

Traditional vs. Networked Partnerships -- Handout

	Traditional	Networked
<i>Partners</i>	Similar organizations	Different types of organizations with shared values
<i>Time frames</i>	Short term	Longer term
<i>Focus on</i>	Organization, control, hub	Mission, trust, nodes
<i>Activities</i>	Internal to hub: fundraising, staff recruitment, and program development	More external, building the network and mobilizing community resources
<i>Leadership model</i>	Rooster rules the nest. One “brain”, many hands.	Beehive. It’s hard to spot the queen. Many brains, many hands. Shared leadership.
<i>Partnership Norms</i>	Hub imposes norms and creates rules which the spokes obey	Norms , processes, and systems emerge from the network
<i>Opportunities</i>	Dominant a well-understood market, reduce competition, create and enforce a service standard	<p>Increase efficiencies–Get more impact out of limited resources by coordinating some aspects of the work, reduce redundancies and generate synergies;</p> <p>Coordinate affiliates– forge solutions to common problems together;</p> <p>Unify sectors–Big problems require big solutions → networking to aggregate capital, share expertise, coordinate programs, create a unified agenda.</p>

Source: Table based on Wei-Skillern and Marciano (2008). The Networked Nonprofit. Stanford Social Innovation Review, Spring 2008. Stanford University. www.ssireview.org