

# LEADING WITH APPROPRIATE GOVERNANCE

Considerations in authorities, representation,  
decision-making, and accountabilities



# **AGENDA**

- 1 Governance for planning**
- 2 Governance for monitoring**
- 3 Governance for implementation**
- 4 Governance for specific initiatives**

## KEY TERMS

### GOVERNANCE

structures and processes that are designed to ensure accountability, transparency, responsiveness, stability, equity and inclusiveness, empowerment, and broad-based participation.

## KEY TERMS

### LEADERSHIP

the ability of an individual or a group of individuals to influence and guide followers or other members of an organization.

# GOVERNANCE AND SYSTEM PLANNING



# SYSTEM PLANNING

System planning is a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what the community and corresponding systems are expected to do, to achieve specific intended outcomes, that result in improvements to the homelessness response system that are aligned with core, shared principles, an understood vision, and a clear mission.



# GOVERNANCE OF SYSTEM PLANNING

Governance is how the system planning body (government, community non-profits, coalition, combinations, etc.) exercises its authority, control, and direction over the system planning process.

Good governance in system planning has clarity in:

Authorities

Engagement

Decision-making

Implementation responsibility

Monitoring



# 2 DOMINANT MODELS OF SYSTEM PLANNING GOVERNANCE

**Rational comprehensive** – leader is the subject matter expert and follows a logical, evidence-driven approach following the principles of the planning body

**Participatory** – leader is the facilitator of inputs from subject matter experts, including various interests on the subject, and co-create the principles followed in the process





# INTER-AGENCY, INTER-DEPARTMENTAL AND/OR INTER-MINISTERIAL COUNCILS

Popularized through the USA, the inter-agency, inter-departmental and/or inter-ministerial council model holds promise for governance in leading monitoring from a continuous improvement perspective:

- Identify and remove policy or regulatory barriers
- Identify and remove funding barriers
- Identify and remove implementation barriers



# A PLAN, NOT A DREAM

System planning work must be realistic, and directed to be so, acknowledging current realities and resources while constructing a desired future state

System planning should be hopeful, but not laden with aspirations that will unlikely be realized

System planning requires considerable community buy-in, and good governance approaches see the responsibility of communicating with various interested parties to determine emotional and intellectual connection as paramount



# GOVERNANCE FOR MONITORING



# MONITORING, PERFORMANCE MGMT & CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Performance management is an ongoing process of communication between system leadership and service providers and service participants in support of accomplishing shared aims

Monitoring of the system functions, accomplishments, barriers and results should be a shared responsibility of the leadership structure

Leaders in monitoring drive system change as a response to inputs, outputs and outcomes of performance and are not intended to be static actors that only report what happened...they need to lead where services, supports, funding and policy goes next



# ARE THOSE WHO MONITOR NEUTRAL ACTORS?

Leaders are rarely neutral in monitoring and the governance model for monitoring results is laden with influences of morality, privilege, experience and principles

In a shared governance model, monitoring results represent the will of a coalition of actors; however, in top-down leadership structures monitoring may exclusively represent the will of the funder



# WHOSE INTERESTS ARE PROTECTED & ADVANCED THROUGH MONITORING?

Are people experiencing homelessness or receiving housing supports the central interest of the monitoring efforts?

If we agree that PWLE have an important voice in monitoring, does the governance structure embrace this voice or does it resort to tokenism?

To whom are results from monitoring reported to, and what influence does the receiving body of the information have to influence the actions moving forward?



# GOVERNANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION



# WHO ENSURES WHAT IS WRITTEN ON PAPER OCCURS IN PRACTICE?

System leadership most often results in written plans with specific performance targets and identified practices to realize results

Without an appropriate implementation governance structure individual agencies will be interpreting the plan intentions on their own and designing program delivery that may or may not be aligned with the governing body





# FEEDBACK LOOPS AND MILESTONES

Examples of feedback loops and milestone approaches:

- Coalition
- Government body (service manager model in Ontario for example)
- Independent entity (CBO model in Edmonton or Calgary for example)
- Ad hoc committee
- Intergovernmental steering committee



# GOVERNANCE FOR SPECIFIC INITIATIVES



# TIME LIMITED GOVERNANCE

Specific initiatives can benefit from a time-limited governance structure to effectively lead the response to a time-limited event

Specific initiatives may leverage existing governance structures or create a new governance structure separate from the broader system of care

Specific initiatives can be an opportunity to try different approaches to leadership, decision-making, engagement and accountability



# EXAMPLES OF SPECIFIC INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT FROM THOUGHTFUL GOVERNANCE

- Encampment response
- Disaster response
- Infectious disease response
- Responding to influx of specific populations (for example, refugees)
- Motel closure response



**QUESTIONS,  
COMMENTS,  
CRIES OF ANGUISH**

EMAIL: [idejong@OrgCode.com](mailto:idejong@OrgCode.com)

TWITTER: [@OrgCode](https://twitter.com/OrgCode)

WEBSITE: [www.OrgCode.com](http://www.OrgCode.com)

FACEBOOK: [www.FB.com/OrgCode](http://www.FB.com/OrgCode)

PHONE: 416-432-0410

