Developing a Young Professionals Network for the Arts:

Teaching Note

Introduction

The Young Professionals Network for the Arts simulation is an exercise that allows students to think through the process of creating a network from the ground up. The structure of the class session that includes the simulation consists of a lecture on the readings and an 8-Step network building process, followed by the simulation. I have used it as a culmination of class reading and work that introduces the topics identified in Table 1:

Table 1 – Topics and Assignments Leading Up to Simulation

Topic	Assigned Readings	Exercise
Alternatives to Hierarchy	• Powell, Walter W. (1990) "Neither Market Nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization," *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 295-336. • Milward, H. Brinton and Keith G. Provan (2000) "Governing the Hollow State," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(2), 359-379. • Goldsmith, Stephen. 2000. "City Services in the Competitive Marketplace," In Andrisani et al (eds.) *Making Government Work*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 173-184.	Students apply lessons from health care networks and private sector health care practices in California to an emerging case in Cincinnati, Ohio.
Negotiation and Conflict Resolution	• Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton (1991) *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. 2nd Edition. New York: Penguin Books. (Entire Book) • Innes, Judith E. and David E. Boher (2003) "Collaborative policymaking: governance through dialogue," in Maarten Hajer and Hendrik Wagenaar, eds. *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 33-59.	Students use the Electronic Hallway case "Clarkson Airport Authority" to experience a consensus building process.
Building Alliances, Partnerships and Networks	• Herranz, Joaquin Jr. (2007) "The Multisectoral Trilemma of Network Management," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(1), 1-31. • Kiefer, John J. and Montjoy, Robert S. (2006) "Incrementalism Before the Storm: Network Performance for the Evacuation of New Orleans," *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, 122-130. • Moynihan, Donald P. (2005) "Leveraging Collaborative Networks in Infrequent Emergency Situations," IBM Center for the Business of Government.	***Young Professionals Network for the Arts Simulation***

Lecture Content

Based partially on the readings listed above, I teach an 8-Step process for students to follow in developing the Young Professionals Network for the Arts. The 8 steps are listed below and are expanded further after that.

1. Identify problem or information needs/Identify the type of network
2. Identify possible network members
3. Specify the skills, resources, relationships, or information each potential network member possesses
4. Map existing relations among potential members
5. Map the relations that you might want to exist, given member skills, etc.
6. Identify unique environmental conditions
7. Determine strategic orientation of network members
8. Select management structure of network

Identify Problem or Information Needs/Identify the Type of Network

This is a first step in any purposeful project, whether it is the creation of a public participation process, a strategic planning process, or, as in this case, a network. In the instance of this simulation, the problem or information need is primarily with the local arts agency official who wants to broaden his/her agency's programming appeal to the young professionals demographic. As seen in the character descriptions in the simulation write-up, there are other existing needs. Thus, the first step for students to complete is the clear identification of problems and/or needs for which the network might be used.

Doing so will allow students to identify the best functional type of network to develop. For this step, I lecture from Milward and Provan's IBM report: "A Manager's Guide to Choosing and Using Collaborative Networks." They identify four types of networks, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2—Milward and Provan's Network Types and Features

Network Type	Features
Service Implementation Network	• Government funds the service under contract • Services are jointly produced by 2+ organizations • Horizontal management of service providers • A fiscal agent acts as sole buyer of services • Management tasks include encouraging cooperation negotiating contracts, planning network expansion
Information Diffusion Network	• Horizontal and vertical ties between interdependent government agencies • Primary focus in sharing information across departmental boundaries • Commonly used for disaster preparedness or high uncertainty environments • May be designed or emergent
Problem-Solving Network	• Purpose is to help set an agenda for policy issues • Focus is on solving existing problems rather than developing relations for possible future problems • Often emerge from information diffusion networks • May be temporary in order to solve a problem • May be designed or emergent
Community Capacity Building Network	• Primary goal to build social capital in communities • Focus is both present and future oriented • May be created from the bottom or top • Involves a wide range of agencies, each with sub-networks, to address emergent problems

Identify Potential Network Members

It is important for students to experience a process of stakeholder identification and selection. Defining a stakeholder as anyone who can affect or be affected by the actions of an organization (or in this case a network), I ask students to utilize Bryson's teachings to identify those stakeholders who have the most potential to either help or hurt the network and its ability to accomplish its goals. This step can be more advanced or less advanced, depending on the amount of time you want to devote to the question of stakeholder identification. If more involved, students can utilize a stakeholder power-interest grid, in which all possible stakeholders are categorized as having high or low degrees of power (or ability to influence the network's success and direction) and interest (or concern for the topic or problem being addressed by the network). Those stakeholders who have high amounts of power and high interest are potentially most needed for inclusion in the network; those with high power and low interest might be necessary but perhaps in a different role. Those with low power and high interest need not be included from a strictly power perspective but may be instrumental in goal achievement.

Specify the Skills, Resources, Relationships, or Information Each Potential Network Member Possesses

This step asks students to identify the existing capacities of potential network members, including how they currently relate to each other. This activity allows students to identify not only existing strengths but also the weaknesses of the potential membership (i.e. where are the skill or relational gaps?). For insight on this step, students can refer to their reading of Moynihan's examination of the Exotic Newcastle Disease network as well as Kiefer and Montjoy's study of the Hurricane Katrina response network. In both cases, it is evident where there are benefits of well-documented and planned relations across parties and the harm that can result from the lack of such systemic planning.

Map the Relations That Exist Among Possible Members

As in the previous step, it is important to understand existing capacity before considering how to move forward. The mapping exercise is simple, with a uni- or bi-directional arrow indicating whether there is an existing relationship between potential members. It may be that there are multiple types of relations to explore, and this is one of the questions for the students. Should they only look at communication relations? Perhaps they should ask if possible members serve on

boards together, or live in close proximity to each other? For the purposes of the simulation, students can make assumptions about existing relations, as they can about factors in the previous step.

Map the Relations That You Might Want to Exist

For the simulation, you can skip the previous two steps and jump right to this one, unless you build in some information about potential members with which students can work. On a blank slate, who needs to be connected with whom in order for the network to succeed? What should the density of the network be? Should there be bridges between cliques or groups in the network? Or should everybody be connected to everybody? Are there key members of the network?

Identify Unique Environmental Conditions

Moynihan's Exotic Newcastle Disease study, as well as Kiefer and Montjoy's Hurricane Katrina study shine a light on the importance of aligning network structure and design with environmental conditions. The question to ask here is: What factors in the environment might influence the ability of the network to operate or achieve its goals? Possible answers to this question include:

- General uncertainty
- Unanticipated events
- Member/institutional representative turnover or rotation
- Resource constrains or availability
- Political/policy priority shifts

The importance of asking this question is to force students to revisit the previous step in mapping desired network relations, given the possibility of an environmental dynamic, and to prepare the students to consider the ideal network structure (step 8) to successfully manage environmental conditions.

Determine Strategic Orientation of Network Members

In discussing the multi-sectoral trilemma of network management, Herranz identifies three potential strategic orientations of network members: bureaucratic, entrepreneurial, and community. Each orientation suggests a different preferred mode of behavior for network members, which is particularly the case and thus a challenge in networks involving individuals from different sectors—which is the

case in this simulation. The question for students is to assign each member with an assumed orientation, which would then inform the next step of how to structure and manage the network given a potential diversity of behavioral orientations. Table 3 summarizes Herranz's three orientations.

Table 3 –Herranz's Strategic Orientations of Network Members

Strategic Orientation	Key Features (Behavioral Preferences)
Bureaucratic	• Legislated order • Stable and equitable treatment of others • Centralized with reliance on rules • Hierarchical in design • Rational decision process based on routines
Entrepreneurial	• Market and individual focus • Goal of value maximization • Quasi-centralized with reliance on teams • Opportunistic decision process
Community	• Civil society focused • Goal of social balance and equitable outcomes • Less centralized control with loose coupling • Participatory decision process

Select Management Structure of Network

Milward and Provan in the same IBM report referred to above identify three network governance structures. The final step for students is to, given their responses to the previous seven steps, identify the optimal structure to guide the network and allow it to best achieve its goals. The three structures identified by Milward and Provan are: self-governance, lead organization, and network administrative organization. Table 4 summarizes each.

Table 4—Milward and Provan's Network Governance Structures

Structure		Optimal Number of Members	Decision-Making	Advantages	Problems
Self-Governance	No administrative entity; participation in network management by all members	Few	Decentralized	Participation, commitment by members, ease of forming	Inefficient—frequent meetings, difficulty reaching consensus, no network "face"
Lead Organization	Administrative entity (and network manager) is a major network member/service provider	Many	Centralized	Efficiency, clear network direction	Domination by lead organization, lack of commitment by members
Network Administrative Organization	Distinct administrative entity set up to manage the network (not a "service provider")—manager is hired	Many	Mixed	Efficiency of day-to-day management, strategic involvement by key members, sustainable	Perception of hierarchy, cost of operation, complex administration

Alternative Simulation/Case Designs

If you do not wish to have students role play, this exercise also works well for small group work. Students can divide into groups of 3 or 4 and proceed through these steps without adopting specific roles. The benefit of a role play is to allow students to both experience negotiation of network design and to critique the negotiation. Instructors may choose to incorporate lessons on consensus building or conflict resolution to use in the design of the network.

Still another alternative is to use a "homegrown" example with a guest speaker or speakers from a local government or non-profit organization that wishes to develop a network. Doing so might make this exercise more relevant for students. The same 8-step process would still apply.

Whatever case is chosen, I suggest a brief written assignment following the exercise, where students write a one to two page memo offering their top five or so lessons learned or questions still remaining about network development. This assignment not only ensures students are gaining the skills you want them to gain but it allows the instructor to re-visit any topic that was not fully understood.