Introduction

The Intersector as a Tool to Address Intractable Problems

DANIEL P. GITTERMAN | NEIL BRITTO

We live in uncertain times. Today—and in the future—we face a range of seemingly intractable domestic and global challenges. Powerful economic, demographic, and technological forces shape our daily lives at home and across the globe.[1] Since the onset of the Great Recession of 2007 and 2008, only 20 percent of Americans trust the federal government to do what is right, either just about always or most of the time. Moreover, public trust in the federal government remains at a record low as we struggle to address a global pandemic and economic recession.[2] Currently, there remains uncertainty as to the nature of global and domestic economic recovery from COVID-19.[3] It is difficult to imagine successfully addressing these interrelated challenges without collaboration across the public, private, and nonprofit sectors in the United States.

Our responses to the COVID-19 pandemic depend on unleashing new forms of cross-sector cooperation. For example, in April 2020, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) created the Accelerating COVID-19 Therapeutic Interventions and Vaccines (ACTIV) partnership, a cross-sector collaboration to develop a coordinated research strategy for prioritizing and speeding development of the most promising treatments and vaccines. While NIH refers to ACTIV as a public-private partnership, it is coordinated by the nonprofit

Foundation for the National Institutes of Health (FNIH) and includes public- and private-sector partners. The ACTIV initiative pursues four fast-track focus areas, each of which is led by a cross-sector working group representing the public (government), the private sector (industry), and nonprofits, as well as philanthropic (foundations) and academic organizations (universities).[4] By December 2020, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration accepted the non-binding recommendation from the Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee—a pivotal moment in the COVID-19 pandemic response. As NIH director Francis Collins reaffirms: "to address what may be the greatest public health crisis of this generation, it is imperative that all sectors of society work together in unprecedented ways, with unprecedented speed."[5]

This book has a simple premise: perhaps more than ever before, addressing our interdependent problems requires collaboration across the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. While each sector has its limitations, it also has unique assets, capabilities, relationships, and mandates. If the sectors collaborate toward a common purpose, they can accomplish far more than each one can alone. In sum, there is a need for an "intersector," where the public, nonprofit, and private sectors share expertise, resources, and authority to address our most difficult challenges. As a tool of public action, cross-sector collaboration is an instrument through which collective action is structured to address public problems.

We are far from the first scholars and practitioners to argue that cross-sector collaboration can make a difference locally, regionally, nationally, and globally. Each contributor to this book lends new insights into how an intersectoral approach can address the enduring challenges of today and tomorrow. This book introduces a range of concepts and frameworks for understanding intersectoral or collaborative governance, showcases a range of important and emergent applications, and offers guidance on how to design, implement, and measure the outcomes of cross-sector collaboration. All too often, scholars, philanthropists, and practitioners operate in separate silos; this book aims to open new forms of communication between those who advance knowledge, those who invest in solving problems, and those who apply knowledge to improve the economic and social well-being of our communities, nation, and globe. We hope the broad range of academic disciplines and the diversity of philanthropy and practitioner perspectives will yield a distinctive contribution to thinking and practice on the topic.

A Brief Review of the Literature and Defining the Terms

The concept and the definition of cross-sector collaboration remain imprecise. Cross-collaboration can be viewed as a form of innovation in the public interest when resources are deployed in new ways based on new ideas about their relevance to public interests or new mechanisms are used in their deployment.[6] Cross-sector entrepreneurs pursuing the public interest can combine public resources in light of, and sometimes in concert with, private resources in pursuit of social objectives.[7] John Bryson specifically defines cross-sector collaboration as "the linking or sharing of information, resources, activities, and capabilities by organizations in two or more sectors to achieve jointly an outcome that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector separately."[8] In more popular terms, cross-sector collaboration has been defined as "alliances of individuals and organizations from government, nonprofit, philanthropic, and business sectors that use their diverse perspectives and resources to jointly solve a societal problem and achieve a shared goal."[9]

Much of the early research on cross-sector collaboration has been advanced by public administration and management scholars. Researchers in various disciplines have studied cross-sector collaboration, but there is much work to be done in the social sciences, business, and strategic management.

Several important frameworks for understanding cross-sector collaboration have been published in the last decade. While the definitions of collaboration used by the frameworks' authors vary, they generally report a continuum of progressively more intense interorganizational relationships.[10] The literature also affirms cross-sector collaboration as necessary and desirable as a strategy for addressing many of our most difficult challenges.[11] Scholars with interest in nonprofit management and philanthropy have begun to survey the benefits to the sector,[12] assess potential issues with their participation,[13] and study the important role of private philanthropy.[14]

Introduced by the consultancy FSG, "collective impact" refers to a structured partnership model that brings together stakeholders in government, business, nonprofits, and philanthropy to tackle complex social issues.[15] By uniting key players from across sectors, this structured partnership model empowers these groups to commit to a shared agenda and measurement system that will better position them to solve a given social problem. Unlike many collaborations, collective impact initiatives involve a centralized infrastructure, a dedicated staff, and a structured process that leads to a common agenda, shared measurement, continuous communication, and mutually reinforcing activities among all participants. Since its 2011 release in the *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (SSIR), collective impact has become popularized as a form of cross-sector collaboration to address complex social and environmental challenges.[16]

There is literature more narrowly focused on public-private partnerships (variously referred to as PPP, 3P, or P3), which typically involve formal long-term contracts between a government and a business to provide public infrastructure or services.[17] There is no one widely accepted definition of public-private partnerships. The World Bank's PPP Knowledge Lab defines a PPP as "a long-term contract between a private party and a government entity, for providing a public asset or service, in which the private party bears significant risk and management responsibility, and remuneration is linked to performance."[18] A collaboration with the private sector is invoked when government lacks the resources—or the ability to mobilize the resources—required to accomplish a mission. In much of the PPP literature, the public sector defines the task to be accomplished and then transfers the responsibilities, risk, and value of a project to the private sector through a competitive bidding process as opposed to collaboratively creating value and sharing risk.

Given the limited industries involved in P3s, business and strategic management scholars have allocated far less attention to the area.[19] Instead, they have debated the value and evolution of concepts such as corporate social responsibility (CSR). The CSR literature has brought attention to businesses' voluntary efforts to use their resources to benefit society but also historically ignore collaborating with other sectors to create value and share risk.[20] While streams of literature recognize the need for business to generate profit, they lack a deeper consideration of how business generates profit and assesses the risk of achieving profit that effective collaboration with companies requires.[21]

In recent years, academic and practitioner interest has shifted from P3s governed by formal contracts primarily in infrastructure to a broader set of formal and informal collaborative agreements in multiple industry and issue areas.[22] Cooperation across sectors takes a range of forms, from outsourcing, multistakeholder governance, and informal emergency aid to more complex joint ventures, alliances, and formal partnerships. According to Peter Klein and Anita McGahan, in this volume, research in the field of strategic management emphasizes the importance of aligning the governance arrangement of the partnership with the governance arrangements of the participating organizations. Specifically, a range of theories, from economics, sociology, and public management or administration, point to key challenges of intersectoral collaboration and the ways in which organizations overcome them to achieve cross-collaborative success.[23]

"Collaborative governance," as it has come to be called by some, brings public and private stakeholders together in collective forums with public agencies to engage in consensus-oriented decisionmaking. Chris Ansell and Alison Gash define collaborative governance "as a governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decisionmaking process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets."[24] In sum, collaborative governance is a type of governance in which public and private actors work collectively in distinctive ways, using processes, to establish laws and rules for the provision of public goods.[25] The literature pays less attention to the challenges of collective decisionmaking.

John Donahue and Richard Zeckhauser define collaborative governance "as the pursuit of authoritatively chosen public goals by means that include engaging the efforts of, and sharing discretion with, producers outside of government."[26] The literature suggests that collaborative governance efforts typically face three types of challenges: substantive problem-solving challenges, collaborative process challenges, and multi-relational accountability challenges.[27] Donahue and Zeckhauser identify two dimensions of collaborative governance: shared discretion (that is, shared control) over the specific goals to be achieved, and the methods for achieving them.[28] Kirk Emerson, Tina Nabatchi, and Stephen Balogh introduce the concept of collaborative governance regimes (CGRs), defined as open and dynamic collaborative systems of public governance where autonomous organizations work together over time to achieve some collective public purpose; specifically defined as "a particular mode of, or system for, public decision making in which cross-boundary collaboration represents the prevailing pattern of behavior and activity."[29]

When the term "partnership" shows up in the literature and the broader public agenda, most think of public-private partnerships. Indeed, public-private partnerships are organizational arrangements with a sector-crossing or sector-blurring character.[30] However, as Gunnar Folke Schuppert concludes, partnerships should be understood in this to mean not only P3s in a narrow sense—from building roads and prisons to collaborative provision of public services—but also a whole range of cooperation by government and "non-state" (private and nonprofit) actors.

Rob van Tulder, in this volume, defines cross-sector partnerships more broadly, as "societal arrangements that combine complementary organizational logics, rationalities, roles, values, and societal positions." The public, private, and nonprofit sectors each generate complementary goods and services, and thereby add value to society. They provide the potential to create new ways to govern and to manage relations in society, and to form new kinds of goal- or purpose-oriented institutional configurations to address societal challenges. Indeed, the proliferation of coordination among actors and sectors offers opportunities for new paradigms.

Sectoral social capital or cross-sector collaboration is usually not the stakeholders' goal, but it is a necessary means to solve the challenges communities face. Erin M. Graves and Amy Higgins, in this volume, contribute to and advance the understanding of how we might operationalize cross-sector collaboration, a difficult-to-measure but important feature of how a community functions.[31] Having a quantifiable indicator about the effectiveness of the cross-sector collaboration is also likely to be useful because cross-sector collaborations rely on relationships within and between sectors. Social capital measurements address both bonding and bridging relationships.

While the definitions and frameworks might vary, all of the authors in this volume view cross-sector collaboration or partnerships as a tool or instrument for public action. Policymaking is about making choices, and choosing the instrument or tool that best addresses a certain public problem. A focus on policy instruments can direct new attention to the mechanisms of rule and the relationship between government and the governed. Governance can be defined in different ways, but a distinctive line of research has aligned it with the implementation of public policy. A tool or instrument of public action creates new opportunities to enlist a range of different actors in meeting a collective public purpose.[32]

Other contributors reference the importance of a space for cross-sector collaboration. Rob van Tulder, in this volume, reports that studies on the dynamics of cross-sector partnerships for development have adopted a variety of perspectives on the nature of the partnering space as the action arena in which the actual process of partnering takes place. Dealing with practical partnering complexities requires a better understanding of the way "partnering space" must be approached. Zia Khan, in this volume, speaks of the need to "create the initial space for people to debate, shape, and own their shared objective." Often, big initiatives first need an environment or ecosystem in which to germinate and take root.

Moving Beyond the "Think" and "Do" Silos

The collaboration of this volume was based on a mutual goal to create a book that includes interdisciplinary scholarly perspectives and the experiences and insights of both practitioners and philanthropists. This book offers new perspectives on the topic from a variety of experts. Our scholarly contributors come from a range of disciplinary perspectives and areas of substantive expertise, including business (strategic management, accounting), law, public policy, sociology, political science, public administration and management, public health, and education. Our practitioners, some of whom have worked in all three sectors, offer first-hand accounts of cross-sector collaboration at varying scope and scale and across a range of substantive challenges.

In chapters 1 through 5 of Part I, scholars advance and share new knowledge about cross-sector collaboration. In chapter 1, "Why Intersectional Governance Matters," Klein and McGahan identify factors to make intersectional governance effective and draw out implications for leaders who seek to address domestic and global challenges. They introduce the term "intersectional governance" to account for the management of partnerships and cooperation between organizations in different sectors of society, such as collaborations between international organizations, government agencies, private for-profit firms, and nonprofit firms. Moving beyond a traditional focus on private-public partnerships, Klein and McGahan shift to a broader set of formal and informal collaborative agreements. They identify the unique challenges that all organizations face when collaborating across sectors: 1) goal congruence among all parties; 2) alignment of complementary resources; and 3) how outcomes are measured. They conclude that addressing governance over emergent resources and capabilities is a crucial facet of sustainability and will distinguish successful from unsuccessful intersectoral relationships.

In the second chapter, "Cross-Sector Collaboration for the Sustainable Development Goals: A Global Necessity, Not Luxury," van Tulder highlights that many academic disciplines address an intellectual and practical challenge: when faced with so-called "wicked problems," society faces a collective action problem. But he warns that it is far from easy to achieve the right coalitions and ideal cooperation. Cross-sector partnering should be geared toward creating collaborative solutions[33] through "collaborative advantages,"[34] in which new sources of trust can be built between governments, businesses, and civil society organizations. Van Tulder concludes that cross-sector collaboration is not a luxury but a necessity to get out of the societal paralysis and/or negative interaction patterns.

Mary Margaret Frank and Kathryn Babineau, in chapter 3, "Creating Value and Sharing Risk: The Next Frontier of Cross-Sector Collaboration," suggest that the next frontier of research on cross-sector collaboration must generate a richer understanding of how business creates value and shares risks. This frontier must include scholars from operations, marketing, finance, accounting, etc.—the functional areas of business. While two streams of management literature (public-private partnerships and corporate social responsibility) recognize the need for business to generate profit in a capitalist society, Frank and Babineau conclude that they lack a deeper consideration of how business generates profit and assesses the risk of achieving profit that effective collaboration with companies requires. By organizing around the business functions instead of the societal issue, they offer an understanding of how companies "can do well by doing good" and empower new cooperation across all the sectors.

Kirk Emerson and Min Woo Ahn, in chapter 4, "Collaborative Governance Regimes: Informing Practice through Research," focus our attention on CGRs, defined as systems of public governance where autonomous organizations work together over time to achieve some collective public purpose. They highlight how collaborative governance regimes occur at a variety of scales (local, subnational, national, cross-national, and global) and across different policy domains, from environmental to public health, emergency management, and public education. Their findings from a review of studies offer insights for practitioners, especially the importance for initiating leaders to conduct careful assessments of the system context to understand the potential value and the challenges ahead for forming a CGR.

Lisa Blomgren Amsler, in chapter 5, "Collaborative Governance and Rules of the Game in the United States," examines how public law impacts our capacity to collaborate and how the rules shape what the public, nonprofits, and private sector produce through collaboration. Blomgren Amsler argues that as problems call for approaches that scale from local to global, our legal and policy frameworks need to evolve to support and to foster collaborative governance. This means that practitioners must ensure they understand the existing rules and legal framework (rules of the game) within which action takes place, and how this shapes what is possible. Moreover, it means that practitioners should advocate to change rules that limit collaborative action.

In chapters 6 through 9 of Part I, scholars examine cross-sector collaboration in several substantive areas, including: public health, education, and infrastructure. Anita Chandra, in chapter 6, "Is Public Health's Multisectoral Mission Achieving Its Promise in the United States?" examines the progress and limitations of public health's current approach to cross-sector collaboration and offers insights about paths forward. Chandra covers some of the contemporary conflicts that have been illuminated in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the calls to address systemic racism as a public health issue. According to Chandra, one of the hallmarks of public health is the recognition that improving a population's health requires consideration of structural and systemic drivers that extend across all sectors. Given this context, cross-sector collaboration should have a mechanism to lift up less dominant views of health across cultural groups (for example, more holistic considerations of health across physical, mental, environmental, and spiritual domains) as well as those that may exist in other sectors to accelerate improvements in population health outcomes.

Jeffrey Henig, in chapter 7, "Cross-Sector Collaboration in Education: The Apolitical Impulse," describes the emergence of cross-sector collaboration in education and explains why it has caught on to the degree it has. He also delves into issues of governance and interest group politics that are often overlooked in our hope to frame cross-sector collaboration as a natural outgrowth of a pragmatic pursuit of shared interests. Henig warns that failure to acknowledge and confront competing interests, both locally and across levels of government, risks exposing a promising movement to funding and legitimacy threats that may "doom it to repeat the cycle of episodic and ephemeral reform that has been too common in the education arena." As a political scientist, he illustrates several ways in which failure to consider and address politics and power risks consigning cross-sector collaboration to an insubstantial role.

In chapter 8, "Three Lessons from a Research-Practice Partnership in Education," Ruth N. López Turley and Brian Holzman introduce us to research-practice partnerships (RPPs)—long-term, mutually beneficial, formalized collaborations between education researchers, practitioners, administrators, and policymakers. Although RPPs include at least one academic research institution and one education agency, they vary in terms of the number and types of institutions and agencies, as well as the extent to which they involve other government and community stakeholders. López Turley and Holzman explain that other stakeholders, such as business and nonprofits, also have varying roles in RPPs, depending on their engagement with local education. They highlight the case of the Houston Education Research Consortium

(HERC) to illustrate the benefits and challenges that come with a cross-sector collaboration in education.

In chapter 9, “Collaboration for the People: Community Consultation and the Case of the El Paso Children’s Museum,” Eric Boyer focuses our attention on lack of community consultation or public involvement in the planning and implementation of PPPs and other forms of cross-sector collaboration. Boyer illuminates the importance of early, in-person approaches to community consultation in the initial planning of a collaboration. He suggests that these efforts are likely to be most critical during the early stages, where the fundamental aspects of the partnership are being designed. Moreover, he concludes that there is a need for a clear public education component to any consultative program. In sum, members of the public need to understand what the collaboration or partnership itself is to adequately weigh in on its actual implementation.

In Part II, practitioners and philanthropists highlight the successes and failures of cross-sector collaboration from the field.

Sonal R. Shah, in chapter 10, “Creating Cross-Sector Collaborations to Change Lives,” shares three lessons about cross-sector collaborations from her tenure as deputy assistant to the president and director of the White House Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation. First, leadership matters at the top. Either the president, the secretary, or someone in senior leadership needs to make cross-sector collaboration a priority. Second, collaboration is not just internal; it requires bringing people together within and outside of government. A third and important part of effective cross-sector collaboration is to start small and prove it can work, then replicate, and scale.

In chapter 11, “Lift Every Voice: The Biden Administration and Partnerships with Faith-Based and Neighborhood Organizations,” Melissa Rogers illuminates how federal, state, and local officials have partnered with faith-based organizations to help people in need. Rogers provides a brief history of some ways in which recent administrations (Clinton, Bush, Obama, and Trump) have institutionalized this work. She offers a few suggestions for the new Biden administration regarding faith-based partnerships.

Zia Khan, in chapter 12, “Challenges in Cross-Sector Collaboration and Learning from Doing: Insights from Philanthropy,” explains how philanthropies, especially large ones like The Rockefeller Foundation, exist, in many ways, to drive broader collaboration. They have the capital, the expertise, and the convening powers to catalyze big collaboration between government, the private sector, civil society, and the communities they want to serve. However, Khan warns that well-intentioned collaborations “often go awry due to insufficient upfront attention to what specifically the collaboration is meant to achieve, and how to achieve it"—what elsewhere in the volume is called "goal congruence." Khan argues that creating the right "blend of different groups' organizational capabilities is essential for collaboration to be an impact multiplier rather than a tax." This is particularly true for the softer aspects of each group's makeup: its internal culture; its networks; and the motivations of its members. Khan concludes that teams can have more impact when they resist the pressure to deliver quickly on a collaboration's promised outcomes and, instead, invest time in designing and building mechanisms that consider those differences and transform them into advantages for the cross-sector collaboration.

Bobby Milstein, Beth Siegel, and Jane Erickson, in chapter 13, "How Philanthropy Can Amplify Multisector Stewardship to Support Health and Well-Being," argue that philanthropy often plays a central role in advancing regional cross-sector collaboration—both as funders and collaborative participants. They explain that networks of partners, by contrast, can create durable cross-sector collaborations that encompass one or more of the vital conditions that everyone needs to reach their full potential (including basic needs for health and safety, lifelong learning, meaningful work and wealth, humane housing, a thriving natural world, reliable transportation, as well as a sense of belonging and civic muscle). Philanthropy can play a key role in strengthening multisector stewardship.

Simone D. Brody, in chapter 14, "Improving Economic Mobility through Cross-Sector Collaboration in America's Cities," argues that cross-sector collaboration is critical to drive economic mobility in communities and to create equal opportunities for all residents. The private sector relies on the public sector to adequately educate and prepare young people to become independent and join the workforce. The government relies on nonprofits to provide the "last mile" of service on social goods (for example, housing quality, workforce training). And the private sector produces a robust economy to resource government and nonprofit services. Given this deep interdependence, Brody concludes that cross-sector collaboration is particularly well-suited for creating solutions that boost economic mobility.

Erika C. Poethig, in chapter 15, "Building a Racially and Economically Inclusive Recovery: What Is the Role for Cross-Sector Collaboration?" reports on the Urban Institute's Inclusive Recovery in U.S. Cities report, which highlighted trends in economic health and inclusion across more than 250 cities and within a subset of cities that have experienced an economic recovery. She reports that cross-sector collaboration was a critical ingredient to ensuring a more racially and economically inclusive recovery. She highlights the following practices: adopt a shared vision; inspire and sustain bold public leadership; recruit partners from across sectors; build voice and power; leverage assets and intrinsic advantages; think and act regionally; reframe racial and economic inclusion as integral to growth; and adopt policies and programs to support inclusion.

In chapter 16, "Social Capital and Quantifying Success Factors for Cross-Sector Collaboration: Insights from the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston," Erin Graves and Amy Higgins highlight the interest within the Federal Reserve System community to promote cross-sector collaboration as a way to improve economic outcomes for low-income communities. Together with partners in philanthropy and state government, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston created the Working Cities and Working Communities Challenges. It developed a survey tool that would allow cross-sector collaborations, those supported by the Fed as well as outside the Fed, to measure cross-sector social capital. The survey items ask leaders for their view of how professionals in their own sector, as well as each of the other sectors, communicate, work together, trust, and are inclusive of one another. Higgins and Graves suggest that devising a tool for measuring overall cross-sector social capital, as well as identifying differences between bonds and bridges and locating asymmetries, may aid actors who seek to foster cross-sector collaboration by identifying aspects to target for effective collaboration.

John Melville, Francie Genz, and Lindsey Woolsey, in chapter 17, "Cracking the Collaboration Code: Why Do Some Regions Advance while Others Falter?" highlight the dozens of regions across eighteen states that have launched Next Generation Sector Partnerships based on these two principles: strong industry leadership and integrated community support. They offer a distillation of what these places have learned from their experience. Next Gen Sector Partnerships are collaborations of business leaders from a common industry in a shared labor market region who team up to identify, prioritize, and address shared talent and the broader competitiveness needs of their industry, working together with a coordinated team of public and nonprofit partners, including education, workforce development, and economic development organizations. The authors' experience in over eighty regions around the country suggests that the difference lies in how leaders from public, private, and nonprofit sectors work together.

In chapter 18, "The Costs and Benefits of Cross-Sector Partnerships: The Revitalization of New York City's Central Park," William Eimicke highlights the revitalization of Central Park in New York City as one of the best examples of a successful cross-sector collaboration with organizations—New York City's Mayor's Office, Department of Parks and Recreation, nonprofit Central Park Conservancy, multiple private architects and construction companies, and numerous neighborhood friends of the park associations—led collaboratively by the Central Park Conservancy and the City's Department of Parks and Recreation. Eimicke highlights the key elements of successful cross-sector partnership management: collaborative leadership; communication; advanced communication; and feedback mechanisms to survive, improve, and succeed. A team management approach is essential for cross-sector partnerships given the diverse set of skills and knowledge required to accomplish the complex objectives they are created to achieve.

Kathryn Pettit and Leah Hendey, in chapter 19, "Cross-Sector Collaboration at the Community Level: Perspectives from the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership," report on the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership (NNIP), a peer-learning network of organizations that ensures communities have access to data and the skills to use information to advance equity and well-being across neighborhoods. The authors highlight the value of local data intermediary organizations that help local governments and their communities identify priority issues, find new allies, and devise data-driven policies and programs more effectively. The authors conclude that the basic model of a local data intermediary is standing the test of time, but it must continue to evolve to facilitate the use of data for community action by government, the nonprofit sector, and the private sector in a changing environment.

In chapter 20, "Rural Place-Based Collaboration: The Transformation of Danville, Virginia," Karl N. Stauber focuses our attention on rural areas. Stauber concludes that rural areas exist within a larger ecosystem that does much to determine the options available. While smaller communities can do little to "make the waves" that drive the economic, cultural, and political climates, he uses the case of Danville, Virginia, to explain how "they can decide which waves to ride and how to ride them." Stauber notes that too many want "silver bullets and superheroes," but those do not exist. Even as Danville, like many rural regions, experienced significant economic decline and growing pessimism, it had significant assets. But, like many communities experiencing long-term decline, the assets were hard to see. Transformation requires organizations and leaders with priorities to collaborate and an ability to identify and leverage the assets.

In chapter 21, "Collaboration at the Speed of Trust, Not Technology: Making Space for the Public Interest in Intersector Data Collaboration," Michelle Shevin and Maia Woluchem suggest that stakeholders across the public, nonprofit, and private sectors have interest in data-sharing capabilities, whether to better understand their constituents, to predict future needs, to measure outcomes, or to improve their own products and services. However, Shevin and Woluchem warn that there are few thoughtful, interdisciplinary, cross-sector conversations about what to do with the abundance of public-sector data and how to use it to best serve the public interest. Too often such conversations are characterized by sales pitches, industry-insider events, or lawyers drawing up data-sharing agreements behind closed doors. Of fundamental interest to funders is that many issues around data governance remain unsettled even as the deployment of these technologies speeds ahead. Key questions include: What agency is held by the people whose data is represented in the system? Who has the right to challenge a decision made or informed by a data-driven system? What recompense is owed to those harmfully labeled, continually over-surveilled, falsely accused, or wrongfully incarcerated by algorithms? Shevin and Woluchem warn that these questions must be asked at scale and infrastructure built to enable public debate and response if continued deployment of data-driven systems can be said to be in the public interest.

Dan Wu and Aaron Truchil, in chapter 22, "Intersector Data-Sharing Strategies: Challenges, Risks, and Opportunities," focus on data as an asset being exchanged. Each sector and its comprising entities (for example, the various levels of government; conglomerates in the private sector, foundations, and nonprofits; and service providers) have a range of tangible and intangible assets relevant to data collaboration. They highlight that the benefits of intersector data collaboration are often not attained due to a range of motivational, economic, ethical, political, legal, and technical challenges. The authors outline general strategies that can be useful to help navigate these challenges. The data-sharing strategies show the importance of demonstrating the benefits—and safely addressing the risks—of data sharing from the beginning of any collaboration.

Maxwell Zorick and Joey Wozniak, in chapter 23, "Multisector Collaboration for Civic Engagement: The Case of Vote Early Day" report on the inaugural Vote Early Day launched on Saturday, October 24, 2020. MTV helped spearhead Vote Early Day, a fiscally sponsored project of the New Venture Fund, and founded it in partnership with ViacomCBS; Students Learn Students Vote Coalition; Twitter; Univision; Snap, Inc.; Civic Alliance; Center for Tech & Civic Life; CAA Foundation; and Poder Latinx. It was a multisector collaboration working to ensure all eligible Americans know their options to vote early. The mutual goal was to ensure voter turnout was high among Americans (especially first-time voters), not just voter registration in the 2020 national election. Companies, nonprofits, influencers, creatives, and election administrators all helped to elevate information about how and where to vote early, while making voting early feel like a social and celebratory act (which social science research shows increases voter turnout).

In sum, our contributors highlight innovation in cross-sector collaboration, in localities ranging from cities, regions, states, federal, and the international community. Each contributor illuminates emergent areas of research and practice that warrant greater attention.

Our final chapter highlights the future challenges—known and unknown—that can benefit from intersectoral governance and cross-sector collaboration. We believe that cross-sector collaboration can be a form of "good" governance. Good governance should be a concern if a society is in possession of the political, legal, and administrative institutions that make it possible to enact and implement policies that can be understood as public goods.[35] Moreover, good governance refers not only to certain qualities of government institutions but also to governments' interactions with private or nonprofit sectors. Good governance can be produced by the government alone, but in many cases there is a need for collaboration with for-profit and/or nonprofit organizations.[36] With the rise of complex interdependent challenges, we need a new generation of leaders who can leverage cross-sector collaboration between the public, nonprofit, and private sectors. In the face of the intractable problems that the United States and other countries face in the future, productive collaboration across the public, private, and nonprofit sectors is needed now more than ever.

Notes

1. See World Economic Forum, "The Global Risks Report 2020," www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Global_Risk_Report_2020.pdf.

2. See Pew Research Center, "Americans' Views of Government: Low Trust, but Some Positive Performance Ratings," September 14, 2020, www.pewresearch.org/politics/2020/09/14/americans-views-of-government-low-trust-but-some-positive-performance-ratings/.

3. David McMillan, "Five Graphs that Show How Uncertain Markets are about the Coronavirus Recovery," World Economic Forum, August 4, 2020, www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/08/five-graphs-coronavirus-covid19-recovery-economics.

4. See National Institutes of Health, "Accelerating COVID-19 Therapeutic Interventions and Vaccines (ACTIV)," www.nih.gov/research-training/medical-research-initiatives/activ. Through ACTIV, NIH brings together government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and numerous biopharmaceutical companies.

5. Francis S. Collins and Paul Stoffels, "Accelerating COVID-19 Therapeutic

Interventions and Vaccines (ACTIV): An Unprecedented Partnership for Unprecedented Times," *JAMA* 323, 24 (September 2020), pp. 2455–57.

6. Peter Klein and others, "Toward a Theory of Public Entrepreneurship," *European Management Review* 7, 1 (Spring 2010), pp. 1–15.

7. Elinor Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutional Forms of Collective Action* (Cambridge University Press, 1990).

8. John M. Bryson, Barbara C. Crosby, and Melissa Middleton Stone, "The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature," *Public Administration Review* 66 (November 2006), pp. 44–55.

9. Jeanine Becker and David B. Smith, "The Need for Cross-Sector Collaboration," *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Winter 2018), https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_need_for_cross_sector_collaboration.

10. John M. Bryson, Barbara C. Crosby, and Melissa M. Stone, "Designing and Implementing Cross-Sector Collaborations: Needed and Challenging," *Public Administration Review* 75 (August 2015), pp. 647–63.

11. Bryson, Crosby, and Stone, "Designing and Implementing Cross-Sector Collaborations."

12. Michelle Shumate and others, "Does Cross-Sector Collaboration Lead to Higher Nonprofit Capacity?" *Journal of Business Ethics* 150 (April 2018), pp. 385–99; Kathy Babiak and Lucie Thibault, "Challenges in Multiple Cross-Sector Partnerships," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 38 (December 2007), pp. 117–43.

13. Heidi Herlin, "Better Safe than Sorry: Nonprofit Organizational Legitimacy and Cross-Sector Partnerships," *Business & Society* 54, 6 (January 2013), pp. 822–58.

14. Michal Almog-Bar and Ester Zychlinski, "Collaboration between Philanthropic Foundations and Government," *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 27, 3 (April 2014), pp. 201–11.

15. See FSG website, "About," www.fsg.org/about.

16. See Collective Impact Forum, "About Us," www.collectiveimpactforum.org/about-us.

17. Timur Narbaev, Alberto De Marco, and Nurlan Orazalin, "A Multi-Disciplinary Meta-Review of the Public-Private Partnerships Research," *Construction Management and Economics* 3, 2 (July 2020), pp. 109–25.

18. See World Bank Group Public-Private-Partnership Legal Resource Center, "What Are Public Private Partnerships?" https://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/overview/what-are-public-private-partnerships.

19. Mary Margaret Frank and Kathryn Babineau, "Creating Value and Sharing Risk: The Next Frontier of Cross-Sector Collaboration," chapter 3, this volume.

20. Maria May Seitandi and Andrew Crane, "Implementing CSR through Partnerships: Understanding the Selection, Design, and Institutionalization of Nonprofit-Business Partnerships," *Journal of Business Ethics* 85 (April 2009), pp. 413–29.

21. See Frank and Babineau, this volume.

22. See Peter Klein and Anita McGahan, "Why Intersectional Governance Matters," chapter 1, this volume.

23. See Klein and McGahan, this volume.

24. Chris Ansell and Alison Gash, "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18, no. 4 (October 2008),

pp. 543–71. This definition stresses six important criteria: (1) the forum is initiated by public agencies or institutions, (2) participants in the forum include non-state actors, (3) participants engage directly in decisionmaking and are not merely "consulted" by public agencies, (4) the forum is formally organized and meets collectively, (5) the forum aims to make decisions by consensus (even if consensus is not achieved in practice), and (6) the focus of collaboration is on public policy or public management.

25. Ibid.

26. John D. Donahue and Richard J. Zeckhauser, "Public-Private Collaboration," in *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy*, edited by Robert E. Goodin, Michael Moran, and Martin Rein (Oxford University Press, 2008).

27. Maurits Waardenburg and others, "Paradoxes of Collaborative Governance: Investigating the Real-Life Dynamics of Multi-Agency Collaborations using a Quasi-Experimental Action-Research Approach," *Public Management Review* 22, 3 (May 2019), pp. 386–407.

28. John D. Donahue and Richard J. Zeckhauser, *Collaborative Governance: Private Roles for Public Goals in Turbulent Times* (Princeton University Press, 2012). The authors distinguish three kinds of shared discretion—production, payoffs, and preferences. Production discretion regards the means to pursue defined ends. Payoff discretion regards how the gains from efficiency are shared. Preference discretion arises when various kinds of payoffs are valued differently by the partners (even when "altruistic").

29. Kirk Emerson, Tina Nabatchi, and Stephen Balogh, "An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 22, 1 (January 2012), p. 6.

30. Gunnar Folke Schuppert, "Partnerships," in *The SAGE Handbook of Governance*, edited by M. Bevir (London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2010), pp. 286–99.

31. Christiaan Grootaert and Thieery Van Bastelar, *Understanding and Measuring Social Capital: A Multidisciplinary Tool for Practitioners* (The World Bank, 2002); P. Ruuskanen, "Social Capital and Innovations in Small and Medium Sized Enterprises," paper presented at the DRUID Summer Conference, Denmark, June 14–16, 2004; Robert Putnam and others, "Using Social Capital to Help Integrate Planning Theory, Research, and Practice: Preface," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70, 2 (2004), pp. 142–92.

32. Lester M. Salamon, "The New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: An Introduction," *Fordham Urban Law Journal* 28, 5 (2011); Donald F. Kettl, "The Job of Government: Interweaving Public Functions and Private Hands," *Public Administration Review* 75, 2 (2015), pp. 219–29.

33. Stuart L. Hart and Sanjay Sharma, "Engaging Fringe Stakeholders for Competitive Imagination," *Academy of Management Executive*, 18, 1 (February 2004), pp. 7–18.

34. Chris Huxham and Siv Vangen, "Doing Things Collaboratively: Realizing the Advantage or Succumbing to Inertia?" *Organizational Dynamics* 33, 2 (February 2004), pp. 190–201.

35. Bo Rothstein, "Good Governance," in *The Oxford Handbook of Governance*, edited by David Levi-Faur (Oxford University Press, 2012).

36. Jon Pierre and B. Guy Peters, *Governing Complex Societies: Trajectories and Scenarios* (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).