**Integrated working**

Please note this is a first draft/prototype reference guide. There is room for improvement and some areas where little or no identified help is listed at present. If you can recommend additional resources, suggest alternative questions, or otherwise assist in improving the guide, please contact the TRUE team leader, Paul Chatterton (P.Chatterton@leeds.ac.uk).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the barrier?</th>
<th>What is worth considering?</th>
<th>What may help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmes/projects managed as discrete entities without regard to links to other programmes/projects.</td>
<td>• What are the relationships between this project and others or the broader programme? Do they all have the same partners? Require the same governance? • Can linkages be made across boundaries, partners and governance without compromising relationships or requiring control beyond the organisational capability? • Is there support from leaders and governance structures to manage this project as part of a system of projects, at least some of which depend on success with this one? • Is there comprehension of the potential benefits from a systemic approach to projects and programmes?</td>
<td>Consider benefits – do several projects contribute to the same benefits. Consider using a mind map with the team – they may have knowledge you don’t. Mind map templates are available from many sources including <a href="https://www.lucidchart.com/pages/examples/mind-map">https://www.lucidchart.com/pages/examples/mind-map</a>, and free software from: <a href="https://www.smartdraw.com/mind-map/mind-mapping-software.htm">https://www.smartdraw.com/mind-map/mind-mapping-software.htm</a>. Some good resources on partnership working here: <a href="http://partnerships.org.uk/part/index.htm">http://partnerships.org.uk/part/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice or focus limitations compromise the delivery of outcomes.</td>
<td>• How are limitations potentially compromising delivery of the project’s strategic importance? • Are existing leadership and governance structures sufficient to overcome limitations and better match practice/focus to strategy? • Is the organisational practice or project focus so limited it compromises the team’s ability to meet project demands? • Does it/do they require new methods, technologies or practices to ensure outcome delivery? • Are the practice or focus limitations a result of the lack of history delivery similar projects successfully? • Does a rigid/unresponsive organisational culture limit practice or focus options?</td>
<td>Consider empowerment culture to support individual decision taking. Consider inviting people from outside your team to participate in a Design for Wiser Action process: <a href="https://uccommunity.org.au/sites/default/files/designing_for_wiser_action.pdf">https://uccommunity.org.au/sites/default/files/designing_for_wiser_action.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Culture is suspicious or not transparent. | • What is the source of organisational/team culture of suspicion or non-transparency?  
• Is it ubiquitous and endemic or a response to one or more discrete events?  
• Do leaders support a culture change? Does governance allow for it?  
• How might stakeholders be included in and contribute to a cultural change?  
• How does the suspicious or non-transparent organisational/team culture impact the ability to work across boundaries and build relationships with partners?  
• Do project aspects outside of organisational control contribute to the suspicion or lack of transparency?  
| Are policies in place to support a genuine open culture covering aspects such as HR policy, Openess, whistle blowing etc? Where are the relational strengths and weaknesses which would help or hinder trust?  
Systemic constellations are a good way to explore the hidden or invisible dimensions of organisational culture: http://isca-network.org/systemic-constellations/what-is-a-constellation |
| Poor strategic awareness of partner(s)' capability or capacity. | • What is the strategic perception of partner(s)' capabilities?  
• Where does it come from?  
• Have partners been engaged in discussions of their relevant capability and capacity?  
• Are leadership and governance supportive of learning about partner(s)' capabilities and capacities?  
• Can they track changing capabilities and capacities or are they limited to a one-off snapshot? If a snapshot, when was it "taken"?  
• What might be done organisationally to ensure awareness is improved now and for the future?  
| Are overall objectives genuinely signed up to by all partners, and is there a culture of openness? Is there clarity about the responsibilities and accountabilities required from each partner? Where are these held within the system and is authority given by partners for them to be held there? Are staff encouraged to move between organisations either permanently or on a secondment basis?  
Some good resources on partnership working here: http://partnerships.org.uk/part/index.htm |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reluctance to learn from experiences or external stakeholders.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Partnerships do not result in expected benefit(s).</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Is the organisation or team set up to learn from experience or external stakeholders?  
• Are there organisational barriers to learning?  
• How do stakeholders perceive the organisation/team learning processes?  
• What is the origin of the reluctance to learn from experience or external stakeholders?  
• Do current leaders and governance structures impose limits on learning?  
• Are partners willing to share their knowledge and experience?  
• Are common objectives and common finances set up which would support cross organisational risk taking?  
• Are own organisational KPIs allowed to slip in support of cross boundary goals? | Have responsibilities been defined which genuinely span more than one organisation? Is there a single budget?  
Are learning intervals part of the process? See Kolb’s Experiential Learning cycle: [https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/gradschool/training/eresources/teaching/theories/kolb](https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/gradschool/training/eresources/teaching/theories/kolb)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Partnerships do not result in expected benefit(s).</strong></th>
<th><strong>Partnerships do not result in expected benefit(s).</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Have the right partnerships been identified and pursued?  
• Are essential relationships with some partners missing?  
• Is someone clearly responsible for managing partnership relationships?  
• Do team members have the necessary collaborative skills to work effectively with the range of partners?  
• Do they have a tolerance for uncertainty sufficient to the complexity of the circumstances?  
• Are risks and issues which would identify partnership shortfalls regularly reviewed and resultant actions discussed in joint governance meetings?  
• Is there a commitment to learn from ‘failure’?  
• How much is this due to horizontal relationships between partners and how much to the partners’ internal hierarchies impeding genuine partnership working? | Some good resources on partnership working here: [http://partnerships.org.uk/part/index.htm](http://partnerships.org.uk/part/index.htm)  

---

Some good resources on partnership working here: [http://partnerships.org.uk/part/index.htm](http://partnerships.org.uk/part/index.htm)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly risk averse regardless of real risk levels.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Where does the risk aversion come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there leaders who are intolerant of risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is governance too limited or restrictive to allow for better risk management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is the overall organisational structure challenged by basic risk management requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are common objectives and common finances set up which would support cross organisational risk taking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are own organisational KPIs allowed to slip in support of cross boundary goals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cut risk levels by prototyping on the principle “Fail early to learn quickly.” You prototype an idea before you have fleshed it out completely. Prototyping is an experimental way of exploring and getting feedback from stakeholders in order to move forward. [http://www.ted.com/talks/tom_wujec_build_a_tower](http://www.ted.com/talks/tom_wujec_build_a_tower).