HIV PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND EDUCATION: UTILIZING THE TOOLS OF COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE
or WHY IS A 545-MILE BICYCLE RIDE A CASE STUDY OF COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE?
TEACHING NOTE

This teaching note opens by providing a case summary including the purpose of the case and key learning outcomes from the case. The next section of this teaching note provides suggested activities, including pre-class and in-class activities—and includes individual, group, and online activities. This teaching note closes with the works cited section from the original case, however here the citations are sorted into major topic areas and are followed by suggested additional reading resources for each topic area.

This case is best suited for use in either undergraduate-level or masters-level Public Affairs, Public Administration, or not-for-profit management curricula. It pairs well with coursework focused on public management, not-for-profit management, not-for-profit fundraising, and/or collaborative governance / networking. The case should be assigned as a reading in advance of class and paired with suggested readings as the instructor sees fit. The case can be completed in conjunction with one full standard class session (approximately 3 hours). To maximize interest / benefit to the students, the photo exhibit attachment should be provided to students along with the written case.

1. Case Summary and Key Learning Outcomes

Purpose of the Case

This case study utilizes the event AIDS/LifeCycle as an illustrative example to assist students in better understanding key concepts rooted within collaborative governance. The AIDS/LifeCycle is a long running event with sustained success and as such it presents a strong "success story" case study. The key deliverables should have a three-fold purpose: (1) help the students to understand the concept of collaborative governance via this real world case, (2) embed a number of academic definitions commonly utilized within the governance context within the circumstance of this real world case, and (3) teach students about a real world example of successful not-for-profit fundraising that utilizing a collaborative governance arrangement for its delivery.

Summary of the Case

This case study takes an in-depth look at how a 545-mile bicycle ride down the California coastline has become a prime example of collaborative governance, social networking, service coproduction, and social capital building. The case also provides the greater context of the ride, specifically how two not-for-profits collaborate toward the execution of the event and how these nonprofits leverage a small paid staff by recruiting and utilizing a substantial number of volunteers to maximize the successful delivery of the bicycling event, maximize delivery of their HIV education and prevention message, and maximize their fundraising efforts to ensure their day-to-day operations can continue throughout the year. Finally, the case is designed to be fun to read, with the hope it will draw the student in as the reader so that they can feel like they have had an "armchair experience" of what participating in the AIDS/LifeCycle feels like.

Key Learning Outcomes from the Case

The key learning outcomes for this case study are to help students achieve a mastery of the case's five primary topic area, including understanding definitions of each of these terms, ability to identify example of each within the case study, and to be able to think critically and identify additional examples of each in contemporary society. This case study focuses on five primary topic areas:

- Not-for-profit fundraising (presented throughout—not as single distinct section)
- Collaborative governance
- Social networking

- Service coproduction (both as a tool of fundraising and as a tool of event execution)
- Social capital building

The next section of this teaching note is suggested activities and the final section is a works cited and additional reading resource section. For both of these sections, topics are sorted into the four primary collaborative governance topic areas and (like the case itself) the fundraising component is imbedded within each of these sections. This gives the instructor a clear path to specific learning outcomes and allows the instructor to focus in on the topic areas most pertinent to their specific course.

2. Suggested Activities

Collaborative Governance
Pre-class Activity:
To formalize class preparation, the instructor may require students to write a one-page or a two-page memo summarizing the case or dealing with one of the five primary topic areas of not-for-profit fundraising, collaborative governance, social networking, service coproduction, or social capital building. This assignment should include the task of reading journal articles related to the topic.

Group In-class Activities:
(1) Break the class into five teams. Have each team present one of the five primary topic areas to the rest of the class. As a follow-up you may have another team critique the initial team presentation and identify any gaps in their presentation. End with a full class summary discussion of the topics.

(2) Often it is hard for students to fully conceptualize the differences between coordination, cooperation, and collaboration. Break the class into three teams. Have each team present one of these three topics to the rest of the class and/or have them demonstrate an example of coordination, cooperation, or collaboration to the rest of the class. End with a full class summary discussion of the topics.
Individual In-class Activities:

(1) Have each student in the class write down the five topic areas of not-for-profit fundraising, collaborative governance, social networking, service coproduction, and social capital building. Then have them each think of real world examples of each. Encourage them to include examples that are personal to them. End with a full class discussion of each, having the students share one or more item from each of their lists.

(2) Ask students to first write down a list of fundraising efforts they have participated in in the past. Ask them to identify if any of the five key topic areas came into play with any of these past fundraising efforts. End by having the full class share their findings—looking for commonality among the class.

Online Class Activity:

Create a discussion thread or voice thread for the course. As a primary thread have individuals post examples of multiple organizations working together—these organizations can be any combination of government, not-for-profit, and/or for profit. As a secondary thread have classmates decide if this example is coordination, cooperation, or collaboration—have them defend and define their choice. Allow debate within the thread and close with the instructor posting their position on the topic.

Social Networking

Pre-class Activities:

 (1) Have all members of the class create a free LinkedIn profile. Ask them to link with each other so that classmates can compare profiles. As an *in-class follow-up* have the students discuss the strategies they will use on LinkedIn to connect with other users of the service. Will they only connect with existing friends? Will they request connections with people who have expertise they desire to know more about? Etc.?

(2) Identify a topic of choice (collaborative governance, social networking, service coproduction, and social capital building can all work). Break the class into small group teams and have these teams prepare a presentation to the rest of the class on the selected topic. The key component, however, is this team project must be completed 100% remotely from each other (no in person meetings) and must 100% be via one or more social networking platforms. The presentation *MUST* include the *HOW* behind the team presentation as well as the presentation of the topic itself. As an *in class follow-up*, have the teams present their presentations in class.

Group In-class Activities:

(1) With AIDS/LifeCycle as the initial discussion, break the class into teams. Have these teams brainstorm further real world examples of social networking in play. Do the identified social networks have a fundraising component? If yes, what is it? If no, what is the purpose of the particular social network?

(2) Break the class into two teams: riders and roadies. Have the two teams consider this scenario: They have just signed up to participate in AIDS/LifeCycle. Have the team brainstorm how they will approach their social networks to initial their fundraising? Bring the full class together for a sharing of findings across the two teams. As a follow-up you may have each team critique the other teams plans and identify gaps in their planning efforts.

Individual In-class Activities:

(1) Start with a full class discussion of what Granovetter (1973, 1983) means by "the strength of weak ties". When the instructor feels the class collectively has a good understand of the topic have the students individually review one of their social media outlets (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Etc. – if they have none have them use their contact list in their phone). Have the students go through their friends/follower list and group the individuals into strong ties friends/followers and weak tie friends/followers. Bring the class back together and as a full class discuss the counts and ask students to use their criteria for selecting if someone was a weak or strong tie.

(2) Have the class individually consider this scenario: They have just signed up to participate in AIDS/LifeCycle (as a rider or roadie—their choice). How will they approach their individual social networks to initial their fundraising?

Online Class Activities:

(1) Have the class complete some kind of activity (it can literally be any of the above questions) but require that the activity be complete 100% via a social media platform. After the activity is completed create a discussion thread or voice thread and have the students critique the success of failure of the platform itself and the outcome of the activity—encourage brutal (but constructive) honesty on the thread.

(2) Have the class individually consider this scenario: They have just signed up to participate in AIDS/LifeCycle (as a rider or roadie—their choice). Have them visit the AIDS/LifeCycle website www.aidslifecycle.org and encourage them to seek answer to any "newbie" questions they have about the ride. Create a discussion thread or voice thread and have the students critique their success or failure in getting their questions answered via the website. Encourage discussion of how transparent or opaque the site is in delivering answer to their questions. (As a follow-up, this exercise can be repeated with any charitable fundraising site of the instructors – or students – choice.)

Service Coproduction

Pre-class Activity:

Have all members of the class generate a personal list of examples of service coproduction in their daily lives (sorting trash from recyclables is a good example to provide them a starting point). Open the class with a discussion of the findings. As an *in-class follow-up* you can ask classmates to assess if the identified example of service coproduction meets Brudney and England (1983) three criteria of true service coproduction and/or which of Whitaker's (1980) three categories of service coproduction does the identified service coproduction fall within?

Group In-class Activities:

(1) Similar to the "coordination, cooperation, and collaboration" activity above, break the class into three teams. Have each team demonstrate an example of service coproduction to the rest of the class. After all three teams have presented discuss as a full class.

(2) Break the class into small teams and have each of the teams discuss the following question: Many cyclists raise well beyond the $3,000 minimum for AIDS/LifeCycle. Roadie participants (who are not required to raise any funds) often fundraise as well. What motivates these individuals to fundraise at this level? Bring the class together after a prescribed time and have the teams present their findings.

(3) Break the class into small teams and have them discuss the following question: Donors to AIDS/LifeCycle contribute their money to organizations they may or may not ever receive services from and make the donation on behalf of a particular participant. What would be their motivation for this?

Individual In-class Activity:

Have each student envision himself or herself as either a rider or roadie on the AIDS/LifeCycle. Have them write down the expectations they have of AIDS/LifeCycle and what they believe AIDS/LifeCycle's expectations will be of them. Bring the full class together for a discussion of these individual findings.

Online Class Activities:

(1) As a discussion thread or voice thread, have the class discuss the following question: Many cyclists raise well beyond the $3,000 minimum for AIDS/LifeCycle. Roadie participants (who are not required to raise any funds) often fundraise as well. What motivates these individuals to fund raise at this level?

(2) As a discussion thread or voice thread have the class discuss the following question: Donors to AIDS/LifeCycle contribute their money to organizations they may or may not ever receive services from and make the donation on behalf of a particular participant. What would be their motivation for this?

Social Capital Building

Pre-class Activity:

Have students individually describe and define "boundary experiences" and, if possible, identify examples. Open class by discussing the findings and as an in-class follow-up, ask students if their definition is aligned with (or influenced by) the Feldman et al. (2006) definition of "boundary experience".

Group In-class Activities:

(1) Break the class into small teams and provide them a short script by which they can introduce themselves to each other—name, what they are studying, background, favorite activity, etc. Bring the full class together after the exercise is complete and ask how this activity relates to social capital.

(2) Break the class into small teams and have them discuss this question: Do you buy the case study assertion that the AIDS/LifeCycle "love bubble" is essentially a manifestation of social capital. Tell them to be prepared to defend their answer whatever side it ends up being on. Bring the full class back together and discuss and debate.

Individual In-class Activity:

Have the students individually think back to a "group homework assignment gone wrong". Have them assess if social capital (or lack thereof) did or did not come into play in contributing to the failure. Bring the full class together to discuss and compare notes. As a follow-up, select one particular "group project gone wrong" and have the class discuss if the assignment could be reformulated in a way to build rather than diminish social capital.

Online Class Activity:

As a discussion thread or voice thread have the class discuss the following questions: Why do you suppose the AIDS/LifeCycle return retention is higher for riders who participate in the event on a team rather than individually? A follow-up thread can be: How do you feel social capital comes into play?

3. Works Cited and Additional Resources by Topic Areas

Collaborative Governance—Works Cited

Ansell, C. & A. Gash (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory Advancement*, doi:10.1093/jopart/mum032.

Bingham, L.B., T. Nabatchi, & R. O'Leary (2005). The new governance: Practices and processes for stakeholder and citizen participation in the work of government. *Public Administration Review* 65(5): 547-558.

Emerson, K., T. Nabatchi, & S. Balogh (2011). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, doi: 10.1093/jopart/mur011.

Huxham, C. & S. Vangen (2005). *Managing to Collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge.

O'Leary, R. (2015). From silos to networks: Hierarchy to heterarchy. In M. E. Guy & M. M. Rubin eds., *Public administration evolving: From foundations to the future*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge 84-101.

Collaborative Governance—Additional Resources

Agranoff, R. (2006). Inside collaborative networks: Ten lessons for public managers. *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, 56-65.

Agranoff, R. (2003). *Leveraging networks: A guide for public managers working across organizations*. Washington, DC: IBM Endowment for the Business of Government.

Agranoff, R. & M. McGuire (2003). Collaborative public management: New strategies for local government. Washington, DC, USA: Georgetown University Press.

Bovaird, T. & E. Loeffler (2003). *Public management and governance, 3rd edition*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge.

Bryon, J. M., B. C. Crosby, & M. M. Stone (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review,* Special Issue, 44-55.

Emerson, K. & T. Nabatchi (2015). Evaluating the productivity of collaborative governance regimes: A performance matrix. *Public Performance & Management Review* 38, 717-747.

Emerson, K. & T. Nabatchi (2015). *Collaborative governance regimes*. Washington, DC, USA: Georgetown University Press.

Frederickson, H. G. (2005). Whatever happened to public management? Governance, governance everywhere. In E. Ferlie et al., eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 282-304.

Kettl, D. F. (2002). *The transformation of governance: Public administration for twenty-first century America*. Baltimore, MD, USA: The John Hopkins University Press.

McGuire, M. (2006). Collaborative public management: Assessing what we know and how we know it. *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, 33-43.

O'Leary, R. and L. B. Bingham (2010). *A manager's guide to resolving conflicts in collaborative networks*. IBM Center for the Business of Government.

Provan, K. G. & P. Kenis (2007). Modes of network governance: Structures, management, and effectiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, doi: 10.1093/jopart/mum015.

Weare, C., P. Lichterman, N. Esparza (2014). Collaboration and culture: Organizational culture and dynamics of collaborative policy networks. *Policy Studies Journal* 42(4): 590-619.

Social Networking—Works Cited

Agranoff, R. (2007). *Managing within networks: Adding value to public organizations*. Washington, DC, USA: Georgetown University Press.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360-1380.

Granovetter, M. S. (1983). The strength of weak ties: A network theory revisited. *Sociology Theory* 1(1983), 201-233.

Provan, K. G. & H. B. Milward (2001). Do networks really work? A framework for evaluating public-sector organizational networks. *Public Administration Review* 61(4): 414-423.

Varda, D. M. (2009). The community-level impacts of national youth service: Assessing bridging social capital. In McBride, A. M., Ed. *Youth services in comparative perspective*. Center for Social Development, Washington University in St. Louis: 50-64.

Varda (as Vogenbeck), D. M. (2005). *Social network analysis for policy design: Collaborative discourse between nonprofit/government organizations and the resulting effect on community level social capital* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Colorado Denver, Denver, CO, USA.

Social Networking—Additional Resources

Klijn, E-H. (2005). Networks and inter-organizational management: Challenging, steering, evaluation, and the role of public actors in public management. In E. Ferlie et

al., eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 257-281.

Lin, K-Y, H-P Lu (2011). Why people use social networking sites: An empirical study integrating externalities and motivation theory. *Computers in Human Behavior* 27 (2011) 1152-1161,

Meier, K. & L. J. O'Toole (2001). Managerial strategies and behavior in networks: A model with evidence from U.S. public education. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 11(3): 271-293.

Monge, P. R. & N. S. Contractor (2003). *Theories of communication networks*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press.

O'Toole Jr., L. J. (2014). Networks and networking: The public administrative agendas. *Public Administration Review* 75(3): 361-371.

Powell, W. W. & S. Grodal (2006). Networks of Innovation (pp56-85) From Ed. J. Fagerberg, D.C. Mowery, & R.R. Nelson *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Oxford University Press.

Streeter, C. L. & D. F. Gillespie (1992). Social network analysis. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 16(1/2), 201-222.

Waters, R. D., E. Burnett, A. Lamm, & J. Lucas (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How are nonprofit organizations using Facebook. *Public Relations Review* 35 (2009) 102-106.

Wellman, B. & S. D. Berkowitz (1988). Social structures: A network approach. Cambridge, MA, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Service Coproduction—Works Cited

Brudney, J. F. & R. E. England (1983). Toward a definition of the coproduction concept. *Public Administration Review* 43(1): 59-65.

Oakerson, R. J. (1999). *Governing local public economies: Creating the civic metropolis*. Oakland, CA, USA: ICS Press 7-9.

Parks, R. B. et al. (1981). Consumers as coproducers of public services: Some economic and institutional considerations. In M. D. McGinnis ed., *Polycentricity and local public economies* (1999), pp.381-391.

Whitaker, G. P. (1980). Coproduction: Citizen participation in service delivery. *Public Administration Review* 40(3): 240-246.

Service Coproduction—Additional Resources

Bovaird, T. (2007). Beyond engagement and participation: User and community coproduction of public services. *Public Administration Review* 67(5): 846-860.

Brandsen, T. & M. Honingh (2016). Distinguishing different types of coproduction: A conceptual analysis based on the classical definitions. *Public Administration Review* 76(3): 427-438.

Brandsen, T. & V. Pestoff (2006). Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public services. *Public Management Review* 8(4): 493-501.

Ostrom, E. (1996). Crossing the great divide: Coproduction, synergy, and development. *World Development*: 24(6): 1073-1087.

Sharp, E. B. (1980). Toward a new understanding of urban services and citizen participation: The coproduction concept. *Public Administration* 14(2): 105-118.

Social Capital—Works Cited

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York, NY, USA: Greenwood.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(Suppl.), S95-S120.

Derose, K. P. & D. M. Varda (2009). Social capital and health care access. *Medical Care Research and Review*, doi: 10,1177/1077558708330428.

Feldman, M. S., A. M. Khademian, H. Ingram, A. S. Schneider (2006). Ways of knowing and inclusive management practices. *Public Administration Review* 66(SI): 89-99.

Lin, N. (1999). Building a network theory of social capital. *Connections* 22(1): 28-51.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy,* 6(1): 65-78.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY, USA: Simon & Schuster.

Social Capital—Additional Resources

Lesser, E. L. ed. (2000). *Knowledge and social capital: Foundations and applications*. Boston, MA, USA: Butterworth-Heinemann

Lin, N., K. Cook, R. S. Burt, eds. (1996). *Social capital: Theory and research.* Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press.

Walker, A. (2004). Understanding social capital within community / government policy networks. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 22: 1-18.

Additional Cited Case Study Resources

AIDS/LifeCycle (2016). www.aidslifecycle.org Last accessed: February 14, 2016.

Schein, E. H. (1993). *Organizational culture and leadership, 2nd edition*. San Francisco CA, USA: Jossey-Bass.

Thaler, R. H. & C. R. Sunstein (2009). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. New York, NY, USA: Penguin Books.