
  - Contribute to program design
  - Contributing to implementation
  - Contributing to evaluation
- Individual leaders
  - Help create a sense of shared purpose
  - Promote big-picture focus
  - Create a climate of problem-solving
  - Find resources

> - Bring in strategic partners
> - Implement or participate in change management, including selves
> - Directive leadership or facilitative leadership

Discussion

This brief provides key considerations for measurement based on a review of definitions for governance and research on organizations focused on the fundamentals of organizational governance, non-profit governance in particular, collaborative governance, and finally governance in health-oriented cross-sector collaboratives specifically. At the broadest level, the considerations identified primarily concern fundamental governance structures and leadership dynamics, the relation of non-profits to market forces, the level of formality and informality in governance, the sustainability and life-cycle of collaboratives, institution building, and roles specifically in the context of health collaboratives.

When assessing governance in the context of health collaboration, the key considerations identified in this brief can be used to empower individual collaboratives or to better understand general tendencies across collaborative contexts.

References

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, *18*(4), 543-571.

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.

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.

Carlisle, K., & Gruby, R. L. (2019). Polycentric systems of governance: A theoretical model for the commons. *Policy Studies Journal*, *47*(4), 927-952.

Cornforth, Chris. "The governance of cooperatives and mutual associations: A paradox perspective." Annals of public and cooperative economics 75.1 (2004): 11-32.

Cornforth, Chris., and William A. Brown. Nonprofit Governance Innovative Perspectives and Approaches. London ; New York: Routledge, 2014. Routledge Contemporary Corporate Governance. Web.

Cornforth, Chris; Hayes, John Paul and Vangen, Siv (2018). Windows of Collaborative Opportunity: Consideration of Governance. The Nonprofit Quarterly, 2018(Spring)

Daily, Catherine M., Dan R. Dalton, and Albert A. Cannella Jr. "Corporate governance: Decades of dialogue and data." *Academy of management review* 28.3 (2003): 371-382.

Ebrahim, Alnoor, Julie Battilana, and Johanna Mair. "The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges in hybrid organizations." Research in Organizational Behavior 34 (2014): 81-100.

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, *22*(1), 1-29.

Graham, J., Plumptre, T. W., & Amos, B. (2003). Principles for good governance in the 21st century.

"Governance and Development" World Bank, Washington, D.C. 1992b

Guo, C., & Acar, M. (2005). Understanding collaboration among nonprofit organizations: Combining resource dependency, institutional, and network perspectives. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *34*(3), 340-361.

Keasey, K., Wright, M., & Wright, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Corporate governance: responsibilities, risks and remuneration*. John Wiley & Son Limited.

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.

Lenz, D.O. and Andersson, F. in Cornforth, Chris., and William A. Brown. Nonprofit Governance Innovative Perspectives and Approaches. London ; New York: Routledge, 2014. Routledge Contemporary Corporate Governance. Web.

Meyer, J. W., and Rowan, B. (1977) "Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony", American Journal of Sociology , 83, 340– 63.

Miller, J. L. (2002). The board as a monitor of organizational activity: The applicability of agency theory to nonprofit boards. *Nonprofit management and leadership*, *12*(4), 429-450.

Muth, M., & Donaldson, L. (1998). Stewardship theory and board structure: A contingency approach. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, *6*(1), 5-28.

Nonprofit Governance : Innovative Perspectives and Approaches, Editors: by Chris Cornforth , and William A. Brown, PUBLISHER Taylor & Francis Group DATE. 2013-06-17.

Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond markets and states: polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *American economic review*, *100*(3), 641-72.

Ostrower, F., & Stone, M. M. (2010). Moving governance research forward: A contingency-based framework and data application. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *39*(5), 901-924.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). Resource dependence theory. *The external control of organizations: A resource dependance perspective.*

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.

Lesley Rosenthal, Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts) Nonprofit Corporate Governance: The Board's Role posted on Sunday, April 15, 2012 at https://corpgov.law.harvard.edu/2012/04/15/nonprofit-corporate-governance-the-boards-role/ accessed March 2, 2021.

Salamon, L. M., & Anheier, H. K. (1996). The emerging nonprofit sector: An overview.

Stone, M. M., & Ostrower, F. (2007). Acting in the public interest? Another look at research on nonprofit governance. *Nonprofit and voluntary sector quarterly*, *36*(3), 416-438.

Stone, M. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). Governing public–nonprofit collaborations: understanding their complexity and the implications for research. *Voluntary Sector Review*, *1*(3), 309-334.

Stone, M. M., Crosby, B. C., Bryson, J. M., Cornforth, C., & Brown, W. (2013). Adaptive governance in collaborations. *Nonprofit Governance: Innovative Perspective and Approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.*

Van Puyvelde, S., & Raeymaeckers, P. (2020). The governance of public–nonprofit service networks: Four propositions. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *49*(5), 931-950.

Young, Dennis R. "The prospective role of economic stakeholders in the governance of nonprofit organizations." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 22.4 (2011): 566.