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For the practicing public administrator serving within a government or quasi-governmental agency at the federal, state, regional or local level, the kinds of administrative skills and knowledge needed to negotiate the networked terrain of intergovernmental relations (IGR) are apparent and will, by 2020, be major considerations in the design of professional development, opportunities, and daily practice. In this chapter, I make two arguments and one empirical observation. First, IGR should be understood in terms of network theories and metaphors. Second, the types of skills and dispositions needed by public administrators within or around IGR networks need to be articulated and subjected to deeper explanation and refinement. The empirical observation is that the current curriculum found in most master’s degree programs that train and prepare intergovernmental managers may not be currently focusing on the kinds of competencies needed to successfully manage IGR networks.

We begin with an examination of the first argument by discussing the application of network metaphors and frameworks to the traditional study of IGR. We then draw a conclusion that, by thinking of IGR in terms of intergovernmental networks, a particular set of administrative skills and dispositions becomes important. We then introduce some data that suggest there is a need to critically examine the curriculum designed to train and prepare IGR network managers.

Intergovernmental Relations

IGR may be described as comprising two or more nongovernmental arrangements that exchange resources, pool or pool resources, and are distinguished as a part of the executive process (Koliba, Meek, and Zia, 2010). Intergovernmental arrangements have only relationships between nodes and “ties” (2010) make the argument that national, state, and local government operate through a network of networks that provides a framework for understanding the various actors of governance and the kinds of policy tools they use.

Basic network structure through coordinated action (Koliba, Meek, and Zia, 2010). In social science, the network organization of social networks has been operationalized as the notion of a social network system (Koliba, Meek, and Zia, 2010). Within this framework, the notion of pattern or systematic or the interdependence of the institutions that patterns have formed, the impact that these patterns have on the qualities of governance networks are because of the characteristics of collective actions they take on, and the one or more policy streams (Koliba, Meek, and Zia, 2010).
Intergovernmental Relations Networks

IGR may be described in terms of interorganizational governance networks comprising two or more nodes linked together through some concerted effort to exchange resources, pool resources, and/or coordinate actions. IGR networks are distinguished as a particular type of governance network (Sørensen and Torfing 2005; Koliba, Meek, and Zia 2010) that comprises two or more public-sector government organizations. Although studies of IGR have described how governments at various levels of geographical scale coordinate activities, these arrangements have only recently been fully articulated as a series of relationships between nodes and “ties.” Christopher Koliba, Jack Meek, and Asim Zia (2010) make the argument that the very nature of checks and balances; the federalist systems of national, state, and local level governments; and the differentiation of government operations into distinct areas of specialization may be thought of in terms of network configurations. Describing IGR in terms of network structures provides a material basis on which to describe and evaluate the various actors of government, the nature of their relationships to one another, and the kinds of policy tools and resources that flow between them.

Basic network structures are described in terms of nodes tied together through coordinated actions and resource exchanges (Wasserman and Faust 1994; Rhodes 1997). In social networks, nodes may be described as existing across several levels of social scale, from the micro-level of individuals to the meso-scales of interpersonal groups and organizations to the more macro-level of interorganizational networks. This basic framework for describing and analyzing social networks has been described by Samuel Leinhardt as a paradigm that, operationalizes the notion of social structure by representing it in terms of a system of social relations tying [sic] distinct social entities to one another. Within this framework the issue of structure in social relations becomes one of pattern or systematic organization. It also involves the corollary issues of the interdependence of the patterns formed by different relations, the implications that patterns have for the behavior of the individual entities, and the impact that the qualities of the entities have on the patterns. (1977, xiii)

Governance networks are distinguished from other forms of social networks because of the characteristics of network actors and the kinds of functions and collective actions they take on. These functions are aligned with the pursuit of one or more policy streams (Kingdon 1984).
Donald Kettl observes that “the Constitution—in its drafting, its structure, and its early function—was a remarkable balancing act of complex issues, political cross-pressures, and boundary-defined responses…. For generations since, flexible, bend-without-breaking boundaries have been the foundation of American government” (2006, 11). To this end, the network configuration of government conceived by the framers of the U.S. Constitution allows for frequent “border crossings” between branches and levels of government as well as between agencies and units within a particular branch. Because governments are network structures in their own right, we must be careful not to assume that government interests are represented by one, unified actor. To this end, we should not think in terms of one “government” but, rather, in terms of governments. This assertion serves as one of the central tenants of IGR.

**Intergovernmental Relations**

Intergovernmental networks have been described as possessing a combination of “vertical interdependence” and “extensive horizontal articulation” (Rhodes 1997, 38). Because IGR are marked by combinations of hierarchical and collaborative arrangements, there has been little consensus around a singular model of IGR. Dell Wright’s (2000) three models of IGR represent the relationship among local, state, and national governments as taking one of three forms: coordinate, inclusive, and overlapping authority. Each model represents the possible types of relationships that exist between governmental institutions.

The coordinate-authority model implies that national, state, and local governments are independent and autonomous (Wright 2000, 75). The inclusive-authority model is best described as a series of nested, essentially hierarchical relations between levels of government. This model assumes that national governments exist as the principals over state and local governments, implying a hierarchical network arrangement (Wright 2000, 79). Under this view, states exist as “administrative districts” for federally established policies (Wright 2000, 82).

Wright’s third model of IGR suggests that the different levels of government exist as arenas of overlapping authority. Wright (2000, 84) outlines the three critical characteristics of this particular model: substantial areas of governmental operations involve national, state, and local government simultaneously; the areas of autonomy between levels of government are comparatively small; and the power and influence available to any one jurisdiction is significantly limited. Wright notes that overlapping authority is established through substantial negotiation and bargaining.
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The articulation of power between levels of government is highly dependent on the context of the policy domain that is implicated. Matters of federal constitutional law, for instance, take precedence over laws established at the state or local levels. In other areas, states are independent of federal authority, as in the case of determining marriage rights and the setting of land use and zoning policies. In still other cases, the federal government attempts to influence state and local polices with the powers of the purse, as in the case in transportation and education policy.

**Devolution** is the transfer of governance responsibility for specified functions to subnational levels, either publicly or privately owned, that are largely outside the direct control of the central government. Devolution is used to describe the shift toward administrative decentralization that transfers specific decision-making powers from one level of government to another (which could be from a lower level to a higher level of government) or from the government to nonprofit and private-sector interests and constituencies.

**Intragovernmental Relations**

The checks and balances inherent to most forms of modern democratic governments may be explained in terms of one branch having authority over the others, as well as all branches sharing authorities with each other. Thus, the separation of powers flows through relational ties that may be vertically, horizontally, or diagonally articulated. In essence, the early designers of modern democratic governments understood one of the major contributions that separate, distinct, yet interdependent and networked institutions bring to the study and design of systems of governance—that relational power may be conveyed through both vertical (hierarchical) and horizontal (collaborative) ties. Because each branch of government has its share of checks and balances vis-à-vis the others, they are encouraged to find ways to build strong horizontal ties among them and, when substantive disagreements persist, weld vertical authority to keep the other branches in check.

Network relationships are also established between institutions within a single branch of government, creating the basis for intragovernmental relations. This is most easily demonstrated in the bicameral structure of the U.S. Congress and state legislatures. The role that intragovernmental relations plays in the design and execution of public policy and public service delivery has been described in the literature as “joined-up government.” The joined-up government literature is chiefly concerned with “coordination.
principally within a single tier of government” (Perri 6 2004, 105). The nature of intra-agency coordination and collaboration is a topic that still demands further study. As governance agencies are asked to align practices around topics that transcend jurisdictional boundaries, the challenges and opportunities associated with joined-up government gain in importance. These intra-agency configurations should be considered as variations of governance network form.

Administrative Strategies Needed in Intergovernmental Relations Networks

Individual public administrators are often challenged by the need to seek clarification regarding the rules and roles governing IGR. The crossing of intergovernmental boundaries is mediated through legal interpretations of the U.S. Constitution and the legal and political precedence used to determine the distinction among national, state, regional, and local levels of government. Governance network managers, particularly those immersed within intergovernmental networks, need to understand these legal, administrative, and political dynamics.

Across the literature that has evolved to account for the increasing complexity of cross-jurisdictional ties, a picture of network administration is emerging that can be described as the combination of network governance and public management under conditions requiring the balancing of autonomy and interdependency. Network administration is defined here as “coordinating strategies of actors with different goals and preferences with regard to a certain problem or policy measure within an existing network of inter-organizational relations” (Kickert, Klijn, and Koppenjan 1997, 10). Effective network management requires an understanding of all forms of administrative dynamics, including the kind of administrative skills most often tied to vertical arrangements (command and control) as well as to a set of more horizontally oriented arrangements found in settings guided by negotiation and bargaining, and collaboration and cooperation.

Table 3.1 lays out one interpretation of the major management paradigms of public administration beginning with classical public administration’s focus on command and control issues; new public management’s focus on competition, concession, and compromise; collaborative public management’s recent focus on cooperation and collaboration (Agranoff and McGuire 2003; Bingham and O’Leary 2008); and governance network management’s

Table 3.1 Paradigms of Public administration paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical public admin</th>
<th>New public management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative public management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance network administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Koliba, Meek, and Zi
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According to Walter Kickert and Joop Koppenjan,

Network management is an activity which takes place at the meta level: it involves steering efforts aimed at promoting these cooperative strategies within policy games in networks. Thus, network administration may also be seen as promoting the mutual adjustment of the behaviour of actors with diverse objectives and ambitions with regard to tackling problems within a given framework of interorganizational relationships. (1997, 44)

A network administration paradigm blends a range of administrative roles and functions, leveraging the mechanisms of authority found in command and control environments, with administration through formal and informal agreements. Network administration must also account for the administration of horizontal ties built on the establishment of trust, reciprocity, and durability. Hans Bressers and Lawrence O'Toole suggest that network administration "involves such important but potentially multilateral tasks as facilitating exchange, identifying potential options for multiactor agreement, and helping to craft patterns of communication as well as multilevel and multiactor governance arrangements" (2005, 141).

As interest in network administration has proliferated, a series of best practices or axioms have been put forth by some of the leading researchers and theorists in the field. To give the reader a sense of the range of practical guides found in the literature, I highlight a few of these suggested best practices next.
The research of Stephen Goldsmith and William D. Eggers (2004) has provided a strong basis for understanding the skills needed by public managers for initiating and developing mixed-actor governance networks. These authors assert that working within a collaborative network model requires attitudes and behaviors beyond what is typically called for in a public manager accustomed to exercising hierarchical control. The central feature of network management is working in shared power relationships, an environment that requires flexibility and adaptability. Sharing power to achieve collective outcomes calls on competencies to move networks toward performance outcomes while still managing to achieve high levels of performance against an agreed-on values and measures (Goldsmith and Eggers 2004).

The qualities of network managers are also reflected in the work of Robert Agranoff (2007), who examined managerial lessons evident in networks that were established by network managers. These lessons are distinguishable from those represented in hierarchical structures. Among the ten lessons identified by Agranoff among network managers include: taking a share of the administrative burden, operating by agenda orchestration, and accommodating and adjusting while maintaining purpose. Public managers need to rely on interpersonal skills that reflect working in a shared-powered arrangement.

After studying fourteen collaborative networks, Agranoff provides additional observations regarding managing in networks. These observations include the recognition that managers still tend to do the bulk of their work within hierarchies. He recognizes that “most collaborative decisions or agreements are the products of a particular type of mutual learning and adjustment.” These mutual learning adjustments lead to the proliferation of public-sector knowledge management activities. He also observes that “Despite the cooperative spirit and aura of accommodation in collaborative efforts, networks are not without conflicts and power issues” (Agranoff 2006, 61).

With these findings, it is evident that network management calls on the public manager to operate in very different ways and in many different settings. A review of lessons from the literature on collaborative networks reveals that the role of the public manager is even more complicated by the additional burden of having to manage and participate in administrative arrangements premised on a combination of vertical and horizontal ties.

Not surprisingly, governance networks have been found to experience points of conflict. Conflicts may come about as the result of real, substantive differences of opinion, or they may be exacerbated by the nature of collaboration and interorganizational interactions. For a network management to be considered successful, it must effectively manage these differences, ensuring that they are addressed in a way that promotes the overall goals of the network (O’Leary and Bing 1997, 1).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2</th>
<th>Governance network a coordinating strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>mandating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation and barges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokering</td>
<td>boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems thinking</td>
<td>situational awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Koliba, Meek, et al.
differences of opinion and perspective. Rosemary O'Leary and Lisa Bingham studied the nature of conflict and conflict resolution in network settings. They conclude their study with observations about the complex sources of network conflict: differences in mission, cultures, methods of operation, stakeholder groups and different funders, and degrees of power (O'Leary and Bingham 2007, 10-11). Conflict in IGR network contexts is all but inevitable.

As a network manager contemplates the range of strategies at his or her disposal, she or he must consider that a strategy "can be used both to influence goal-oriented processes (governance) and to create the conditions which facilitate the mutual formulation of targets (network management)" (Kickert and Koppenjan 1997, 120-121). These strategies are employed through the enactment of certain policy tools and the execution of certain network management skills. A variety of governance strategies have been recognized as being crucial to interorganizational networks (Salamon 2002; Fox, Ward, and Howard 2002). Combined with the practices outlined here, a picture of some of the central network administration strategies emerges. Table 3.2 summarizes these strategies. In the next sections, the characteristics of each strategy are described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2 Governance Network Administration Coordinating Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance network administration coordinating strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight; mandating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation and bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokering; boundary spanning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems thinking; situational awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Koliba, Meek, and Zia (2010, 201).
Oversight and Mandating

Oversight is a standard managerial function found in any hierarchical or principal-agent relationship. The establishment of administrative oversight may be premised on the designation of a “lead organization” (Provan and Kenis 2007) or an individual leader of a governance network. When the authority is based on the position of the leader or overseer, the capacities of the leader to lead and followers to follow become critically important. Administrative oversight may be derived through the issuance of executive orders, spelled out in contract agreement language, or agreed on through memoranda of understandings.

Mandating provides “minimum standards for . . . performance within the legal framework” (Fox, Ward, and Howard 2002, 3). The role of a government agency in a mandating relationship is that of a traditional command and control orientation that is defined through legislation and implemented through agency regulations (Fox, Ward, and Howard 2002, 3). Tools associated with mandating roles include social and economic regulation, fines, and sanctions. For the public administrator, implementing mandates may be seen either in terms of the traditional command and control perspective or in terms of an emergent perspective on mandates that explicitly provides regulated agents with more negotiating and bargaining power. This phenomena surfaces in IGR networks when governments at different levels of geographical scale negotiate the terms of their agreements in intergovernmental grants and contracts, and in determining the terms of regulations and compliance with standards. One supra-level government serves as the principal over sublevel government agents. Mandating sets parameters, but regulated interests may have room for “adjustment seeking” (Agranoff and McGuire 2003, 75). The ability of IGR network managers to grant “regulatory relief” is a critical component of managing across sectors (Agranoff and McGuire 2003, 75). Regulatory relief can be viewed as what Ian Ayres and John Braithwaite (1992) call “responsive regulation.”

Providing Resources

To account for an actor’s role as a provider of resources to a network, we distinguish the provision of resources as a distinct network management strategy. From a network perspective, the provision of such resources serves as critical input and process factors. Such provisions may either require or lead to the establishment of a lead organization, as in the case when a funder enters into an agreement with those that it funds. The selection of which capital resources to provide, when provided falls in network management.

The selection strategies employ a wide array tools, financial and accounting, project management, the management of human resources. The management of people is often with certain funder, network managers. Network managers information and learning. Th influence and lending.

Lester Salamon and others have developed the idea of “modulation” of other kinds of policy investments in networks. The provision can work (Journard et al.) national/federal governments. With these subnational graphical scale can include governmental, into the realm of capital. The capacity, work probably involved to serve the network.

Negotiating and Involvement

In studying the participation, Robert A
to provide, when to provide them, and on what conditions that they are provided falls into the realm of network management strategies adopted by network managers.

The selection of certain forms of capital resources predicates the specific strategies employed. Those public managers responsible for managing the flow of financial resources into and/or out of an IGR network will employ budgeting and accounting practices. Network managers may be stewards of the physical or natural resources that are used by the IGR network, bearing responsibility for the management of buildings, office equipment, and other built infrastructure or for certain forms of ecosystem services at the disposal of the network. Network managers will probably provide human capital to the network, bringing with them certain skills sets and knowledge that are used by the network at large. Network managers may bring their social capital to the network, providing boundary-spanning and bridging functions. As Agranoff has noted (2006), network managers may take a role in managing the flow of knowledge and facilitate learning. They may also bring political capital into the network, exerting influence or lending their legitimacy to network operations.

Lester Salamon refers to the provision strategy of network management as the “modulation” of rewards (2002, 17). Providing resources such as subsidies or other kinds of policy incentives may be used to convince private parties to make investments in network-wide activities. The provision of resources in terms of modulating network activity is a critical facet of network management practices.

The provision of resources is a critical function undertaken in IGR networks (Joumard and Kongsrud 2003), generally predicated on the flow of national/federal level grants, contracts, and tax expenditures to subnational governments. With expectations for the provision of matching funds from these subnational governments, all government actors, regardless of their geographical scale can undertake the provisioning of resources. Also note that the kinds of resources that may be provisioned extend well beyond financial capital, into the realms of human, social, political, knowledge, built, and cultural capital (see Koliba, Meek, and Zia 2010 for an explanation of these resources). Thus, the capacity of network managers to provision resources in an IGR network probably includes the discretion to allocate virtually any kind of resource to serve the network’s functions and goals.

**Negotiating and Bargaining**

In studying the role that bargaining plays in the practice of public administration, Robert Agranoff and Michael McGuire ask the question: “Is bargaining
a useful tool for advancing mutual interests?” (2004, 502). Clearly, “people negotiate to advance their interests and those of the institutions they represent” (Watkins 1999, 245). It appears that the use of negotiation and bargaining strategies, at the very least, allows for individual actors to represent their own interests in processes premised on mutual adjustments between two or more parties. Negotiation and bargaining skills appear to be a critical strategy employed by network managers if only because these processes of mutual adjustment provide a space for alignment around common goals and expectations, as well as agreements around the parameters for resource exchanges and pooling.

Although negotiation and bargaining have been recognized as a critical skill set in contract management (Cooper 2003), the integration of negotiation and bargaining strategies and processes into the public administration mainstream has been slow to develop. This is not to suggest that negotiation and bargaining skills and strategies have lacked attention in the wider literature. Texts on negotiation have proliferated in the fields of business and international diplomacy, with Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton’s Getting to Yes (1991) being the most popular text in this genre. Much of the literature on negotiation has presented negotiation processes in a linear or staged fashion, with negotiators sitting at the table to hammer out an agreement.

In contrast, Michael Watkins has suggested that negotiations take on nonlinear dynamics marked by sensitivity to early interactions (that is, the beginning of negotiations sets the tone for future interactions), irreversibility (that is, sometimes negotiators “walk through doors that lock behind them”), threshold effects (that is, small incremental moves result in large changes in the situation), and feedback loops (that is, established patterns of interactions among actors readily become self-reinforcing) (1999, 255). Watkins suggests that negotiation skills and strategies should be viewed more as a generative process. He outlines ten propositions that skilled negotiators should consider. Although Watkins studies the negotiation process as a generative, phenomenological process, his view of negotiation processes still advances negotiation as a formalized process involving two parties. However, network managers may negotiate in less formal settings. We must also account for the possibility that negotiation processes can unfold without conscious recognition that a negotiation is taking place. We suggest here that network managers recognize when negotiation is needed and being undertaken and that they attempt to exert their influence over the processes as needed.
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Within IGR networks in particular, the capacity of government managers, across all levels of geographical scale, to engage in mutual adjustments has been noted (Agranoff and McGuire 2003). A network manager's capacity to weld discretion in adjusting expectations through extensive negotiation and bargaining with representing actors at different levels of geographical scale is imperative.

Facilitation

As a facilitator, a network manager can “bring parties together” and create an “enabling environment” (Lepoutre, Dentchev, and Heene 2007, 10) in which common goals/standards or common agreements around resource exchanges and pooling can be reached. In this role, the manager can activate network partners to reach a policy goal or outcome. Salamon (2002) recognizes network activation as a critical strategy undertaken by network managers. The activator is responsible for bringing together all available resources, such as money, expertise, and information, into one integrated network (Agranoff and McGuire 2003). Salamon (2002) also identifies orchestration as an important network management skill set, equating the concept with the conscious facilitation of network activities as a matter of sustaining its collective action.

According to Camilla Stivers, facilitative managers emphasize the possibility of leadership as facilitation rather than the giving of orders, and emphasizes authority as accountable expertise rather than as chain of command. Ultimately, working within such a perspective, we should be able to ground administrative legitimacy in accountability that is not only exercised in the privacy of the individual conscience or in the internal process of a particular agency but also tangibly enacted in substantive collaboration with affected others, including members of the general public (Stivers 2004, 486).

Facilitation is not always synonymous with traditional forms of leadership. "Although many leaders can (and should) be effective facilitators, the facilitator differs from a leader in that the former is cognizant about the use of power, authority, or control and places limitations on uses of it" (Reed and Koliba 1995, 2). The execution of effective facilitation skills is central for the development of mutual accountability structures within collaborative settings.

To be successful, network managers need to rely on what Kickert and Koppenjan (1997) refer to as reticulist skills, or assessment skills to correctly determine involvement, interaction processes, and the distribution of information. Linze Schaap describes facilitation strategies as providing the "means for creating procedures for ongoing interaction, discussions, negotiations, and
decision-making." The effective facilitator helps "[a]ctors ... bind themselves to those procedures ..." (Schaap 2008, 126–127).

In IGR networks, facilitation skills are central to the kind of convening roles that are needed to coordinate the range of mutual adjustments and resource provisioning taking place between two or more governments. The convening of stakeholder groups to advance intergovernmental objectives is a critical mobilizing skill that effective network managers must possess. Drawing useful outcomes from such convening closes the loop on effective facilitative leadership in that clear and present results may be derived from such meetings.

**Boundary Spanning and Brokering**

A critical feature of network management is the capacity to take on boundary-spanning or brokering strategies. Network managers can serve as boundary spanners who, according to Agranoff and McGuire (2003, 16), may transcend boundaries that are both vertically and horizontally arranged. Situating brokering activity as a central feature of communities of practice, Etienne Wenger discusses the role that brokers play in managing networks. "Brokers are able to make new connections across [organizations] and communities of practice, and enable coordination.... Brokering provides a participative connection ... because what brokers press into service to connect practices is [the broker's] experience of multimembership and the possibilities for negotiation inherent in participation [within and across these groups]" (Wenger 1998, 109). Wenger describes brokering as a process of translating knowledge and information, opinions, and perspectives into reference frames that are comprehensible to actors across a network. Brokering also requires some measure of coordination, aspects of which may be found in our previous discussion of provisioning, negotiation, and facilitation. As a result of generative translations and efforts at coordination, the broker may assist in the achieving of some alignment between network actors. Brokers need enough legitimacy to influence the development of a practice, mobilize attention, and address conflicting interests. They also require the ability to link practices by facilitating transactions between them and to stimulate learning by introducing into practice elements of other actors. Brokering strategy inevitably calls for the mobilization of human, social, and political capital.

Ronald Burt's structural hole theory of social networks underscores the importance that boundary spanning and brokering can play within networked environs. Structural holes exist wherever there is a lack of tie between two or more relevant actors, making them somewhat ubiquitous. They are important to network man links. Burt describes them, and his recent discussion of the diffusion of ideas across previously weak ties hypothesizes the existence of structural holes present opportunities for managers to seize the momentary position a network manager needs to be in to be successful.

The role of brokers in the network is to serve the bricolage of practitioners. In the context of network management, these brokers are the ones who facilitate the exchange of information and ideas across different groups. They are the ones who help to bridge the gaps between different parts of the network and facilitate the flow of information and knowledge.

**Systems Thinking**

Popularized by organizational development, systems thinking encompasses a complex network of interactions within and across different levels of activity. The interrelations between different levels of activity and the way they interact are key to understanding the behavior of a complex system. Systems thinking is particularly important in the context of network management, as it allows managers to understand the complex interactions between different actors in the network and the ways in which they influence each other's behavior. By understanding these interactions, managers can better facilitate the exchange of information and knowledge across different parts of the network and help to achieve the desired outcomes.
network managers when an opportunity exists to fill a hole by building links. Burt describes how most social networks possess structural holes within them, and his research in organizational settings has led him to conclude that the existence of structural holes may actually provide a better environment for the diffusion of innovation because of opportunities for new ideas to flow across previously non-connected actors. Following Mark Granovetter’s strength of weak ties hypothesis, Burt asserts that “Networks rich in structural holes present opportunities for entrepreneurial behavior” (1997, 342). Thus, network managers who serve as brokers can play a role in fostering greater innovation.

The manager who is capable of filling in a structural hole by linking two nodes that had not been previously linked “has a say in whose interests are served by the bridge” (Burt 1997, 342). Brokering and boundary spanning may position a network manager to be highly influential. As Burt notes, “When coordination is based on negotiated informal control, as in network organization, more successful managers will be the managers with better access to the information and control benefits of structural holes” (1997, 360). But filling in structural holes across organizations also possesses hazards to the broker. Wenger warns that “Brokers must often avoid two opposite tendencies: being pulled in to become full members and being reflected as intruders. Indeed, their contributions lie precisely in being neither in nor out” (1998, 110). Thus, network managers may face an identity crisis as they seek to span boundaries and possibly “serve two (or more) masters.”

The role of brokering within IGR networks has been discussed in the literature pertaining to joined-up government. Brokering functions have been integrated into recent reforms around intragovernmental coordination, as witnessed in the appointment of various “czars” and point people around complex policy issues such as health care, climate change, and homeland security.

**Systems Thinking and Situational Awareness**

Popularized by Peter Senge and others who integrated systems theory into organizational development and managerial leadership, systems thinking encompasses a capacity to see and act on an appreciation of the interrelatedness within and among systems. Systems thinkers hold on to this capacity to see the interrelatedness between the parts of the system and the whole by maintaining a time span of interest long enough for patterns of interaction and behavior to appear (van den Belt 2004, 22). Systems thinking has also been equated with situational awareness. Mica Endsley observes that managers with situational awareness seek to classify and understand the situation around
them. They rely on “pattern-matching mechanisms to draw on long-term memory structures that allow them to quickly understand a given situation.” Situational awareness “is the perception of the elements in the environment within a volume of time and space, the comprehension of their meaning, [and] the projection of their status in the near future” and should explain dynamic goal selection, attention to appropriate critical cues, expectancies regarding future states of the situation, and the tie between situation awareness and typical actions (Endsley 1995, 34).

Systems thinking, when applied to the coordination of governance networks, leads to the identification of bifurcation points within the system that, when pushed, pulled, or enacted, lead to changes in the system’s dynamics. The execution of systems thinking within the context of governance network administration involves the conscious manipulation, facilitation, and coordination of the variety of forms of feedback that guide the system’s dynamics.

Ralph Stacey distinguishes between systems thinking and complex responsive processes, criticizing some of the first-generation systems thinking as ignoring the emergent adaptive characteristics of the system. Rather than pulling the levers and exploiting discernable leverage points to elicit responses, his view (which we might characterize as second-generation system thinking) focuses less on thinking in terms of what already exists and more on “thinking in terms of patterns that are continually reproduced and potentially transformed” (Stacey 2001, 197). Stacey emphasizes the intersubjective creation of shared meaning that emerges only through the interactions of social actors. This position echoes the calls for more phenomenological interpretations of administrative action made by Ralph Hummel (2002). Stacey, Hummel, and others concerned about the reign of positivist interpretation of network administration and performance underscore the need to view systems thinking as an important contributor to the social construction of social reality.

The systems thinking approach to network administration needs to be viewed within the context of organizational learning (Senge et al. 1994; Korten 2002). According to proponents of viewing systems thinking as social learning such as David Korten, “The key . . . is not an analytical method, but organizational process; and the central methodological concern is not with isolation of variables or the control of bureaucratic deviations from centrally defined blueprints, but with effectively engaging the necessary participation of system members in contributing to the collective knowledge of the system . . . .” Suggesting that social learning be integrated into administrative practices, Korten goes on to observe that “The more complex the problem and the greater the number of solutions participation thinking essential feedback ing them can support The approach includes environmental points to st example, a situation. They help align resource strategies at

An Education

During his time at Indiana, Levinators and give rise to the chapter, he future public collaborative initiatives that seem like For educators, management study of go
number of value perspectives brought to bear, the greater the need for localized solutions and for value innovations, both of which call for broadly based participation in decision processes” (2002, 483). Thus, we conclude that systems thinking and the kind of situational awareness arising from it become an essential feature of all governance network administration. In other words, for any of the skills and strategies outlined here to succeed, the managers employing them must possess a view of the whole and envision ways that their actions can support the network’s capacity to learn.

The application of systems thinking within an IGR network is likely to include cultivating a situational awareness of the nature of inter- and intragovernmental ties that make up the network. They may seek to exercise leverage points to steer the behavior and operations of an IGR network. They may, for example, seek to influence either new or changes to existing enabling legislation. They may advocate the development of new coordinating mechanisms to help align the goals of participating governments or invest in new patterns of resource provision.

Our consideration of network administrative skills leads inevitably to questions of performance and, specifically, to the question of how these skills are imparted to new and existing network managers operating in IGR networks. We presume that all of the skills and strategies employed by network managers can be cultivated through structured learning experiences. Next we discuss where within the traditional public administration curriculum these kinds of strategies and skills should be addressed.

An Education Gap?

During his 2004 keynote address at the National Society of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) Annual Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana, Lester Salamon threw down a gauntlet to higher education administrators and graduate program directors. After laying out the conditions that give rise to the inherently networked perspective we’ve been discussing in this chapter, he called for curricular reforms geared toward preparing present and future public administrators to “design and manage the immensely complex collaborative systems that now form the core of public problem-solving and that seem likely to do so increasingly in the years ahead” (Salmon 2005,10).

For educators interested in preparing public administrators for network management, there is a growing need to provide curriculum devoted to the study of governance networks generally and of IGR networks in particular.
Given the proliferation of, complexity of, and need for greater accountability within governance networks, the importance of providing students of public administration with opportunities to critically examine governance networks and ascertain where and how public administrators are to play a role within them is only increasing. To this end, we need to develop courses that provide students with an overview of the trends and factors shaping governance networks.

It would be false to argue that there is a complete dearth of curricular offerings that expose students to these kinds of learning objectives. The networked reality that we have been describing has been with us since the inception of the republic (Cooper 2003; Koliba, Meek, and Zia 2010). Networked relations arise out of and through IGR. The implementation of public policies often calls for the execution of both vertical and horizontal arrangements involving actors spanning sectors and layers. These realities have historically been reflected in the public administration curriculum in courses with such titles as Intergovernmental Relations, Policy Implementation, Community Economic Development, Emergency Management, Regulation, Contracting, Public-Private Partnerships, Cross-Sector Governance, Collaborative Management, and Privatization. Coinciding with the rapid development of the voluntary sector within the United States over the past three decades, course offerings relating to nonprofit administration and governance have emerged, suggesting a growing recognition that public service is not carried out only by and through governments.

To ascertain the extent to which the current curricular offerings provide sufficient opportunities for students to learn how to function within networked environments, we need to know how prevalent these course offerings are. In the process, we can identify places where curricular innovations are taking place that reflect the growing demands of governance by and through networks.

To obtain a better understanding of the current curricular landscape, we undertook a systematic study of the course offerings of NASPAA-accredited MPA/MPP programs in two years: 2007 and 2010. The course listings of one-third of the NASPAA-accredited MPA/MPP programs (152 on January 1, 2007, and 161 on September 15, 2010) were reviewed for course titles and descriptions that were likely to address some or all of the learning objectives we have listed. Accredited online programs were not included in this sample. Every third program was selected from an alphabetical listing of colleges and universities by state. In the 2007 sample, of the fifty program websites reviewed, course I of the fifty-three f for fifty of them.

The obvious linings listed on prog of program v drawn from these curricular offerings in the current state of the obvious list courses in nonpro courses rising to 46 per cent and completing 46 percent or more addressing the nonpro course offerings of the major challenge of the present time, the training of public leaders.

We might point to the most obvious those that incorporated modestly increasing, nomic development courses) policy offering such a concept of all programs given by the FDRs, emergency man...
Accountability and transparency of public programs are central to the networked governance model. People within these programs and at the top provide a more open, collaborative, and accountable governance model.

The rise of networked offerings is associated with the development of the nonprofit sector. The changes arise from a lack of resources, increased calls for accountability, and new thinking about the role of nonprofit organizations. This new thinking is reflected in the United States Interagency Council on Economic Development's Public-Private Sector Report, and other reports.

While the networked approach provides new opportunities for collaboration, it also brings new challenges. The major challenge confronting our efforts to address complex public problems at the present time is the growing recognition that we need to extend the training of public managers with whom they will increasingly interact. (2005, 13). He fears, in the process of diversifying the public administration curriculum to include nonprofit administration, we have inadvertently manifested new silos through which we reduce governance into its component parts without obtaining a systems perspective.

The most obvious courses in a curriculum to feature a focus on IGR are those that incorporate IGR as a central theme. Our data suggest that between 2007 and 2010 the number of programs offering courses in IGR rose from 40 to 56 percent. However, the percentage of programs requiring a course in IGR as a part of their core remained small (4 percent). Focal areas that imply the study of some measure of IGR network activity were found in courses that modestly increased in frequency. Such courses included community and economic development (rising from 25 to 42 percent of all programs offering such courses), policy implementation (rising from 23 to 36 percent of all programs offering such courses), and emergency management (rising from 10 to 20 percent of all programs offering such courses). Undoubtedly, the extensive consideration given by the field to the failed response and recovery following the landfall of Hurricane Katrina in 2005 contributed to the rise in courses in emergency management.
Table 3.3 Frequency of Course Titles with Network Management Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course titles containing the following terms:</th>
<th>Courses offered at regular intervals (every semester, annually, or biannually)</th>
<th>Courses required as part of the core</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007 (n = 48)</td>
<td>2010 (n = 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit administration</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental relations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and economic development</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy implementation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sector governance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public-private partnerships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatization</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that the course titles are often presented as overlapping, with some courses falling under multiple categories. The table above provides a snapshot of the frequency of these course titles across different years, indicating the growing interest in network management in higher education.

One might also observe a trend towards more courses being offered as part of the core curriculum over time, reflecting a growing emphasis on these themes within the academic landscape.
Interestingly, courses focusing on particular aspects of network governance, including courses relating to regulation, cross-sector governance, public-private partnerships, contracting, collaborative management, and privatization, either were steady or actually decreased in frequency of offering. This finding suggests that programs are paying less attention to the trends in and policy tools being used to manage and govern IGR networks. What remains to be seen is the extent to which network management has become a central feature of traditional core courses, such as courses providing an introduction to public administration or public management and courses in organizational development, or to elective courses that focus on strategic management, leadership, conflict mediation, administrative theory and practice, and capstone experiences. More extensive research is needed into the content of such courses and to see how our courses are evolving to address the changing skill demands of the intergovernmental manager.

One way that curricular reforms will take place is when individual programs revisit and reevaluate their core curriculum and elective offerings. The new accreditation standards recently adopted by NASPAA may also reflect a growing recognition of the complex terrain that now makes up network governance. The new competencies that all accredited programs must adhere to include: to lead and manage in public governance; to participate in and contribute to the policy process; to analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make decisions; to articulate and apply a public service perspective; and to communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry (National Society of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration [NASPAA] 2009). The intentional use of the term public governance reflects the shift away from viewing public administration as the management of unitary governments and toward the recognition that modern administration takes place within and across polycentric governance networks. It will be worthwhile to follow how the public governance competency is interpreted as programs adjust their curricula to reflect this competency. The skills and strategies discussed in this chapter certainly contribute to effective public governance.

I close this chapter with a set of considerations that may develop a network administrator’s capacity not only to lead and manage public governance but also to think critically, work across cultural and organizational boundaries, and employ a public service perspective that takes into account the responsibilities that come with serving the public interest. Present and future network managers must understand the challenges and factors involved in the successes and
failures of networked activities, including the importance of goal alignment and functional compatibilities. There is a growing body of literature that looks at network failure and successes, particularly in IGR settings. These studies may be used to provide managers with insights into the kinds of conditions necessary to ensure network effectiveness. Case studies of network failures—such as the responses to 9/11 (Comfort 2002) and the failed response in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina (U.S. Government Accountability Office [GAO] 2006; Kiefer and Montjoy 2006; Koliba, Mills, and Zia 2011)—may be juxtaposed to cases of success or near-success (Proven and Milward 1995; Agranoff and McGuire 2003; Wines Smith and Roberts 2003; Townsend 2004; Guo and Acar 2005) to highlight the central issues pertaining to governance and management within networked environments. John Bryson, Barbara Crosby, and Melissa Stone (2006) offer a useful set of propositions for students to consider when describing and assessing these kinds of network activities.

Present and future network managers must be able to identify the skills and functions that public administrators take on within the context of networked relationships. The field of public administration has historically focused on the structure and functioning of vertical relationships in public bureaucracies. However, the growing recognition that public administrators must cross boundaries (Kettl 2006) and work horizontally across departmental and even organizational lines calls for the study of collaboration and of the situations and conditions within which collaborative arrangements are feasible and effective. Students must be exposed to case studies about, and expert practitioners skilled in, building collaborative partnerships. In the process, they must be prepared to execute “coordinating strategies of actors with different goals and preferences ...” (Kickert, Klijn, and Koppenjan 1997, 10).

Conclusion

In this chapter, we set out to define IGR and intragovernmental relations as networks of governments of various geographical scales and functions that coordinate actions, share and pool resources, and serve the public interest. We conclude that these networks are administered through a combination of vertical and horizontal ties. Effective public administrators operating within these mixed-authority IGR networks need to possess a situational awareness of the network ties around them and apply a number of administrative strategies to work effectively within these networks.
We recognize that our discussion of IGR networks and network administration strategies has been broad. We believe that this brief introduction to the range of administrative strategies opens the door to a consideration of the kind of skills, situations, and scenarios that IGR network managers will face by 2020. Our limited research into the range of courses offered in accredited MPA/MPP programs suggests that, despite some areas of advancement, more can and should be done to prepare present and future network managers with the skills they need to successfully operate within IGR networks.

We have limited our discussion of governance networks to those networks built predominantly around IGR and intragovernmental relations. The full range of potential actors involved within governance networks more broadly encompasses the private and nonprofit sectors as well. The network administration strategies discussed here are also employed in a host of other governance network configurations, including public-private partnerships, regulatory subsystems, interest group coalitions, and grant and contract agreements. The coordinated actions, resource exchanges, and resource pooling that occur within governance networks of all forms no doubt require a range of strategies in addition to those discussed here.
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