

Daniel Muijs
Mel Ainscow
Chris Chapman
Mel West

Collaboration and Networking in Education

Collaboration and Networking in Education

Daniel Muijs · Mel Ainscow · Chris Chapman ·
Mel West

Collaboration and Networking in Education

 Springer

Prof. Daniel Muijs
University of Southampton
School of Education
Highfield Campus
Southampton
United Kingdom
d.muijs@soton.ac.uk

Prof. Mel Ainscow
University of Manchester
School of Education
Oxford Road
M13 9PL Manchester
United Kingdom

Dr. Chris Chapman
University of Manchester
School of Education
Oxford Road
M13 9PL Manchester
United Kingdom

Prof. Mel West
University of Manchester
School of Education
Oxford Road
M13 9PL Manchester
United Kingdom

ISBN 978-94-007-0282-0

e-ISBN 978-94-007-0283-7

DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-0283-7

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2011

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

1	Introduction: Networking in Schools	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	The Impact of Networking and Collaboration in Education	2
1.3	Structure of This Book	5
 Part I Theories and Backgrounds		
2	Networking and Collaboration as a Public Policy Framework	9
2.1	The Development of Networks as Policy Delivery Mechanisms	9
2.2	Types of Public Policy Networks	11
2.3	Research on Public Sector Networking	14
2.4	Collaboration as an Educational Policy	15
3	Localised Theories of Networking and Collaboration	19
3.1	Constructivist Organisational Theory as a Basis for Networking	19
3.2	Creating Social Capital as a Basis for Networking	21
3.3	Social Network Theory as a Basis for Networking	24
4	Societal Theories of Networking and Collaboration	29
4.1	Creating Networks as New Social Movements	29
4.2	Avoiding Organisational Anomie as a Basis for Collaboration	31
4.3	Functionalist Theories of Networking	33
4.4	Conclusion	36
5	Towards a Typology of Educational Networks	37
5.1	Goals and Activities	37
5.2	What Networks? Further Classifications on Key Dimensions	40
5.2.1	Voluntarism or Coercion	40
5.2.2	Power Relations	41
5.2.3	Network Density	42
5.2.4	External Involvement	43

5.2.5	Different Time Frames	44
5.2.6	Geographical Spread	44
5.2.7	Density of Schools	46
5.2.8	Vertical or Horizontal Networking	47
5.2.9	Network Diffuseness	47
5.2.10	Network Formalisation	48
5.3	Conclusion	48

Part II Networking in Practise

6	Federations of Schools: Case Studies of Practice	51
6.1	Introduction	51
6.2	Methods	52
6.2.1	Identification and Selection of Case Studies	52
6.2.2	Data Collection and Analysis	53
6.3	Findings	54
6.3.1	Governance Arrangements	54
6.3.2	Leadership and Management	58
6.3.3	Senior Leadership and Management Within Federations	59
6.3.4	Middle Level Leadership and Management in Federations: Ownership and Involvement	61
6.4	Conclusion	62
6.4.1	Reflecting on Governance	63
6.4.2	Reflecting on Leadership	64
7	The Impact of Federations on Student Achievement	67
7.1	Introduction	67
7.2	Methods	67
7.2.1	Researching the Relationship Between Federations and Student Outcomes: Aims and Objectives	67
7.2.2	Researching the Relationship Between Federations and Student Outcomes: Defining a Research Approach	68
7.2.3	Methods	68
7.2.4	Sampling	69
7.2.5	Federation and Comparator School Characteristics	70
7.3	Results	71
7.3.1	A Typology of Federations	71
7.3.2	Federations and Impact on Performance	72
7.4	2005 Cohort	72
7.5	2006 Cohort	74
7.5.1	Impact on Performance by Federation Type	76
7.6	2005 Cohort	76
7.7	2006 Cohort	78

7.7.1	Relationship with Ofsted Grades	81
7.7.2	Summary of Results	82
7.8	Conclusion	83
8	Achieving Excellence and Equity: Reflections on the Development of Practices in One Local District Over 10 Years . . .	85
8.1	The Policy Context	85
8.2	Making Sense of Practice	86
8.3	Phase 1 (1997–2001)—Raising Standards	88
8.4	Phase 2 (2001–2004)—Fostering Inclusion	91
8.5	Phase 3 (2004–2007)—Networking Across the Authority . . .	94
8.6	Some Implications	98
9	Widening Opportunities? A Case Study of School-to-School Collaboration in a Rural District	103
9.1	Introduction	103
9.2	Context and Methods	105
9.3	Results	106
9.3.1	Set-up and Structures	106
9.3.2	Building Relationships	108
9.3.3	Impact	110
9.4	Discussion	112
10	Leadership in Full-Service Extended Schools: Communicating Across Cultures	115
10.1	The Move to Extended Schools	115
10.2	Methodology	118
10.3	Results	119
10.3.1	Views on Multiagency Work	119
10.3.2	Barriers and Facilitators	120
10.3.3	What Does Success Look Like?	123
10.3.4	Leadership	124
10.4	Conclusion	127
Part III Successful Collaboration		
11	Reflections on Networking and Collaboration	131
11.1	Challenges and Possibilities	131
11.2	Impact of Collaboration	133
11.3	Direct Impact Activities	133
11.4	Strengthening Capacity	134
11.5	Responding to Crises	135
11.6	Sustaining Improvements	136
11.7	Sharing in Leadership	137
11.8	Roles and Responsibilities	137
11.9	Raising Expectations	138
11.10	Managing Change	139

11.11	Understanding What Helps Collaboration to Develop	139
11.12	From Collaboration to Collegiality	140
11.13	Conclusion	142
12	Successful Networking: In-School Conditions	143
12.1	Clear Goals and Mission	143
12.2	Finding the Right Partner Schools	144
12.3	Establishing Clear Communication Channels	145
12.4	Creating Trust	146
12.5	Capacity for Improvement	147
12.6	Continuing Professional Development	148
12.7	Time Constraints	148
12.8	Ending Collaboration	149
12.9	Conclusion	149
13	Successful Networking: External Conditions	151
13.1	External Factors That Enhance Trust	151
13.2	The Role of Network Brokers	152
13.3	Accountability	153
13.4	Partner Motivations	155
13.5	The Role of the Local Authority	155
13.6	Conclusion	158
14	Leading Networks	159
14.1	The Role of the Head Teacher	159
14.2	Other Leadership Roles in a Network	160
14.3	Characteristics of Successful Leadership in Networks	162
14.4	Distribution and Devolution of Leadership in Networks	163
14.5	Conclusion	164
15	Some Final Thoughts	167
	References	169
	Author Index	177
	Subject Index	181

Chapter 1

Introduction: Networking in Schools

1.1 Introduction

Traditionally, a network has been defined as a set of actors (individuals or organisations such as schools) connected by a set of ties, which can be of a more or less formal nature (Borgatti & Foster, 2003). The principle of networking and collaboration has become more prevalent and more widely studied in organisations both in the private and public sectors. This move is seen to arise from advances in the understanding of learning and especially the perceived advantages of collaborative learning, and, in the private sector at least, from an increased need for innovation stemming from intensified international competition, that is seen to necessitate flexible networks that can reduce the exposure of firms to risk and uncertainty (Cohen & Levintal, 1990; Borgatti & Foster, 2003). Arguably, this need for increased innovation is also present in the education system, as demands on the system have increased due to a greater political interest in education. This has resulted from both a perceived growth of the importance of education in the globalised knowledge economy which requires highly educated citizens, and a (perceived) diminution of the influence of politics on the economic sphere in the light of heightened global competition and a broad consensus, at least in the developed economies, around a free market approach to economic policy, leaving education as one of few major spheres which politicians see themselves as able to influence. The demands for ever higher levels of achievement, intolerance of failure and, in some countries at least, concern over the remaining inequities that characterise the system mean that schools too are set demanding goals requiring innovation. This is especially challenging for schools serving disadvantaged communities, that are required to show high levels of raw performance, while being able to directly affect at most 25% of the variance in pupil achievement, the remainder being down to pupil-level factors (Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000). Furthermore, while both national policies and school improvement programmes and initiatives can show evidence of impact, they have not been able to close the gap in achievement between high and low SES schools (West et al., 2006).

In part as a result of this, many educational systems have experimented with networking and collaborative approaches to improvement. For example, in the 1990s

over 100 schools were involved with the National Schools Network in Australia. In the US, there are a number of school improvement networks including the League of Professional Schools and the Coalition of Essential Schools. The school improvement network, Improving the Quality of Education for All (IQEA) exists in diverse contexts ranging from Hong Kong to Iceland. However, it would seem it is the English context where the commitment to networking and collaboration has been greatest. During the past decade significant resources have been invested in collaborative arrangements including Education Action Zones (EAZ), Excellence in Cities (EiC), Leadership Incentive Grant (LIG), Schools facing Extremely Challenging Circumstances (SfECC), Network Learning Communities (NLCs), and various Specialist Schools partnership and network programmes. These developments have been aimed at relocating innovation closer to schools in order to generate greater collective capacity for change and have relied on teachers working together across organisational boundaries without any significant structural changes to their organisations.

1.2 The Impact of Networking and Collaboration in Education

Interestingly, in light of the interest of both policy and practice in networking and collaboration in education, more research appears to focus on the conditions under which networks and collaborative arrangements between schools can be effective than on whether they have a positive impact in the first place. Most studies are cross-sectional in nature, though some longitudinal work exists, usually focussing on a 2–3 year period. The overall evidence of the impact of networking and collaboration on school effectiveness and improvement is therefore limited, though there is some evidence from individual programmes, such as the SSAP run by the Specialist Schools Trust which partnered low achieving schools ‘lead’ schools that supported them and showed positive outcomes for schools in the study (Chapman & Allen, 2005).

OECD (2000) findings suggest creating collaborative structures around schools is more likely to result in deeper organisational learning both collectively and individually. This work shows that school networks are locations in which specialised knowledge can be created and transferred within collaborative contexts. Senge (1990) emphasises collaborative learning and team skills as being the key to successful and sustainable organisational development rather than individual skills and individual learning. His work suggests that networks of schools do not just facilitate innovation but the evidence would suggest that they offer the possibility of new ways of working. It has been shown that they offer the potential for redesigning local systems and structures by promoting different forms of collaboration, linkages, and multi-functional partnerships (Senge et al., 2000). Consequently, school networks are increasingly being seen as a means of facilitating innovation and change as well as contributing to large-scale reform (Chapman & Fullan, 2007; Ainscow & West, 2006; Hargreaves, A., 2003a; OECD, 2000).

In 2005 the Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education (CUREE) published a review of the impact of networking arrangements of various kinds on students, teachers, schools, and their communities. The review locates studies that claim impact on student attainment and engagement, on teachers on schools, and on parents.

With regard to pupil attainment, studies by Montgomery (2001) and Greenberg (1996) are cited as evidence of high impact. Bielefeldt et al. (1999) also offer evidence of increases in student skills and progression. Further, the Montgomery and Bielefeldt studies claim significant impact on levels of student engagement, with supporting evidence from studies by Adler (1995) and Thurlow et al. (1999). Though findings from these studies are robust, it should be understood that these were, for the most part, closely focussed studies, targeted on particular student groups, rather than on whole school communities. Nevertheless, CUREE also reports a number of studies claiming some impact to support these cases (e.g. Reyes & Phillips, 2002; Riley & Jordan, 2004). While the review also finds some studies (e.g. Sanders, 1999) that focussed on the impact of networking on practitioners, ignoring any student effects, and others reporting no impact (e.g. Pinon, Samii-Shore, & Batchelder, 2002), overall, the balance of evidence seems to be that collaborative arrangements *can* impact on students, though not all do.

The review cites 11 studies that have reported changes in teachers knowledge and skills as a result of network 'interventions', the majority of which 'led to clearly identifiable behaviour changes' (CUREE, 2005). Six of these (Bielefeldt et al., 1999; Adler, 1995; Gettinger et al., 1999; Greenberg, 1996; Thurlow, 1999) were considered to offer evidence of high impact judged by such criteria as observable changes in classroom behaviour, changes in attitudes towards parental involvement, improved classroom management and deepened knowledge, and understanding of teaching and learning. Again, there were some less promising studies: Kahne et al. (2001) reported high levels of teacher mistrust, and reluctance to commit to externally determined goals, and Pinon et al. (2002) noted that school principals seemed to be more stirred by collaborative work than were their teachers, but these are comments on the way collaboration has been practised, rather than collaboration per se. In fact, we have made similar observations ourselves in the early phase of collaborative activity, when the 'groundrules' and operating principles have not been adequately clarified. However, this has not necessarily proved a barrier to the development of cohesive collaborative cultures.

The review's comments on school level impact are disappointing. It seems they were unable to locate anything that had any substantial contribution to make to understanding the ways collaborative arrangements influence school structures and processes. But, there are impacts on the school community reported, which themselves imply that something different is going on within schools. The main areas of community development identified are increased involvement of parents in the life of the school and closer links with local communities. Tantalisingly, there is little comment on how such networking arrangements influence either governance arrangements, or relationships with the responsible education authority or district personnel.

Looking close to home, in England, Chapman and Harris (2004), reviewing the impact of *Network Learning Groups* on schools facing challenging circumstances offer a number of propositions. These suggested that successful collaboration hinged on the use of key levers within the network. Levers include a clear focus on teaching and learning, which encourages teachers to focus on and experiment with their own classroom practice; distributed leadership, which draws in the various members of the schools in the network and allocates real tasks to them; a shared commitment to professional development at all levels, including headship, and the capacity to identify and to exploit opportunities for external support. This last point is especially interesting, as it implies that far from joining together in order to establish a common boundary, successful networks remain open to their environments and the opportunities to draw on resources to be found there.

With regard to impact, the authors are measured. They point to important structural and cultural changes that have taken place within schools in the networks. They are able to identify clear advances in school performance in some instances. But they suggest that if the networks are to become a significant improvement strategy for all the schools involved, then they will need also to become rather more rigorous arrangements too. They voice particular reservations about the suitability of current NLGs as improvement vehicles for schools facing challenging circumstances, pointing out that in planning collaborative arrangements for such schools internal capacity (Stoll, 1999), internal structures and practices (Potter, Reynolds, & Chapman, 2002) and particular external factors (Muijs, Harris, Chapman, Stoll, & Russ, 2004) would all need to be taken into consideration.

Chapman and Allen (2005), in a report for the *Specialist Schools Trust*, concluded that targeted, collaborative approaches to support the development of a specialised school system were proving highly effective. At its simplest, the partnerships had demonstrated greater increases in student achievement over their lifetime than the national average increase, and also increased or maintained added value scores. At a broader level of analysis, there seemed to have been improvements in school climate, staff morale, staff development opportunities, and an increase in the number of staff contributing to leadership roles. Again, the importance of a clear focus for partnership efforts was underlined, though here successful areas of focus extended beyond the development of teaching and learning. Successful partnerships leant heavily on the skills of the ‘case manager’—generally an outsider who brings new skills and a wider perspective to the partnerships. But, ‘brokerage’ was also important—the capacity to initiate links and access support. Though case managers played an important role here, it was noticeable that others, too, developed brokerage skills. Facilitation was a similar issue. Partnerships need to be facilitated—setting them up is not enough—but there a range of staff who can grow into facilitation roles. The report points out, however, that sustainability remains an issue; it seems likely that partnerships will need to be ‘renewed’ if they are to be sustained, perhaps through the renegotiation of points of focus. Nevertheless, it could be argued that sustained improvement and sustained partnerships are not the same thing, and so long as the one is maintained, perhaps we should not be concerned if the other turns out to be a series of short-term engagements, rather than a marriage.

One of the key advantages of collaborative networks compared to other forms of school improvement, such as externally led school improvement programmes, is that it allows schools to co-construct improvement around individual school needs, rather than buying into programmes that may not be properly contextualised (Datnow, Hubbard, & Mehan, 2002). Similarly, it can help solve the problem of purely internal improvement programmes that may flounder due to the lack of internal capacity in schools. The fact that networks co-construct their own solutions rather than simply implementing externally developed programmes is advantageous in that it leads to active construction of knowledge, and therefore stronger learning than is possible in a buy-in situation. However, this can also be a slower process than adopting external reforms, and can lead to an element of reinventing existing solutions and susceptibility to educational fads. However, buy-in is unlikely to generate new knowledge in the way that collaborative learning has been found to do in successful instances (Ainscow & West, 2006). There is evidence in a number of studies that this collaborative learning can indeed increase school capacity (Chapman & Allen, 2005), can help forge relationships across previously isolated schools (Harris et al., 2005), and they can therefore be an effective means of sharing good practice (Harris et al., 2005; Datnow et al., 2002). The extent to which this actually happens in existing collaborations is variable, however, some finding that real sharing of practice can be limited (Lindsay, Harris, Chapman, & Muijs, 2005). Ainscow and West (2005) report that collaboration leads to teachers viewing disadvantaged pupils in new ways, and to lesser polarisation between schools. However, we need to be careful to easily assume that learning can occur or that competencies can merely be transferred from one school to another. Competencies are both contextual and embedded, in the sense that they are ultimately located in people and culture. This means that ongoing intervention will be required before sharing is possible, and that a shared language needs to be developed between the partners (Nooteboom, 2004).

As well as these advantages, collaborations can sometimes be entered into for reasons that are not related to improving performance. Ego and empire building on the part of senior managers may be one of the reasons for taking on leadership within a federation, for example, as are the desire for a ‘new challenge’ on the part of managers. Added prestige by allying to another school seen as more successful or higher status can also be seen as a cause for collaboration (Borgatti & Foster, 2003). External coercion may be another reason for entering into collaboration.

1.3 Structure of This Book

There is therefore some promising evidence of the strength of networking and collaboration, though it is limited in scope. There is also growing evidence of the conditions required for effective networking and collaboration.

One aspect that has not been explored in any depth, however, is the theoretical background to networking and collaboration. Therefore, in Part I of this book we will look at theoretical positions on networking between organisations, with a view to informing both research and practical decision making. In [Chapter 2](#) we will

discuss networking and collaboration as a public policy framework, looking at the reasons why collaboration and networking have become increasingly popular public service delivery mechanisms, and what research on non-educational parts of the public sector can teach us. In [Chapter 3](#) we will discuss localised theories of networking and collaboration, in particular constructivist organisational theory, social capital theory, and social network theory. In [Chapter 4](#) we will look at societal theories of networking and collaboration, like the theory of New Social Movements, Durkheimian notions of networking, and anomie and functionalist organisational theories. In [Chapter 5](#) we will develop a typology of social networks.

In Part II we will take a more practical look at research on existing networks and collaborative arrangements, and will present a range of research studies of collaboratives and networks. In [Chapters 6](#) and [7](#) we will discuss federations of schools, a form of networking that has been officially sanctioned and become popular in England over recent years. In [Chapter 6](#) we will focus on qualitative evidence on governance, management, and school improvement, and in [Chapter 7](#) on quantitative evidence of impact on performance. In [Chapter 8](#) we will look at a longitudinal study of collaboration at school district or local authority level, while in [Chapter 9](#) we focus on collaboration in rural areas. Finally, in [Chapter 10](#) of this part, we will look at collaboration between schools and external agencies in so-called multiagency contexts.

In Part III we will look in more depth at what conditions and processes may help us to develop successful collaborative networks. In [Chapter 11](#) we will draw some general conclusions from a decade of research on networking and collaboration conducted by the authors. In [Chapter 12](#) we will look at internal conditions for effective collaboration. In [Chapter 13](#) we will look at external conditions and constraints, while in [Chapter 14](#) we will discuss leadership issues in networks.

Part I

Theories and Backgrounds

Chapter 2

Networking and Collaboration as a Public Policy Framework

As we mentioned in [Chapter 1](#), networking and collaboration have become increasingly popular mechanisms for the delivery of public policy over the past two decades. In this chapter we will explore some of the backgrounds to this evolution.

2.1 The Development of Networks as Policy Delivery Mechanisms

In this chapter we will therefore present an overview of international policy initiatives aimed at promoting collaboration in education. We will then frame these within broader public sector policy, drawing on models positing networking as the new framework of public policy more generally. We will discuss the background to these changes in public policy, implications thereof, and the role of education policy in this.

Over recent years management of the public sector has become increasingly devolved from central government in many countries. In countries like the US and the UK, the central government is less inclined than in the past to directly run public services, preferring to devolve services to lower levels of government, and, more often, to develop partnerships and collaborations with private and public sector organisations, in many cases charities. Government has increasingly become a commissioner of services, and a partner in delivery networks rather than a deliverer itself (Milward & Provan, [2003](#)).

The increase in multiagency and multi-partner work is in part the result of a view that sees these as being able to result in greater use of common local resources, and the ability to take collective action. This is most likely to be successful where transaction costs (the cost of setting up and maintaining the network) are low and the benefits to individuals and organisations involved are high, and where resources are scarce, as is frequently the case in the public sector (Berry et al., [2004](#)). A perceived increase in the complexity of problems government has to deal with is likewise seen as contributing to this trend. Increasingly, government managers are no longer primarily in charge of managing large bureaucracies in a hierarchical manner, but are instead managing resources and relationships between providers of the resources needed to fulfill particular policy goals (Goldsmith & Eggers, [2004](#)). The perceived

benefits of networking in the public sector are multiple, and include, according to Lawson (2004) effectiveness gains, efficiency gains, resource gains (such as savings and increases in resourcing), capacity gains, and legitimacy gain.

Therefore, networks have become increasingly common in public sector management. McGuire and Agranoff (2007, p. 1) define such networks as *A public management network includes agencies involved in a public policy making and/or administrative structure through which public goods and services may be planned, designed, produced, and delivered.*

The growth of networks is taking two main forms in public policy. The first is the increased use of private sector partners in the delivery of services. Such networks have become widespread as policy delivery has increasingly been devolved to various quasi-governmental agencies, who, in turn, work with local networks to fill in capacity gaps in their own organisations. This is seen by many commentators as essential in light of the growing complexity of the issues that government and its agencies need to address, and of the increasing demands being made by the public with regard to the quality and choice of public services offered to them (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004), a factor that is certainly obvious in the increased emphasis on educational and school quality in popular discourse and the press in many countries. The private sector is seen as more efficient and effective, and more responsive to consumer demand than traditional bureaucratic public sector organisations.

The second key form of networking is more internally focussed, and involves greater joined-up governance between public sector bodies. Again, this evolution has occurred mainly as a result of the perceived complexity of the issues facing the public sector, in some cases hastened by cases of neglect occurring due to a lack of coordination between different public agencies, such as in the highly publicised 'Baby P' child neglect case in the UK. In the UK in particular, 'joined-up government' has been a theme of recent administrations that have attempted to stop unnecessary overlap and people falling between the cracks created by varying responsibilities of different agencies. An example of this that has had a profound influence on education is the creation of Children's Services at the local government level, that have replaced the old Local Education Authorities with integrated authorities responsible not just for education but also for all social and health services for children across a local authority or district. This was mirrored at the national level in the creation of the Department for Children, Schools and Families to replace the Department for Education and Science that was previously responsible for schools and education policy. Of course, it remains unclear to what extent these efforts can be seen as genuine networks rather than just larger and more centralised bureaucracies, and the future of these structures is uncertain at the time of writing as a new coalition government takes charge in a climate in which budget cuts are essential to safeguard the economic future and health of the country.

These developments are seen to have been aided by the development of digital technology, which, as well as allowing for ever greater volumes of information to be collected and stored, also allows for easier communication and sharing of

information between agencies and organisations, be it in the form of electronic communication or in the form of shared or jointly accessible databases (Goldsmith & Eggers, 2004). The creation of large electronic databases is therefore another characteristic feature of recent changes in governance. The National Pupil Database in England, for example, collects pupil achievement on statutory tests as well as background data such as ethnicity and eligibility for Free School Meals. As each pupil gets a Unique Pupil Number, they can be tracked over time, with the possibility of additional data being added.

2.2 Types of Public Policy Networks

Two main motivations appear to underlie the formation of networks in the public sector. In one set of cases, a charismatic leader of one of the organisations involved, or an external political actor, will take action to set up the network in light of perceived advantages of networks, deficiencies in current organisational structures or personal ambition and empire-building. In other cases networks are formed specifically to carry out a particular project or function that would be hard to do for any individual organisation. Again, changes in policies and priorities on the part of the government often underlie these networks (Agranoff, 2006). Sometimes networks can develop more organically in response to perceived client needs, especially where there is limited perceived overlap in functions between the organisations in the network.

Goldsmith and Eggers (2004) identify five main types of public sector networks, many relating to public–private partnerships (PPP):

- Service contracts, in which the government or its agencies essentially go into a contractual relationship with other public or private sector organisations to provide goods or services;
- Supply chain networks, where a complex product delivery mechanism is set up with private sector partners;
- Ad hoc networks, set up in response to a particular need or crisis, such as fighting an infectious disease and informing the public about it;
- Channel partnerships, in which partner organisations act as disseminators of goods or services for government;
- Information dissemination partnerships, where government partners with public or private partners to disseminate information to the public; and
- Civic switchboard, where the government connects organisations to create network to deliver particular services to the public.

This typology seems overly government-led however, and ignores the many networks of public sector organisations that have come about without direct government intervention or with the goal of delivering services that are not directly government-mandated.

Sullivan and Skelcher (2002) identify three types of public sector network:

- Contractual relationships, which are similar to Goldsmith & Eggers Service Contracts
- Networks, which in contrast to contractual relationships are informal rather than legally binding, are based on personal relationships and are fluid in nature
- Partnerships, which the authors describe as collaboration through joint decision making and production, and involve different agencies negotiating shared goals and committed to working together for long term. It is the latter which would most commonly describe educational networks.

Networks can also be distinguished based on the extent to which they are located within the public sector, are collaborations between state and non-profit charitable organisations, or form collaborations between public and private sector organisations.

Within-public sector networks have traditionally been most common, and often emerge as a reaction to a perceived fragmentation of services delivered by organisations responsible to different governmental bodies. For example, Health and Social services typically resort under separate government ministries and are delivered by different institutions. In view of the many services such as health prevention that are more usefully seen as partnerships between health and social services, joint networks are increasingly being set up to deliver specific programmes between the two. The goal of this type of collaboration is primarily to provide a better level of service and overcome the problem of overspecialisation that may hinder effective provision (Nylen, 2007). Although in principal such governmental and quasi-governmental organisations should work together relatively seamlessly in the light of the oft-stated preference for integrated policy and delivery, this is frequently not the case, as differences in organisational culture can be every bit as strong as between private and public sector organisations, and differences in accounting and accountability structures between different government ministries make networking problematic. In many cases it appears that government agencies are more constrained in terms of adapting structures and procedures to networking and collaboration than many private organisations.

An increasingly popular form of networking consists of networks between public sector bodies and not-for-profit charitable organisations. This form of collaboration has been particularly popular with right of centre governments, who see this as a way of bypassing what they consider to be the inefficiencies of government agencies by harnessing the dynamism of charitable organisations, which are also seen as having better direct contacts with the people particular programmes are trying to reach. An example of this is the important role played by churches and community groups alongside local government in rehousing efforts after the Katrina disaster, which provides an example of successful networking between public and charitable organisations, delivering many of the benefits that were hoped for by its proponents (Airriess, Li, Leong, Chen, & Keith, 2007). Obviously, as with