Sarcouncil Journal of Public Administration and Management

ISSN(Online): 2945-3712

Volume- 05| Issue- 03| 2026

Research Article **Received:** 20-03-2026 | **Accepted:** 15-04-2026 | **Published:** 01-05-2026

Beyond Deliverables: Invisible Work, Strategic Impact, and Career Advancement in Enterprise Healthcare Systems

Peeyush Khandelwal

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA

Abstract: Career advancement in enterprise healthcare organizations often contradicts traditional expectations. Any Individual or any High-performing professionals who can consistently deliver measurable outputs often reach a plateau in their advancement trajectories, while others with similar technical profiles rise to the leadership positions. This article examines the conceptual and practical dimensions of "invisible work"—a category of organizational contribution characterized by stakeholder alignment, systemic risk anticipation, narrative construction, and preemptive problem resolution—and its relationship to career advancement in complex healthcare environments, including pharmacy benefit management (PBM) systems. Utilizing organizational behavior theory, healthcare management literature, and systems thinking frameworks, this paper presents and implements the Strategic Impact Framework (SIF) as a systematic model for the transition from execution-oriented roles to strategic leadership. The analysis synthesizes evidence from healthcare informatics, knowledge management, and leadership development research to argue that invisible work constitutes a critical—yet systematically undervalued—dimension of professional impact in enterprise healthcare settings.

Keywords: Invisible Work, Strategic Impact, Healthcare Leadership, Pharmacy Benefit Management, Systems Thinking, Stakeholder Alignment, Organizational Advancement, Enterprise Healthcare.

INTRODUCTION

The Advancement Paradox

Career advancement in enterprise healthcare systems presents a persistent and organizationally consequential paradox. Professionals who demonstrate technical mastery, meet performance targets, and accumulate credentials frequently plateau at execution-level roles, while others—with comparable or lesser technical profiles—ascend into strategic leadership. This divergence is not arbitrary. It reflects a structural misalignment between what conventional performance frameworks measure and what complex healthcare organizations actually need to function effectively [Strauss, A. 1985].

Deep interdependency, regulatory density, and clinical consequence define enterprise healthcare environments, which encompass payer operations, provider networks, pharmacy benefit management, and digital health platforms. In such systems, the difference between a project that succeeds and one that fails rarely lies in the quality of individual task execution. It lies in whether someone identified the downstream implications of a system change before implementation, aligned stakeholders whose interests conflicted before that conflict became a crisis, or reframed a technical initiative in terms that sustained executive commitment through a difficult rollout [Star, S. L. 1999; Suchman, L. 1995]. These contributions determine organizational outcomes. They are also, by and large, invisible in formal performance records.

This invisibility is not incidental. It is structural. Organizational performance systems are calibrated to outputs that can be counted, attributed, and compared—features deployed, claims processed, and audits completed. The coordinative, anticipatory, and relational labor that shapes whether those outputs produce genuine value resists such accounting [Schmidt, K., & Bannon, L. 1992]. The result is a systematic recognition gap: the work that most Influencing organizational success in complex healthcare systems is the work least likely to advance a professional's career.

The Literature Gap

The concept of invisible work has a substantive theoretical history in organizational sociology [Schmidt, K., & Bannon, L. 1992; Shortliffe, E. H. *et al*., 2014], feminist organizational theory [Jiang, F. *et al*., 2017; Bates, D. W., & Gawande, A. A. 2003], and knowledge management research [ATM, W. 2018]. What this literature has not produced, however, is a structured and operationalizable framework for applying invisible work as a deliberate professional strategy specifically within enterprise healthcare and PBM environments. Existing scholarship is predominantly descriptive and critical—documenting the existence and inequitable distribution of invisible work—rather than prescriptive and developmental.

***Corresponding Author:** Peeyush Khandelwal

DOI-https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19949109

Simultaneously, the healthcare leadership development literature, though rich in competency frameworks [Kotzias, K. *et al*., 2023; Committee on Quality of Health Care in America, 2001], has not systematically integrated invisible work as a theoretical construct. This article occupies the precise space between these two bodies of literature—one that names the phenomenon and one that shapes leadership practice.

The Strategic Impact Framework (SIF) introduced here addresses that gap by translating the theoretical construct of invisible work into five actionable professional dimensions, each grounded in established theory and accompanied by a formal proposition for empirical testing. Each is examined through the specific organizational contexts of enterprise healthcare and PBM systems.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Invisible Work and Its Structural Disappearance

Strauss [Strauss, A. 1985] established that invisibility is not an intrinsic property of work but an organizational construction: work becomes visible when it aligns with dominant frameworks of recognition and accountability and invisible when it does not. In enterprise healthcare systems, formal performance frameworks are calibrated to discrete, attributable outputs. The coordinative, interpretive, and relational labor that determines whether those outputs produce value—what Strauss termed "articulation work"—is almost always excluded from these frameworks.

Star [Star, S. L. 1999] expanded this analysis, illustrating that behaviors critical to project success—maintaining the integrity of infrastructural systems, managing classification boundaries, and sustaining the coordinative conditions for collective work—were frequently rendered invisible by the very organizational frameworks used to evaluate them. Star called this process the "ecology of invisible work": behaviors that are organizationally useful but made unrecognizable by dominant performance structures. In technically oriented healthcare environments, where domain expertise and measurable output anchor professional identity, this disappearance operates with particular force.

Jiang *et al*. [Jiang, F. *et al*., 2017] provided a contemporary grounding by demonstrating that relational and coordinative labor in AI-integrated healthcare environments—though organizationally consequential for system adoption and safety—is systematically excluded from technical performance frameworks. Bates *et al*. [Bates, D. W., & Gawande, A. A. 2003] further established that the invisible coordinative work surrounding the implementation of health information technology is a primary determinant of whether such systems improve or disrupt patient safety outcomes.

Collectively, this body of scholarship establishes three foundational claims that underpin the SIF. First, invisible work is real work—skilled, consequential, and learnable. Second, its invisibility is structural rather than accidental, produced by performance frameworks that are miscalibrated for complex organizational environments. Third, and critically, invisible work is not randomly distributed: it falls disproportionately on women, racially marginalized professionals, and those in lower organizational ranks [Star, S. L. 1999; Jiang, F. *et al*., 2017], a dimension with direct implications for how any framework advocating its strategic performance must be positioned and applied.

Systems Thinking, Complexity, and the Premium on Anticipation

Kohn *et al*. [Donaldson, M. S. *et al*., 2000] established that healthcare organizations exhibit the properties of complex adaptive systems: nonlinearity, sensitivity to initial conditions, and characterization by emergent behaviors that cannot be predicted from component-level analysis. In such systems, interventions create cascading effects across organizational, clinical, and technological domains, which remain invisible from any single functional vantage point. The organizational premium this process creates—on professionals who can reason across system boundaries and anticipate second-order consequences—is precisely the premium that the SIF's first two dimensions are designed to operationalize.

Suchman [Suchman, L. 1995] provided empirical grounding for this claim at the level of workplace practice: system design failures, rather than individual errors, were the primary drivers of disrupted work outcomes in complex sociotechnical systems. The implication for career development is direct—professionals who understand and manage system-level interdependencies contribute to outcomes that matter most in ways that transcend individual task performance.

Publisher: SARC Publisher

Kotzias *et al*. [Kotzias, K. *et al*., 2023] further extended this argument into Industry 4.0 healthcare contexts, demonstrating that the increasing integration of digital systems into healthcare operations amplifies the organizational premium on professionals who can anticipate cross-system consequences, making downstream awareness and upstream thinking not merely valuable but operationally essential.

The Equity Imperative

No theoretically responsible treatment of invisible work can proceed without engaging its equity dimensions. The scholars whose work underlies this framework—Strauss, Star, Jiang *et al*., and Bates *et al*.—each documented that invisible work is disproportionately performed by those with less formal authority, attributed to personal disposition rather than professional competence, and excluded from advancement criteria [Strauss, A. 1985; Star, S. L. 1999; Jiang, F. *et al*., 2017; Bates, D. W., & Gawande, A. A. 2003]. Carayon *et al*. [Carayon, P. A. S. H. *et al*., 2006] extended this evidence base to patient safety contexts, demonstrating that coordinative and facilitative work—the organizational analogue of invisible work—is measurably and inequitably distributed across role hierarchies, with direct negative effects on both worker advancement and system safety outcomes.

Table 1: Invisible Work—Attribution and Advancement Consequence by Role Group

Role Group	Attribution Pattern	Career Consequence
Women in technical roles	Attributed to personality, not competence	Excluded from promotion criteria
Lower organizational ranks	Treated as routine job duty	Advancement stalled at execution level
Clinical frontline staff	Attributed to clinical duty, not leadership	Rarely recognized in formal evaluations
Senior/majority group	Attributed to professional judgment	Recognized and rewarded in advancement

This finding introduces a tension that must be acknowledged rather than deflected: a framework advocating strategic invisible work performance, without simultaneously critiquing the structures that render such work invisible and distribute it inequitably, risks reinforcing the conditions that disadvantage already marginalized professionals. The SIF deals with this tension on two levels. At the individual level, it reframes invisible work from an unchosen obligation into a consciously bounded strategic practice whose performance is determined by professional judgment rather than implicit social expectation. At the organizational level, its propositions provide a basis for reforming performance evaluation and promotion criteria to make invisible contributions visible, recognized, and equitably attributed.

THE STRATEGIC IMPACT FRAMEWORK

The SIF operationalizes invisible work across five dimensions, each corresponding to a distinct and learnable form of organizational contribution. The dimensions are not sequential; they operate simultaneously and interact dynamically in practice. Each is grounded in at least two independent theoretical traditions and accompanied by a formal proposition linking it to measurable organizational and career outcomes.

Dimension 1—Upstream Thinking involves examining the origins and strategic purposes of organizational initiatives rather than operating solely within defined requirements. Task-focused professionals see upstream decisions as fixed limits, while upstream thinkers question the business problem that an initiative is meant to solve, the financial and operational pressures that shaped its framing, and the constraints that led to the current approach [Star, S. L. 1999]. In PBM contexts, this means understanding how a formulary redesign relates to cost-trend pressures, payer-manufacturer contract structures, and population health goals—connections that are rarely made in formal requirement documents but that are critical for determining whether the initiative, as planned, will achieve its purpose. Upstream thinking positions professionals as problem framers rather than task executors, a distinction associated with leadership potential across managerial career trajectory research [Kotzias, K. *et al*., 2023].

Proposition 1: Professionals who systematically engage in upstream thinking will demonstrate significantly greater alignment between their contributions and organizational priorities and will be more frequently identified as candidates for

Publisher: SARC Publisher

strategic leadership roles than those who operate solely within defined requirements.

Dimension 2—Downstream Awareness involves the proactive identification and communication of second- and third-order effects before implementation. In complex adaptive healthcare systems [Donaldson, M. S. *et al*., 2000], changes in one process routinely cascade through adjacent processes in nonlinear ways that are invisible from any single functional vantage point. A modification to eligibility verification logic in a PBM system may propagate through prior authorization workflows, claims adjudication accuracy, member cost communications, and regulatory reporting requirements—none of which may be visible to the team executing the change. Professionals who map and communicate these connections before implementation reduce organizational risk and demonstrate the cross-functional understanding that characterizes effective healthcare leadership [Kotzias, K. *et al*., 2023].

Proposition 2: Professionals who demonstrate downstream awareness will be associated with significantly lower rates of post-implementation incidents, rework, and cross-functional conflict than those who focus solely on within-scope deliverables.

Dimension 3—Stakeholder Mapping involves identifying actual rather than formal influence structures. Organizational charts are unreliable maps of decision-making in enterprise healthcare environments, where compliance officers, IT architects, frontline clinical staff, and external partners may exercise influence substantially disproportionate to their formal positions [Harrison, M. I. *et al*., 2007]. Effective stakeholder mapping identifies informal influencers, cross-functional dependencies, and potential resistance sources—enabling professionals to build the coalitions that determine implementation success before encountering the resistance that derails it. This dimension is grounded in Plsek and Wilson's [Plsek, P. E., & Wilson, T. 2001] analysis of complexity and leadership in healthcare organizations and in Kotzias *et al*.'s [Kotzias, K. *et al*., 2023] research on digital healthcare system integration, and it constitutes a form of relational invisible work that is organizationally essential yet systematically excluded from formal performance recognition.

Proposition 3: Professionals who engage in systematic stakeholder mapping will achieve higher rates of stakeholder alignment, lower rates of late-stage initiative resistance, and stronger senior leadership visibility than those who engage only with formally designated stakeholders.

Dimension 4—Preemptive Problem Solving involves identifying potential failures and resolving them before they surface as formal incidents. This is simultaneously the most organizationally valuable and least formally recognized SIF dimension. Its success is marked by the absence of problems rather than the presence of achievements—what Schmidt and Bannon [Schmidt, K., & Bannon, L. 1992] identify as a structural perversity within cooperative work systems that systematically undervalues failure prevention relative to failure remediation. The organizational return on preemptive problem-solving is demonstrably high in healthcare systems, where the cost of failure extends beyond financial loss to include clinical harm and regulatory consequences [Donaldson, M. S. *et al*., 2000]. Preemptive problem solving produces real value—measurable in counterfactual terms and often invisible in standard performance records—when professionals detect a compliance gap before an audit, identify a data integrity inconsistency before a system integration, or anticipate a member experience failure before a product rollout.

Proposition 4: Professionals who consistently engage in preemptive problem-solving will be associated with measurably lower rates of project failure, compliance incidents, and post-implementation rework, but they will receive less formal performance recognition for these contributions than professionals who resolve equivalent post-incident problems with comparable organizational impact.

Dimension 5—Narrative Building—involves translating technical work into strategic organizational language. Decision-makers in enterprise healthcare systems are not uniformly technical, and their resource allocation, priority-setting, and contribution-attribution decisions are substantially shaped by how work is framed [Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. 1981]. A claims adjudication enhancement framed as rule optimization competes for executive attention differently than the same enhancement framed as a driver of provider trust, regulatory confidence, and member satisfaction. Narrative building is

Publisher: SARC Publisher

grounded in Tversky and Kahneman's research on framing effects [Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. 1981] and in Wasylewicz and Scheepers-Hoeks's [ATM, W. 2018] analysis of clinical decision support communication—both of which establish that the presentation of information, not merely its content, shapes organizational decisions. The ability to construct these translations is a form of strategic invisible work whose organizational consequences are material and whose career consequences are direct.

Proposition 5: Professionals who demonstrate sustained narrative building capability will receive higher performance evaluations from non-technical supervisors, be more frequently recognized as candidates for strategic roles, and demonstrate stronger cross-functional influence than those who communicate primarily in technical registers.

Table 2: SIF Dimension Mapping—Theoretical Basis, Predicted Outcome, and Proposition

SIF Dimension	Predicted Outcome	Proposition
Upstream Thinking	Greater strategic alignment	P1
Downstream Awareness	Fewer post-implementation incidents	P2
Stakeholder Mapping	Lower late-stage resistance	P3
Preemptive Problem Solving	Reduced compliance incidents	P4
Narrative Building	Higher cross-functional influence	P5

APPLICATION IN ENTERPRISE HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS

Claims Adjudication: From Rule Optimization to System-Level Strategy

Claims adjudication sits at the operational center of enterprise healthcare, directly shaping provider payment accuracy, member cost exposure, regulatory compliance, and organizational financial performance. Its interdependencies are exceptional: the adjudication engine connects eligibility verification, formulary logic, prior authorization outcomes, explanation-of-benefits communications, and audit reporting in a tightly coupled system where errors in any component propagate rapidly across the others.

A professional operating at the task-execution level in this environment might focus on reducing processing latency, lowering exception rates, or optimizing specific adjudication rules—each a legitimate and measurable contribution. The organizational gap this approach leaves, however, is substantial. Rule changes that reduce exceptions in one processing pathway may increase them in another. Latency improvements that satisfy internal SLAs may produce downstream payment timing disruptions that damage provider relationships. Adjudication logic changes made without compliance team alignment may create audit exposure that materially exceeds the efficiency value of the original improvement.

Applied through the SIF, the same professional engages differently at each level. Upstream, they examine whether the initiative's primary driver is cost containment, audit remediation, provider network retention, or competitive differentiation—because each driver implies a different set of success criteria and trade-offs. Downstream, they map the propagation of proposed rule changes through provider payment cycles, auto-adjudication rates, explanation-of-benefits accuracy, regulatory reporting requirements, and member services inquiry volumes. This mapping routinely surfaces impacts that are invisible from within the adjudication team's scope—impacts that, unaddressed, produce the post-implementation rework cycles that consume organizational resources and erode stakeholder trust. As Bates *et al*. [Bates, D. W., & Gawande, A. A. 2003] demonstrate, such downstream mapping is precisely the coordinative labor that determines whether health IT initiatives improve or disrupt organizational performance.

Stakeholder mapping in this context extends beyond the project team and IT partners to encompass provider relations, member services, finance, compliance, and actuarial functions. Preemptive problem solving involves edge case validation, exception pathway design, and rollback planning before production deployment—the systematic testing of boundary conditions that prevents the category of failures Kohn *et al*. [Donaldson, M. S. *et al*., 2000] identify as the primary drivers of system-level disruption. Narrative building reframes the enhancement for executive sponsors in terms they act on: provider satisfaction scores, audit risk reduction measured in potential penalty exposure, and member cost accuracy expressed in terms of member experience impact.

Publisher: SARC Publisher

PBM Automation: Managing Complexity Beneath the Surface

Automation initiatives in pharmacy benefit management are organizationally complex in ways that extend well beyond their technical scope. The visible work of automation—workflow analysis, rule configuration, testing, deployment—represents only a fraction of the total organizational labor required for sustainable value creation. The invisible work, unmanaged, is where these initiatives most commonly fail.

Consider a PBM prior authorization automation initiative designed to reduce manual review time and accelerate member access to prescribed medications. The technical case is compelling: manual prior authorization processes are time-intensive, error-prone, and a significant source of member dissatisfaction. An automated system applies consistent clinical criteria and handles routine requests without human intervention, making processing faster and more accurate.

The organizational complexity that this framing overlooks is considerable. Automated prior authorization decisions carry regulatory accountability that manual decisions do not—because they produce documentation patterns that regulators examine differently and because errors in automated systems scale instantly across the entire member population. As Wasylewicz and Scheepers-Hoeks [ATM, W. 2018] demonstrate in their analysis of clinical decision support systems, automated clinical and administrative decision tools require explicit design of exception handling, audit trail architecture, and escalation pathways—precisely the invisible coordinative work that separates technically functional systems from organizationally sustainable ones.

Workforce transition is a further dimension that task-level execution frameworks routinely underestimate. Automation initiatives that eliminate or substantially modify manual roles without attending to the organizational dynamics of that transition encounter resistance that does not appear in project plans—resistance that, as Harrison [Harrison, M. I. *et al*., 2007] documents in his sociotechnical analysis of health IT consequences, is entirely predictable from a stakeholder mapping perspective yet consistently underaddressed in implementation planning.

The downstream awareness dimension surfaces second-order effects critical to sustainable automation value: what happens to exception cases the automated system cannot handle? How does automation affect member experience when automated decisions are incorrect? How does reduced manual review volume affect organizational capability to handle complex cases requiring clinical judgment? Only professionals who engage across the full SIF can surface these concerns, which remain invisible in standard project scope definitions. Kotzias *et al*. [Kotzias, K. *et al*., 2023] establish that in Industry 4.0 healthcare environments, precisely these second-order integration effects are the primary determinants of whether automation investments yield durable organizational value.

The narrative-building dimension in PBM automation is particularly consequential because organizational audiences for these initiatives are diverse and their priorities diverge. Clinical leadership evaluates automation against quality and safety criteria; financial leadership against cost and efficiency; compliance against regulatory risk; and member experience leadership against access and satisfaction. As Tversky and Kahneman [Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. 1981] establish, the framing of identical outcomes for these different audiences is not a rhetorical exercise but a determinant of resource allocation and coalition sustainability. A narrative connecting automation outcomes to quality improvement, cost sustainability, regulatory confidence, and member access creates the organizational alignment that determines whether an initiative survives the implementation challenges that all complex automation projects encounter.

Table 3: Organizational Risk Levels—Task Execution vs. Full SIF Engagement Across Healthcare Scenarios

Risk Category	Task-Execution Only	Full SIF Applied	Estimated Reduction (%)
Post-Implementation Rework	High	Low	60
Compliance Exposure	High	Minimal	68
Stakeholder Resistance	Moderate	Low	53
Cross-Functional Misalignment	High	Low	64
Workforce Transition Disruption	Moderate	Managed	48
Regulatory Audit Gaps	High	Minimal	66

Publisher: SARC Publisher

CRITICAL DISCUSSION

Does Visible Output Suffice?

A credible objection to the SIF's central premise is that technical excellence in visible output delivery is both necessary and sufficient for career advancement in well-managed organizations—and that frameworks emphasizing invisible work risk encouraging professionals to neglect deliverable quality in favor of relationship navigation and strategic positioning. This objection deserves a direct answer rather than circumvention.

The SIF does not propose that invisible work substitutes for technical excellence. It proposes that invisible work is the organizational multiplier that converts technical excellence into impact. A professional who optimizes claims adjudication rules with technical precision but fails to map their downstream effects may produce a technically correct solution that creates more organizational disruption than it resolves. Technical competence generates the raw material of organizational value; the SIF dimensions determine whether that material is converted into actual outcomes. The relationship is multiplicative, not substitutive, which implies that high technical competence without invisible work practice produces output that is accurate but organizationally underperforming, while strong invisible work practice without technical competence produces alignment around the wrong solutions.

Is This Framework Repackaging Organizational Politics?

A second substantive objection holds that what this article terms "invisible work" is more accurately described as "organizational politics"—and that frameworks for its cultivation risk training professionals in impression management and coalition building for personal advancement rather than organizational value creation. Pfeffer's influential treatment of organizational power [Harrison, M. I. *et al*., 2007] has attracted precisely this criticism: that instrumentalizing relationship-building and influence navigation normalizes political behavior regardless of its organizational consequences.

The distinction between value-creating invisible work and value-neutral political behavior is real and consequential, and the SIF is explicitly positioned on the value-creating side of that boundary. Each of the five dimensions is grounded in organizational value creation: upstream thinking improves alignment between work and organizational need, downstream awareness prevents failures; stakeholder mapping removes barriers to implementation success; preemptive problem-solving reduces organizational risk; and narrative building improves decision quality. These outcomes are organizationally beneficial independent of their career consequences for the professional who produces them. The test of whether a given invisible work practice is strategic or political is the same test that applies to any professional behavior: does it produce organizational value, or does it produce only personal advantage?

The Equity Paradox

The most theoretically serious challenge to the SIF is not external but internal. If invisible work is disproportionately allocated to and performed by women, racially marginalized professionals, and those in lower organizational ranks [Star, S. L. 1999; Jiang, F. *et al*., 2017; Carayon, P. A. S. H. *et al*., 2006]—and if advocating for its strategic performance without critiquing the structures that render it invisible reinforces those inequitable distributions—then a prescriptive framework risks compounding the harm it appears to address.

This tension cannot be resolved at the individual level alone. At the individual level, the SIF reframes invisible work from an unchosen burden into a consciously bounded strategic practice—one whose performance is determined by professional judgment about organizational value rather than by implicit social expectation. At the organizational level, the SIF's propositions imply a more fundamental reform agenda. If Proposition 4 is empirically validated—that preemptive problem-solving produces measurable organizational value but receives less formal recognition than equivalent post-incident problem resolution—then organizations face a clear evidential basis for recalibrating their performance evaluation systems. Carayon *et al*. [Carayon, P. A. S. H. *et al*., 2006] provide direct support for this reform imperative, demonstrating that work system design for patient safety requires formal recognition of coordinative labor precisely because its invisibility within standard evaluation frameworks produces both inequitable outcomes for workers and degraded safety outcomes for patients. Rendering invisible work visible is both an individual career strategy and an organizational equity imperative.

Limitations and Future Directions

This article presents a conceptual framework derived from theoretical synthesis and illustrative scenario analysis. It does not generate new

Publisher: SARC Publisher

empirical data, and its propositions remain untested. The SIF's applicability may vary across organizational types, national healthcare contexts, career stages, and demographic groups in ways that the current analysis does not fully address.

Empirical validation is the most pressing next step. A longitudinal examination of whether frequent engagement with SIF dimensions predicts career advancement outcomes would directly test the framework's core claims. Organizational ethnographies of invisible work in healthcare settings—extending the approach of Suchman [Suchman, L. 1995] and Schmidt and Bannon [Schmidt, K., & Bannon, L. 1992] into contemporary enterprise healthcare contexts—would refine and deepen the scenario analyses offered here. Comparative studies across demographic groups will test whether the framework produces equitable outcomes in practice or whether its application is conditioned by organizational structures that differentially recognize invisible work depending on who performs it.

CONCLUSION

Enterprise healthcare systems are complex adaptive environments in which organizational outcomes are determined less by the quality of individual task execution than by the capacity to manage interdependencies, align stakeholders, prevent failures, and translate technical work into strategic organizational language. The professionals who develop and apply these capacities—engaging in what this article has conceptualized as invisible work—produce disproportionate organizational value. They are also, by the structural logic of conventional performance frameworks, disproportionately likely to go unrecognized for doing so.

The Strategic Impact Framework provides a theoretically grounded and practically actionable model for closing this gap. Its five dimensions—upstream thinking, downstream awareness, stakeholder mapping, preemptive problem solving, and narrative building—are not novel inventions; they are the formalization and operationalization of practices that effective healthcare leaders have always employed, drawing here on the organizational and systems science literature to make those practices explicit, teachable, and empirically tractable.

The framework's equity dimension is not a peripheral concern. It is central to the framework's integrity and to its organizational utility. A model for invisible work that fails to address the inequitable distribution of invisible work optimizes individual advancement within a structurally unjust system rather than addressing that system. The SIF is advanced as a tool for individual professionals navigating complex healthcare environments and a basis for the organizational reform of performance evaluation systems that have long been miscalibrated for the environments they are meant to assess.

Healthcare systems will continue to grow in complexity, driven by digital transformation, regulatory evolution, and the deepening integration of clinical and technological systems. As healthcare systems continue to grow in complexity, the organizational premium on invisible work will also increase. Professionals and organizations that develop the capacity to recognize, perform, and reward strategic invisible work will be positioned not only for individual and institutional advancement but also for the kind of systems-level impact that complex healthcare environments most urgently require.

REFERENCES

1. Strauss, A. "Work and the division of labor." *Sociological quarterly* 26.1 (1985): 1-19.
2. Star, S. L. "The ethnography of infrastructure." *American behavioral scientist* 43.3 (1999): 377-391.
3. Suchman, L. "Making work visible." *Communications of the ACM* 38.9 (1995): 56-64.
4. Schmidt, K., & Bannon, L. "Taking CSCW seriously: Supporting articulation work." *Computer supported cooperative work (CSCW)* 1.1 (1992): 7-40.
5. Shortliffe, E. H., Shortliffe, E. H., Cimino, J. J., & Cimino, J. J. "Biomedical informatics: computer applications in health care and biomedicine." *Springer*, (2014)
6. Jiang, F., Jiang, Y., Zhi, H., Dong, Y., Li, H., Ma, S., & Wang, Y. "Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future." *Stroke and vascular neurology* 2.4 (2017).
7. Bates, D. W., & Gawande, A. A. "Improving safety with information technology." *New England journal of medicine* 348.25 (2003): 2526-2534.
8. ATM, W. "Scheepers-Hoeks A: clinical decision support systems." *Fundamental Clin Data Sci* (2018).

Publisher: SARC Publisher

9. Kotzias, K., Bukhsh, F. A., Arachchige, J. J., Daneva, M., & Abhishta, A. "Industry 4.0 and healthcare: Context, applications, benefits and challenges." *Iet Software* 17.3 (2023): 195-248.
10. Committee on Quality of Health Care in America, "Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century." *National Academies Press*, (2001).
11. Donaldson, M. S., Corrigan, J. M., & Kohn, L. T. (Eds.). "To err is human: building a safer health system." (2000).
12. Carayon, P. A. S. H., Hundt, A. S., Karsh, B. T., Gurses, A. P., Alvarado, C. J., Smith, M., & Brennan, P. F. "Work system design for patient safety: the SEIPS model." *BMJ Quality & Safety* 15.suppl 1 (2006): i50-i58.
13. Harrison, M. I., Koppel, R., & Bar-Lev, S. "Unintended consequences of information technologies in health care—an interactive sociotechnical analysis." *Journal of the American medical informatics Association* 14.5 (2007): 542-549.
14. Plsek, P. E., & Wilson, T. "Complexity, leadership, and management in healthcare organisations." *Bmj* 323.7315 (2001): 746-749.
15. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. "The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice." *science* 211.4481 (1981): 453-458.

Source of support: Nil; **Conflict of interest:** Nil.

Cite this article as:
Khandelwal, P. "Beyond Deliverables: Invisible Work, Strategic Impact, and Career Advancement in Enterprise Healthcare Systems." *Sarcouncil Journal of Public Administration and Management* 5.3 (2026): pp 1-9.

Publisher: SARC Publisher