Syllabus

Networks and Public Management

Course Rationale
If as a discipline we are to “treat networks seriously” (O’Toole 1997), students of public administration need to be well versed in the theory, practice and methods of studying networks operating in the public sphere. Therefore, the foci of this course are to integrate the questions concerning networks with management strategies for those who are “managers of” or “managers in” (Milward and Provan 2006) networks and to equip students with a tool for diagnosing network problems. As a result of this course, students should be well-versed in network theory, the practical issues of working in networks, and the methodological approaches available for studying networks.

Learning Objectives
By the end of the semester students will:

- Identify the pressing public sector network questions from the view of practitioners as well as researchers. These questions are normative (Should we be using networks? How should we evaluate network effectiveness?), descriptive (Can we classify the types of networks that are in use?), explanatory (Why do networks result in specific outcomes? How do networks emerge?) and prescriptive (What should managers of and managers within networks do to make networks operate more efficiently?).
- Have a working knowledge of the public administration literature as it relates to these types of questions.
- Be able to differentiate between formal and informal networks and between inter-organizational and intra-organizational networks.

This syllabus was a winner in the 2007 Don Kettl/Smith Richardson Foundation “Networks and Public Management” competition. It was written by Pamela Mischen of the University of Binghamton. It is brought to you by E-PARC, part of the Maxwell School of Syracuse University’s Collaborative Governance Initiative, a subset of the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts. This syllabus may be copied as many times as needed as long as the author is given full credit for her work.
Understand the role that networks play in the implementation of public policy.
Use social network analysis as an analytical tool for evaluating networks.
Evaluate networks for effectiveness by using various network diagnostics.
Develop their own personal networking capabilities.
Understand the limitations of networks, a “network perspective” and social network analysis.

Grading
Weekly Assignments (6 of the 13 assignments at 10% each) 60%
Final presentation 15%
Final written document 15%
Participation 10%

Required Texts

Required Software

Assigned Articles

knowledge creation and sharing in social networks. *Organizational Dynamics*, 30(2), 100 – 120.


**Weekly Outline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Assigned Readings</th>
<th>Assignment Due*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Introduction to Networks  
|      | • Characteristics of Networks  
|      | • Network as a Level of Analysis  
|      | • Role of Networks in Policy Implementation | O’Toole (1997)  
|      |      | Cross & Parker, Chapter 1 |  
|      |      | Agranoff, Chapter 1 |  
|      |      | Cross & Parker, Chapter 2 – 3 |  
|      |      | Agranoff, Chapters 4 – 5 |  
| 3    | Network Governance and Accountability | Provan & Kenis (2005)  
|      |      | Agranoff, Chapters 6, 9 |  
|      |      | Provan et al. (2005) |  
| 4    | Modeling Networks  
|      | • Whole networks  
|      | • Ego-centered networks  
|      |      | Cross & Parker, Chapter 5 |  
|      |      | Hanneman & Riddle, Chapters 1 – 3 |  
|      |      | Provan & Milward (2001) |  
| 5    | Sociograms and Sociomatrices  
|      | • Using Netdraw  
|      | • Using UCINet | Hanneman & Riddle, Chapters 4 – 6 |  
|      |      | Hanneman & Riddle, Chapters 4 – 6 |  
| 6    | Network Diagnostics  
|      | • Connection  
|      | • Distance  
|      | • Centrality  
|      | • Power | Hanneman & Riddle, Chapter 7 – 8, 10 |  
|      |      | Provan et al. (2005) |  
|      |      | Provan et al. (2005) |  
|      |      | Provan et al. (2005) |  
| 7    | Collecting Network Data | Borgatti & Molina (2005)  
|      |      | Kadushin (2005)  
|      |      | Cross & Parker, Appendix A |  
|      |      | Provan & Milward (1995)  
|      |      | Agranoff, Chapter 8 |  

**Approval of Survey by Institutional Review Board**
*More details to be handed out in class. Some of these assignments will be in-class, others will be take-home. Six of the 13 assignments will be graded.*

| 9 | Network Strengths & Weaknesses | Pardo et al. (2006)  
|   |   | Cross et al. (2001)  
|   |   | Agranoff, Chapter 7  
|   |   | Collect and enter data  

| 10 | Network Strengths & Weaknesses | Edelenbos & Klijn (2007)  
|   |   | Moore (1992)  
|   |   | Cross & Parker, Chapter 6  
|   |   | Using SNA to analyze communication and information/knowledge management  

| 11 | Network Strengths & Weaknesses | Eglene, Dawes & Schneider (2007)  
|   |   | Harris & Clements (2007)  
|   |   | Cross & Parker, Chapters 3 – 4  
|   |   | Using SNA to analyze power and trust  

|   |   | Cross & Parker, Chapters 7, 8  
|   |   | Agranoff, Chapter 10  
|   |   | Using SNA to analyze expertise and leadership  

| 13 | Network Evolution | Suitor, Wellman, & Morgan (1997)  
|   |   | Anderson (1999)  
|   |   | Morel & Ramanujam (1999)  
|   |   | Using SNA to analyze management  

| 14 | Final Presentations | Final presentations due  