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Origins

- Roman Law of Inheritance
- Medieval Property Partitions
- Diplomacy
- Commerce
- Professions
Commercial Code

- Jointness + Fair Division

- Sharing Profits and Losses
  - Bear some risk,
  - pay some cost,
  - share some gain
Positive Connotations

- Diplomacy – “peace, neighborliness, prosperity”
- Professions – “proven and accomplished”
- Commerce – “shrewd, entrepreneurial and efficient”
Separating Roles

- Partners v.
  - Competitors
  - Clients
  - Customers
  - Agents
  - Contractors
  - Subordinates
The Feds and Foundations

- Partners to share the burdens
- Partners to assume responsibilities
- Partners to leverage resources
- Partners for cooperation
- Partners as mid-way to privatization
Principal-Agent v. Partnership

- Resource Flows
- Know-How
- Control
The Symmetry Test

- Formulation
  - Measure of Control Over Terms

- Function
  - Resource Commitment
  - Shared Fate

“Fair Division”
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From Potential Ally to Partner

Less Demanding

1. Perceived mutual advantage
2. Mutually agreed upon objectives
3. Shared commitment
4. Pooled resources
5. Shared accountability
6. Shared formulation and function

More Demanding
**Relationships between stakeholders**

**Less Demanding**

1. Networking – exchange information
2. Coordination – alter activity to avoid conflicts
3. Cooperation – share resources
4. Collaboration – share risks and rewards
5. Partnership – stable, fair division

**More Demanding**
Motives

- Why partner?
  - Economic reasons
    - Leverage Resources – New Capital
    - Complement Assets – know-how, expertise
    - Shortcut Administrative Channels
    - Efficiency Gains
Why Partner?

- Social reasons
  - Nurture Civic Culture
  - Reduce Conflict
  - Promote Engagement
  - Encourage Cooperation
  - Community-Building
  - Symbolize Success
  - Sustainability
Why Partner?

Political Reasons

- Expand Legitimacy & Support
- Spread Responsibility
- Increase Influence
- Avoid Narrow Accountability
- Cooptation of Potential Rivals
- Promote Market-Oriented Values
Our Sectoral Complex

- What is public and what is private?
- Changing American ideas
  - Domains -- economy, household
  - Rights claims
  - Limited government
Efforts to keep Public and Private separate

Use Organization types

- Government (courts, agencies, elected officials)
- Business (e.g., Microsoft Corporation)
- Voluntary Private Organizations (e.g., Planned Parenthood)
- Non-governmental Organizations (e.g., United Way)
More Efforts to keep Public and Private separate

Use Legal definitions

- Public -- taxes and sovereign immunity
- For-profit -- commerce and incorporation
- Nonprofit -- gifts and tax breaks

Use forms of governance

- The State -- Elected Officeholders for Voters
- The Firm -- Board of Directors for Stockholders
- The Organization -- Community Board
Post World War II Consensus

(Limited Welfare State)

- Public – common defense and market intervention
- Private – economic growth and employment
- Voluntary – social stability and inequality
Post-Reagan Consensus
(Devolution)

- Privatization (Government $\rightarrow$ Business)
- Substitution (Government $\rightarrow$ PVOs)
New Governance (Strategic Alliances)

- Collaboration (Government + NGOs)
- Partnering (Government + Business)
- Convergence (NGOs \(\leftrightarrow\) Business)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Firms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-Profit Organizations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Firms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td><em>partnerships</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td><em>contracts</em></td>
<td><em>Firms</em></td>
<td><em>affiliations</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>sponsorships</em></td>
<td><em>Non-Profit Organizations</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institute for Health Policy
Stephen Linder, Ph.D.
## Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td><em>asset sales</em></td>
<td>grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td><strong>procurement contracts</strong></td>
<td>Firms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td><em>service contracts</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>subsidies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Profit Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Nonprofits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Commerce</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government</td>
<td><em>grant proposals</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Firms</td>
<td><em>campaigns</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary Sector</strong></td>
<td><em>lobbying</em></td>
<td><em>branding</em></td>
<td><strong>Non-Profit Organizations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The MBA Checklist

- What is your mission, goals and affiliations?
- What do you hope to gain through the partnership? What are you willing to forego?
- What are you willing to contribute? What are you not willing to contribute?
What degree of autonomy are you willing to give up?

Will management support and reward collaboration and partnership?

What are your non-negotiables? What do you fear most about collaboration and partnership?
Relationship Issues

Shirking ← ? → Self-Seeking

- Trust

- Obstacles
  - Suspicions or preconceived notions of the other
  - No history of working together
  - Poor communication
  - Reputation
Leadership Issues

- Encouraging collaboration
- Nurturing versus controlling
- Persistence and enduring commitment

Obstacles

- Lack of commitment
- Opposition from within
- Few shared goals
- Lack of adequate planning and integrated support
- Inability to institutionalize trust and confidence
Who’s In and Who’s Not

Process Partners: 132 Organizations

56% Statewide (have Texas in their name)

8% Academic Orgs.

~6% Nonprofit Community Orgs.

<1% For-profit Organizations

Work Groups: 12 with 24 co-chairs

~50% Statewide

16% Academic Orgs.

<3% Nonprofit Community

0% For-profit Organizations

The following organizations have sent representatives to Partnership meetings and/or provided a Commitment to Texas expressing their organization’s commitment to the goals identified by the Partnership.

Adolescent Development and Achievement Program of Tyler, Inc. (ADAPT)
Alamo Area Women’s Health Information Network
Albomoz & Associates Language Services
American Cancer Society
American Diabetes Association
American Heart Association, Texas
Atascosa Health Center
Austin/Travis County Health & Human Services Department
Brazos Valley Council of Governments
Cancer and Chronic Disease Consortium
Center for Health and Social Policy
Central East Austin Community Organization
Children’s Hospital Association of Texas
City of Amarillo, Department of Public Health
City of Austin/Travis County
Coastal Bend Health Education Center
Community Voices
Consulate General of Mexico
Dallas County Health & Human Services
East Texas Area Health Education Center
El Paso Diabetes Association
Glencoe/McGraw-Hill
Good Samaritan Center
H.O.P.E. Bi-National
Harris Methodist-Walls Regional Hospital
Health and Human Services Commission
Health Disparities Task Force
Health Industry Council of the Dallas-Fort Worth Region
House Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Public Health
Imperial Social Services
Irving Health Leaders Association
JPS Health Network
Kelsey Research Foundation
League of United Latin American Citizens
Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, Center for Health and Social Policy
March of Dimes
Medical Institute for Sexual Health
National Public Health Performance Program

- Categorical Representation
  - Community Organizations
  - Local Businesses and Employers
  - Neighborhood Organizations
  - Faith Institutions
  - Transportation Providers
  - Civic Organizations
  - Educational Institutions
  - Public Safety Organizations
CBPR is a collaborative research approach that is designed to ensure and establish structures for participation by communities affected by the issue being studied, representatives of organizations, and researchers to improve health and well-being through taking action, including social change.

To expand this definition, we conclude that CBPR emphasizes:
(1) co-learning about issues of concern and reciprocal transfer of expertise;
(2) sharing of decisionmaking power; and
(3) mutual ownership of the products and processes of research.
A Mid-Course Advisory

- Pursue Symmetry
- Forget Public v. Private
- Cultivate Unlikely Partners
- Trust Subsidiarity
- Nest the Rest
A Final Note

“We have found that there are many ways to achieve partnership…There is no ideal partner or partnership arrangement.

Successful building of partnerships requires an open and proactive spirit. The craft and tactics can be learned.”

-- Soros Foundation