



E-PARCC

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

Syracuse University

Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs

Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration

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?

Introduction *Or You Belong Here: Ride 545*

AIDS/LifeCycle is a 7-day 545-mile bicycle ride from San Francisco to Los Angeles, California held annually during the first week of June. It is a fundraising ride for the San Francisco AIDS Foundation and the Los Angeles LGBT Center. The event is the largest single fundraising event for both of these not-for-profit charities. For both, the AIDS/LifeCycle event helps to fund their organizations' efforts to treat and prevent HIV (HIV is the acronym for "Human Immunodeficiency Virus") infection and to educate about HIV and AIDS (AIDS is the acronym for "Acquired Immunodeficiency Virus"). Put simply, the money raised by the event allows the two organizations to carry on their life saving work on a year round basis.

Annually 2000+ bicycle riding volunteers (termed "riders") and 500+ non-bicycle riding volunteers (termed "roadies") participate in this event. A relatively small paid staff of approximately 30 employees supports this army of volunteers. The event itself is an incredibly unique gathering and a very challenging bicycle ride. Digging deeper, the event is also an exceptional case study of collaborative governance.

This case was written by Mark W. Davis of the Department of Public Policy and Administration at West Chester University of Pennsylvania, and was awarded Honorable Mention in E-PARCC's 2015-2016 Competition for Collaborative Public Management, Governance, and Problem-Solving Teaching Materials. The case is intended for classroom discussion and not to suggest either effective or ineffective responses to the situation depicted. It may be copied as many times as needed, provided that the authors and E-PARCC are given full credit. E-PARCC is a project of the Collaborative Governance Initiative, Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration- a research, teaching and practice center within Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs. https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/parcc_eparcc.aspx

This case study will take an in-depth look at how a 545-mile bicycle ride down the California coastline has become a prime example of successful collaborative governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Huxham & Vangen, 2005; O’Leary, 2015), social networking at its best (Varda, 2005), effective service coproduction via both fundraising and volunteer service delivery (Brudney & England, 1983; Oakerson, 1999; Parks, 1981; Whitaker, 1980), and social capital building (Bourdieu, 1986, Coleman, 1988, Lin, 1999; Putnam, 1995, 2000). The ride, as it is simply termed by many participants, has many taglines and slogans. One of these is, “You Belong Here!” If you are a student of collaborative governance, not-for-profit management, or want to learn more about successful not-for-profit fundraising, effective service coproduction, and social capital building, then *YOU BELONG HERE*.

A Day in the Life of an AIDS/LifeCycle Rider *Or* It’s Not a Race - It’s a Ride

Because this case study is built on the reader having a basic understanding of the event itself, this section will briefly outline what a typical day is like on AIDS/LifeCycle. Organizers clearly states up front and stresses over and over, “It’s not a race - it’s a ride.” (ALC, 2016). The sense of ride-with-purpose over competition-based race is key to AIDS/LifeCycle’s overarching environment of welcoming diversity. On any given day, a rider and their tent mate will awake before dawn to pack-up their tent and belongings. The rider then delivers their gear to their designated moving truck where an eager, enthusiastic, and often-in-costume roadie will take their luggage bag and tent and load both onto the moving truck. The rider can then eat a hot breakfast provided by the event, collect their bike, and get on the road soon after first light.

Each day averages approximately 80 miles of bicycling—the shortest day is 42 miles and the longest is 109 miles. Throughout the day, maps, signs, and real people give riders directions as to where to go. Table 1 on the following page is a brief summary of the day-to-day itinerary of AIDS/LifeCycle from 2015.

Table 1: Typical Itinerary, Mileage, and Highlights on AIDS/LifeCycle		
Itinerary	Mileage	Highlights From These Days
Day 1: San Francisco To Santa Cruz	82 Miles*	At the top of the first large hill of the ride, cyclists are handed strawberries from a cheering crowd. The remainder of the day hugs the scenic California Coastline.
Day 2: Santa Cruz To King City	109 Miles	Two famous rest stops highlight today: The fried artichoke stop and the cookie lady / otter pop stop.
Day 3: King City To Paso Robles	65 Miles	Lunch today is in the small town of Bradley. This town annually welcomes cyclist by cooking them hamburgers— but this is in fact a fundraiser within a fundraiser. Cyclists buying this lunch help to fund scholarships for students living in this town.
Day 4: Paso Robles To Santa Maria	91 Miles	Riders climb a near-2,000 foot ascent out of Paso Robles to be greeted by the “Half Way to LA” point of the ride—a breathtaking panoramic view of the Pacific Ocean.
Day 5: Santa Maria To Lompoc	43 Miles	Today is termed “Red Dress Day”. Creative costumes built around the color red make this festive day a highlight for all participants. While climbing one of the hills this day riders experience a switchback that allows riders to form a human red ribbon as they collectively climb this particular hill.
Day 6: Lompoc To Ventura	88 Miles	The City of Santa Barbara sponsors the “Paradise Pit” rest stop: it is an ice cream extravaganza. In camp this night, riders and roadies participate in a solemn candlelight vigil to remember all those lost due to AIDS.
Day 7: Ventura To Los Angeles	62 Miles	Arriving in LA, riders cross the finish line to throngs of cheering people.
* Mileage based on 2015 AIDS/LifeCycle Route Sheets – Annually there are slight variations in the route and mileage based on local road conditions (ALC, 2016).		

Rider safety is a key consideration on the ride and announcing the environment and intentions to fellow riders is a critical component of this safety. The term “On your left!” is an example—it is used when a rider from behind announces their intention of passing a rider in front of them. Paralleling riders along the route is a combination of SWEEP vehicles (a team to help with minor problems) and SAG vehicles (for a rider who has had enough for one day and needs to get directly to camp for whatever reason) constantly watching out for the well-being of the riders. All these vehicles are in constant radio contact with one another and provide vital support to riders.

There are typically four rest stops and a lunch stop each day. Each of these stops provide food and drink, port-o-potty facilities, and specialized services including medical for riders and bicycle tech for the riders’ means of conveyance. These stops always foster a festive and celebratory environment.

At the end of the day the rider comes into camp to the cheers of both roadie and individuals who simply want to greet and congratulate riders upon their arrival. Once a rider parks their bike for the night within bike parking and collects their gear, they can take full advantage of the many offerings camp has awaiting them. Most popular on this list would certainly be the hot showers and hot food but certainly the announcement and entertainment elements further foster the congratulatory and triumphant environment. There are also specialized services such as bike tech and a wide range of medical and sports medicine services in camp—even massage!

What does not come through in this narrative of “a day in the life” is the full color and flavor of the event. With hills that have names like “The Evil Twins”, with individual participants using nicknames like “The Chicken Lady”, and a full day of the event named “Red Dress Day” these descriptions alone would take page upon page to impart. As such, the author is including a photo exhibit section as an additional attachment to the case. Using the old adage, “a picture is worth a thousand words” these pictures are included with the case as a means to impart a small measure of the event’s hues and zest. The photo exhibit is available as downloadable attachment to accompany the case.

Collaborative Governance Or “Hi! I’m Your Cycling Rep! Welcome to ALC! Are you ready for this?”

The first step of any collaboration is the forming of a relationship. In 1994 the LA Gay and Lesbian Center, frustrated by the lack of government action towards researching, treating, and ending AIDS, created a new event: The California AIDS Ride. The event was designed to raise awareness via its audacity: a bike ride from San Francisco to Los Angeles. In that first year 478 riders participated and raised \$1.5 million for the LA Gay and Lesbian Center. In 1995, the

second year of the California AIDS Ride, the San Francisco AIDS Foundation was added as the co-collaborator and co-organizer for the event. The two organizations have worked together in a collaborative governance arrangement event ever since. In 2002 the event was reorganized and rebranded as the AIDS/LifeCycle but both the core mission of the ride and the core mission of the two not-for-profits remained the same.

When scholars use the term collaborative governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Huxham & Vangen, 2005; O’Leary, 2015) they attach specific meaning to it. While there is certainly not full agreement on the definition (Emerson, Nabatchi, Balogh, 2011) there are certainly common themes across varied definitions. Collaboration denotes a deeper interaction than mere cooperation or even coordination (Agranoff, 2007; O’Leary, 2015). Huxham and Vangen (2005) note the critical components of true collaboration include each participant giving up some degree of autonomy, but this sacrifice comes with the collaborative advantage of the collaborators collectively producing an innovative outcome that no one participant could have achieved alone. Turning to define governance, Bingham et al. define it as follows: “Governance refers to the creation, execution, and implementation of activities backed by the shared goals of citizens and organizations, who may or may not have formal authority” (Bingham, Nabatchi, & O’Leary, 2005, p.548).

In combining the two terms, Ansell and Gash (2008) note that collaborative governance should include a collective decision making process, a consensus-based orientation, and collaborators may be governmental or nongovernmental in nature. Emerson et al. would add shared motivations and joint action (Emerson, Nabatchi, Balogh, 2011). In looking at AIDS/LifeCycle, the collaboration between the Los Angeles LGBT Center and the San Francisco AIDS Foundation clearly meets these individual and combined definitions of collaborative governance. Likewise, the collective collaboration between these two not-for-profits and each and every one of their rider and roadie volunteers, also meet these definitions of collaborative governance.

Thus when a new rider signs up to participate in AIDS/LifeCycle they soon after receive a phone call, “Hi! I’m your cycling rep! Welcome to AIDS/LifeCycle! We call it ALC for short! Are you ready for this?” While the script may change slightly from call to call the message is clear: AIDS/LifeCycle and the volunteer have now formed a collaborative partnership, they are in this task together, AIDS/LifeCycle is here to help—and the cycling rep is the face and point-of-contact for this assistance—but AIDS/LifeCycle, the Los Angeles LGBT Center, and the San Francisco AIDS Foundation can’t do this alone! The volunteer is a critical component of this collaboration. Through this initial phone call a new collaboration is initiated and the governance further shared, most importantly, the collaborative advantage is initiated.

Social Networking Or Ride Safe, Be Safe

How can a paid staff of approximately 30 people raise over \$16 million dollars in a year? In the case of AIDS/LifeCycle, the answer is by enlisting 2,500+ volunteers and leveraging these volunteers' collective social networks. This section will first briefly introduce the concept of social networking and will then turn to how social networking is used as the key fundraising tool of AIDS/LifeCycle.

The study of social networks is ultimately the analysis of the sum of individual relationships. Varda (2005) describes social networks as a grouping of individuals that are linked by some type of meaningful social relationship. Granovetter's (1973) piece *The Strength of Weak Ties* is a foundation for this relationship building. The strength of ties is defined by the "combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding), and the reciprocal services which characterize the tie" (Granovetter, 1973, p.1361). Where Granovetter (1973, 1983) defines a "strong tie" as a relationship with someone you would consider a close friend or a familial relative, by contrast a "weak tie" relationship would likely be considered an acquaintance. Most importantly to this case study is how Granovetter (1973) describes how it is weak ties (not the strong ties) that create a diverse, resilient, and vibrant network. "Weak ties . . . are here seen as indispensable to individuals' opportunities" (Granovetter, 1973, p.1378).

Provan and Milward (2001) would note that a network is only as successful as their demonstrated effectiveness. For AIDS/LifeCycle this success is clearly built in the highly diverse "weak tie" network of volunteers and the subsequent "weak tie" network each of these individuals then bring to the overarching fundraising effort (Granovetter, 1973). In turn, the success of this network model is demonstrated in the fundraising numbers for the event: in 2015 AIDS/LifeCycle raised \$16,675,273 (ALC, 2016).

The participants in AIDS/LifeCycle do indeed represent a vast diversity: expert cyclist to near beginners, varied ethnicities, all age groups, individuals of both HIV+ and HIV- status, varied sexual orientations, genders, and gender identities, and wide-ranging geographic localities. As noted by Varda, "It is through weak ties that we begin to diversify our networks and create avenues for accessing more varied resources" (Varda, 2009, p.52). This diversity translates to a vast network of "weak ties" – both in terms of the collective network of the volunteers and in terms of each individual's personal social network. Everyone who participates in AIDS/LifeCycle has a story as to why they are participating. These narrative serves as the power behind each individual's personal fundraising efforts as they approach the members of their own social networks, whether these individual be friends, acquaintances, co-workers, or relatives. For cyclist AIDS/LifeCycle requires a minimum of \$3,000 in fundraising to participate in the event.

While roadies are not required to fundraise because of their sweat equity contribution to the event they are certainly not discouraged from fundraising if they choose to do so.

While one key goal of this case study is to help readers understand how to use the tools of collaborative governance toward successful fundraising efforts, it is important at this point in the case to pause from this topic and briefly take a look at the broader mission of the charities receiving these funds. Per ALC (2016), the goals of AIDS/LifeCycle are to:

1. Raise funds to support the HIV/AIDS services of the Los Angeles LGBT Center and the San Francisco AIDS Foundation;
2. Increase awareness and knowledge about the services and programs offered by the benefiting organizations;
3. Increase awareness and knowledge about HIV/AIDS among participants, their donors, and the general public;
4. Increase AIDS activism and volunteerism among the participant and donor communities, inspiring them to become ambassadors in the fight against AIDS;
5. Provide a positive, life-affirming experience for people affected and infected by HIV;
6. Contribute to an increased understanding of the disproportionate impact HIV has had on the GLBT communities in SF and LA; and
7. Encourage an environment of dignity and improved quality of life for those affected by HIV and AIDS.

It is critical to note that all seven of these stated goals are likewise accomplished through the 2500+ “weak tie” social networks of each participant in the ride. While a potent fundraising network, this network is also an information network (Agranoff, 2007). The event and its many riders and roadies are ambassadors in raising awareness and knowledge about HIV in general, and educating as to the specifics of treatment and prevention options available today. By banishing ignorance, the dignity and quality of life is improved for *ALL* participants, but certainly especially for those affected by HIV.

Beyond this “weak tie” information network the ride annually generates a buzz of print, radio, and television media attention. Each of these furthers the penetration of the collective message to not forget about AIDS and HIV and to become better educated about both. Growing in importance in recent years, is also the additional attention generated by the social media created by the event’s participants—paid staff, riders, and roadies alike all “post” about their experiences and impressions along the ride, expanding the audience far beyond the two geographic areas served by the charities: San Francisco and Los Angeles. While not all members of these social networks will choose to donate to the event, all members of these social

networks will be exposed to the educational and outreach message of AIDS education and prevention.

While this section focuses on the leveraging of the participants' social networks as a key to overall fundraising, the next section of this case study will dig deeper into the components of this fundraising by discussing how participation in AIDS/LifeCycle is itself a form of service coproduction.

Service Coproduction as Successful Nonprofit Fundraising *Or* The F Word

Public affairs scholars coined the term service coproduction as a way to describe a service delivery mechanism where a citizen actively and voluntarily participates in the delivery of the service (Oakerson, 1999; Parks et al., 1981). Traditionally the term service coproduction has been applied to governmental entities (and most commonly a municipal government). In this context, Whitaker defines service coproduction as "Citizens influenc[ing] the content of many public services through their direct participation in service delivery" (Whitaker, 1980, p.240).

Brudney and England (1983) note the critical conditions of true service coproduction: (1) The individual is a *participant* (not merely respondent to a bureaucratic request); (2) the individual is both an *active* and a *voluntary* participant (if action is compulsory it is not coproduction); and (3) the action is *cooperative* in nature (not compliance). "The coproduction model is based on the assumption of an active, participative populace of consumer producers" (Brudney & England, 1983, p.60). The volunteers who participate in AIDS/LifeCycle meet all three of these service coproduction conditions. Whitaker (1980) identifies three types of service coproduction: (1) citizens request aid from public agents; (2) citizens provide assistance to public agents; and (3) citizens and public agents interact to adjust each other's service expectations and actions. In the case of AIDS/LifeCycle the term "citizen" should likely be replaced with "individual" and the term "public agent" should likely be replaced with "not-for-profit agent", however, beyond these minor alterations both the identified categories and the broader meaning of each category is still applicable.

Most AIDS/LifeCycle volunteer-participants primarily interact with their not-for-profit agent via the second identified category: active assistance. This active assistance role will be discussed in the remainder of this section and much of the following section—where service coproduction toward successful event delivery will be discussed.

There are, however, cases where some volunteer participants will also conduct themselves within the third category to adjust future expectations and actions. This additional example of service coproduction will be discussed in the following section of the case.

Regarding the active assistance category, riders are the fundraising workhorses of AIDS/LifeCycle. As such, the riders are providing voluntary and active participation toward the fundraising goal for the event. To assist riders AIDS/LifeCycle staff have designated staff members who are “Cycling Reps” – these reps become the cyclists primary point-of-contact with the organization and provide the cyclists coaching and training regarding how to better fundraise. “The F Word” is a popular in-person or web-based seminar that cycling reps present to volunteer participants—in case you are wondering “the F word” is *FUNDRAISING*.

While the fundraising minimum for cyclist is \$3,000, many cyclists choose to raise significantly more. While this is a personal choice by the participants, AIDS/LifeCycle certainly creates an environment where setting high goals is encouraged. Three examples illustrate this: (1) the AIDS/LifeCycle website regularly publishes “top fundraisers” according to a number of categories; (2) there are numerous fundraising “incentives” (such as cycling jerseys, caps, socks, etc.) offered to participants; and (3) many cyclist participate in AIDS/LifeCycle as a member of a team and often teams take pride in and compete for top fundraising spots at the event—like with individuals, top fundraising teams are also published on the AIDS/LifeCycle website.

“Top fundraisers” receive praise from AIDS/LifeCycle via regularly updated and published “top fundraiser” categories, including: top 100 participants, top 545 participants, top 100 cyclists in Northern California, top 100 cyclists in Southern California, top 100 cyclists out-of-state, top 100 roadies, and even a “virtual cyclist” top 100 category. This category is for individuals unable to participate in the physical event but who believe so strongly in the cause and the charities that they still volunteer to fundraise on the behalf of AIDS/LifeCycle.

During the year leading up to the actual ride, AIDS/LifeCycle offers the participants numerous fundraising incentives. These incentives create a choice architecture that “nudges” (Thaler & Sunstein, 2009) participants. Initial fundraising incentives encourage the participants to begin their fundraising earlier rather than later. These nudges are deliberate on the part of AIDS/LifeCycle. Besides engaging participants in a longer total period of fundraising, these early incentives also encompass the month of December—the single largest month of the year for charitable giving in the United States—and also the month that opens with World AIDS Day. Incentives closer to the actual ride rewards those who exceed the fundraising minimum of \$3,000. A rider who successfully fundraises according to AIDS/LifeCycle’s incentive sequence will begin the ride with numerous jerseys, and other gear including a cycling cap, socks, wind vest, and/or hoodie. On days that a rider wears their fundraising jersey, it is common for fellow riders to complement and praise them for their accomplishment. This “good job rider” mentality is part of the social capital building discussed in the final section of this case study.

Many cyclists participate in AIDS/LifeCycle as members of a team. These teams often take pride in, and compete for, top fundraising spots at the event. Like with individuals, top fundraising teams are also published on the AIDS/LifeCycle website regularly. These teams also serve as part of the event's social capital building and will likewise be discussed further in the final section of the case.

The next section of this case study discusses an additional example of service coproduction, specifically the sweat equity contribution provided by roadie volunteers.

Service Coproduction as Successful Event Delivery Or Roadies Rock!

In addition to the service coproduction via fundraising, the ride offers a further example of service coproduction. Among the event participants are 500+ volunteers who are termed "roadies". Where the riders' service coproduction contribution comes via funds raised, the roadies' contribution comes via sweat equity—volunteering to work throughout the event. Put simply, the roadie volunteers make the entire event happen. AIDS/LifeCycle effectively becomes a tent city that moves down the California Coast for seven days. Beginning in San Francisco on a Sunday and ending in Los Angeles the following Saturday. The AIDS/LifeCycle webpage describes the roadie volunteers as, "Selfless, dedicated, and unbelievably committed... these folks will dedicate their time, energy, and hearts to waking up very early, going to sleep very late and being in charge of pretty much all the work that happens on the event" (ALC, 2016).

Roadies are broken into a number of teams. These teams fall into three primary categories: teams that aid moving and constructing the event's tent city, teams tasked with providing support to the riders, and teams that do a combination of both. There is much love for the roadies on the ride, and the term "Roadies Rock!" has come to exemplify this love. In each of these categories the roadie volunteers are conducting service coproduction in the active assistance category (Whitaker, 1980).

A team that typifies the camp management role is Team Pack-up. This team has the daily task of packing, moving, and assembling the camp's tarps and/or tents and all the tables, chairs, and equipment that support life in camp. During camp's active operation Team Pack-up is in charge of the management and removal of trash.

In addition to their bicycles, each rider is allowed up to 70 pounds of gear on the event. Team Gear & Tent is a good example of a team that both moves the tent city forward and provides direct support to riders. Each day, before departing camp on their bicycles riders report to their appointed moving truck where a member of Team Gear & Tent takes their luggage bag and tent

a load it onto the moving truck. By the time the riders arrive in the next camp, Team Gear & Tent has now unloaded the truck and the riders' bags and tents are awaiting them.

Finally, there are the many roadie teams specifically dedicated to serving the riders. These teams range from bike tech and food service in camp to each rest stop and lunch having their own team. One team that illustrates the volunteer spirit embodied in a roadie is Team Medical. While a limited number of services are contracted out to companies on the AIDS/LifeCycle (notable examples being a catering company prepares all camp meals and a private contractor services the port-o-potties), one service that is not contracted out and is a 100% volunteer effort is Team Medical. This team provides extensive support to both riders and roadies all performing at very high levels of physical activity day in and day out over a seven-day period.

One important final observation regarding roadies is that there is most definitely a hierarchy embedded within the collaboration. This is what Agranoff (2007) has termed a "collaborarchy"—combining the terms collaboration and hierarchy. He notes, "networks must go beyond the formalities of officers and rules in order to devolve a collaborarchy that holds the group together and provides means that support its actions" (Agranoff, 2007, p.123). Like most paid employment settings, roadie teams operate on a seniority system where knowledge sharing is key and more seasoned volunteers lead the team and train new recruits. Previous experience with AIDS/LifeCycle is key to being appointed to a leadership role on a roadie team. Agranoff's (2007) concept of collaborarchy is certainly applicable - teams are neither randomly organized nor ad hoc. Instead each team has a distinct leadership structure and internal arrangements of operation. Likewise, unlike pure hierarchy, this collaborarchy operates on a purely voluntary basis.

While roadie volunteers generally conduct service coproduction in the active assistance category, the more senior roadies who perform supervisory roles within the volunteer corps also fulfill the third service coproduction category of interacting with not-for-profit agents to adjust future service expectations and actions. This back-and-forth collaboration between senior/supervisory roadies and paid staff brings this additional form of coproduction into full execution and allows AIDS/LifeCycle to have an organizational culture that learns and improves over time (Schein, 1993).

Some may find the ability of this collaborarchy to successfully operate annually, for only one week of the year, doubtfully. This success, however, is largely built upon AIDS/LifeCycle's ability to build social capital among its participants. This social capital breeds a sense of loyalty and pride that ensures the annual collaborarchy's success. This social capital element is discussed further in the next section of this case study.

Retention Through Social Capital Building Or The Love Bubble

It's called "the love bubble" on the ride. It's a sense of common purpose, mutual kindness, and collective effort that individuals who participate in AIDS/LifeCycle feel. Taking a scholarly view, "the love bubble" is essentially a very real manifestation of what is termed social capital (Bourdieu, 1986, Coleman, 1988, Lin, 1999; Putnam, 1995, 2000). Coleman notes, "Like other forms of capital, social capital is productive, making possible the achievement of certain ends that in its absence would not be possible" (Coleman, 1988, p. S98; in Derose & Varda, 2009). Putnam defines social capital as the "norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit" (Putnam, 1995, p.65). Lin states it even more simply, "Investment in social relationships with expected returns" (Lin, 1999, p.30). When participants attempt to describe "the love bubble" they will often note peoples' willingness to be helpful and the mutual friendliness between people who very often do not even know one another. This mutuality and generalized reciprocity, however, is not surprising to scholars of social capital. As noted by Putnam, "Spontaneous cooperation is facilitated by social capital" (Putnam, 1995, p.167).

While highly valuable during the event itself, this cache of social capital has a huge additional dividend for AIDS/LifeCycle: it fosters deep loyalties and pride that bring people back for more on an annual basis. Feldman et al. (2006) describes this as a boundary experience. "Boundary experiences are shared or joint activities that create a sense of community and an ability to transcend boundaries among participants" (Feldman et al., 2006, p. 94).

Bourdieu (1986) ties social capital to membership in a group. This case has already discussed the broader community of AIDS/LifeCycle as a whole and likewise the cooperative efforts of the varied roadie teams, but beyond these there is an additional "membership" common within AIDS/LifeCycle. While riders are welcome to participate in the event as individuals, most choose to participate in the event as part of a team. Bourdieu (1986) describes how this kind of "membership" leads to a "collectively-owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit" (Bourdieu, 1986, pp. 248-249; in Derose & Varda, 2009).

With team names ranging from Team Unpopular (They declare, "Go ahead, be Unpopular!") to Team New Bear Republic (Their team's core values include, "Support and encourage others, build community, practice safety and good humor on the road, and wear bear ears on our helmets."); from Team Colorado (Yes, they are from Colorado) to Team Swiss (Yes, they are from Switzerland); and even Team ALCaholics (They proclaim themselves, "a fellowship of men and women who share a common affliction: an addiction to the warm, fuzzy, sweaty feelings that one experiences during a 7-day, 545-mile bicycle ride") (ALC, 2016). Among all the teams,

the Positive Peddlers certainly hold an extra degree of respect among participants. Members of this team are both HIV+ and willing to be publically open about their status—in a world where HIV+ stigmas run deep their actions can only be described as brave and life affirming. As one of their team jersey's note, "Positive is an Attitude!"

Beyond these taglines and good humor is a further social capital dividend: membership on a team has a statistically significant increase in participant retention (ALC, 2016). Put simply, a rider on a team is more likely to return to AIDS/LifeCycle the following year than an individual participant. Teams give participants a sense of place in a more intimate setting than the broader AIDS/LifeCycle community. For new riders, team members can be a source of valuable information. For seasoned riders, it offers a range of benefits from leadership opportunities to simply a venue to share the stories collected by participating in AIDS/LifeCycle. In all cases, it is a furthering of the social capital dividend.

Conclusions *Or We'll Keep Riding Until AIDS is a Thing of the Past!*

If this case study were the ride itself, riders would now be collectively crossing the finish line in Los Angeles, CA. While physically tired, the throngs of cheering people at the finish would be energizing the riders on arrival. The announcement will soon be made regarding how much money has been collectively raised this year leading up to, and during, the event. Finally, all present will be solemnly reminded that the ride will not end until AIDS itself is at an end and a thing of the past.

The mission statement of the ride is this, "AIDS/LifeCycle is co-produced by the San Francisco AIDS Foundation and the Los Angeles LGBT Center and is designed to advance their shared interests to end the pandemic and human suffering caused by AIDS" (ALC, 2016). For the now-past week, riders and roadies alike have been steeped in a culture of acceptance of diversity, in particular in relation to HIV status, and a collective and collaborative will to end the epidemic known as AIDS. For the participants, and the benefactors moved to donate on their behalf, this mission statement is an active statement of pro-active collaboration (O'Leary, 2015) by two not-for-profits who have teamed up to use service coproduction (Oakerson, 1999) and social capital (Putnam, 1995) as their chosen tools by which to build a considerable social network of weak ties (Granovetter, 1973). This network serves as both a pro-active information network (Agranoff, 2007) and potent fundraising network.

While this case study is in fact not the ride, the case is a journey into the entity and phenomenon known as AIDS/LifeCycle. Through this case, students of public affairs can use AIDS/LifeCycle as a lens to better understand the concepts of collaborative governance, social networking, service coproduction, and social capital. Likewise, for students of not-for-profit

management, they can use this case to better understand how each of these concepts is used towards a key goal for all not-for-profits: successful fundraising efforts to ensure the future delivery of critical services. While this journey has ended, remember, YOU BELONG HERE.

Works Cited

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

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

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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