

GOVERNANCE & SERVICE INTEGRATION

A practical operating model for clarifying roles, coordinating work, resolving barriers and making shared decisions across organizations.

FICTIONAL DEMONSTRATION

This sample was created by Between Points to demonstrate the structure, thinking and level of finish that can be provided. It does not reproduce confidential information, employer-owned materials or a real client's records.

DEMONSTRATION CLIENT

Riverbend Community Partnership · Integrated Access Network

Fictional scenario: six partner organizations supporting residents through different programs, with overlapping responsibilities and no shared operating model.

WHAT IS INCLUDED

- Governance architecture and committee structure
- Partner roles and decision-rights matrix
- Terms-of-reference framework
- Coordination and referral workflow
- Barrier escalation pathway
- Information-sharing and minimum-necessary principles
- Meeting rhythm and accountability tools
- Performance framework and governance dashboard
- First 90-day implementation plan

1. The operating challenge

Multiple organizations were contributing. The system between them was unclear.

STARTING POINT

Riverbend Community Partnership brought together public, nonprofit and community organizations to improve access to essential services. Partners were committed, but coordination relied heavily on individual relationships and informal workarounds.

WHAT WAS NOT WORKING

- Partners had different understandings of the network's purpose and authority.
- The same issue could be discussed at several tables without a clear decision owner.
- Operational barriers were mixed with policy and system-level issues.
- Referrals were made, but follow-up and closure were inconsistent.
- Meeting notes recorded discussion without consistently capturing decisions and actions.
- Information-sharing expectations varied by organization and staff member.

BETWEEN POINTS APPROACH

BUILD THE SPACE BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONS

The work focuses on the operating structure between participating organizations: who decides, who delivers, how issues move, what information is required, and how the partnership knows whether coordination is improving.

FINISHED OPERATING MODEL

Layer	Question answered	Primary tool	Result
Governance	Who has authority and accountability?	Governance map and terms of reference	Clear tables, mandates and reporting lines
Coordination	How does work move across partners?	Referral and coordination workflow	Consistent handoffs and follow-up
Escalation	What happens when a barrier cannot be resolved?	Escalation pathway and issue log	Visible ownership and timely decisions
Information	What may be shared, with whom and why?	Information-sharing principles	Minimum-necessary, purpose-based practice
Performance	Is the model being used and producing value?	Indicators and dashboard	Decision-ready governance reporting

2. Governance architecture

A small number of tables with distinct purposes, authority and escalation relationships.

Level	Primary purpose	Membership	Authority	Reporting rhythm
Executive Sponsors	Set direction, approve structural changes and resolve system-level issues.	Senior leaders from participating organizations	Approve mandate, resources and major policy direction	Quarterly
Steering Committee	Oversee implementation, review performance and resolve cross-organizational barriers.	Directors or delegated decision-makers	Approve procedures, assign owners and escalate unresolved issues	Monthly
Operations Table	Coordinate workflow, review referrals and address operational barriers.	Program managers and frontline leads	Resolve operational issues within approved authority	Bi-weekly
Working Groups	Design time-limited products or improvements.	Subject-matter experts and affected users	Recommend options and deliver approved products	As required

TERMS-OF-REFERENCE ESSENTIALS

- Purpose and scope
- Membership and required authority
- Chair, secretariat and record-keeping roles
- Decision method and quorum
- Escalation and reporting relationships
- Meeting frequency and standing agenda
- Confidentiality and information-handling expectations
- Review date and amendment process

DESIGN PRINCIPLE

Each table should have a reason to exist that no other table already performs. Governance becomes heavier when the same issue can circulate through multiple groups without a clear decision point.

3. Roles and decision rights

Participation is not the same as accountability.

Decision / responsibility	Executive Sponsors	Steering Committee	Operations Table	Secretariat	Lead Partner
Approve partnership mandate	A	R	C	I	C
Approve shared procedures	I	A/R	C	C	C
Resolve operational barriers	I	I	A/R	C	R
Escalate policy or system barriers	A	R	C	C	C
Maintain action and decision records	I	C	C	A/R	I
Produce quarterly performance brief	I	A	C	R	C

LEGEND

A = Accountable · R = Responsible · C = Consulted · I = Informed

DECISION STANDARD

- Name the decision required, not only the topic being discussed.
- Identify one accountable decision owner.
- State the latest date the decision can be made without affecting delivery.
- Record the decision, rationale, conditions and next action.
- Escalate only when the issue exceeds the authority or capacity of the current table.

4. Coordination and referral workflow

A consistent path from initial request to confirmed outcome.

1. Identify	2. Confirm	3. Refer	4. Follow up	5. Resolve	6. Learn
Clarify the person's goal, immediate need and consent.	Confirm eligibility, available options and required information.	Send the referral using the agreed minimum information.	Check the referral status within the agreed service standard.	Confirm access, redirect, or document the unresolved barrier.	Review repeated barriers and workflow gaps through the appropriate table.

CLOSED-LOOP REFERRAL STATUSES

Status	Meaning	Required next action
Pending	Referral received but outcome not yet known.	Follow up by the service standard date.
Accessed	Participant connected with the intended service.	Close or continue agreed support.
Redirected	A different service or pathway was more appropriate.	Confirm the new referral and follow-up owner.
Ineligible	Eligibility criteria were not met.	Explain reason and identify available alternatives.
Unable to confirm	Outcome could not be confirmed.	Document attempts and decide whether further follow-up is reasonable.

5. Escalation and information-sharing

Escalation should move the issue to the lowest level with the authority to resolve it.

Barrier level	Example	Initial owner	Target response	Escalates to
Operational	Missed handoff, unclear contact or local process breakdown	Operations Table / lead partner	Within 10 business days	Steering Committee if unresolved
Program / policy	Eligibility rule, conflicting procedure or recurring program gap	Steering Committee	Within 30 business days	Executive Sponsors
Systemic	Legislation, sustained resource gap or cross-system authority issue	Executive Sponsors	Defined action and review date	Participating organizations' formal authorities

MINIMUM-NECESSARY INFORMATION PRINCIPLES

- Share information for a defined coordination purpose, not because it may be useful later.
- Use the minimum information required to complete the referral or decision.
- Confirm consent and organizational authority before sharing identifiable information.
- Separate individual coordination records from aggregate governance reporting.
- Record access, changes and revocation where applicable.
- Seek privacy, legal or policy advice when the authority is unclear.

IMPORTANT LIMITATION

This demonstration provides an operating framework, not legal advice. Client-specific information-sharing tools must be aligned with applicable legislation, policy, consent requirements and organizational privacy practices.

6. Performance and governance review

The partnership should measure whether the operating model is being used, not only whether meetings occurred.

Result area	Indicator	Target	Frequency	Source	Owner
Governance	Percentage of required partner seats filled by authorized representatives	90%	Quarterly	Partner register	Secretariat
Decision-making	Percentage of decision items resolved by required date	80%	Quarterly	Decision log	Steering Chair
Coordination	Percentage of referrals with a confirmed outcome	75%	Monthly	Referral tracker	Operations Lead
Escalation	Percentage of operational barriers resolved within target	70%	Monthly	Escalation log	Operations Lead
Accountability	Percentage of action items completed by due date	80%	Monthly	Action tracker	Secretariat
Learning	Number of documented workflow improvements adopted	4 annually	Quarterly	Improvement register	Steering Committee

REVIEW RHYTHM

- Bi-weekly operations review: referrals, barriers and immediate actions.
- Monthly steering review: decisions, risks, milestones and performance.
- Quarterly sponsor review: strategic barriers, resources and structural changes.
- Annual governance review: mandate, membership, table effectiveness and continuation.

7. First 90 days

A focused implementation sequence that establishes authority before adding administration.

Timing	Action	Finished product	Approval / owner
Days 1-15	Confirm partners, mandate, existing tables, authorities and current coordination process.	Current-state governance and workflow map	Executive Sponsor
Days 16-30	Draft governance architecture, terms of reference and decision-rights matrix.	Draft operating model	Steering Committee
Days 31-45	Validate referral, follow-up and escalation workflows with operational users.	Approved workflow and status definitions	Operations Leads
Days 46-60	Set up partner register, meeting calendar, decision log, action tracker and escalation register.	Working governance toolkit	Secretariat
Days 61-75	Confirm indicators, baseline measures and reporting responsibilities.	Performance framework and dashboard	Steering Committee
Days 76-90	Launch the operating rhythm and complete the first governance review.	Mobilization brief and active workplan	Executive Sponsors

FOCUSED STARTER ENGAGEMENT

STARTING AT CAD \$1,250

One focused governance or coordination problem; one kickoff meeting; review of available material; one defined finished product; and one revision round. Examples include a terms-of-reference reset, decision-rights matrix, referral workflow, escalation pathway or governance dashboard setup.

FULL GOVERNANCE & SERVICE INTEGRATION ENGAGEMENT

A complete engagement is scoped according to the number of organizations, governance tables, workflows, information-sharing requirements and implementation supports involved. The full system may include governance design, facilitation, terms of reference, roles and decision rights, coordination and referral workflow, escalation tools, performance reporting, implementation support and staff orientation.

BETWEEN POINTS

The goal is not to create more committees. It is to make the relationships, decisions and workflows between organizations clear enough to work.