

**EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE**

**THE GROWTH OF UNIVERSITY STUDY OF  
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS**

**AND**

**THE ORIGINS AND FOUNDING OF THE NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND  
ADMINISTRATION**

**LAURIN L. HENRY**

**CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA  
DECEMBER, 2015**

## CONTENTS

### FOREWORD

- Ch. 1 THE PUBLIC SERVICE AND THE COUNCIL ON GRADUATE EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (CGEPA)**
- Ch. 2 EARLY CGEPA YEARS**
- Ch. 3 A MORE AMBITIOUS CGEPA**
- Ch. 4 SEEKING RECOGNITION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION**
- Ch. 5 FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP, LIMITED**
- Ch. 6 TOWARD A MORE EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION**
- Ch. 7 NASPAA FOUNDED: THE PRINCETON CONFERENCE**

### EPILOGUE

### APPENDIX: DATA ON GROWTH OF EDUCATION IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND ADMINISTRATION

### THE AUTHOR

Laurin L. Henry (Ph.D., University of Chicago) began his professional career as staff assistant for the Public Administration Clearing House (1950-55), then was a research associate and senior staff member at the Brookings Institution (1955-64). He became professor of government and foreign affairs, University of Virginia (1967-78), and later was professor of public administration and dean of the school of community and public affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University (1978-87). He is the author of *Presidential Transitions* (Brookings, 1960) and other writings on government and public affairs, and has been consultant to several federal and state agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget, GAO, NASA, and the Office of Personnel Administration. He participated in NASPAA's founding conference in 1970 and was president of NASPAA in 1971-72.

*Note: After another proofreading and a few corrections, this version differs in a few minor details from the one recorded earlier on cassette disc.*

## FOREWORD

In 1986 the officers of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) asked me to take the lead in a project to develop a history of that organization. The project had been started the year before by Robert F. Wilcox, who was NASPAA's first president (1970-71), but was soon interrupted by Wilcox's untimely death. My qualifications for the task were that I had succeeded Wilcox as NASPAA president and in this and other ways had been involved in the early years of the organization, while heading public administration and affairs programs at two different universities since 1967. I was glad to accept the assignment out of affection for Bob Wilcox and loyalty to NASPAA--plus, I suppose, a certain amount self-centered desire to re-live and see recorded some of the events in which I had participated. More importantly, it seemed to me that here was a piece of the generally neglected subject of public administration history that ought to be saved, and if I didn't write it, who else would?

I accepted the job with an understanding that it could not be a totally solo effort, and that I would be able to draw on the resources of other key persons. To launch the effort, NASPAA at its annual conferences in 1984, 1985, and 1986 had scheduled oral history sessions in which veterans of NASPAA and its predecessor recorded their memories and interpretations of what had occurred; transcripts of these sessions were provided to me, along with a few materials that had been gathered by Wilcox and a small collection of interview notes and materials assembled by the NASPAA staff. Individuals who had played key roles in this history were requested to search their files and send documents, and I received valuable contributions from Donald C. Stone, Henry Reining, Jr., Don K. Price, Don L. Bowen, and Charles Bonser. Stone and Bowen later read and provided comments on portions of an early draft. The contributions of these and many other persons are gratefully acknowledged.

I did not promise immediate production and in fact got seriously into the project only after my retirement from Virginia Commonwealth University in 1987. At that time I re-connected with the University of Virginia, where I had been during my most active involvement with NASPAA, and for several years, until about 1993, enjoyed the privileges of a guest scholar at the Institute of Government (now the Weldon Center Center for Public Service). The assistance of that organization and its director of that time, Carl Stenberg, was invaluable. In that period I completed a draft of a history of the predecessor organization, the Council for Graduate Education in Public Administration (CGEPA), and of NASPAA from its founding in 1970 through its first adoption of standards for graduate programs in 1974. At that point I had a manuscript in five monstrous chapters, totaling almost 1,000 typed pages. One copy of this was deposited with NASPAA headquarters, which found no immediate way to use it, and except for drawing upon it for my 25th anniversary talk at NASPAA's annual conference in 1995, the draft has been untouched until recently, along with several boxes of documents and related materials accumulated in course of the project.

In 2014, through the good offices of Harry Harding, then dean of the University of Virginia Batten School of Leadership and Public Policy, I discussed with Laurel McFarland, executive director of NASPAA, what might become of these remains, including the source materials, which may be a unique collection on this aspect of public administration history. While agreeing to accept this material for deposit with NASPAA, she expressed interest in a more usable version of the history, particularly the part bearing on the founding of NASPAA. Consequently, in the past year and a half I have completed a rewrite to produce what I hope is a more accessible version of the first half of the old draft, culminating in the founding of NASPAA in 1970 (with a brief epilogue on how the organization survived infancy). The new version, somewhat shorter, breaks the story into eight chapters of readable length and is rather more interpretive and judgmental than the original. I have done it on the computer, enabling consistent treatment of such things as headings and footnotes, and the production of both a paper copy and a disc drive version which can be transmitted and made computer accessible. This version was produced entirely by reworking the earlier manuscript and its lengthy footnotes, without resorting to the source documents. I am sure it could have been improved had I done so, but I also felt that attempting a full revision of that sort would embroil me in an effort beyond my present capacity and never be finished.

A few words about the content. The work has turned out to be both longer and broader, in several respects, than originally anticipated.

In the first place, it covers a longer time period. It was clear from the beginning that the formation of NASPAA in 1970 was anything but an act of spontaneous creation. The founding was an evolutionary outcome of collaborative efforts of university people to promote and improve graduate study of public administration that had been going on since at least the mid-1950s. Sources for this early period were available, showing actions of some important leaders in the field who ought to be remembered. Therefore it seemed appropriate to go back and describe those efforts, revolving around NASPAA's predecessor entity, the Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration (CGEPA). Because of this stretching-out, most of what follows here is NASPAA pre-history, leading up to and including the founding conference in 1970. Furthermore, the founding itself was more of a way-station than a destination, because NASPAA as first created differed little except in name from its predecessor. A period of consolidation and growth would be required until NASPAA could approach the more ambitious goals of those who had led the conversion from CGEPA, and begin performing the distinguishing function that characterizes it today. The last two chapters of the original manuscript covered the four years it took for NASPAA to grow from its infancy to early adulthood, signified by its first adoption of a declaration of standards for graduate programs in 1974. Some of this is summarized in a brief Epilogue. I would like to and may still do a re-casting of those chapters as well as extending the story until NASPAA reached maturity as a fully independent organization and an accrediting authority; because of age and other responsibilities I make no promises.

Secondly, I found it difficult, or at least unrewarding and insufficiently explanatory, to focus narrowly on CGEPA itself. CGEPA (as well as NASPAA for the years of my study)

was a specialized entity within a broader organization, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). The history of CGEPA had to deal with its changing relationship with ASPA, which at various times was both nurturing and limiting; the overall story is one of CGEPA-NASPAA's growing strength and autonomy until it finally broke the organizational tie and set off on its own. More significantly, CGEPA developed in a context of national events and forces that created both possibilities and limitations for itself and the university programs that were its constituents. These forces included major political events of the time; several aspects of federal government policy, including aid to higher education and its policies and practices for employee training; rapid growth of universities in that period, which made room for new and expanded programs of public affairs and administration; and intellectual and organizational developments specific to both structure and content of those programs. The story of CGEPA is primarily a story of response to, and secondarily of attempts to influence, those environmental forces. It has been a challenge to treat these contextual matters in sufficient detail to make CGEPA understandable without depicting it as a totally dependent variable and losing the acts and ambitions of its leaders in the historical shuffle.

Finally, a note on nomenclature: the terms used to identify the field of study of concern here and to name the individual university programs and entities that were members of CGEPA and then NASPAA. Historically and up to the time of CGEPA's beginning, the academic field (and individual university programs to the extent that they had separate identity) was almost universally known as "public administration." Although adherents probably would have said that the term and its underlying concept, properly understood, were broad enough to encompass a multitude of approaches and subject-matters of public concern, there began around that time a tendency to reach for what was seen as a more inclusive terminology. Newly founded programs, as well as existing ones being expanded, upgraded, and re-conceptualized to include subjects of increasing prominence (such as urban and international affairs, as well as new disciplinary and analytical methods to deal with them), began to use what was intended as a broader (and more up to date and fashionable) term "public affairs." By the time of NASPAA's founding, both of the key terms were in common use, and the namers of the new entity found it expedient to embrace the awkward dual usage of "affairs and administration." "Public policy" as a key term, to some degree supplanting "public administration," was still in the future. In this study I have tended to follow the drift of the times, using "public administration" almost exclusively in the early chapters, with increasingly frequent use of "public affairs" later in the study. In most cases the two are meant as virtually interchangeable, without any differentiation of intended content.

Laurin L. Henry  
Charlottesville, Virginia  
November 2015

## Chapter One

### **THE PUBLIC SERVICE AND EMERGENCE OF CGEPA**

Between 1957 and 1959 a group of deans, program directors, and senior professors of public administration in American universities created an entity called the Conference on Graduate Education for Public Administration (CGEPA).<sup>1</sup> The organization resulted from the conjunction of a few unusually purposeful people and certain conditions in the worlds of government and higher education that stimulated and aided their efforts. CGEPA was not intended as an end in itself but as an instrument of a well-understood set of purposes: to improve, expand, multiply, and achieve appropriate status for public administration programs in academia. This cluster of purposes arose naturally enough from the founders' proprietary impulse to develop the full potentiality of their enterprises, and was justified in their minds by the public good that would result from the knowledge that would be created and disseminated through trained students, whose public service careers would contribute to improvements in government.

The public service idea was more than shallow rationalization. The founders of CGEPA believed in public administration, with a depth of commitment that might seem odd or naive to later-day academics or skeptical ordinary citizens. The founders were mostly of the second generation of academic public administrationists, a set of program-builders following the pioneers who had planted the field in U.S. universities earlier in the century. Like their predecessors, CGEPA's leaders were characterized by idealism about public service. They saw a career in government as not just a job but an honorable calling, which they were glad to encourage students to undertake. Although they differed among themselves about some aspects of their subject, and no doubt displayed a few of the normal human vanities and personal ambitions, they were united in certain beliefs: that the study of government administration, properly approached, was both inherently interesting and a legitimate academic subject; that the nation had benefitted from the contributions of public administration in the rather short time that the subject had been taught; and that those benefits would be enormously increased if the field could be intellectually clarified, extended to reach more students, applied to more government activities, and properly established within universities and in relation to government.

The founders of CGEPA responded to national conditions during the 1950s that seemed to foretell a great increase in need and opportunities for public administration. Governments at all levels faced a growing agenda of problems that almost certainly would lead to new programs requiring high capacities of administration. At the same time, as the implications for education of the post-World War II baby boom became

---

<sup>1</sup> The first word in the title later was changed to "Council" in the belief that a "Conference" suggested a temporary or ad hoc gathering, while the leaders meant to have a continuing, established organization. This did nothing to help an unfortunately awkward acronym, generally pronounced as "suh-jeep-uh."

clear, higher education looked forward to a period of rapidly increasing enrollments and institutional expansion, which would open possibilities for new and enlarged academic programs of all sorts. Public administration leaders aimed to seize those opportunities and fill those needs.

In the dozen years of its existence, CGEPA would succeed in establishing patterns of cooperation among educators who shared its purposes, welcome a surge of enrollments and new programs all around the country, and begin to have limited effects on the image and status of public administration in academic and governmental circles. However, the larger ambitions of the founders remained unfulfilled, partly because of the inherent difficulty of structuring the field, both conceptually and organizationally, and in part because the governmental climate became less supportive in the later 1960s just as CGEPA and its constituents were gathering momentum. In 1970, CGEPA's constituents would come to an understanding that the goal of establishing their field in a proper status in U.S. universities would require a more vigorous collective effort than seemed likely to occur with the existing organizational form, and voted to transform CGEPA into a new entity with a broader potential membership and more capacity for action.

### THE PUBLIC SERVICE IN THE FIFTIES

Improvement of the public service in the United States was a recurring topic on the national public affairs agenda in the 1950s and '60s. It was not, of course, a top-level concern, like the cold war, or unemployment, or civil rights; administrative improvement, even in the broadest sense, never had a large primary constituency, and the citizens who saw a serious national interest in the vigor and capacity of the public service (as distinguished from alarms about waste and bureaucracy on the one hand, and the bread-and-butter interests of government workers on the other) were few in number. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of government--or at least selected parts of it--could be seen to affect many different policy goals and therefore became a second-degree concern to leaders of widely differing interests and viewpoints. The first Hoover Commission,<sup>2</sup> in 1949, stirred public interest for a time in reorganization and efficiency, and as that faded away there lingered in national leadership circles an underlying concern about the state of the public service, especially the quality and effectiveness of persons in executive, professional, and managerial positions. This concern would intensify as the policy agenda and governmental responsibilities grew in the '50s and '60s. The relatively small academic and professional groups already focused on public

---

<sup>2</sup> The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, headed by former president Herbert Hoover, was created in 1947, largely at the instigation of a conservative Congress anticipating a Republican administration to be elected in 1948. After president Truman's surprising victory he agreed to cooperate with Hoover on the understanding that the Commission would take as given the existing federal programs--no more talk of dismantling the New Deal--and confine its recommendations to organization and management improvements. On that basis, the Commission made a number of broadly acceptable proposals. When the Republicans finally took over all three branches in 1953, they created a second Hoover Commission with a broader mandate, but it had difficulty agreeing on really sweeping recommendations, the Eisenhower administration displayed no great enthusiasm for its products, and in the end not much happened.

management sensed a quickening interest among business, government, and education leaders, the communications media, and the philanthropic foundations. Over two decades the public climate gradually changed and governments at all levels began to seek improvements in the quality of their administrative leadership.

The state of the public service and proposals for its improvement were, of course, old business for the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), an aggregation of several thousand individual members from governmental, academic, and citizen reform circles. ASPA shared interests and some degree of overlapping membership with more specialized professional societies of public officials like the International City Management Association (ICMA) and the International Public Personnel Association (IPMA). The influence of such groups was limited, however, by their small numbers, inhibitions about lobbying, a tendency to preach to the choir, and a touch of self-interest in reforms they might propose. To make headway they had to follow public events patiently, enlist support from outside their professional ranks, and look for opportunities to persuade top governmental leaders, both executive and legislative, that administrative and personnel improvements required attention despite lack of broad political demand for such measures.

### Events of the Forties and Fifties

At the end of the 1940s there was good reason for concern about the nation's public services. Whether one approved or deplored it, the scale of government activity was not going to return to pre-war--much less pre-New Deal--levels. In Washington the generation of talented careerists who had seen the government through the crises of depression and war were moving rapidly toward retirement, and there seemed no condition likely to attract or system to develop comparable replacements. The government service embodied many features tending to frustrate ambition and limit the growth of talent. Able youth looked to the rewards of private enterprise rather than public service.

For those paying attention to such matters, several events during the Truman administration raised questions about managerial capacity in the federal government. Even as the federal service was shaking down after years of wartime expansion and improvisation, the staffing of such new agencies as the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Economic Cooperation Administration (Marshall Plan) demonstrated needs for new varieties of high-quality talent and perhaps new methods of acquiring it. Scandals in the Internal Revenue bureau and other agencies shook public confidence in the integrity of government. Then the administrative difficulties of the defense establishment and civilian agencies handling the partial national mobilization for the Korean war became severe enough to produce a flurry of discussion in public leadership circles about a shortage of qualified government executives.<sup>3</sup> At the highest levels, men of the generation later identified as the Wise Men

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, see John J. Corson, *Executives for the Federal Service* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952).

(Acheson, Lovett, McCloy, et. al.) extended their service or returned after short post-war respites. But who would support and execute for the topmost leaders? There was a brief revival of the wartime expedient of asking industry to release executives for temporary federal service, either on a paid or a “woc” (without compensation) basis.

Attracting and retaining federal executives, both temporary and career, was helped in the 1950s by one legacy of the first Hoover Commission that turned out to be more significant than was appreciated at the time. Although most of the Commission’s recommendations about personnel were for sensible but unexciting managerial improvements, its strong statements about inadequate recognition and pay at the upper levels of the service led, in 1949, to a Classification Act that included authorization for 400 “supergrades”--positions at three new rank and salary levels above the previous classified structure. The next year, in response to Korean war needs, the number was increased to 1,000. The expansion was supposed to be temporary and limited to defense-related agencies, but the precedent was irresistible to other agencies and their congressional committee patrons, and within a few years there were several thousand supergrades permanently established around the government. In the short run, this raise of the ceiling made federal service more attractive to both careerists and temporary appointees below the presidential appointment level. In the longer term, the supergrades turned out to be an embryonic executive corps, on which many subsequent reforms would focus. Except for Korea-related expedients, however, personnel improvement was largely in abeyance as the Truman administration, in its later years, became more and more distracted by the war and bogged down politically.

The return of Republicans to power in 1953, after twenty years out of the White House, brought renewed partisan attacks on the federal service, plus reductions in force in search of economy, and an intensified loyalty-security program exacerbated by McCarthyism. These disturbances, intense for a couple of years and damaging to the careers of many individuals, eventually faded as the managerial types outlasted the extremists and the Eisenhower administration settled down to trying to slow the growth of government and manage it better--in effect relegitimizing government personnel as a bipartisan subject.

In the midst of the transitional disruptions, John D. Rockefeller, III, made an important gesture of confidence and encouragement to the civil service by announcing a program of annual cash awards to a dozen or so top officers for outstanding performance, as evaluated by outside judges. Another signal that constructive talk about the public service was again in order was a 1954 meeting of the American Assembly devoted to problems and proposed reforms of the federal service.<sup>4</sup> Such issues were raised officially in 1956 by the second Hoover Commission, which advocated

---

<sup>4</sup> American Assembly, *The Federal Government Service*; Final Report of the Sixth American Assembly (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955). The assemblies were occasional invited conferences of high-ranking business, academic, media, and interest group leaders on topics of general public interest. Initiation of the series was associated with Dwight Eisenhower’s presidency of Columbia, and their meetings and recommendations were considered important expressions of non-partisan establishment opinion.

a major expansion of federal employee training, including special programs for the development of executives. The Commission also proposed creation of a senior civil service corps of carefully selected and trained executives, who would be moved as needed around the government rather than serving entire careers in single agencies in the traditional civil service pattern.<sup>5</sup> The Eisenhower administration embraced the senior civil service idea but failed to convince Congress and had to fall back to some low-key measures that could be done without legislation, such as inventorying talent, tracking careers, and encouraging voluntary inter-agency movement of existing supergrades.

The reformers registered an important achievement in 1958 by steering through Congress the first general authorizing statute for training federal officials. Although federal expenditure for employee training was not totally new, it had been generally on a small scale and inconspicuous, almost furtive lest congressional disapproval be attracted, except in a few agencies that enjoyed special authority. Now, with training fully authorized and the Civil Service Commission charged to encourage and monitor it, there was prospect of a great expansion of employee training in all agencies, which would make government careers more attractive to young people. Academic public administration could expect increased enrollments and possibly opportunities for direct participation in federal training activity.

### The Public Service Establishment

Events like the Training Act and other innovations that followed it owed much to the efforts of a loose network of men (regrettably, virtually all men at this time) who could, with only slight license, be called a public service establishment of the 1950s and '60s. At the center were several men, long active in ASPA, who had risen from the career service to high positions in the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. These included Roger W. Jones, of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission (and briefly the State Department); Elmer B. Staats, of the Budget Bureau (and later Comptroller General of the U.S.); and John W. Macy, Jr., of the Civil Service Commission (and later and additionally the White House staff). Such careerists were associated in various ways with important in-and-outers from the business world, such as John J. Corson, Bernard Gladieux, and James E. Webb; in-and-outers from academic administration, such as Harlan Cleveland and Arthur S. Flemming; a few influential professors, such as Wallace S. Sayre of Columbia; and key foundation executives, such as James Perkins and John Gardner of the Carnegie Corporation and Don K. Price of the Ford Foundation (later Harvard). These men and others who followed their leads pushed administrative and personnel reform from inside and outside government, sponsored and participated in major studies and

---

<sup>5</sup> This idea of a senior executive corps, somewhat separate from the bulk of the civil service and nurtured and deployed from a central authority, was and to some degree remains a favorite idea of American public administration scholars, who have had a perhaps not too well informed admiration of the old administrative class of the British civil service.

innovative projects, and encouraged linkages among federal agencies, universities, and professional organizations.

It is important to note, however, that although the leaders of this establishment strongly supported education for public service, and most of them held university positions at one time or another, their perspective tended to be more governmental than academic. Their ideas about universities and how they should relate to government would differ in some respects from most of the leaders of academic public administration programs. They were much less likely than the university leaders to see the prosperity of the teaching programs, at least as they then existed, as crucial to national administrative progress. The instinct of the national establishmentarians was to urge the university programs to become more flexible and creative to meet governmental needs, and to strive for a level of quality they presumed to exist at a few high-status institutions with which they were most familiar. For studies and projects intended to influence the public service environment they often turned to non-university organizations like the Brookings Institution, which was an important center of such activities in this period.<sup>6</sup>

Although the federal government's administrative problems got most of the public attention, a reality of the 1950s was that state and local governments had begun a long period of growth that far outpaced the federal government's, as they expanded to provide the services demanded by an increasingly affluent, mobile, suburbanized America--and later struggled with the problems of the less affluent left behind in the big cities. Toward the end of the decade, with encouragement from the leading organizations of administrative professionals, the major foundations sponsored a temporary Municipal Manpower Commission, which produced studies showing that with respect to administrative, professional, and technical personnel it was the local governments that had the greatest qualitative deficiencies, the weakest career systems, and the least developed sources of supply.<sup>7</sup> Clearly, there was a job of almost universal public service upgrading to be done, with implications for colleges and universities all over the country. The scale of need suggested an expanded role for public higher education; serious activity to train for the public service could not be left to a few leading institutions, most of them private and historically oriented to the federal government.

---

<sup>6</sup> Brookings was the base for a Conference on the Public Service which brought together members of this little establishment a couple of times a year to discuss priorities and strategies for personnel improvement; the Conference was funded by the foundations, which took cues from it about projects they would finance. (This writer, then at Brookings, was secretary for the Conference for several years in the early 1960s.) Such Brookings eminences as Paul T. David, George A. Graham, and James M. Mitchell were part of the network described above. Brookings projects of the period, most of them initiated with the blessing of this network, included: an experimental program of developmental conferences for senior career executives; studies on such topics as alternative executive personnel systems, the responsibilities and working environments of federal executives, career patterns of federal executives, appointment processes of political executives, the public prestige standing of various kinds of public services, and how presidential transitions might be managed so as to minimize disruption and facilitate appropriate response to new leadership.

<sup>7</sup> Municipal Manpower Commission, Governmental Manpower for Tomorrow's Cities (New York; McGraw-Hill, 1962).

To summarize, by the end of the 1950s problems and proposals for new governmental activity, involving both federal and state-local effort, in such areas as transportation, housing, education, and health services had been almost inexorably pushed onto the national agenda. The Kennedy administration in 1961 brought only modest programmatic expansion but a great renewal of interest among citizens, especially students, in public service. Great things seemed about to happen. How would the universities respond?

## PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNIVERSITIES <sup>8</sup>

Leaders and teachers of public administration in U.S. universities viewed the national scene of the 1950s with a mixture of hope and exasperation. They had been sustained for years on modest successes, limited recognition, scant resources, and strong personal convictions about the public need for their contributions. They now saw that need growing, which stimulated visions of an enlarged future for them and their academic offerings, but realization of the dreams was far from certain. The reality from which they had to start was that, after a generation of development of the field, public administration was still a minor and largely undefined element in higher education.

Public administration's status in the universities reflected some perennial external limitations, including the prevailing values of the nation and the structure of the public services. In a society that exalted private enterprise and gave high recognition and generally higher rewards to business and the traditional professions, preparation for the public service did not attract large numbers of students. Appeal to students was further limited by the structure of the public services, fragmented as they were by levels of government, separate agencies, and technical specialization, all tending to provide narrow and regrettably short career ladders. Although for almost forty years students educated in public administration had, in one way or another, found their way into some branch of public service, and most of them had had satisfying (if not notably lucrative)

---

<sup>8</sup> Unless the context requires otherwise, the term "universities" will be used generically to denote both universities and colleges. The usage is particularly appropriate here because for most of its life CGEPA was almost entirely concerned with graduate level study. Also, in this chapter "public administration" will be used predominantly and almost synonymously with the broader (and, in the minds of some, more dignified) term "public affairs." The latter will appear more frequently in later parts of this study, reflecting a shift over time in not merely prevailing usage but also to some degree in program content and purpose. For the founders of CGEPA, public administration was almost all about preparation for work in governmental service; as content and career outlooks of graduates broadened to include a variety of publicly oriented but not necessarily specifically government work, "public affairs" was generally deemed more appropriate--although scholars of the earlier period probably would not have conceded the distinction.

careers, the linkages between education and career opportunities were weak.<sup>9</sup> Fragmentation on the government side was paralleled in higher education by enormous variations in the availability, content, and quality of public service education in different institutions, states, and regions of the country.

Around 1950 there seemed to be some growth in public administration enrollments and a few new academic programs in the field were appearing, but most of the new ventures were started on a shoestring and weakly supported within their institutions. Public administration program leaders were often frustrated by inability to recruit enough students to make a thriving program, and at the same time by inability to refer enough graduates to fill the available placements. The academics frequently urged their practitioner counterparts to help call attention to the attractions of public service and to devise ways to subsidize study in the field.<sup>10</sup> As long as the existing courses more or less satisfied the immediate student demand, and without government subsidy or other intervention, university authorities and potential donors were cautious about major commitments to expand and make the programs more attractive, regardless of what might be said about society's underlying need.

Political developments of the '50s gave the public administration faculties new encouragement. Perhaps now, in a time of governmental growth and emerging consensus about need for improved public services--especially better prepared personnel--public administration education would come into its rightful place, with its graduates in high demand and its programs generously supported. Somewhat jealous of public support long given to education in certain other fields, such as agriculture and medicine, public administrationists felt a surge of hope from the federal government's new interest in higher education after the Soviets launched their Sputnik. If there was a

---

<sup>9</sup> "Weak linkages" characterized public services as a whole, although there had been some progress in opening a clear track to federal employment through what was called the Junior Management Assistant examination. The JMA was the latest version of an innovation of the later 1930s due largely to the service of one of the early public administration professors, Leonard D. White of the University of Chicago, on the U.S. Civil Service Commission. The JMA program offered an annual examination for bachelor's and master's level graduates who could be placed in entry-level administrative positions. Although the JMA and its several predecessor and successor programs brought many public administration graduates into federal service, there were important limitations. Considering the scale of the federal government, these exams led to a small number of appointments, varying from year to year. Not all agencies used JMA as a recruiting source. And the examinations were usually general in nature, not particularly keyed to what was taught in public administration. On the latter point, although there had been experiments from time to time with examination options that gave some edge to applicants who had public administration backgrounds, they never lasted for long. The Civil Service Commission staff thought the number of public administration grads too small to make a good recruiting pool; the examiners claimed to have difficulty determining what it was that such graduates were supposed to know and could be tested for; and there was insufficient evidence that such graduates performed better in actual service than recruits with other backgrounds. Unhappiness with the federal government's apparent lack of respect for their product was one of the motivating concerns of the founders of CGEPA, leading them to gradually increasing interest in program standards that would increase such respect. For a Civil Service Commission examiner's view of the JMA in the early Fifties, see Milton Mandell, "The JMA Program," Public Administration Review (PAR), Vol. XIII, No. 2 (Spring 1953), p. 106.

<sup>10</sup> For example, see American Society for Public Administration, Proceedings, National Advisory Committee, March 20, 1957, and attached documents; from files of Don L. Bowen.

national interest in science and engineering, as both Congress and the administration declared, was there not a parallel public purpose to train the specialists who would be needed to coordinate and manage all the new programs being talked about? But higher authorities who controlled the priorities in government and higher education did not always reach what the public administration people thought obvious conclusions. Resources and support for change were slow in coming, and there was concern in public administration circles that despite all their years of faith and good works, their moment might slip away.

What held back the breakthrough? It was more than mere inattention or perversity among top decision makers. There were several reasons why public administration, as of the 1950s, had not received the recognition it sought. First, on the total educational scene it was almost too small to be noticed; only in a few institutions had the field achieved enough mass to become a force respected by university leaders and external observers. Second, it suffered from a blurred identity, as illustrated by the variety of organizational settings and labels under which it appeared; only insiders knew where on the campus to find it and how to recognize it. Third, even those identified with the subject did not fully agree on exactly what it was, and key questions about the content of the field, its appropriate aspirations, and strategies for propagating it remained unanswered. Fourth, whatever its ideal content might be, public administration's subject-matter and intellectual orientation were out of step with the predominant intellectual movements in American universities in the 1950s and '60s.

### Still A Small Enterprise

To be sure, public administration had come a long way since the 1880s, when Woodrow Wilson and a few other professors began to offer occasional courses in the subject. By now, it was widely recognized as a subdivision of political science, and most departments had at least one faculty member professing some specialization in it. One or two courses were usual components of majors at both the bachelor's and master's level, and at the latter a thesis requirement provided opportunity for further specialization.

Although this was the baseline status of public administration at most colleges and universities, at a few institutions it received more emphasis. Starting before World War I, and increasingly during the 1920s and '30s, some institutions had begun to offer additional courses and to think of *programs*: curricula of more or less coordinated courses specifically intended to prepare graduates for government service. Under the leadership of such pioneers as Charles A. Beard and Luther H. Gulick at Columbia, William E. Mosher at Syracuse, and Leonard D. White at Chicago, a movement toward

instruction for an emerging profession had begun.<sup>11</sup> But the movement was slow and uneven, buffeted by large events and fraught with uncertainty about both the propriety and the method of a distinctive form of education for public service careers. Some of the early university ventures sparked by progressivism and municipal reform had faltered along with those movements in the 1920s. Academic programs with avowed public service training purposes had flourished briefly in the 1930s, as the New Deal made a brisk market for their graduates, then stalled during World War II as their students left for military service and the professors left for temporary service in Washington. After the war a few of the programs--generally those with previously established favorable organizational status within their institutions, or those that happened to have the luck of unusually strong leadership--had regained strength, reaffirmed their public service orientation, and begun to think of themselves as offering professional education. Other programs, however, with turnover of university leadership and key faculty, had lapsed into inactivity, or lost their distinctive public service training purpose, or continued to declare the purpose without providing much educational content distinguishable from general academic instruction.

In the early 1950s the movement toward public service career education was led by a new generation that included such men as Paul H. Appleby, of Syracuse, Henry Reining, Jr., of the University of Southern California, Lloyd M. Short, of the University of Minnesota, and Stephen B. Sweeney, of the University of Pennsylvania. They were joined later in the decade by such persons as Don K. Price at Harvard and Donald C. Stone, who established a School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh--one of the few new ventures of its kind in that decade. But even at the vanguard institutions, most of the public administration programs were modest in scale and, with few exceptions, precarious in status. In the great majority of American

---

<sup>11</sup> In interest of brevity and because it is treated better elsewhere, the history of American public administration teaching before CGEPA is skipped over here. The best source is Frederick C. Mosher, ed., American Public Administration: Past, Present, Future (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1975). See especially the essays by Alice B. and Donald C. Stone, "Early Development of Education in Public Administration," pp. 11-48; Rowland Egger, "The Period of Crisis," pp. 49-96; James W. Fesler, "Public Administration and the Social Sciences," pp. 97-141; and Alice B. and Donald C. Stone, "Case Histories of Early Professional Educational Programs," pp. 268-290.

universities the movement toward professional education in public administration was tentative, if perceptible at all.<sup>12</sup>

The small scale of education in public administration, as distinguished from general political science (or from business education, with which it was associated at a few institutions), as of the early 1950s, was shown by a national survey conducted by the Public Administration Clearing House and subsequent analysis of its data by professor Roscoe C. Martin of Syracuse.<sup>13</sup> Martin reported the award in the 1952-53 academic year of 309 bachelor's, 256 master's, and 15 doctoral degrees, either specifically in public administration or with sufficient concentration to be identified by the awarding institution as in that field. The specifically labeled public administration degrees came from a relatively few places: 28 different institutions at the bachelor's level, 22 at the master's, and only 3 at the doctoral. There was a significant discrepancy between the number of institutions reporting some kind of public administration activity and the actual production of degrees in the subject. Although 105 institutions reported offering graduate instruction in public administration, only 22 of them (or 25, counting the doctorates separately) awarded degrees in the survey year. The ostensible availability of some kind and amount of public administration instruction obviously did not necessarily mean an active, productive program. Public administration was a significant, high-visibility enterprise at a relatively few universities; at most institutions it was not an important program in its own right.

### Variety of Organizational Bases and Titles

The several different types of organizational settings in which public administration was taught contributed to the blurred identity and obscurity of the field. Although most such instruction had originated, and in a majority of institutions still occurred, in political science departments, a few programs had either arisen from or been transferred into the jurisdiction of interdepartmental committees or centers, which could offer interdisciplinary and more specialized teaching. Other programs could be

---

<sup>12</sup> It is worth noting that until around the 1960s a disproportionate share of the leadership in developing public administration education came from major private universities rather than the public or state institutions. Why this was so is not entirely clear. Perhaps it resulted from the private elite institutions' history and continued self-perception as seedbeds of national social and political leadership. That environment encouraged, or at least tolerated, various sorts of activism by professors and occasionally made those institutions attractive to civic-minded donors, resulted in public affairs entities with adequate resources and staying power. In the state universities, on the other hand, despite a few notable exceptions, mostly in California and the Upper Midwest, where the progressive reform tradition was strong, public administration or public affairs ventures may have seemed risky to politically cautious presidents and trustees. At such institutions, public administration was not likely to attract activist benefactors, and found it difficult to compete for support and resources with other professions and proto-professions, such as business education, that enjoyed large external clienteles and a public perception of social and economic utility. Against this historical state of affairs, the efforts of CGEPA and its successor to establish the expectation of public responsibility for education for the public sector, was truly an uphill proposition.

<sup>13</sup> Roscoe C. Martin, "Educational Preparation for Public Administration," Higher Education: A publication of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Vol. X, No. 9 (May 1954), pp. 135-146.

found in non-departmental, externally oriented research and service bureaus, centers, or institutes. And in a few universities public administration or public affairs enjoyed the status of a separate school, outside the departmental structure and in organizational status similar to the established professional schools like law and engineering and the rapidly growing schools of business administration. In the 1952-53 survey discussed above, 68 of the 105 institutions reported graduate instruction in public administration in departments of political science or government; 16 programs were in bureaus or institutes; and only 6 universities had clearly designated schools of public administration--plus 3 combined schools of business and public administration. The remaining 12 institutions had a miscellany of committees, centers, and difficult-to-distinguish organizational arrangements.

The degree titles used added to the confusion. In the same survey, 89 public administration graduate programs led to the Master of Arts and 15 to the Master of Sciences; presumably most of these did not have Public Administration as the primary label but were officially in political science with some kind of public administration concentration or emphasis. Only 13 institutions awarded the Master of Public Administration, which later would become the preferred degree for professionally oriented programs.<sup>14</sup>

### What Is It, Really?

The variety of organizational arrangements and degree titles reflected more fundamental issues and differences of opinion, even among those actively engaged in it, about just what public administration was. Was the actual doing of administration to be considered an art, a skill, or--at least potentially--a science? What did that question imply about the subject's teaching? If it was an art, did this mean that capability of practice depended essentially on personal traits or experience to which formal instruction was largely irrelevant? If a skill, could that really be learned in an academic setting, or did it have to come with experience and tutelage on the job? If a science, then it must rest upon knowledge developed and transmitted in higher education, but where in the university was that science--or the building blocks of knowledge to compose it--to be found?

Despite uncertainty about the teachability of administrative skill, few would consider education in the field irrelevant; at minimum, higher education could provide orientation to public careers and substantive knowledge about government processes and public issues that would constitute foundations for administrative capability. And perhaps some day, if public administration could forge alliances and successfully meld

---

<sup>14</sup> The numbers here add up to more than the 105 institutions reporting; apparently some offered alternative degrees.

knowledge from the several social sciences, a science of public administration (or would it then be a general science of administration?) might emerge.<sup>15</sup>

If public administration really was an appropriate university subject, how should it be defined, organized, and approached? Was it an academic discipline in itself? A field or subfield within a broader discipline? Or a profession, implying a multidisciplinary base? And what might each of these definitions imply for the content and manner of instruction? Few teachers of public administration claimed it as a separate discipline in itself. Many, especially the older scholars, had been introduced to the subject through their own study of political science and still regarded it as a subdivision of that discipline (Skip for now if poli sci itself was a legitimate, separate discipline, or just a second-class pudding of history, law, sociology, and a half-dozen other things, as some traditionalists still thought). Whether a result of the kind of preparation they had been steeped in, or simply because of the expectations of their institutional settings, the teaching of many professors was in a style more akin to liberal arts instruction than to professional education. Those interested in exploring the idea of professionalism often were restrained by traditional graduate school departmental settings and requirements, and some had reservations about the real-world acceptance of a public administration profession regardless of what they might personally prefer. And there was widespread concern--indeed, active suspicion in conservative academic circles--that at some institutions premature pretensions to professional education covered intellectual mediocrity and specialization in trivia.

Even among academics committed to the idea of professionalism in public administration, and in institutional situations permitting its exploration, there were issues about the form and content of instruction. Should intensive teaching of the subject begin at the undergraduate level, as was common in engineering, or start at the graduate level, as in law and medicine? The weight of informed opinion seemed to favor public administration specialization beginning at the graduate level, perhaps ideally after a liberal arts base, despite the fact that according to Martin's data (referred to above) there were more undergraduate than graduate degrees being awarded. The numerous institutions awarding graduate degrees in political science with a public administration specialization generally held to the traditional arts and sciences requirement of a year of study for the master's degree, but the universities striving for professionalism tended to think longer was needed and required as much as two years. The one-year programs typically ended with a master's thesis, but in the more

---

<sup>15</sup> A convenient sampling of opinions and approaches to such questions can be found in a compilation of eleven PAR articles under the heading of "Education and Training" in Claude E. Hawley and Ruth G. Weintraub, eds., *Administrative Questions and Political Answers* (Princeton, N.J.; Van Nostrand Co., 1966), pp. 520-600. In that volume, on "Trends in the Teaching of Public Administration", George A. Graham, of Princeton, noted that because of the need to bridge between concepts and skills, the present trend in teaching was "essentially clinical." (p. 28). Lynton K. Caldwell, of Indiana University, in "Public Administration and the Universities: A Half-Century of Development" (pp. 531-539), thought that in the future the impulse toward science might lead public administration away from its historic reliance on political science and toward close relations with other social science disciplines, and eventual development of a generic science that would be applicable at least to the broad body of "public professions," and perhaps to administration in any context.

professionalized programs the thesis was usually in the form of a practical project or waived altogether. The idea of professional education implied integration of experience with classroom teaching, and to that end many programs required an internship, which might range from a few weeks up to a year for students without significant experience. Other institutions, however, assumed that academic instruction would have to be complemented with professional experience in any event, and left that part of the education to the individual's post-graduate employment.

As to the content of teaching, most of the universities that offered more than one or two introductory or survey courses in public administration seemed to emphasize management processes in the public sector. The survey course might be followed by courses in organizing, personnel, finance, and so on--the so-called PODSCORB approach, using Luther Gulick's famous acronym. Some leaders in the field, however, considered that approach too likely to produce staff specialists with low career horizons; they advocated a broader approach emphasizing decision-making and leadership, in conscious preparation for higher executive positions, and might prefer the label public affairs rather than public administration. Some argued that teaching management or leadership in an unspecified policy context, in anticipation of producing an "administrative generalist," was futile, and urged curricular emphasis on policy and administration in some substantive sphere of government, such as national defense, or social welfare, or public works. Most of the teaching was in a traditional textbook-lecture-discussion format, but a few of the leading professors had begun to experiment with a case approach--a variant on methods long used in law and medical schools and increasingly in business administration.<sup>16</sup>

### Conceptual Issues and Organizational Restraints

The experience of the New Deal and World War II had taken public administration thought well beyond some of the issues that preoccupied it earlier. No one thought much any more about finding universal principles of organization. The relation of politics and administration was, of course, a perennial. Whether or not anyone had ever taken it literally, few thought it worth while to spend printer's ink attacking the notion of a theory and practice of administration totally separate from politics. More in fashion were pseudo-sophisticated discourses on the "dichotomy." The more advanced thinkers like the leaders of the case program didn't bother much with overt theorizing; they just displayed the decision-making process and let the reader draw out the implications.

Public administration was, however, caught up with--or, more exactly, caught in the middle of--other theoretical and methodological issues that arose in the 1950s and raged

---

<sup>16</sup> Some of the most influential leaders in the field were involved the Inter-University Case Program, which began to flourish in the Fifties after publication of the first major casebook: Harold Stein, ed, Public Administration And Policy Development (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1952). For many years thereafter, the Case Program produced a stream of cases and other materials, mostly from a base at Syracuse under the leadership of Edwin A. Bock.

through all the universities in the '60s: issues that severely strained relationships between public administration and the social sciences, including political science. Specialists in public administration had long labored under the suspicion of some of their more theoretically inclined colleagues that their field, with its orientation to practical matters and interest in procedures, was not really a serious academic subject. Now they began to be attacked from a new direction. Since the war the rising intellectual fashion in social science, in emulation of the methods and hope of replicating the successes of the physical sciences, had emphasized theory-building through precise statements of value-free propositions that could be tested by rigorous research, quantified if possible. Known in its various manifestations as positivism, scientism, or behavioralism, this movement attracted many of the rising generation of political scientists, leading them toward studies of political behavior in situations where quantification was possible, such as voting in elections and legislatures, and away from the interest in executive institutions and processes that preoccupied public administration. The latter's predominant style, which included orientation toward current problems of public organizations, and a desire to be involved, helpful, and prescriptive, seemed to violate the ideal of detached, value-free study that inspired the behavioralists. Public administration's tendency to prefer engagement over research, and the relatively low level of theory in most of the research that did occur, caused many of the leading political scientists to conclude that public administration was an intellectually inferior enterprise, hardly to be taken seriously or encouraged. Such downgrading and consequent strain in public administration's relationship with its parent discipline often was most acute in departments that were "on the make" in this period, expanding doctoral studies and striving for new respect as serious research institutions. Conflict with both the behavioralists and the traditionalists often occurred if the public administration people tried to respond to the rising external demand for a more professionalized program in their field.

Such conflicts created for public administration faculty members both anxieties about their academic respectability and practical difficulties in advancing their programs. Mostly brought up in political science themselves, they could hardly imagine teaching public administration without the underlying ideas of their parent discipline, and, as noted, many had reservations about whether public administration could ever become a real profession. Nevertheless, it was becoming clear that the needs of the public service called for more specialized instruction, with a different emphasis, than was customary in traditional academic departments. But public administration professors often found their political science colleagues indifferent, even hostile, to their efforts to adjust the curriculum to external need, add specialized courses and degree options, involve faculty from other department and schools, and create a more professional program. The obvious solution to such problems was to break out of the political science department and achieve some kind of organizational separateness in the university structure--an academic house of their own where they would be free to establish an interdisciplinary and more professionalized curriculum. However, their field's dubious repute made it difficult to secure organizational elbow-room and resources. Even separate organizational identity did not assure success; some programs that had got out of a departmental context into a school or institute status found themselves isolated with

slim budgetary and other support, or tied down in a network of cross-listed courses and joint faculty appointments that limited what they could do.<sup>17</sup>

## THE EMERGENCE OF CGEPA

As the 1950s went on, public administration faculty members, sensing important possibilities but frustrated by many limiting conditions, took counsel with their peers at other institutions and sought the support of friends in government.

### Organizational Antecedents

To go back in time, as interest in public administration had taken hold in American universities in the early years of the 20th century, faculty members developing the subject naturally sought opportunities to exchange ideas with counterparts at other institutions, as well as to meet government officials whose organizations provided both materials for study and jobs for their students. Most of the early teachers were members of the American Political Science Association (APSA), whose journal, the *American Political Science Review*, provided an outlet for writings in the field. Under the leadership of men like Charles A. Beard, APSA maintained a strong interest in both theory and practice of public administration, and as late as the 1930s had an active committee on training for public service. Some of American political science's oldest roots were in the reform movements of the 19th and early 20th centuries, and this lineage was particularly relevant to the public administration specialists, many of whom were also active in reform-minded organizations like the National Civil Service Reform League and the Governmental Research Association (GRA). The latter was a broad coalition that included representatives of the old municipal research bureaus, state and local reform associations, and taxpayers' leagues, as well as academics and a few practicing administrators. Some professors of a practical bent also established

---

<sup>17</sup> Education for business administration, historically, had experienced issues and debilities similar to those afflicting public administration but was generally ahead of public administration in overcoming them. By the 1950s growth of enrollments and external support from businessmen had made business education a considerable force on most campuses. Among the results was separation of business education from its early close identification with economics. At most universities, business had become a clearly designated school, while economics remained with other social sciences in a school of arts and sciences. (The exceptions were generally in developing institutions where the liberal arts tradition was still weak and economics had remained allied with strength as a department of the business school.)

In the 1950s, with its organizational status, if not its prestige value, secured, business education was in process of clarifying its purposes, strengthening its intellectual foundations, and setting standards for the future. An influential assessment of the state of business education sponsored by major foundations suggested goals which were then pushed by a collective instrumentality, the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). No public administration professor could be unaware of the growing mass and status of business administration, and at least some leaders saw the significance of the national movement to upgrade the field. A few began to argue that if public administration did not get itself similarly organized it might be pulled into the orbit of business education, remaining a minor appendage thereof and subject to the accrediting straightjacket of AACSB. What, then, would become of the higher order of public values that the public administration people believed they stood for?

connections and attended meetings of the International City Managers Association (ICMA) and other organizations of administrative practitioners.

Developments of the 1930s strained and eventually altered these organizational allegiances. APSA was increasingly dominated by its academic members, and, whatever else it was providing to the public administration professors, it was no longer a good bridge to citizen reformers or government officials. The same period brought increasing tension in the GRA, as the academics and professionals tended to be comfortable with the New Dealish times, while the efficiency and economy interests were not. The outcome was a split of the GRA and the founding in 1939 of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), led by a coalition of professional administrators and some leading academics, including Luther H. Gulick and William E. Mosher.<sup>18</sup> Most of the academics continued affiliation with APSA, at least for a while, but ASPA and its journal, *Public Administration Review (PAR)*, soon became the leading arena for public administration teachers, especially those consciously preparing students for government service.<sup>19</sup> ASPA's generalist orientation and programs reflecting the interests of a mixture of academic and practitioner members provided a broad perspective, established connections between agencies and universities, and fostered an attitude and aspiration to professionalism. In a very direct way, CGEPA and its successor organization were scions of ASPA.

### Exploratory Studies and Meetings

We have seen that organizational units specializing in public administration--schools, departments, programs, institutes, etc.--were slow to emerge within universities. While some of the people heading such units undoubtedly did compare notes from time to time at ASPA and other meetings, it took some years for them to emerge as a distinct interest within ASPA. The events that would lead to the formation of CGEPA began with discussions among a few such leaders, beginning around 1955, about the need for a broad national review of purposes, approaches, needs, and resources in public

---

<sup>18</sup> Based in recollections of Donald C. Stone and Stephen B. Sweeney, who had participated in those events, at a NASPAA Oral History Roundtable, Nov. 3, 1984. When invited to reminisce about the origins of NASPAA old-timers like Stone and Sweeney instantly began with the formation of ASPA; the continuity was very strong in their minds. See also, Donald C. Stone, "Looking Back: The Origins of ASPA," *Public Administration Times*, Vol. 12, No. 6 (April 21, 1989).

<sup>19</sup> The break was not as sharp as the split from GRA, but the founding of ASPA began a gradual drift of public administrationists from APSA as well. Although APSA had once declared training for public service one of the principal tasks of political science, that interest had diminished gradually since World War I. In the late Thirties, though, annual conferences of APSA were still the largest gatherings of people interested in public administration. Ironically, it was on the fringes of such a conference that the group looking for something more or different from what they were getting from APSA decided to proceed with the establishment of ASPA. Many of these people continued with APSA as well, at least for a time, but the existence of ASPA encouraged increasing differentiation of faculty whose interest in public administration were mainly vocational and professional from those whose interest was primarily disciplinary and academic. The division would widen as tension between political science and public administration increased during the 1950s and '60s.

administration teaching. The principal study of such a scope, by George A. Graham of Princeton, was pre-war and presumably now outdated.<sup>20</sup> Such discussions led to initiatives in 1956 in three different organizations: the University of Pennsylvania, ICMA, and ASPA. It does not appear that these projects were conceived as a joint enterprise, but they involved many of the same people and proceeded almost simultaneously, with much interchange.

The leading provocateurs were Lloyd M. Short, director of the Public Administration Center at the University of Minnesota, and Stephen B. Sweeney, director of the Institute of Local and State Government at the University of Pennsylvania. Their conversations led to an ambitious project on public administration education and training, financed by a foundation grant to Sweeney's Institute and involving cooperation by ASPA and ICMA, with participation by both administrators and academics from all over the country. The division of labor was that Short chaired the planning committee and a series of conferences, while Sweeney served as project director and, with his associates at the Institute, provided staff papers, conference reports, and logistics. Reflecting the name and principal clientele of the Institute, the project was entitled "Education and Training for Administrative Careers in Local and State Government," but the promoters clearly were seeking national impact, and most of the activity was at a level of generality broader than state and local.

The strategy of the Short-Sweeney project was to begin by looking at the realities and needs of administrative practice, and move from there to the implications for education and training. The activities kicked off with a workshop on "The Position and Role of Principal Administrative Officers," in St. Louis, November 24-25, 1956. This was co-sponsored by ICMA and involved members of that organization's committee on training and some twenty other city managers, plus a few academics, perhaps most notably Edwin O. Stene, of the University of Kansas, who was known especially as a trainer of city managers. A second workshop on "The Position and Role of Administrative Policy-Making Officers," in Chicago, March 20-21, 1957, brought together a mixture of state and city administrators, some heading staff departments and others concerned with various policy areas such as health, law enforcement, and public welfare.

While cooperating with the Pennsylvania project, ASPA meanwhile launched a parallel activity, a Committee on Education and Training, chaired by the eminent Luther Gulick and composed about 50/50 of leading academics (including the ubiquitous Short) and a mixture of practitioners from all levels of government. The ASPA committee proceeded mostly by correspondence and questionnaires to its members and other informants; by early 1957 it had produced a data book with many thoughtful responses and letters, amounting in many cases to little essays, and a preliminary report drawing from the data. This material was worked over at the ASPA national conference in March, 1957,

---

<sup>20</sup> George A. Graham, *Education for Public Administration* (Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1941).

where Sweeney also presented a preliminary report on his project.<sup>21</sup> At the same meeting ASPA started a related activity, a Committee on Research Needs and Resources, chaired by Donald C. Stone, dean of the recently established School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh.<sup>22</sup>

### “We Have To Talk Shop”

The Pennsylvania project led up to a large conference at Philadelphia, June 12-14, 1957, timed to mark the twentieth anniversary of the Institute of Local and State Government and its renaming as the Fels Institute in honor of its principal benefactor. The participants were mainly university public administration deans and program directors, who explored the implications for education of the staff studies and workshop reports about the needs and responsibilities of senior administrators. The main topics were curriculum, teaching methods, the place of field experience, and the respective responsibilities of government and universities for training administrators.<sup>23</sup>

These activities in 1956-56 had some important effects for the university public administration leaders. They were drawn into assessment of public administration teaching in terms of public service needs, with attention to the views of active administrators. This approach by-passed or subordinated many of the theoretical issues that agitated the professoriate and pointed toward defining what they were doing as professional education.

It also was important that the university people were encouraged, both by their own conversations and the advice of senior administrators, to aim high. They should think about educating public leaders, not training administrative technicians. From this perspective, although future federal, state, and local administrators, generalists and specialists, pre-career and post-entry students might have needs differing in some respects, it should be possible to identify fundamental educational objectives suitable for all, for which common curricular approaches might be devised. The appropriate education should be broad and conducted in a university setting that would permit a professional approach and contributions from several disciplines--economics, sociology, and psychology, at least, in addition to political science. Given these high objectives, universities should give priority to graduate level study.

---

<sup>21</sup> Data on both the ASPA and the University of Pennsylvania project from the files of Don L. Bowen, who at the time was Associate Director of ASPA, responsible for staffing the ASPA committee and liaison with Short and Sweeney.

<sup>22</sup> A little material on the committee was available from Stone's files. Note that "education" and "research" interests were structured separately within ASPA at that point, although they involved many of the same individuals, and would virtually merge in the 1960s with the activity of CGEPA.

<sup>23</sup> A final report was published as Stephen B. Sweeney, Thomas J. Davy, and Lloyd M. Short, *Education for Administrative Careers in Government* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1958). Note that the final product dropped the initial specification to local and state government.

Finally, these discussions moved the public administration program directors to an understanding that despite many differences in their programs and institutional situations, they were something of a distinct community, with interests and responsibilities that may have overlapped but were not fully shared by either the practicing administrators or faculty members in general. The Fels wind-up meeting, in particular, brought together the right people on the right subjects to generate a sense of peership and mutual concern. By the end of it, they were talking about more meetings of such a group.

This was not a totally spontaneous or unanticipated outcome, at least to Short and Sweeney, who had had something of the kind in mind all along. Earlier, Short had told Luther Gulick: "I have hoped for a long time that we could bring together, perhaps annually, the directors and deans of public administration to discuss mutual concerns....As a consequence of a talk I had about this with Steve Sweeney..., Steve sought funds...to finance such a conference this year."<sup>24</sup> So, when one of the Fels conferees suggested that those interested in continuing the conversation might remain after the meeting to discuss how future conferences could be arranged, Sweeney encouraged a rump session. Short convened an informal meeting at which he proposed and got general assent to the outlines of what would become CGEPA: a continuing organization of deans and directors of programs offering graduate degrees in public administration and related subjects; affiliation with ASPA; meetings at least annually, probably in conjunction with ASPA annual conferences; each institution to have one vote in the group's business. To help the movement, Sweeney offered facilitating services by Fels, and his associate, Tom Davy, was designated secretary.<sup>25</sup>

### Getting Organized

Over the next two years the enterprise was gradually enlarged and formalized, the latter involving establishing its status with ASPA--a matter that would always remain problematical, as it turned out.

A few of those who had been at Philadelphia met that September on the fringe of the American Political Science Association meeting<sup>26</sup> to plan an organizing session during the next ASPA annual conference. That setting was appropriate and propitious, because

---

<sup>24</sup> Letter, Lloyd M. Short to Luther H. Gulick, Nov. 14, 1956, reproduced in the report of the ASPA Committee on Education and Training: "Education for Government Management: A Statement of Issues and Approaches" (American Society for Public Administration, 1957), p. 50. Many years later, Sweeney would confirm that CGEPA was an extension of Short's long-standing interest. "Lloyd was always saying, 'We have to get together and talk shop.'" NASPAA Oral History, Vol. 1.

<sup>25</sup> In a letter to this author, Oct. 14, 1991, Davy recalled the events on June 15, 1957. Although he did not recall for certain who first suggested the need for additional meetings, he thought it might have been Wallace S. Sayre, of Columbia. Others present at the rump gathering were Henry Reining, Jr., of Southern California, Robert F. Wilcox, of San Diego State, and two or three others, probably George A. Graham and Stephen K. Bailey of Princeton, and George Shipman of the University of Washington.

<sup>26</sup> Note the continuing ties that most of the public administration leaders still had with political science.

one of the features of that conference, in March, 1958, was a general session sponsored by its Committee on Education and Training. Indicating a convergence of the ASPA and Fels projects, the session was chaired by Short, rather than Gulick. It reviewed the by now established topics: needs, approaches, objectives, and responsibilities in public administration education. In a related session, Don Stone held an open meeting of his Committee on Research Needs and Resources.<sup>27</sup>

To push their idea of a continuing group, Short and Sweeney had arranged in advance and invited about 50 university people to a special breakfast meeting. About 30 showed up to endorse the idea and encourage Short to continue as provisional chairman. Short broadened the leadership base by designating a planning committee consisting of himself, Harlan B. Cleveland, dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse; Robert B. Highsaw, of the Southern Regional Training Program at the University of Alabama; John W. Lederle, director of the Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan; George A. Shipman, director of the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Washington; and, of course, Sweeney.

ASPA proliferated sub-groups in all directions at that 1958 conference. In addition to Short and his university program directors, representatives of university-based governmental research organizations also met and took steps to create an entity that would become known as the Conference of University Bureaus of Governmental Research (CUBGR). CUBGR's constituents were products of a historically noted "bureau movement" in public administration, some of them dating back to the 1930s, others of more recent vintage. Mostly located in state universities, their main functions were to provide applied research, consultation, and sometimes training services to state and local governments. Their external missions and clienteles had led in many cases to organizational status and special financing that separated them from teaching programs. In some cases, however, such as at the universities of Michigan, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, the institutes or bureaus did both research and teaching, which might be an advantage in permitting more practice-oriented degree programs. Even in places where the two functions were separated, joint faculty appointments and other cooperative practices sometimes provided a bridge. In terms of both institutions represented and individuals involved, the constituencies of the emerging CGEPA and CUBGR overlapped considerably. For example, the provisional chairman of the research bureau group, Lederle of Michigan, was also on Short's planning committee; Sweeney, too, was active among the research bureaus, and, given his position at Minnesota, undoubtedly Short as well.

Another group at the 1958 ASPA conference tried to organized around an interest in technical assistance to foreign governments and overseas universities in the field of public administration. Prominent in this were representatives of universities with programs supported by the U.S. foreign aid agencies, although the group also included ASPA members who were agency officials and private consultants. This group, too,

---

<sup>27</sup> These and other events during the 1958 ASPA annual conference that will be mentioned below were reported in the ASPA Newsletter for April 1958; copy from files of Don L. Bowen.

overlapped with the graduate program directors, in such persons as Henry Reining, whose Southern California School of Public Administration was very active overseas. However, this internationally oriented group would fairly soon fade away, leaving its constituents and interests to be served to some degree by the emerging CGEPA, and later a new ASPA Committee on Comparative Administration.

At this 1958 conference, ASPA's governing body, the National Council, recognized the three enterprises just mentioned as sub-groups of ASPA and authorized its national headquarters to provide secretariat services to them. From Short's breakfast meeting and the Council's act, the founding of CGEPA therefore could be dated March 1958. However, there seems to have been a considerable tentativeness about it all. The organization around Short was still called "provisional," and the groups were given no proper names, being still referred to in the newsletter reporting the event as "the graduate program directors," and "the public administration bureau directors."

No minutes from that 1958 National Council meeting seem to have survived, and from the brief newsletter account and later recollections of participants it is unclear just what those involved understood about what was being started and where it might lead. Apparently there was at the time at least a little concern in the Council that proliferation of subgroups would lead to fragmentation of activity and weakening of attachments to ASPA itself. Nor perhaps was there greater clarity among the subgroups. Short's view seems to have been that his venture amounted to an intensification of an existing interest of ASPA, which would serve to strengthen ties of its academic members with ASPA. Tom Davy, who was in the middle of all this, recalled Short as vehement that the emerging group must be "part of ASPA," but also saying that it would be "affiliated with, but completely independent of ASPA."<sup>28</sup> Short apparently thought the new group could be both strongly affiliated and programmatically independent, which seems a bit of a stretch if it had been thought necessary to get the sanction of the Council in the first place. That idea also appears to ignore the question of staff support and resources, which would be a serious issue in the future. While the possibility of eventual spin-off of these new groups may have been recognized, the view of the ASPA leadership, according to one observer, was that if the university people were determined to have special meetings there really was no way to stop them, and it was better to sanction the activity and affirm the ASPA connection than to discourage it and risk a secession.<sup>29</sup> Initial relations with the ASPA leadership must have been smoothed by the involvement of Reining, who was ASPA president in the year ending at that 1958 conference, and of York Willbern, program director at Indiana, who at the same time became ASPA president-elect for 1959-60. Also helpful was the involvement of Don Bowen, ASPA Associate Director, who had been handling most of the relationships with its academic constituency; both then and as Executive Director after 1962, Bowen would give as much support as he could to the CGEPA group.

---

<sup>28</sup> Davy letter to Laurin L. Henry, Oct. 14, 1991. Davy wrote about these events in "A Brief History of the Conference on Graduate Education," dated 12/31/60, a memorandum issued in various versions by CGEPA in connection with its meetings. Surviving copies in Bowen's files have been helpful in this study.

<sup>29</sup> Don L. Bowen, NASPAA Oral History, Vol. 1.

## GETTING STARTED

Provisionally authorized and organized at the March 1958 ASPA annual conference, Short and his collaborators did not want to wait a whole year to get the group together again. After consulting his planning committee, he arranged for Willbern to host a meeting of program directors at Bloomington during the Christmas holidays, December 29-30. He got the attention of the people he wanted, because representatives of 23 very respectable universities and 5 other organizations showed up<sup>30</sup>--rather remarkable for that location and time of year. Invitees had been asked to provide advance information about their programs' objectives, clientele, and curricular methods, and this data was compiled and circulated--a forerunner of subsequent CGEPA annual surveys. An ambitious agenda foreshadowed most of the organization's concerns in years to come: recruitment, selection, and financing of students; teaching goals and curriculum; university roles in government training and executive development; and research in public administration. From the conference summary prepared by Davy,<sup>31</sup> the talk seems to have ranged from broad principles to gritty detail. The conclusion, almost inevitable, was that more meetings and a continuing organization were needed. The planning committee was asked to arrange a final organizing meeting at the upcoming 1959 ASPA conference.

### Organization Completed

The more-or-less formal organization was completed at a meeting during the ASPA conference in Washington, April 3, 1959. This, apparently was when the name "Conference on Graduate Education for Public Administration" became the consistent usage. Short was elected Chairman, and the provisional committee, with the addition of Don K. Price, dean of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard, and Henry Reining, from Southern California, was reconstituted as an Executive Committee. The group's tie to ASPA was affirmed with a statement that ASPA would be the secretariat for the Conference. There was an important decision about eligibility and basis of membership:

---

<sup>30</sup> Universities represented were: Alabama, American, California (Los Angeles), Colorado, Cornell, Florida, Georgia, Harvard, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Missouri, New York (City College), Ohio State, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Syracuse, Washington, Washington (St. Louis), and Wisconsin. Other participants were from the Brookings Institution, the Ford Foundation, the U. S. Office of Education, the Southern Regional Training Program, and ASPA staff. *Public Administration News* (new name for the previous *Newsletter*), Vol. IX, No. 1 (Jan. 1959); from files of Don Bowen.

<sup>31</sup> Davy reported on this conference both in his "Brief History" mentioned above and in a "General Summary of Discussion," dated March 1959. Apparently at this time the group was still groping for a name: the "Program Directors" were now a "Conference," sometimes on "Graduate Training," sometimes "Graduate Education."

It was agreed that the membership of the Conference would consist of deans and directors of college and university graduate schools, curriculums, and programs in public administration, such membership to be on an institutional basis. The group also should be open to those in universities who may not have the title of dean or director, but who are generally responsible for promoting the graduate public administration program, and others with special and long-standing interest in university preparation for public administration.<sup>32</sup>

This membership policy was of some significance. CGEPA was to be a gathering of program heads, not the general run of faculty. But in another respect it would be open and inclusive. Although leadership in organizing CGEPA had come largely from individuals with leading positions in clearly identified, designated institutions--deans of schools, heads of departments, directors of centers and institutes--the meetings from the beginning had included senior faculty members from universities where the identity of a distinct public administration program was unclear and informal. Some of these were distinguished men from important institutions, old friends of the leaders whom it was important to have aboard. Others were less visible figures, from less important places, with no administrative status and programs that could, at best, have been described as "emerging." Confirming the eligibility of the latter type considerably enlarged the potential membership of CGEPA and brought in people who were, in one sense, most in need of collegial advice and support. The involvement of both types would have the effect of diluting and slowing down the efforts of the leaders who sought to emphasize professionalism and make CGEPA an advocate for the creation and interests of separately organized schools of public administration.

### A Pattern of Meetings

The now completed organization had its next substantive meeting that autumn, September 8-9, at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Although the mailing list now included adherents at 59 universities, plus a dozen others with "special and long-standing interest" (senior statesmen and representatives of foundations and government agencies), only 28 appeared, which must have been a disappointment. Nevertheless, they worked through a meaty agenda of problems and issues: plans for a national survey of public administration education (a new topic, discussed further later), experience with overseas technical assistance, and the perennial problem of recruiting and financing students. With respect to the latter, there were expressions of alarm that

---

<sup>32</sup> This quotation and the preceding paragraph about the final organization from Davy's "Brief History. That account, written a year after the event, remains the only written record of the event. ASPA Council minutes have been lost, so we do not know what, if any, guidelines, mandates, or charter the Council issued to its sub-group; there seems to have been nothing that anyone later remembered. Neither, apparently, did CGEPA itself adopt written by-laws, instead relying on verbal statements, agreed to by consensus and recorded by Davy. Years later, a CGEPA task force preparing for the conversion to NASPAA reported that it could find nothing of the kind, and that CGEPA had never had a written charter or by-laws. Although there never seems to have been serious disagreement between CGEPA and its parent, ASPA, on programmatic matters, the vagueness of understandings would soon lead to difficulties about staffing and finances.

limited financial support was causing public administration to lose ground in the competition for high quality graduate students, and several ideas were floated about government and foundation actions that might support both pre-entry and in-service study. Perhaps because of the light attendance, this would be the last CGEPA meeting separate in time and place from the ASPA annual conference.<sup>33</sup>

The next CGEPA meeting, at Lake Arrowhead, California, April 10-11, 1960, had an impressive agenda, with sessions--some starting with prepared papers--on the relationship of research and teaching in public administration, interdisciplinary elements in public administration study, recent evaluations of business education and their implications for public administration, relationships with other graduate schools, executive development, and student recruitment.<sup>34</sup> This meeting, just prior to an ASPA annual conference in Los Angeles, established a pattern that would prevail for fifteen years. CGEPA (and later NASPAA) would meet for two or three days, either just before or just after the ASPA conference, not at the main conference site but at a more intimate hotel, inn, or conference center not far away where a group of 30 or 40 people could have intensive, informal discussions. The rule, according to Sweeney, was: "We had to eat, drink, talk, and sleep under the same roof."<sup>35</sup>

In 1961 the group changed a word in its name from "Conference" to "Council," apparently because it was felt that the former term suggested something temporary or ad hoc, while the latter implied a stable, continuing entity.<sup>36</sup> After Lake Arrowhead came spring meetings at Philadelphia in 1961, Detroit in 1962, Washington in 1963, and Ardley-on-Hudson near New York in 1964. In 1960 Short passed the chairmanship to Sweeney, who was followed by Price, then Reining, each of them serving two years. Despite ASPA's official secretariat role, service from headquarters was limited and most of the back-up work was by Davy,<sup>37</sup> who was now generally identified a "Program Secretary," apparently on the theory that the "Secretary" was somewhere in the ASPA staff. A few newcomers were added to the Executive Committee, often after an

---

<sup>33</sup> A copy of the mailing list and conference agenda dated 8/5/59 and apparently prepared at ASPA headquarters survived in Bowen's files. There also was found a rather detailed account of the conference proceedings by Donald Hayman, of the UNC Institute of Government. This is about the only record of an early CGEPA meeting in which the hand of Tom Davy is not visible.

<sup>34</sup> An agenda and thorough summary of discussion on each topic at Lake Arrowhead, prepared by Davy, was found in Bowen's files.

<sup>35</sup> NASPAA Oral History, Vol. 1

<sup>36</sup> The mailing list for 1960-61 was headed "Conference"; the one for 1961-62 said "Council." There is no surviving contemporary account of the decision to change the name. The rationale mentioned here was mentioned by Don K. Price in an interview with Joseph Robertson of the NASPAA staff, March 10, 1983; transcript from NASPAA files.

<sup>37</sup> Summaries from the 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 meetings, all by Davy, have survived in the files of Bowen and Don Stone. These reports tend to be quite full accounts of substantive discussions sometimes with prepared papers attached, but they do not record much organizational business conducted in plenary or executive committee sessions; by the later '60s, when ASPA staff was making the records, the weight of content was just the opposite.

individual had come into prominence by creation of a new school or assuming leadership at a prominent existing one. At the annual meetings special guests occasionally were invited for particular topics, but attendance basically consisted of people with program leadership responsibilities and a stable handful of others. Since attendance of alternates or additional faculty members from participating institutions was discouraged, CGEPA acquired a tinge of exclusivity and an informal tag in ASPA circles as “the deans’ club,” or sometimes “the deans’ drinking club.”<sup>38</sup>

To summarize: In a public environment that suggested growing opportunities and need for graduate public administration programs, but was not as yet providing much support for them, a few veteran leaders in the late 1950s established a rudimentary organization for continuing discussions among their peers of ways to improve and advance such programs. We turn now to some matters that would engage the attention of this group, CGEPA, in its early years.

---

<sup>38</sup> Any idea that CGEPA was mainly a social club can be dispelled by a look at the meeting summaries mentioned just above; they dealt seriously with important subjects. The “drinking club” jest was by outsiders. No doubt alcohol was consumed but not in a way that interfered with business. Several of the CGEPA leaders were notable abstainers. In one rare incident in which a university representative did show up noticeably under the influence Sweeney was outraged and had to be talked out of proposing a resolution to censure such conduct. Laurin Henry telephone interview with O. B. Conaway, Jr., September 26, 1991.

## CGEPA CHAIRMEN AND MEETINGS

1957-58	Lloyd M. Short Univ. of Minnesota (temporary)	Philadelphia PA June 15, 1957 (organization proposed)  New York, NY March 24, 1958 (provisional organization)
1958-59	Lloyd M. Short (temporary)	Bloomington, IN Dec. 29-30, 1958  Washington, DC April 3, 1959 (organization completed)
1959-60	Lloyd M. Short	Chapel Hill, NC Sept. 8-9, 1959  Lake Arrowhead, CA April 10-11, 1960
1960-61	Stephen B. Sweeney Univ. of Pa.	Philadelphia, PA April 3-5, 1961
1961-62	Stephen B. Sweeney	Detroit, MI April 9-11, 1962
1962-63	Don K. Price Harvard University	Washington, DC April 1-3, 1963
1963-64	Don K. Price	Ardsley-on-Hudson, NY April 13-16, 1964
1964-65	Henry Reining, Jr. Univ. of S. Calif.	Excelsior Spr., MO April 9-11, 1965
1965-66	Henry Reining, Jr.	College Park, MD April 11-13, 1966
1966-67	Ferrel Heady Univ. of Michigan	Berkeley, CA March 30-April 1, 1967
1967-68	O. B. Conaway, Jr. SUNY-Albany	Cambridge, MA March 25-27, 1968
1968-69	Brewster C. Denny Univ. of Washington	Ft. Lauderdale, FL May 17-19, 1969
1969-70	Donald C. Stone Univ. of Pittsburgh	Princeton, NJ April 4-6, 1970 (CGEPA becomes NASPAA)

## CGEPA CHAIRMEN AND MEETINGS

1957-58	Lloyd M. Short Univ. of Minnesota (temporary)	Philadelphia PA June 15, 1957 (organization proposed)  New York, NY March 24, 1958 (provisional organization)
1958-59	Lloyd M. Short (temporary)	Bloomington, IN Dec. 29-30, 1958  Washington, DC April 3, 1959 (organization completed)
1959-60	Lloyd M. Short	Chapel Hill, NC Sept. 8-9, 1959  Lake Arrowhead, CA April 10-11, 1960
1960-61	Stephen B. Sweeney Univ. of Pa.	Philadelphia, PA April 3-5, 1961
1961-62	Stephen B. Sweeney	Detroit, MI April 9-11, 1962
1962-63	Don K. Price Harvard University	Washington, DC April 1-3, 1963
1963-64	Don K. Price	Ardsley-on-Hudson, NY April 13-16, 1964
1964-65	Henry Reining, Jr. Univ. of S. Calif.	Excelsior Spr., MO April 9-11, 1965
1965-66	Henry Reining, Jr.	College Park, MD April 11-13, 1966
1966-67	Ferrel Heady Univ. of Michigan	Berkeley, CA March 30-April 1, 1967
1967-68	O. B. Conaway, Jr. SUNY-Albany	Cambridge, MA March 25-27, 1968
1968-69	Brewster C. Denny Univ. of Washington	Ft. Lauderdale, FL May 17-19, 1969
1969-70	Donald C. Stone Univ. of Pittsburgh	Princeton, NJ April 4-6, 1970 (CGEPA becomes NASPAA)

## Chapter Two

### EARLY CGEPA YEARS

This chapter will treat several aspects of the history of the Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration (CGEPA) in the early years after its founding in 1958-59. One part shows CGEPA's leaders in action, cooperating with federal officials in a project that established a benchmark of knowledge about the universe of university public administration programs that CGEPA sought to represent. Another section explores developments in a dimension of federal policy that directly involved some of CGEPA's members and was of high interest to the rest. And a third shows the state of CGEPA's relations with its parent organization, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) and other satellites thereof.

### SURVEYING THE FIELD

Throughout the period covered in this study, public administration leaders tried in various ways for broad, objective, authoritative studies of education in their field. Two rather different kinds of study were sought.

All agreed on the need for something like a census of the field: basic data on the number and distribution of relevant educational programs, faculty members, students, degrees awarded, and so forth, periodically updated if possible. The 1952-53 survey (mentioned in the previous chapter) had been limited in scope and by the end of the decade was thought to be outdated. Because of the problems of academic structure and definition already noted, existing national educational statistics provided what people in the field considered inadequate and misleading data, and they looked for surveys of the field as *they* would define it.

Beyond the desire for satisfactory numbers was a repeated effort to secure a different kind of study, what might be termed a qualitative assessment: an authoritative examination of the field's intellectual properties, substantive scope, instructional methods, place in higher education, and potential contribution to the nation's needs. There was a persistent belief among public administration academics that the existing condition and future importance of the field had been underestimated, and that an appropriately grounded, truly adequate examination would reveal this in the right places, resulting in a sweet rain of recognition and resources upon the worthy.

As CGEPA was being born, its leaders became involved in an effort to launch a study that might combine both quantitative and qualitative elements. They did not get what they proposed, but the outcome was a survey that provided the essential basic data and at least raised, if it did not answer, some broader questions about the field. How this came about takes us into the complexity of CGEPA's relations with philanthropic foundations, the federal government, and its parent organization, ASPA.

### ASPA Seeks A Survey

The impulse to survey was strong in the years just prior to CGEPA's founding, leading to such already described enterprises as the Fels Institute study and the questionnaire to its own members and others by the ASPA Committee on Education and Training. But the ASPA committee at the beginning had larger things in mind. In 1957, shortly after the committee's establishment, ASPA went to the Ford Foundation, which was then funding some of ASPA's general operations, with a request for special funds for an ambitious, comprehensive study of public administration education under the committee's auspices.<sup>1</sup> As described in 1959, ASPA's plan called for an 18-month project headed by John D. Millett, president of Miami University of Ohio, who was by then chairman of the committee, with the aid of a subcommittee consisting of Lloyd Short, Harlan Cleveland, Don Price, Henry Reining, Donald Stone, and Stephen Sweeney (all characters met in the previous chapter as founders of CGEPA). A distinguished academic, tentatively York Willbern, would direct the study from ASPA headquarters.<sup>2</sup> Although broad in its scope and declaring an intention to seek outside opinion, an assessment of the field under such leadership would have been essentially a self-study, its outcome subject to the questioning that might arise because of that sponsorship. Evidently Ford showed interest but refused to be rushed, and discussions continued intermittently for two or three years. The foundation did not in the end fund the project, perhaps a reflection less of its merits than of ASPA's general relations with Ford at the time.<sup>3</sup>

More or less simultaneously with its negotiations with Ford, the ASPA-CGEPA leaders had engaged in discussions with officials of the U. S. Office of Education (OE), a bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. OE's historic mission was to collect and disseminate information on all aspects of education (although it would become increasingly important as a distributor of federal funds in the ensuing decades). The same ASPA conference in the spring of 1959 that saw the official organization of CGEPA was also the occasion for a meeting of its leaders with officials of OE about how the agency might fulfill its mission with respect to public administration--a field in

---

<sup>1</sup> "Status Report: Projected Survey of Public Administration Education," a memo by Robert J. M. Matteson, ASPA Executive Director, September 1959, evidently for the ASPA Council. From files of Don L. Bowen.

<sup>2</sup> The plan was described in the Status Report cited above. Note that except for Millett, the steering committee was identical with the leadership of CGEPA, which had been organized earlier that year, but presumably because CGEPA was still in an infant state, and the scheme had originated in the Committee on Education and Training, the project remained officially under the Committee's auspices.

<sup>3</sup> ASPA had been receiving general support from Ford for several years, but by 1959 was more or less on probation with the foundation. In 1958, unsatisfied with the progress ASPA was making toward financial self-sufficiency, Ford had refused to advance the schedule of disbursements under an earlier general support grant, precipitating a period of financial crisis for ASPA. In 1959 Ford presumably was not disposed to fund any new ASPA ventures until ASPA got its leadership situation straightened out, which did not occur until around 1961-62, with the departure of Matteson and elevation of Don Bowen to the Executive Directorship. Darrell Pugh, Looking Back, Moving Forward: A Half-Century Celebration of Public Administration (ASP, 1988), pp. 49-51.

which it had not done much theretofore. The key person at OE was Ward Stewart, a career officer whose interest and sympathy with the aspirations of the CGEPA people were perhaps explained by his political science PhD from the University of Chicago.<sup>4</sup> ASPA's initial idea was to secure some kind of OE support or participation in its own study, to supplement financing from Ford. But by late 1959 or early 1960 the unavailability of foundation money had become clear, and the plan took a new form, in which OE assumed primary responsibility for conducting a survey, with endorsement and advice from ASPA. Proceeding in that way, the project led to an important OE report under Stewart's authorship, published in 1961. ASPA's co-sponsorship was indicated by the report's preface, over Millett's signature, and by inclusion of ASPA's letter to the universities requesting their cooperation and response to OE's questionnaire. Members of the ASPA subcommittee (essentially the CGEPA leadership, plus Bowen) were listed as a Consultant Group to OE.<sup>5</sup>

### The OE-Stewart Report

The Stewart report was quite comprehensive, providing a good view of the field at the beginning of the CGEPA period. The OE survey had asked all U.S. universities to identify and provide data on graduate programs "in which Public Administration is recognized in the title of the degree or as the major area of concentration." The returns yielded both national summary data and a directory of individual programs, for each of which there was information about enrollments, type of degree awarded, admission and degree requirements, program goals and curricular emphasis, and organizational status in the university.

The report was especially valuable for its discussion of the history, development, current status, and recent trends in the field. An important trend noted was clarification of the concept of the Master of Public Administration as a professional degree and its increasing use as an alternative or replacement of the traditional Master of Arts by programs aiming to prepare or advance students in public service careers. Also noted was the recent appearance of several doctoral programs specifically in public administration, and in such programs an emerging distinction between the goals and character of the Ph.D. and the Doctor of Public Administration degree that was being awarded at a few institutions--the latter conceived as an advanced professional degree for practitioners, as distinguished from the research and teaching orientation of the Ph.D. Other trends included an increasing number of programs interested in

---

<sup>4</sup> When Stewart was in graduate school, just prior to WWII, Chicago was one of the nation's two or three leading institutions in public administration, due to the interest of its longtime political science chairman, Charles E. Merriam, and especially to professor Leonard D. White, an early president of ASPA and author of what was for many years the leading textbook. White had retired just prior to the movement to establish CGEPA, and thereafter no one at Chicago would be interested enough in public administration of a professionally oriented sort to participate in CGEPA or early NASPAA.

<sup>5</sup> Ward Stewart, Graduate Study in Public Administration; U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Circular No. 631 (Government Printing Office, 1961).

international administration and economic development, resulting from universities' involvement in advisory missions abroad; affirmation of a multidisciplinary social science conceptual base; erosion of the old policy/administration distinction and a more direct interest in public policy, especially urban or metropolitan problems; and introduction of electronic data processing. Illustrating some of these trends, the report described in some detail several recently established graduate programs and their varying curricular emphases and organizational settings.

This part of the report closed by identifying several important unsettled issues, the first of which was the optimal organizational form or status for the public administration program in the university structure. Perhaps befitting an official government paper, the report ventured no specific recommendation on this or other controversial issues, but its discussion of trends, developments, and issues was comprehensive and well-informed, an important contribution to thinking about the field.

In its mustering of basic data, the Stewart report provided an updated useful picture but was not totally successful in fixing the field's dimension in quantitative terms. In its discussion of new programs, especially those awarding the MPA, the report confirmed the impression that public administration, as of 1960, was a growing enterprise. Unfortunately, although the OE questionnaire had asked for specific numbers of enrollments and degrees awarded, the returns apparently were not complete or consistent enough to provide a base for detailed historical tables or unqualified summary statements, so that it is not possible to gauge precisely the growth of the field since the 1953 survey reported by Martin.<sup>6</sup> As to the number of universities with graduate public administration programs, Stewart produced smaller numbers than Martin had; the totals now were 83 universities and 96 master's programs, as compared to 105 and 120, respectively, in 1952-53. This was almost certainly a result of the survey method and a tighter definition of a public administration degree rather than an indication of actual shrinkage of the field. One comparison on which precision is possible is the number of MPA programs, of which there were now 21, as compared to 13 in the earlier survey. Actual growth also is indicated, if not proven, by Stewart's summary data on students. But, to confound the comparison, Stewart reported enrollments, where Martin had reported degrees awarded. (Although Stewart had asked about degree production, this apparently was an area where the returns did not justify a specific statement.) Thus Martin had reported 256 master's degrees of all kinds in 1952-53, and Stewart now estimated 2,300 to 2,500 students in all master's programs in 1959-60, with 1,125 in MPA programs alone. The ratio of graduations to enrollments must be conjectural, especially since the newer enrollment numbers did not distinguish full-time and part-time students, but it is reasonable to conclude that both enrollments and degrees awarded must have at least doubled, and perhaps trebled, since 1953.

---

<sup>6</sup> Academic administrators who have struggled with such questionnaires will understand the incomplete responses: Stewart had asked for numbers of doctoral, master's, and non-degree students, divided by full- and part-time enrollees, by year, back to 1939-40, and degrees awarded back to 1935-36. Even a sympathetic bureaucrat apparently did not understand how difficult it would be to produce such numbers.

Stewart presented his report at the 1961 ASPA conference, leading to a long discussion of the data and its implications, and stimulating an appetite for such surveys on a regular basis. For several years thereafter, Stewart attended CGEPA meetings, kept in touch with ASPA and CGEPA leaders, and produced from OE a series of newsletters entitled Business And Public Administration Notes. But he was never able to replicate the 1960 survey or keep its data current, and BPA Notes would fall victim to changing OE priorities in 1965. After that, CGEPA would have to look to its own resources for basic data about its constituency.

### FEDERAL TRAINING AND THE UNIVERSITIES

Government policies and practices obviously affected university public administration programs in many ways. The need for the program leaders to keep informed and if possible influence those policies in accord with the universities' interest was a major concern of CGEPA. Individual universities had various relationships with state and local government in their own areas, but their common interest was in the federal government, which was of paramount importance overall and the focus of CGEPA's external attention. Several aspects of federal policy were relevant. One, of course, was the federal role in collecting and disseminating information, as in the OE-Stewart project just described. As teachers and advisers of youth who might enter government service, university people were interested in government recruiting, examining, and hiring practices, but that was a fairly stable sector of federal policy in the 1960s and did not get much attention from CGEPA. For a long time, occasional suggestions had been made that the federal government should subsidize the study of public administration, either by direct aid to students or by financing the development and operation of university programs for that purpose, but such ideas were still in the realm of vague hopes at the time CGEPA was formed; only in the mid-60s, when the Great Society had awakened both university and government leaders to new possibilities, did such proposals reach the active policy agenda. We discuss here an aspect of federal personnel policy that was in active development throughout the CGEPA years: employee training. From the university viewpoint, this is a story of possibilities sensed but never fully appreciated or strongly reached for, and ultimately largely unrealized as government policies evolved in a way that foreclosed early possibilities and left only a minor role to the universities.

Historically, of course, the university public administration programs' main contribution to the public service was in their basic function of offering academic instruction leading to degrees, usually to younger, full-time students who would later enter government employment. Undertaken at the students' initiative and expense, in the training jargon this was referred to as "pre-entry" education. This was distinguished from "post-entry" or "in-service" training provided by government agencies to their employees, usually courses of short duration to impart knowledge and skills of particular relevance to agency missions.

By the 1950s, the distinctions between pre- and post-entry, education and training, had become blurred. Although most of the CGEPA programs had been founded to serve full-time and generally younger pre-entry students, and still bore the marks of that history, many of them had begun to offer courses and degree programs to persons already employed, through part-time study and evening or weekend classes. Prejudice against night school education, and traditional graduate school requirements of full-time residential study, lingered in some places, but part-time study in public administration was increasingly common. This was especially so in the large urban institutions, some of which took the further step of offering courses in off-campus locations convenient for working students.<sup>7</sup> By 1961, part-time students, although concentrated at a relatively small number of universities, almost certainly outnumbered full-timers in any national headcount of public administration graduate students. The distinction between education and training was further blurred when some government agencies encouraged their employees in part-time study by offering rooms in their buildings for university classes, or by releasing employees from work to attend classes, or in some cases by subsidizing tuition costs.

Useful as academic education might be to the individuals who received it, and perhaps to the government in the long run, it did not meet the frequent need of agencies to have their employees trained on particular subjects pertaining to the agencies' missions. Some agencies provided most of their own training, others looked to outside providers, including universities. Some universities had offered such training for many years, often through bureaus or institutes dedicated to the needs of their states. Federal patronage of such programs increased, as did university interest in providing them, after the Training Act of 1958.

### Executive Development

University interest was further stimulated by a new emphasis in the field of training that arose in the 1950s: executive development. This ill-defined concept comprehended a variety of measures intended to broaden perspectives and develop leadership and general management capabilities in persons arriving at (or aspiring to) the higher level positions, often from backgrounds of specialized or technical education and work experience. Among devotees there was optimistic, almost romantic, belief in the possibility of transforming individual attitudes, capabilities, and perhaps even personalities through appropriately planned development experiences. Methods might include anything from solo reading and travel to intense group interactive experience and self-analysis under the guidance of counselors, but some kind and amount of higher education experience was a common element. Executive development programs proliferated through the worlds of business, government, and education. The earliest such programs were mainly for business executives, frequently conducted by university schools of business administration; governments and the parts of universities oriented to them began to catch on in the later 1950s.

---

<sup>7</sup> The University of Southern California School of Public Administration was notable and perhaps the earliest in such practices, offering classes in the Los Angeles Civic Center as early as the 1930s.

The universities obviously had much to offer and might even be indispensable in public executive development, but just how their resources could best be used was not clear. Executive development seemed to lie in a middle ground between narrowly conceived training and traditional academic instruction. Public administration program leaders, including some that disdained old-fashioned training, were attracted to executive development by the breadth of its goals, the organizational level of its participants, and the possibility of a new source of students and income. They remained concerned, however, about maintaining at least the perception of appropriate academic values and standards in any special programs they might undertake. To government officials sponsoring such programs, however, the universities--especially those of highest academic repute and therefore most sought-after--often seemed difficult to deal with, uninformed or indifferent to governmental needs, and reluctant to modify accustomed routines to serve this new clientele. Government training officers could cite frustrating experiences with university contractual red tape, the inflexible academic calendar, casual departure from agreed-on programs, and professors who turned up unprepared or gave canned lectures oblivious to the needs of their audiences, or talked down to government people of important rank and experience. In general, the university public administration or public affairs programs that had achieved professional school or other autonomous status were more flexible and open to governmental needs than those still located in academic departments.

### ASPA's Experience

Many leading public administration professors became involved in executive development through ASPA, which between 1957 and 1961 organized 13 Management Institutes, put on in various parts of the country for senior officials from all levels of government. These programs of several days' duration used ad hoc faculties assembled from diverse sources, chosen for their individual talents and retained directly by ASPA. This was mainly pre-CGEPA, but many of the faculty participants in these institutes came from what would soon be CGEPA institutions--some, indeed, were CGEPA leaders. The experience served to strengthen relations between ASPA and the "CGEPA types," and probably encouraged some of them to try to offer such programs on their home campuses. The experience also, however, demonstrated the feasibility of providing a presumably university-level experience outside a university setting, using faculties individually recruited for the immediate purpose, as an alternative to putting entire programs in the hands of a single institution and its faculty, and having to deal contractually with its administration. The lesson would not be lost on federal officials as they thought about expanded training systems of the future. Nor would it be lost on individual faculty members who enjoyed the travel and outside income from such ventures without having to bother with administrative arrangements or the restraints of working through their home institutions.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> For information about the ASPA Management Institutes I am obliged to Don L. Bowen, who as an ASPA staff member was mainly responsible for organizing them.

CGEPA discussed executive development at several of its early meetings, and a variety of programs under that rubric began to appear at the public administration schools. Some offered executive development short courses and seminars, more or less in emulation of the business schools. Others expanded and increased flexibility in their part-time degree programs, in some cases opening off-campus centers considerable distance from the home institutions. A few others, most notably Harvard, intensified long-standing efforts to recruit government officials on leave for a year or more of full-time study that might--or might not--lead to a degree

### Federal Possibilities And Problems

The earliest university executive development programs for government officials seem to have been state and local oriented, or if they involved federal officials were fragmented arrangements on a regional or client agency basis. In the late 1950s, however, prompted by the Second Hoover Commission and the Training Act, federal interest in expanding and developing a government-wide approach to executive development grew rapidly. Analysis of long-term needs and how to meet them began at the Civil Service Commission under the chairmanship of Roger Jones (1959-61) and intensified with the friendly take-over of that office by John Macy at the outset of the Kennedy administration.

Given Macy's background of long involvement with ASPA, it was not surprising that when he set out to plan expansion of high-level training he turned first to the university public affairs programs rather than the better-established executive development enterprises of the business schools. Under his leadership in November, 1961, the Civil Service Commission convened at Princeton University a federal agency-university conference on career development. CGEPA was not officially involved, but several of its leaders were, and the discussions (preceded by thoughtful working papers) revolved around a topic familiar from CGEPA's meetings: federal needs and possible programs for executive development, and the part that universities might play in those programs. Many ideas that would later be adopted were touched upon, including agency executive workforce planning, career development plans for individual officials, university programs of several kinds, inter-agency management training programs, sabbaticals at universities for senior officials, a summit training or development institution for high

careerists, and arrangements for temporary tours in government for university faculty members.<sup>9</sup>

Especially notable at Princeton and in other discussion of the period was the mutual interest of government and university people in on-campus programs of substantial length for employees at mid-career, when the most promising of them were ready to emerge from specialized functions into broader management and policy-influencing roles. From the government perspective, the idea of “executive education” as distinguished from “training” provided a rationale for looking to universities rather than in-house training resources. For the schools, carefully selected and fully financed federal employees sent for “education” could be welcome additions to their student bodies--especially if their instruction could occur in regular graduate courses.

Tempering the optimism on both sides were questions both practical and philosophical. What kinds of employees, at what career stage, would most benefit from a university experience? Would the employees the government wished to sponsor be capable of university graduate work? Would regular course work meet the needs of the federal students, or would special courses and curricula have to be devised for them? If the latter, how flexible and adaptable would the universities be? Would the presence of government-sponsored students, and any adaptations required to serve them, result in diluting the quality of instruction or diverting universities from their basic mission? How could government selection of participants in such programs be reconciled with the rigamarole of university application and admission processes?

The record of the Princeton conference suggests that although exploration and expansion of university programs for federal employees was clearly favored, questions such as those above created a prevailing sense of limits--a caution about expecting too much from the government-university relationship. In the working papers, the conceptual distinction between training and education was insisted upon, the former considered the proper function of government agencies, the latter of the universities. Universities were warned that the basic responsibility for executive development must rest with the government, and the university role had to be complementary. The government was warned that universities could not sacrifice standards or alter their methods too much to accommodate its needs. Such ideas may have been discouraging to some who hoped to see executive development become an important new role for

---

<sup>9</sup> On the conference, see U.S. Civil Service Commission, University-Federal Agency Conference on Career Development, Princeton University, November 2-4, 1961. This report and separate volumes of working papers were found in the library of the Office of Personnel Management (successor to the Civil Service Commission). Essentially the same agenda was worked through at a repeat conference for the west coast at Berkeley, May 4-5, 1962.

The time and place of the Princeton conference was significant, as it coincided with a re-thinking and expansion of that university's public affairs programs resulting from a recent \$35 million benefaction. The new Princeton program would include a new building for the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, a strengthened MPA program, a doctoral program for senior government officials, and an experiment with a one-year residential program for mid-career officers.

university public affairs programs. They may, indeed, have come from the more conservative elements on both sides, but they seem to have been accepted as realistic, foreshadowing the distinctly limited government-university relationship that would eventually emerge.

Aside from such speculative considerations, there was an important reality barring any immediate federal initiative for a government-wide program to send large numbers of employees to universities. Those primarily responsible for federal policy in such matters--Macy and his colleagues at the Civil Service Commission--had neither money to finance nor authority to mandate any such thing. Decisions about sending employees for development, and the money to pay for it, rested with each agency, and the Commission could only encourage and advise. After generations of caution and penury, the Commission felt unable to ask--probably never even thought of asking--for appropriations to support training programs that it could offer without the constraints of agency willingness to pay. Sending promising employees for a development year at a university sounded fine in theory, but in the crunch would agencies really let their good people go for that long and bear the expense, which would be substantial if the government undertook to bear the full cost.

### The NIPA Experiment

Aware of both interest and caution, on both the university and the government sides, as well of his own limited authority, Macy displayed creativity by stepping outside his official role to arrange an experiment to test the feasibility of long-term university training, using a program managed and partially financed by a non-government entity. With encouragement and support from the public affairs establishment described in the previous chapter, he persuaded the Ford Foundation (the source of most good things in the realm of public affairs in that era) to put up money for several years of an experimental program. To receive the funds and operate the program, he dusted off the National Institute of Public Affairs (NIPA), a non-profit organization that once operated a prestigious Washington internship program for college graduates but had been dormant since World War II.<sup>10</sup> The reconstituted NIPA board appointed as executive director the recently retired head of the Forest Service, Dr. Richard McArdle, thinking

---

<sup>10</sup> A good many people prominent in governmental circles, including Macy himself, had originally come to Washington as NIPA fellows. With the death of its principal benefactor, Frederick Davenport, and better official programs for recruiting college graduates than had existed back in the 1930s, NIPA had become inactive. However, its chairman at the time of winding down, that Mr. Everything in public administration, Louis Brownlow, had kept its charter as a DC non-profit corporation alive, "just in case," and when this new opportunity arose, Brownlow created a new board consisting of Macy and friends and stepped aside.

My knowledge of the background and establishment of the NIPA program comes from my participation as secretary of the Conference on the Public Service (described in the previous chapter), where the plans were hatched, as well as a personal association with Brownlow. The following account of the program as it operated and evolved over the years is based on my involvement with it at the University of Virginia, where I joined the faculty in 1964. There I was closely associated with Herbert Emmerich, who established the program there in 1963. After Emmerich's retirement in 1967 I served as director of the Virginia NIPA program and its successors until I left UVA in 1978.

that a respected career bureau chief would be effective in persuading federal agencies to participate and put up their best people, which was seen as key to the success of the program.<sup>11</sup>

The program provided an academic year of graduate public affairs study for 60-75 federal employees each year, distributed among a select group of universities that agreed with NIPA to provide appropriate programs for this clientele. NIPA chose the universities with a view to academic quality and prestige, after negotiations to establish the nature of the program each would provide; in some cases NIPA agreed to provide subsidies for start-up costs. The several university programs varied considerably, reflecting the characteristic environment, facilities, and faculty interests and resources at each institution, but the common idea was a broad approach to public affairs in an academically rich setting, avoiding anything suggesting administrative trade school. Fellows were generally discouraged from undertaking degree programs because that would tend to unduly channel their studies; they were encouraged to explore the full resources of the university, in balanced individual programs chosen to reflect personal interests and promote intellectual growth. The preponderance of courses taken might be vaguely government or policy oriented, but dabbles in things like anthropology or art history were not uncommon.

NIPA invited agencies<sup>12</sup> to nominate promising employees who were considered “mid-career,” which produced, on average, persons about 35 years old with 10 years of service--presumably a point at which superior talent could be identified and given a push toward the highest career positions. Nominating agencies had to agree to pay all educational costs,<sup>13</sup> plus relocation expenses, and to carry their nominees on full salary during the time of study. NIPA screened nominees, chose the winners, and, in the early years, provided a small cash award to each one. NIPA then assigned the NIPA fellows

---

<sup>11</sup> After a couple of years McArdle retired and was succeeded by Carl F. Stover, a one-time young fed who had been involved in establishing the Brookings experimental executive education program and most recently had established the NIPA program at his alma mater, Stanford. At NIPA Stover provided ambitious, expansionary leadership for the remainder of the 1960s, advocating a broad intellectually challenging approach and encouraging the NIPA fellows to think of themselves as the governmental elite of the future.

<sup>12</sup> The NIPA program was open to all levels of government, but the actual participation was almost entirely federal. A few state employees were brought in through special recruiting and subsidy by NIPA, but NIPA had no effective way to reach broadly to the states, and state governments at this time were not accustomed to making the heavy investments in individuals that this program required. As far as is known, there were never any local government participants. In the later 1960s NIPA tried to devise a program variation that might appeal to state and local government, but by this time NIPA was running out of its line of credit with Ford and it was never implemented.

<sup>13</sup> These could be substantial because NIPA permitted the participating universities to charge the sponsoring agencies an educational fee that covered the regular graduate tuition plus other special expenses of operating the program. This ability to recover something like the full costs of the education helped to make the program attractive to participating universities.

to one of the participating universities.<sup>14</sup> Although Macy was clearly the power behind it all, the Civil Service Commission's role was merely to bless the enterprise and encourage the agencies to make suitable nominees.

The first NIPA fellows arrived at the participating universities for the 1963-64 academic year, and at most of them the program was a quick success. The year-long residential commitment and ability to use existing courses made it relatively easy to fit the fellows into ongoing operations, and the institutions quickly accommodated to the slightly irregular admission process and the need to provide some degree of special attention to the fellows.<sup>15</sup> With rare exceptions, the fellows proved satisfactory--and in many cases outstanding--graduate students. Under the Commission's prodding, the agencies in the early years maintained a reasonable supply of nominees, although there was always a suspicion that some agencies held back their fastest fliers because they could not be spared for a year. Costs were a gradually rising concern. Reservations about the program were mostly on the government side. Hearing good reports from the institutions that had been chosen by NIPA, other CGEPA programs hoped to see expansion that would provide federally supported fellows to them, too.

### Executive Seminar Centers

Given the apparent success of the NIPA program, one might have expected that that experimental model would be taken up and developed into a large, continuing government program. But Macy was not committing to that course.

Almost simultaneously with the NIPA experiment, Macy and associates at the Civil Service Commission launched an enterprise with a similar purpose and clientele but inside the government. In 1963, the Commission opened an Executive Seminar Center (ESC), a residential program housed at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at King's Point, Long Island. (The Center used Academy classroom and dormitory space, and its students ate in the mess hall, but there was no academic connection.) Designed to work within the limits of Commission authority and finances, the ESC was an inter-agency program on a reimbursable basis, depending on the more or less voluntary patronage and payment of fees by federal agencies to cover the costs. It was, in its way, a bold

---

<sup>14</sup> The institutions chosen to start the program in 1963 were Chicago, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, and Virginia. In the next few years, Cornell, Indiana, Southern California, and the University of Washington were added, but Chicago and Stanford withdrew. This experience indicated that despite the preference for a broad, liberal arts environment, the program was mostly likely to survive and flourish at universities where responsibility for it rested in a school of public affairs or similar entity with a serious stake in its success.

<sup>15</sup> The niceties of university control of its admissions were preserved by a process in which NIPA nominated fellows, which the university in theory could reject, although in practice this rarely if ever occurred. A typical arrangement was that the university provided one special course or seminar that served as a "home room" for the mid-career group, and they enrolled in regular classes for the remainder of their programs. Some institutions also provided study rooms or other special physical facilities, and such things as ample counseling from a program director, field trips, and guest lecturers were common.

move. The CSC had been offering reimbursable training for some time, but its previous ventures were occasionally offered brief courses entailing little risk. Leasing a facility and assembling a full-time staff for a program intended to operate year-round, and depending on agency participation to keep the classes full enough to recover the committed costs, was a quite different matter.

Like NIPA, the ESC program sought to broaden knowledge and perspectives, enhance motivation, and establish a mind-set toward higher responsibilities in mid-level federal employees who had been identified by their agencies as having potential and nearing readiness to rise.<sup>16</sup> But there were major differences. NIPA required commitment of the individual and the agency for a full academic year, which often entailed permanent separation from a previous position, a reassignment and frequently a geographic relocation upon return, and in such cases the complication and expense of at least one and sometimes two residential moves for participants. The ESC program consisted of a cycle of ten different two-week seminars, which individuals were not expected to take consecutively, but from which they could pick and choose and take them one by one at different times convenient to themselves and their agencies. Long absences from work, job reassignments, and household moves were thereby avoided. There was a difference in program content as well. Instead of NIPA's preference for broadening by viewing public affairs from an academic perspective, accompanied by substantial doses of liberal arts, the ESC seminars were focused more directly on government policies, operations, and problems in specified areas, some having to do with general management and policy making, others covering various fields of public policy, such as national security or natural resources. Although it was envisioned that promising employees might over time take all or most of the ten seminars (perhaps skipping those that duplicated prior training and experience or were clearly irrelevant to the individual's probable future responsibilities), it was not necessary to commit to the whole series or to take the separate courses in any particular order. Assuming rather intense instruction at a level comparable to university courses, someone who completed all or most of the cycle might be said to have the equivalent of somewhere between a semester and a year of graduate school.

Comparison to graduate school was not altogether fanciful. The on-site CSC staff who provided coordination and did some of the teaching were mostly people with conventional academic credentials and experience. Also, the programs depended heavily on lecturers brought in for a day or two at a time; some of these were government officials of distinction and relevant expertise, but many were university faculty members sought for their specialization in the topics at hand. Visiting lecturers who had demonstrated capacity to communicate with this kind of audience were often used repeatedly. The ESC announced its intent to operate at a level to merit respect and

---

<sup>16</sup> This discussion of the ESC program is based largely on information acquired in personal acquaintance with most of the CSC officers involved in its early years, as well as my occasional visits to King's Point in the 1960s and '70s as a visiting lecturer. My memories were refreshed and in some respects corrected by an interview, Nov. 12, 1992, with J. Kenneth Mulligan, who was the CSC chief of training in that period. I also benefitted from access to an evaluation document, "A Study of OPM's Executive Seminar Centers," by Edward F. Preston, a consultant to the OPM in 1990, and an interview with Preston, Dec. 3, 1992.

cultivate relationships with the academic world. The relationships, of course, would be on the ESC's terms and with the individual lecturers, without involvement of their institutions.

The Civil Service Commission's gamble on the viability of the ESC paid off, and the program proved attractive enough to agencies and participants to keep the classes adequately filled. The two-week seminars, with about 30 participants in each, gave opportunity to provide a developmental experience each year to several times as many employees as were reached through the NIPA program. This had appeal to agencies that generally liked to spread training experiences around rather than concentrating them on a chosen few. Ideally, large investments in a small number of individuals, as the NIPA program required, implied a discipline of careful selection and career and succession planning that few agencies were capable of.

With the success of King's Point, the CSC was soon thinking of additional ESCs to serve distant regions of the country. Nevertheless, the need to attract a steady stream of patronage to support the ESC staff and other sunk expenses weighed considerably on the CSC's training division, and in effect put it into competition for executive development business with NIPA and other university offerings.

### Optimism And Portentous Cautions

With the NIPA program well launched and the Executive Seminar Center started, the Civil Service Commission, in January, 1964, assembled a two-day conference, composed mainly of federal officials plus a few selected academics, on "The Role of Universities in Career Development." The evident purpose was to generate government-wide enthusiasm for such programs at levels where it would count, because the invited officials were not agency training officers but people at the sub-cabinet and bureau chief levels, whose decisions presumably would determine agency training strategies. The conference report reflected enthusiasm in several consensus recommendations. Agencies should give more attention to career development and build expectations for a university experience into the career plans of many individuals. The CSC should look for ways to increase the number and relevance of available university programs, including expansion of institutions participating in NIPA. The conference reviewed the early experience at King's Point and recommended that the CSC explore ways to increase academic involvement, possibly by intensifying the relationship between chosen visiting professors and particular ESC classes, or by farming out pieces of the program to be developed and offered at King's Point and possibly other centers to universities (presumably as an institutional undertaking rather than a private activity of individual professors). Consideration should be given to seeking direct university sponsorship of future ESCs. The conferees took favorable note of the growing number of educational centers on military and other government bases, where universities were welcomed to offer after-hours classes to employees. Finally, there was a rather ambiguous reference to the possibility of stabilizing long-term relationships between

agencies and universities on something like the Department of Agriculture-Land Grant College model.<sup>17</sup>

All this would be highly encouraging to CGEPA people hoping to carve out important roles in federal training. However, reading the conference report with benefit of hindsight, it appears that the recommendations reflected considerably more enthusiasm about the universities among the political level executives than was felt by the staff types that would have to implement the recommendations. The working papers by CSC staff were on balance positive, but they included a number of cautionary notes about the universities' capacity to deliver what the government needed. One staff paper noted that some university people had "cast a quizzical eye" on King's Point's attempt to cover a subject like "The Administration of Public Policy" in a two-week seminar--but then turned the criticism back on the universities: "The fact that courses similar to the King's Point design were not available in the academic world suggests a need to keep the universities better informed of the training and educational demands of the Federal service, so that they might more vigorously examine their traditional role in educational research and innovative curriculum design."<sup>18</sup> Another paper recognized the "rich and varied resources" of the universities, but said that the problem was for the government to make suitable use of them "within the strictures of budgetary limitations, without disrupting the central tasks and purposes of the university and without sapping the vitality of in-house training activities."<sup>19</sup> These ideas, including pious concern for protecting the universities' essential functions, and bottom-line interest in the CSC's own training activities, would be heard repeatedly in years to come and be highly influential in limiting the role of public administration schools in federal training.

In historical perspective, it is perhaps regrettable that CGEPA never seriously undertook to rebut or encourage its members to fashion appropriate responses to such challenges.

### ASPA FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

CGEPA was a sub-group of ASPA, established by authorization of its national council and listed on its letterhead along with the standing committees and other satellites. Recognition by the ASPA council presumably entailed some degree of accountability to it, but the governance seems to have been intermittent and light-handed, if perceptible

---

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Civil Service Commission, "The Role of Universities in Career Development," Report of a Conference, Washington, D. C., January 24-25, 1964. Although the conference dealt mainly with preparing people for leadership and general administration, there was also some discussion of need to broaden and update the technical knowledge of persons coming up through science and engineering professions for advanced responsibilities in those fields. The land grant college analogy may have been in that context. However, as will be seen later in this study, such a relationship between the government and public administration schools would be proposed a few years later.

<sup>18</sup> Conference report cited above, pp. 52-53.

<sup>19</sup> Conference report, pp. 36-37.

at all. As CGEPA became more active, two issues arose in its ASPA relationships. The first, which was only a minor irritant in the early years, concerned overlap of CGEPA's activity with the spheres of other ASPA groups. The second, of gradually increasing importance and difficulty for CGEPA (and later NASPAA as well), had to do with CGEPA's contribution to ASPA finances and the secretariat services provided to CGEPA by ASPA staff.

### CGEPA And CUBGR

CGEPA's establishment was more or less simultaneous with the emergence of another ASPA group with an academic constituency, the Conference of University Bureaus of Governmental Research (CUBGR). There are no surviving records to indicate whether, in its initial authorization of the two groups, the ASPA council made more than nominal effort to distinguish their jurisdictions; at any rate, when the two groups began to function, overlap of interests soon appeared.

If CGEPA had focused narrowly enough on its central subject of graduate teaching, no question needed to arise, but of course it was impossible to talk about graduate study for long without considering research, and that subject was prominent on the agenda at Lake Arrowhead and other meetings. In September, 1963, John H. Ferguson of Pennsylvania State University, newly elected chairman of CUBGR, raised the boundary question in a polite letter to Don K. Price of Harvard, then chairman of CGEPA. Ferguson pointed out that CGEPA had been talking about research, and about continuing education and training as well--both of central interest to CUBGR and its members from the service institutes, centers, and bureaus. Ferguson invited discussion of either a cleaner separation of the spheres of the two groups, or, alternatively, coordination of effort by some means, perhaps joint meetings--possibly even a merger. Price gave him a friendly answer, acknowledging his own concern about organizational proliferation within ASPA, and agreed that they should get together at some mutually convenient time to discuss the matter. Price sent copies of this correspondence to Tom Davy at the Fels Institute, in recognition of the role Davy was playing as *de facto* CGEPA secretary. Price soon got a reaction, not from Davy but from Davy's boss, Stephen Sweeney, who was active in both CGEPA and CUBGR. Sweeney intervened to deny the suggestion that CGEPA had been out of bounds. Its interest in both research and continuing education, he asserted, was from the particular perspective of graduate education and thus different from that of the bureaus and CUBGR. He opposed the idea of joint meetings because he thought each of the groups had plenty of its own business needing undiluted discussion. Sweeney did, though, agree to the idea of a meeting of leaders of the two groups to clarify their respective interests.<sup>20</sup>

After a little further correspondence it was agreed that the interested parties would get together during the next spring's ASPA meeting, and presumably such a meeting did

---

<sup>20</sup> Copies of the Ferguson-Price-Sweeney correspondence were among historical materials collected by NASPAA, evidently obtained from the files of Price.

occur, but there is no surviving record and little seems to have come of it. There was, of course, considerable overlap of membership (as well as interests) of the two groups, and some, like Sweeney attended both. In subsequent years, if anyone thought of it, CUBGR officers got courtesy invitations to CGEPA meetings. In 1968 and a couple of years thereafter there were attempts at joint meetings, but these were dominated by CGEPA's interests and did not lead to any permanent connection. CUBGR seemed to languish, its meetings on the fringe of ASPA national conferences brief and poorly attended, as compared to those of CGEPA. CGEPA continued to define its interest broadly, increasingly so as its leaders clarified and advocated the ideal of the comprehensive school of public affairs--which, if comprehensive enough, would include the functions of the bureaus and make anything like CUBGR even more irrelevant.

### CGEPA And Training Interests

When Ferguson, in his letter to Price, referred to continuing education and training he touched on jurisdictional overlap that both CGEPA and CUBGR had with another more or less organized interest within ASPA. The Committee on Education and Training, which had contributed to the original organization of CGEPA, had been succeeded in the early 1960s by a Committee on Career and Professional Development. This group's constituency included some university people, especially from the bureaus, but also included government personnel and training officers, who of course had no standing in CGEPA and CUBGR. Some coordination between that committee and CGEPA seems to have occurred through the person of the committee chairman, Norman Wengert of Wayne State University, who was local host to the CGEPA meeting in Detroit in 1962 and on the CGEPA executive committee from 1962 to 1965. Indeed, CGEPA may have, for a time, absorbed the committee along with its chairman, because by the middle 1960s the Committee on Career and Professional Development had disappeared from the ASPA letterhead.

While both CGEPA and CUBGR in the middle 1960s dealt to some extent with continuing education and training, a few people in ASPA with that interest remained unsatisfied. Most notable in this respect was Morris W. H. "Bill" Collins of the University of Georgia, who was active in both CGEPA and CUBGR but despaired of getting either of those groups to pay what he would consider adequate attention to training. In 1968, as CGEPA was preparing to broaden its activities and membership, Collins and others took the lead in getting the ASPA council's approval for a new group with status comparable to CGEPA and CUBGR: the Conference on Continuing Education and Training in Public Administration (CCETPA). More background on this development, and CGEPA's response to it will be touched upon in a later chapter.

### Money and Services

What did CGEPA's being part of ASPA mean in practical terms? There was, of course, the fact that CGEPA hitch-hiked on ASPA's conferences, holding its annual meeting immediately prior to the ASPA annual conference. This back-to-back arrangement was thought to bolster attendance by people who, for financial and/or time constraints,

might not attend both meetings if they were totally separate. Despite the initial statement that ASPA staff would be the CGEPA secretariat, the services provided were minimal in the early years. Most of the work of organizing CGEA meetings was done by its chairmen, with Tom Davy at the Fels Institute continuing to provide the back-up that he had provided to Sweeney and others while CGEPA was coming together. The surviving files attest to Davy's conscientious preparation of conference reports and other materials. Davy also, in the early years, tried to perform a more general secretariat function as an information center for public administration programs. With the aid of a student assistant he collected university catalogs, public administration program brochures, course outlines, reading lists, and other materials pertaining to developments in public administration. From this material he responded to inquiries and put people planning new programs in touch with others who might be able to help them, and on a few occasions he or Sweeney made visits to other campuses as program consultants.<sup>21</sup>

CGEPA was not getting much service from ASPA, but neither was it paying for much. The source of the problem was the incongruity between the ASPA and CGEPA bases of membership and dues obligation. ASPA was basically an organization of individuals, while CGEPA membership was said to be "institutional"; individuals participated in CGEPA as institutional representatives. Exactly what institution it was that belonged to CGEPA was a little fuzzy. Sometimes and on some lists CGEPA simply denoted the name of the university, as if it was the whole university that belonged; mostly and more practically, membership was held in the name of the public administration school or other program unit, whose head was the institutional representative. The individual ASPA dues of the representatives active in CGEPA obviously would not justify much ASPA special service to it.

The initial idea for financing CGEPA services was to put the CGEPA member organizations in a special category of ASPA membership, created by the national council in 1957, called Agency Affiliates. The idea behind the agency affiliates was to broaden ASPA's always slender financial base by bringing government agencies into a special class of non-voting membership. Agencies in affiliate status were entitled to a certain number of annual conference registrations for their employees, ASPA publications, and other vaguely defined services available on request. Dues for Agency Affiliates were scaled to agency budgets. The unstated assumption was that loyal ASPA members in government would help the cause by arranging for their agencies to sign up. This did happen in some cases, although considering the scale of government at all levels, relatively few agencies ever joined, and agency affiliate memberships would never become more than a secondary source of income for ASPA.

The agency affiliate status seemed a reasonable fit for the CGEPA situation, and the national council action recognizing CGEPA set the dues for CGEPA membership at \$150 a year. At the outset of CGEPA the institutions whose program heads had been attending the preliminary organizing meetings were simply grandfathered into the

---

<sup>21</sup> Davy described these activities in a letter to this writer, October 4, 1991.

organization by inclusion on the mailing list, in anticipation that their representatives would complete the act of joining by arranging for payment of the dues. Some did, but a good many did not. The benefits of ASPA agency affiliation were of some, but limited, use to CGEPA member programs. What CGEPA really needed was special services to its particular endeavors--services that ASPA, at that time in one of its recurring periods of financial stress, was unable to provide. The problem was intensified by CGEPA free riders. Many member institutions paid irregularly, and a few paid not at all but remained on the mailing list and occasionally sent someone to annual meetings. The division of secretariat functions between the Fels Institute and ASPA headquarters in Washington contributed to the slippage. Davy at Fels worked on programmatic matters and took no responsibility for collecting dues. ASPA staff had difficulty keeping up to date on the institutions that were supposed to be CGEPA members and liable to be billed for agency affiliate dues, and the entity or the individual at each institution to whom a bill could be sent with expectation that it would be paid. As of the mid-1960s, only about half of the CGEPA institutions were in good standing as ASPA agency affiliate members. If CGEPA wanted more service from ASPA it would somehow have to generate more revenue.

Thus in its first few years CGEPA succeeded in establishing a simple continuing organization and a pattern of meetings where its core of constituents enjoyed camaraderie, caught up on news about developments in the field, nourished their sense of common interest (or grievance), and explored the large differences of scale, organizational setting, and approach in their respective programs. Also, despite the existence of other groups with overlapping interests, CGEPA succeeded in establishing itself as the principal representative of the universities within ASPA, and to some extent in relevant circles in Washington, as in its involvement with the Stewart survey and report. But could CGEPA do more? In the middle 1960s, with a public environment offering new possibilities, some energetic leaders would try.

## CGEPA CHAIRMEN AND MEETINGS

1957-58	Lloyd M. Short Univ. of Minnesota (temporary)	Philadelphia PA June 15, 1957 (organization proposed)  New York, NY March 24, 1958 (provisional organization)
1958-59	Lloyd M. Short (temporary)	Bloomington, IN Dec. 29-30, 1958  Washington, DC April 3, 1959 (organization completed)
1959-60	Lloyd M. Short	Chapel Hill, NC Sept. 8-9, 1959  Lake Arrowhead, CA April 10-11, 1960
1960-61	Stephen B. Sweeney Univ. of Pa.	Philadelphia, PA April 3-5, 1961
1961-62	Stephen B. Sweeney	Detroit, MI April 9-11, 1962
1962-63	Don K. Price Harvard University	Washington, DC April 1-3, 1963
1963-64	Don K. Price	Ardsley-on-Hudson, NY April 13-16, 1964
1964-65	Henry Reining, Jr. Univ. of S. Calif.	Excelsior Spr., MO April 9-11, 1965
1965-66	Henry Reining, Jr.	College Park, MD April 11-13, 1966
1966-67	Ferrel Heady Univ. of Michigan	Berkeley, CA March 30-April 1, 1967
1967-68	O. B. Conaway, Jr. SUNY-Albany	Cambridge, MA March 25-27, 1968
1968-69	Brewster C. Denny Univ. of Washington	Ft. Lauderdale, FL May 17-19, 1969
1969-70	Donald C. Stone Univ. of Pittsburgh	Princeton, NJ April 4-6, 1970 (CGEPA becomes NASPAA)

## Chapter Three

### **A MORE AMBITIOUS CGEPA**

The Council on Graduate Education in Public Administration (CGEPA) originated as an informal sideline discussion group of men who periodically came together for another purpose, the annual meetings of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). Those who in the late 1950s moved to give the group a name and rudimentary formal organization had in mind a fairly limited set of purposes: to provide for identification and succession of leadership, to make the annual meetings more productive through a modicum of advance planning, and to have between meetings a center for exchange, assembly and dissemination of relevant information among its constituents, the leaders of university programs in public administration. The early leaders, such as chairmen Lloyd Short (Minnesota), Stephen Sweeney (Pennsylvania) and Don Price (Harvard) had, if not preferred, at least accepted a limited role for the organization and its minor satellite status within the framework of ASPA. They also seemed to take as given and subject only to slow evolutionary change some of the limiting features of CGEPA's environment: the great variety of goals, academic standards, curriculum approaches, and organizational arrangements for public administration in the universities; and the field's tenuous standing with official government, which was characterized by qualified encouragement and very limited support.

In the middle 1960s CGEPA came under the influence of new, generally younger, and definitely more activist leaders. These men tried to seize opportunities presented by the times and make the organization a force for rapid change in the status of public administration, both on campus and with the federal government. They urged a more professional approach to public affairs education, with whatever that might imply for curriculum and academic organization, and sought a new standing with government in which expanded and improved education for public service would be recognized as necessary for the achievement of national goals--and the institutions providing that education supported accordingly.

This brief chapter sets the stage for an account of those endeavors. It begins with a look at the governmental environment and the state of public administration on university campuses in the early Sixties; it tells of the emergence of a new, ambitious CGEPA leader and the goals that he set for the organization; and it notes steps taken to prepare CGEPA, organizationally and financially, to push toward those goals. Subsequent chapters will deal in more detail with efforts made in CGEPA's name to get more attention to public administration education from the federal government and major foundations; a long struggle, with only limited success, to secure direct federal aid for graduate education for public service; and efforts to establish a role for the universities in government training.

## A FAVORABLE PUBLIC AND ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

In the realm of government and public policy the middle 1960s brought fulfillment of many ambitions from previous decades and seemed to open great, almost startling, possibilities for the future. President Lyndon B. Johnson's leadership after the shocking assassination of President John F. Kennedy won public approval, carried him to triumphant election in his own right in 1964, and produced successive major legislative achievements in 1964, '65, and '66. Johnson's domestic agenda, dubbed the Great Society, brought federal initiatives, new programs, and new government jobs in such fields as community action, worker training, health insurance, aid to the aged and disabled, housing and urban development, transportation, and education at all levels. More federal funds poured into basic science, health research, and space exploration. The civil rights movement led to landmark legislation and court decisions, adding the new dimension of equal opportunity to all public activity. Encouraged by general affluence and federal grants, state and local government services and employment grew rapidly. Showing considerably more interest in administration than Kennedy had, LBJ gave support to several initiatives in federal organization, personnel, and budgeting. In the public sector, all things seemed possible. Opposition to American involvement in Vietnam and unrest in urban black neighborhoods were gathering but still not unduly threatening clouds on the political horizon.

In the Sixties decade, growing government activity coincided with a surge of higher education expansion forced by the arrival at college age of the post-WWII baby boom generation, compounded by new national efforts to make college education possible for poor and minority youth. Well-established universities expanded, previously obscure public colleges grew rapidly (some quickly elevated to university status), and many totally new institutions appeared.

Most of the public administration and public affairs programs comprising CGEPA's constituency shared in the flush times, as their enrollments increased and institutional growth made upgrading and new ventures possible with relatively less of the pain and conflict that usually accompanies redistribution of university resources. At prestigious institutions like Harvard and Princeton private endowments permitted expansion and new programs for existing schools of public affairs; established but less well endowed schools like those at Syracuse and Pittsburgh looked to greater futures. Major state universities like California (Berkeley), Indiana, Minnesota, Ohio State, and Washington (Seattle) planned to expand and upgrade existing departmental and institute public administration programs into full school status. New and expanding public institutions, especially those in urban locations, found public administration and its cousins like city planning and urban studies attractive areas for ventures into graduate studies appropriate to such institutions' public service orientation. The expansion, however, was anything but uniform and orderly; the schools were going in many different directions in terms of mission and method; the field was almost chaotic, and it was quite uncertain to what extent either the numbers or the quality met national needs. Here is where CGEPA would come in.

## NEW LEADERS, NEW AGENDA

It was not accidental that an ambitious CGEPA response to the environment sketched above would appear under the chairmanship of Dean Henry Reining, Jr., of the University of Southern California. Head of one of the oldest and most successful public administration schools, an enterprise closely attuned to the California governmental scene but also maintaining relationships with several developing institutions abroad, Reining was nationally prominent in the field, a former ASPA president and veteran of many professional relationships. In person, he was a vigorous, ambitious, outspoken, and sometimes brusque and impatient “doer.” Like many leaders, his ideas often ran well ahead of the thinking of his colleagues, and his ambitions sometimes exceeded his capacity for follow-through. He was elected CGEPA chairman at the 1964 annual meeting and immediately began to move on several fronts.

### Reining’s Agenda

Reining brought his, and CGEPA’s, objectives into sharp focus in 1965. At the annual meeting (mid-way in his two-year chairmanship), he reported and invited discussion of some ideas about CGEPA’s future that had come up in the executive committee. The meeting ended in an agreement that Reining and Don Price (of Harvard, Reining’s immediate predecessor as chairman) would review what had been said and develop a more specific statement of objectives. Reining took the lead and in a long letter to Price<sup>1</sup> laid out an agenda that is so indicative of CGEPA’s future that it merits excerpting at some length :

*....An evaluative study of education for Public Administration...to include at least a ten year projection of needs in the field.*

*....To increase greatly the flow of professors of public administration....This is the key element to any expansion of educational facilities....This means there is great need for more thorough Federal support, for fellowships such as the National Defense Education Act, to be specifically directed toward the preparation of professors of public administration.*

*.....To provide the means to up-date present professors of public administration as to new subject matter and instructional and research techniques....*

*....To provide actual government experience for young P. A. instructors, for example by means of post doctoral administrative internships....*

*.....To coordinate overseas programs of Public Administration. There is need to draw more closely together those schools and programs of Public Administration which have had and are having substantial overseas experience.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Henry Reining, Jr., to Don K. Price, letter July 7, 1965; from Price’s files.

*.... To provide greater contact with the Federal Government.... One way of obtaining this liaison would be to have a staff for the public administration schools within ASPA headquarters.... Such a staff could a) help with the up-dating of older P.A. faculty, b) operate the post doctoral administrative internship program, c) assist with the evaluation study of public administration education, d) operate as a clearing house and information source for public administration schools and programs.*

*....To set up more schools. Finally there is need for a national program to develop more schools of Public Administration in the U.S.A..... How can this best be done? Does Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 offer a facility? Office of Education grants? There is a corresponding need to flesh out existing public administration programs. How can this best be done?*

Price acknowledged Reining's letter without offering any modifications or additions, commenting simply that the proposals "raise all the right questions."<sup>2</sup> Reining took this as "yes" and brought his agenda to an executive committee meeting in Chicago on September 9. Notes from that meeting have not survived, but members clearly supported the thrust of the program, although perhaps with varying degrees of enthusiasm or optimism about its achievement. Price, for one, had reservations about some aspects of it, as might have been guessed from his lukewarm response to Reining's letter, and as he indicated later in a letter to someone else: "I believe the Council is most effective as an informal discussion group and that its effectiveness would not be improved if it were built up into a more pretentious program with a lot of staff work."<sup>3</sup> At any rate, it is clear from subsequent events that Reining's agenda incorporated the aspirations of most of the people active in CGEPA; it was approved at the subsequent annual meeting,<sup>4</sup> and with one important addition would be the organization's working agenda for the remainder of the CGEPA period. Reining's chairmanship marked a turn to a more ambitious CGEPA agenda--one especially reflecting the interests of the separately organized, professionally oriented schools, centers, and institutes.

---

<sup>2</sup> Letter, Price to Reining, July 21, 1965; copy from Price's files.

<sup>3</sup> This was in response to an inquiry from Harvey Sherman, who had been asked by the ASPA Council to review the status and activities of the several ASPA standing committees and satellites; Letters, Harvey Sherman to Don K. Price, March 11, 1966; Price to Sherman, March 16, 1966; both from Price's files.

In his letter Price began by slightly disassociating himself from recent events: "I have not been as actively engaged...in the Council...since Henry Reining took over...." He went on to note that he had been "one of those" who had "strongly opposed" setting up CGEPA as a distinct organization. (Regrettably, he did not say who or how many there were, because no trace of that opposition has survived in the records). He said he had now come to see CGEPA as a "useful institution." But he remained cautious about CGEPA's role: "...It will best serve its purpose if it runs with a reasonable degree of autonomy but with close association with the Society, and it should get whatever help the Society is financially in position to give it with respect to staff."

<sup>4</sup> Minutes of the annual meeting and the executive committee meeting immediately following, at College Park, MD, in March 1966, are in CGEPA files.

## A Matter of Means: Staffing and Finance

The CGEPA goals of 1966 called for performance of certain operational tasks and at least implied a need for staff back-up for leaders who would attempt, in CGEPA's name, to influence public policy and developments in the universities. The executive committee understood that this meant more staff service than was then being received from either ASPA headquarters or the Fels Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, under the arrangement that had been improvised to get CGEPA started. Tom Davy, the Fels associate director who had been conducting the modest secretariat operation, was having difficulty keeping it up along with his growing responsibilities in the Institute, and Fels director Stephen Sweeney, the CGEPA founder who had proposed the arrangement in the first place, now concurred with growing sentiment in CGEPA that a change was in order.<sup>5</sup> ASPA executive director Don Bowen had indicated willingness to fulfill the original commitment that ASPA would provide secretariat services to CGEPA but could not do much without adding staff, which was unaffordable unless CGEPA could generate more revenue. At the September 1965 meeting of the CGEPA executive committee, when the new agenda first began to emerge, one of its members, Dean O. B. Conaway of the State University of New York (Albany) was asked to develop a plan to firm up CGEPA's financial base. Soon after the meeting, Reining alerted everyone on the mailing list that a proposal for dues, perhaps something like \$200 per member university per year, would come up at the next annual meeting. He also urged that meanwhile the CGEPA institutions that were not ASPA Agency Affiliate members--about half of them--should fulfill the original understanding about CGEPA and sign up in that status.<sup>6</sup>

Conaway reported in a letter to members shortly before the 1966 annual meeting. He began by sketching the services CGEPA was beginning to need:

*These services...include assistance in relationships with Federal agencies, in planning and arranging annual and other conferences, in the annual collection and distribution of statistics on the programs of the members, ....in maintaining a clearinghouse on program developments in the member institutions, in personnel placement and exchange, and in research of the kind contemplated under the recent Carnegie grant....*

For such services, Conaway said, it was no longer feasible or fair to depend on the Fels Institute. Executive director Bowen was prepared to step up ASPA headquarters services to CGEPA if CGEPA could generate new revenue of about \$5,000 a year. To

---

<sup>5</sup> Tom Davy to Laurin L. Henry, letter, Oct. 14, 1991; in author's files.

<sup>6</sup> The letter that went to Harvard, dated Oct. 5, 1965, was preserved in the files of Don Price. The letter reflects the fact that Harvard was already an Agency Affiliate; apparently a slightly different version, of which no copy survives, went to those institutions that were not. Reining's prod may have had some effect; an ASPA staff analysis later reported 10 new university agency affiliates that year. Walter L. Webb, Memorandum to Don L. Bowen, "Review of 1966 Activity," March 17, 1967; from Bowen's files.

that end, Conaway proposed an assessment of \$100 a year from each CGEPA institution.<sup>7</sup>

At the annual meeting, held in College Park, MD, there was agreement in principle on expanding the revenue base but considerable disagreement about how much and how the burden should be distributed. Some of the stronger members, mostly from schools or institutes with their own budgets, were prepared to pay much more than Conaway had recommended, up to several hundred dollars a year, if a significant increase in services would result. Others, especially representatives of smaller programs contained in academic departments and having little or no discretionary funds of their own, insisted that such charges would drive them out of CGEPA.<sup>8</sup> The outcome was a resolution that proposed to handle the matter through a more effective and slightly modified ASPA agency affiliation process--an approach that served to reaffirm CGEPA's link to ASPA and ultimate responsibility to the ASPA executive council, about which some had been concerned:

*That CGEPA ask ASPA to undertake secretariat services for CGEPA, and that participating membership in CGEPA shall require ASPA agency affiliation. CGEPA recommends to the ASPA Council that it explore its schedule of fees for agency affiliation with the objective of establishing a range of fees of \$100 to \$300 for educational institutions, using a suitable criterion for setting the fees required for each category of institutions with a public administration program, with the understanding that an appropriate part of the agency affiliation fee would be allocated for providing CGEPA secretariat activity.<sup>9</sup>*

Despite its ambiguity, this apparently was acceptable to the ASPA executive council, and served to bring additional services to CGEPA. Later that spring, Ray D. Pethtel joined the ASPA staff with CGEPA support as one of his main responsibilities. He made an early trip to Philadelphia for a briefing by Davy and Sweeney and took their files with him back to Washington.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> O. B. Conaway, Jr., "To CGEPA Member Institutions," March 18, 1966; copy from files of Don L. Bowen. Conaway did not say in the letter how he arrived at the \$100 figure, but it might have been based on a guess that 50 of the 67 institutions then on the list would pay. Neither did his letter explain the relationship to the \$200 figure mentioned earlier by Reining, or how it related to the \$150 ASPA agency affiliate fee.

<sup>8</sup> Resistance to higher fees was not entirely from the small schools. Many years later Conaway would recall his astonishment during this discussion when Price said that Harvard could not possibly pay as much as \$500 a year. (Telephone conversation with Laurin L. Henry, Sept. 26, 1991.) Price's position perhaps reflected his attitude toward ASPA staff expansion--or simply his assessment of what CGEPA was worth to Harvard--more than Harvard's financial capability.

<sup>9</sup> From Minutes of the CGEPA Annual Business Meeting, April 12, 1966; from Bowen's files. The members also voted thanks to the Fels Institute for its services in past years.

<sup>10</sup> Letter, Tom Davy to Laurin L. Henry, Oct. 14, 1991.

The new arrangement strengthened CGEPA but did not fully solve the problem of dues and revenues. The dues policy proved hard to apply because of confusion about how the amounts mentioned in the CGEPA resolution related to the agency affiliation fee. Bowen and Pethtel understood it to mean CGEPA institutions should pay \$100 to \$300 in addition to the regular base of \$150 for agency affiliation, but many of the schools thought that \$100-\$300 range was to replace the regular flat fee of \$150 and would not pay more. Establishing criteria for assessing the proper level of university dues proved difficult. As Pethtel analyzed it, in a letter to the new CGEPA chairman, Ferrel Heady of the University of Michigan, no single criterion like the program's enrollment, or its budget, or its faculty size seemed completely practical or fair. He recommended that the executive committee assess each institution separately, based on a staff recommendation that would follow "no formalized criteria pattern" but would attempt a "judgment of comparability with other members and the total information available" in each individual case. The executive committee might grant temporary adjustments to schools with new programs or special problems. The information needed to place each institution on the dues scale would be obtained by an annual survey questionnaire to the schools.<sup>11</sup>

Not surprisingly, this no-system was hard to apply effectively and to general satisfaction. Some institutions ignored the annual questionnaire or interpreted it so as to provide the lowest possible base for assessment. Others ignored the CGEPA assessment and continued to pay only the \$150 agency affiliation fee. Whatever the original intent of the policy, the staff soon fell into an illogical straddle: they billed most of the programs at \$150 and the larger ones at \$300, and were glad to collect whatever and whenever they could. Some universities were carried for years without paying anything, because responsibility for enforcement was unclear and no one wanted to strike off the list an institution whose representative showed interest and attended meetings even if unable to find someone in his administration who would authorize the dues payment.

For the remainder of the CGEPA period the matter of assessing and collecting dues remained in an unsatisfactory state, and the revenues were probably insufficient to justify the services that CGEPA expected and sometimes received. The situation eased a bit in the later 1960s as CGEPA began to generate additional income (from a program to be described later), and in CGEPA's final year considerable progress was made in dues collection, but until the end the subjects of finance and secretariat services remained problematic and irritating.

### RAPIDLY GROWING ENROLLMENTS

A valuable by-product of the effort to establish a base for dues assessment was fresh data on enrollments in CGEPA's participating graduate programs. The questionnaire

---

<sup>11</sup> Letter, Ray D. Pethtel to Ferrel Heady, June 21, 1966, with attachment, "Recommended CGEPA Secretariat Fee Schedule"; from CGEPA files. This apparently was for an executive committee meeting June 28-29, of which no record has survived.

sent out from the newly enhanced secretariat asked about degrees awarded in 1966, enrollments in the 1966-67 academic year, and other matters of interest.

The returns showed substantial--indeed, remarkable--growth, especially in the more professionally oriented programs leading to the MPA degree, since the last benchmark, the Stewart report for 1959-60.<sup>12</sup> This was despite the fact that the new survey reached a fewer number of institutions and had fewer responses; it had gone only to the 70 universities on the CGEPA list, of which 53 had responded, as compared to the larger universe of American institutions queried by Stewart, of which 93 had responded. The new data showed that graduate public administration enrollments had almost doubled, from the 2300-2500 estimated by Stewart to a more precise total of 4,458 at the CGEPA responding institutions in 1966-67.

The data also suggested need for re-examination of prevailing assumptions about who these students were: Of the 4,458, only 1,537--a little more than a third--were full time students.

As to degrees, 670 master's and 70 doctoral degrees in public administration (or public administration concentrations within political science or other fields) were awarded in 1966. Of the master's degrees, 440 were MPAs or other designated professional degrees. As in the past, degree production was concentrated at a limited number of institutions. Out of the total of 740 degrees, 532 came from the first 12 universities, which were, in rank order: Southern California, Pittsburgh, American, Harvard, Syracuse, NYU, SUNY-Albany, George Washington, Princeton, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, and Kansas.

Although the Stewart report did not provide a precise base for comparison, it was clear that the trend toward organizationally differentiated and more professionally oriented graduate programs in public administration had continued. In the 53 responding institutions there were now 13 separately organized schools of public administration (or public affairs), plus 9 combined schools of business and public administration. There remained among the respondents, however, 25 programs conducted in political science departments, plus a half-dozen miscellaneous other organizational arrangements. It is probably safe to assume that most of the 17 non-responding CGEPA members were small programs within academic departments. Of the 14 leading institutions in graduate enrollments, only one, UCLA, had its program organized under political science. Clearly, the movement toward professional-aspiring education in entities dedicated to that purpose was gathering momentum.

Henry Reining completed his two-year term as CGEPA chairman by presiding at the 1966 annual meeting. His successor was Ferrel Heady, of the University of Michigan.

---

<sup>12</sup> The data following is from "1967 Questionnaire Summary," a document in CGEPA files undated but probably prepared for the 1967 annual meeting. The surviving files contain hints that similar surveys were attempted after 1967, but no report of comparable completeness has been found for the remainder of the 1960s.

Heady broke the pattern of two-year service by resigning in mid-term, because he had left Michigan to become vice-president (soon to be president) of the University of New Mexico. This event precipitated a change in the practice of electing chairmen for two-year terms. To succeed Heady and thenceforth, CGEPA elected a chairman and a chairman-elect for one-year terms. The chairman-elect would serve on the executive committee for the year prior to his automatic ascension, and the retiring chairman would then serve a year on the executive committee, thus assuring a high degree of continuity in the leadership. Heady's successors were: O. B. Conaway, Jr. (SUNY-Albany), 1967-68; Brewster C. Denny (University of Washington), 1968-69; Donald C. Stone (University of Pittsburgh), 1969-70. These successors would continue efforts to move CGEPA along the lines laid out by Reining, the latter two, Denny and Stone, particularly vigorous in attempts to use CGEPA as a base for achieving change in the nature and status of public affairs education.

## Chapter Four

### **SEEKING RECOGNITION FOR PUBLIC SERVICE EDUCATION**

The items in the goal statement for the Council on Graduate Education in Public Administration (CGEPA) that Henry Reining developed in 1966 and presented to the membership as the final act of his chairmanship were by no means new. Most of them were subjects that had been discussed in the group to one degree or another in years past. The statement was future-oriented, but it referred to several matters on which Reining had been active throughout his term. This chapter will discuss two of those efforts, both of which sought to achieve greater recognition of the importance of public administration/public affairs education in the national scheme of things and establish higher priority for it in both federal government and university policies. It could be summarized as a story of push, frustration, and reassessment: reassessment that would reach no immediate consensus but in the end contribute to a major reorientation of strategy for CGEPA and its organizational successor, NASPAA.

#### **SEEKING DIRECT FEDERAL RECOGNITION: NDEA'S**

One item on Reining's list, on which he was already active, was to increase the supply of public administration teachers by securing fellowships to encourage and support study for doctor's degrees in the field. The main target was the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), a statute from the late 1950s, post-sputnik, era, under which the U. S. Office of Education (OE) made a limited number of grants to universities for fellowships in new or expanded doctoral programs in fields important to national defense. The original intent was that these fellowships would be primarily in science and engineering, and so they were in the early years, but over time the OE had begun to interpret defense-relatedness more liberally and to make awards in response to university proposals in a considerable variety of fields--in effect, using the NDEA to alleviate faculty shortages felt throughout higher education as it expanded rapidly in the 1960s. A few such awards had actually gone to doctoral programs in public administration or to innovative programs construed as "public affairs," but since the total number of fellowships nationally had been only 1,500 a year, and each package of awards had to meet the "new or expanded program" requirement, the number of awards to public administration schools was small--nothing like what those schools felt they needed or deserved, if one accepted their premise about the essentiality of their field in meeting national goals, either in defense or under the new social and economic legislation.

In October 1964, Reining, having become CGEPA chairman earlier that year, wrote to the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, to point out the need for more faculty resources in public administration and to inquire if anything could be done to increase NDEA awards in that field. His reply came from Associate Commissioner Ralph C. M. Flynt, who did not concede that public administration had been treated unjustly. OE

saw public administration as a small field that had generated only a limited number of applications and, consequently, had received only a few awards. Flynt's letter continued with bad news and good news. The bad was that recent appropriations language had directed OE in the current year to give renewed attention to the Act's criterion of defense-relatedness. The good news was that Congress was approving an increase in the number of fellowships to a total of 7,500, of which 5,000 were to be awarded on a basis to be determined by the Commissioner. Flynt invited comments on how the expansion might be handled.<sup>1</sup>

Seeing an opening, Reining sought an appointment with Commissioner Keppel, but because of travel schedules and the holidays the earliest date that could be arranged was in early January. When he finally saw Keppel, Reining got a friendly reception, but by then it was too late to make a special plea for public administration, because on December 22 OE had announced its policy for distributing the new fellowships. OE would no longer take applications for awards in particular fields, but would award broad packages of fellowships to applying universities, which would allocate them internally among their doctoral programs on the basis of need and accordance with the intent of the Act.<sup>2</sup>

This was bad news for CGEPA, which had hoped for a national priority that would help public administration overcome the disadvantages it had always felt in university internal competition for resources. Donald C. Stone, of the University of Pittsburg, now on the executive committee, tried to use his standing as a prominent alumnus of the Bureau of the Budget to get an appointment with its director, Kermit Gordon, in hope of stimulating BoB intervention in OE's policy. But Gordon was unavailable, and Stone had to take up his case in a long letter. The question, he said, was "how to make the NDEA educational programs serve the national interest rather than traditional academic prejudices." Stone asserted that from the start, NDEA allocation had been "dominated by traditional academicians" and went on to elaborate the point:

*A Ph.D. program in 17th century history has far greater chance of approval than one in urban planning and renewal. A proposal for preparing teachers of Greek philosophy will be given preference over the development of instructors capable of educating economic and social development personnel to man the.... overseas programs. Science receives an inordinate proportion of awards in view of the many other massive programs to finance the education of scientists.*

*Education in critical professional fields appears to be downgraded, especially in public service fields. Unless NDEA is prepared to support the preparation of instructors capable of educating practitioners the yield of professors of the future will be restricted to persons who teach persons to teach persons....like the*

---

<sup>1</sup> Copies of Reining's letter to Keppel, Oct. 7, 1964, and Flynt's reply, Oct. 23, were distributed to the CGEPA executive committee and preserved in the files of Don K. Price.

<sup>2</sup> Reining reported this development in a letter to Price, Jan. 13, 1965; copy from Price's files.

*phonograph needle caught in a groove.*

*Could not the Bureau of the Budget examine this question and put some pressure on the Office of Education to use the fellowship program to create national capabilities and competences to deal with our most critical domestic and international problems?<sup>3</sup>*

This plea brought only a perfunctory acknowledgment, not even from Gordon but signed by assistant director William Carey.

Although the main opportunity to get more NDEAs--if there ever really was an opportunity--had slipped by, CGEPA leaders did not give up. A year later Stone tried again in a letter to Roger Jones, a longtime friend of public administration, then a senior consultant at the Bureau of the Budget. He pointed out that the first year's experience with the expanded NDEA program, as shown by OE data distributed by Ward Stewart, had gone exactly as he had predicted: "discrimination against professional education fields concerned with urban, national, and overseas development...." In the second year's distribution now coming up, "...in the absence of guidelines from the federal government, the result again will be that traditional and even classical fields of education will receive a disproportionate share." Stone pointed out that the latest OE regulations had further disadvantaged public administration by prohibiting NDEA awards to students who had already completed more than a half-year of graduate work, because public administration students typically did not decide on doctoral studies--in fact, usually were discouraged from doing so--until they had earned master's degrees.<sup>4</sup>

Stone and others continued to agitate the matter in personal contacts and letters, sanctioned by resolutions at CGEPA annual meetings,<sup>5</sup> but without effect. The federal administration was not going to consider improving the supply of public administration teachers a matter of high priority. Public administration would have to content, campus by campus, for NDEA fellowships, generally with meager results. In subsequent years a

---

<sup>3</sup> Donald C. Stone, letter to Kermit Gordon, Feb. 17, 1965; copy of the letter and the BoB perfunctory response are from Stone's extensive files which were made available to the author.

From this point through the remainder of the CGEPA period and the early years of NASPAA, Stone would be a central and unique figure. An unconventional academic, he had studied public administration in the early years of its availability as a graduate subject, but never sought a doctorate. He had a long, varied, and distinguished career as an administrator in both local and federal government; his posts in the latter included assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget during WWII, and then chief of administration in the Marshall Plan organization. He entered academia as president of Springfield College, and after several years there, in the mid-Fifties he went to the University of Pittsburgh to start an ambitious new School of Public and International Affairs. A 20th century puritan in both public and private life, he was an indefatigable worker, with a passion for order and attention to detail. His capacity for detail was matched by a grand vision of the role that public administration could and should play in the nation's affairs. His demands for government and university support for the educational component of that role were stated in bold terms that often seemed to others unrealistic and impolitic.

<sup>4</sup> Letter, Donald Stone to Roger Jones, March 6, 1966; copy from Stone's files.

<sup>5</sup> See Minutes, CGEPA Annual Meeting, April 12, 1966; from CGEPA files.

few doctoral fellowships in various aspects of public affairs were wangled from other federal agencies such as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and, considerably later, the National Science Foundation. For the most part, doctoral studies in public administration would have to be supported by the resources of the universities and the students themselves. Public affairs teaching continued, as in the past, to depend on recruits from other fields and disciplines, especially political science but also economics, sociology, education, law, and business. The faculty shortage would be eased only gradually as the national supply of Ph.D.'s began to catch up to demand in the 1970s.

### SEEKING EXTERNAL VALIDATION

Reining's letter to the Commissioner of Education in the fall of 1964, in addition to probing for more NDEAs, had a broader purpose to recognize and encourage other OE activity related to public administration. He put in a plug for Ward Stewart's occasional OE publication, *Business and Public Administration Notes*, which he had heard was endangered by changing agency priorities (a futile plea, because BPA Notes was terminated shortly thereafter). Reining placed the newsletter in the context of what he described as an ongoing and valued OE program, going back to the survey and publication in 1961 of Stewart's report on Graduate Study in Public Administration. He reiterated CGEPA's appreciation for that study and the hope that such a survey could be repeated periodically, perhaps every ten years. Reining also reported that CGEPA had "voted to commission two of its members to conduct a qualitative survey of instruction in the field....We may well be coming to you for funds to assist in that effort."<sup>6</sup>

#### An Idea, A Proposal, and A Grant

When Reining finally got to see Keppel, in January 1965, the Commissioner was mildly encouraging about a new survey, or perhaps a conference to plan one, but he made another suggestion whose pregnancy Reining recognized and immediately reported to CGEPA colleagues:

*...It would be highly advisable to have something like the "Carnegie Study" of business administration for the field of public administration. The Commissioner pointed out that it is always more effective to present a case prepared by a third party than a case prepared by an interested participant.<sup>7</sup>*

---

<sup>6</sup> Letter, Henry Reining to Francis Keppel, Oct. 7, 1964. Since records of the 1964 annual meeting have not survived, we do not know who the designated persons were or how far they ever got, but apparently that effort was soon submerged in the broader effort soon to be described.

<sup>7</sup> Reining letter to Don K. Price, January 13, 1965; copy from Price's files.

The “Carnegie Study” of business education<sup>8</sup> was well known to Reining and other public administration leaders. Back in the Fifties a foundation-commissioned review of the field by outside but sympathetic analysts had made criticisms but on the whole affirmed the value of business education, resulting in reforms, enhanced support, and growth; the business schools were now moving to strengthen their field, in part through a standard-setting and accreditation process conducted by the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Around the same time as the business study, ASPA’s scheme for an ambitious self-study of education for public administration had been unable to attract foundation support. But now, with the business school precedent, the new twist of an outside evaluation, and Keppel’s apparent endorsement,<sup>9</sup> perhaps the foundations would be interested in the “qualitative survey” that CGEPA had been talking about. CGEPA discussed the matter at the annual meeting and authorized Reining to explore.

In late May, Reining led a small delegation to explore CGEPA’s ideas with the Carnegie Corporation in New York. The Carnegie officers were interested but used a classic foundation tactic: they suggested a two-stage process, beginning with a short project to establish the need and, if appropriate, define the terms of a thorough study which could be the subject of a follow-up application. Reining reported to his executive committee that Carnegie was prepared to “consider seriously and immediately” a small planning grant, and invited suggestions and volunteers for a planning group that would make the proposed preliminary inquiry.<sup>10</sup> After a lot of telephoning and hasty drafting, Reining sent a proposal to Carnegie on June 11, but the foundation now regretted its inability to make the quick decision contemplated earlier and invited further consideration and a resubmission. Discussions within CGEPA and a considerable amount of back and forth with Carnegie to clarify what the foundation would accept continued through the

---

<sup>8</sup> Frank C. Pierson, *The Education of American Businessmen* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959) reported on the principal study financed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. This was paralleled by an inquiry sponsored by the Ford Foundation: James E. Howell, *Higher Education for Business* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959).

<sup>9</sup> How interested in public administration Keppel really was is not clear. His suggestion seemed helpful but at the same time served to fend off CGEPA by inviting outside opinion. At any rate, Keppel was presumed to have influence with the foundations, both by virtue of his position and the fact that his well-known father had once been president of the Carnegie Corporation, so the opportunity to invoke his name was something for CGEPA to trade upon.

<sup>10</sup> Reining, “Memo to the Executive Committee,” May 28, 1965; copy from CGEPA files.

Reining was accompanied to Carnegie by William Carmichael, dean of the School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell, who was active in CGEPA, and Carl Stover of the National Institute of Public Affairs, a slightly detached party who had important involvement with the public administration schools at the time (as discussed earlier in this study) and was thought to have good foundation connections. Reining’s memo noted that Price had been unable to join the group because of a schedule conflict. In view of what we now know of Price’s reservations about some of Reining’s ambitions, one may wonder about this explanation. In any case, Price, as a former foundation officer, who enjoyed high standing in the field for many reasons in addition to his Harvard position, was always cautious about putting his prestige on the line for the numerous ventures for which his support was sought.

summer and autumn. A final proposal went to Carnegie on December 31<sup>11</sup> and was approved on February 16 in a Carnegie award of \$15,000.<sup>12</sup> The project became active in March and ended with a report to Carnegie dated November 1, 1966.

### A Change In Project Execution

Between CGEPA's initial approach to Carnegie and the report a year and a half later the project changed in several crucial respects. The first change was in the method of executing the project. Both Reining's first proposal and the version eventually approved by Carnegie indicated that the main need for a grant was to cover travel and other expenses of a Planning Group, to consist of key CGEPA people and a dozen or so other academic and governmental figures. It was anticipated that in four or five meetings the Planning Group would do the thinking, plan the contemplated larger study to follow, and take responsibility for the report. After covering Planning Group expenses the remainder of funds would go for staff and support services by ASPA. But at that time ASPA had very limited staff resources beyond the busy executive director (the arrival of Pethtel was still a year away). As the plan was refined after the initial proposal it was realized that something more than a little administrative assistance to arrange meetings would be required; there would be need for substantive support to the Planning Group. The final proposal document did not specify this, but Reining's letter transmitting the document to Carnegie added, almost as an afterthought: "It may be of interest that Dr. John C. Honey, now of Syracuse University, has upon request indicated his possible availability to serve as 'Project Director' for the Planning Group."

Honey's participation was in fact virtually settled by that time, and it was clinched with a blessing from Carnegie in a letter immediately following the formal grant award.<sup>13</sup> Honey's background included a political science doctorate from Syracuse and brief public administration teaching, but his main career had been non-academic: first as a federal official at the Interior Department and the National Science Foundation, followed by several years on the staff of the Carnegie Corporation itself, then briefly with the Institute of Public Administration in New York. He had recently accepted an appointment to Syracuse's Maxwell School but had not yet relocated and was working out of the university's New York City offices. His current projects included some public affairs consulting for the Ford Foundation and a study of university executive

---

<sup>11</sup> Henry Reining, Jr., to Frederic A. Mosher, Executive Associate, Carnegie Corporation, letter with attached proposal, December 31, 1965. Copies of both the June 11 and December 31 proposals, along with various drafts and interim correspondence with Carnegie were found in CGEPA files. It may be appropriate to note here that the Mosher who handled this project for Carnegie, despite the similarity of names, was not Frederic C. "Fritz" Mosher of California-Berkeley, a well-known public administration professor who was active in this matter on the CGEPA side.

<sup>12</sup> Florence Anderson, Secretary of the Carnegie Corporation, to Don L. Bowen, Executive Director, American Society for Public Administration, Feb. 16, 1966. Because CGEPA had no corporate legal standing, the grant had to be officially to ASPA.

<sup>13</sup> Frederic A. Mosher of Carnegie to Reining, Feb. 18, 1966; copy in CGEPA files. As the project turned out, Honey's role would become so crucial--and to a degree controversial--that it was deemed appropriate to append Carnegie's approval to the project final report.

development programs jointly sponsored by the National Institute of Public Affairs (NIPA) and the U. S. Office of Education (OE). Well known in foundation circles, with connections to both Carnegie and Ford, and knowledgeable about public administration practice and research, he was not a complete outsider, but he had had no recent involvement with public administration teaching and--as became evident later--could view such programs with considerable detachment. Honey appears to have been suggested for the job by Carl Stover of NIPA, who had accompanied Reining on the initial visit to Carnegie and may have continued as an informal broker with the foundation throughout the project. During the summer, as CGEPA was developing its second proposal, Stover invited Honey's ideas about the project, and by early November Honey was the presumptive choice.<sup>14</sup>

The negotiations leading to Honey's engagement were conducted principally by correspondence and telephone. He did not meet with the executive committee prior to the commitment and perhaps not even face-to-face with Reining, and it remains unclear just how much discussion there was to clarify in advance the role he would play or his approach to the project. Calling him the Project Director implied a responsibility much greater than merely staff to a committee that would do the substantive work and write the report.<sup>15</sup> Certainly Honey understood it that way, and when he got started in March he immediately took firm hold of the project. His first opportunity to meet with the CGEPA executive committee would be at the annual meeting in April, and in advance of that he circulated a memo on how he proposed to proceed. He wanted to work with "a small advisory committee which will meet once or twice during the summer." He said that in view of time pressure and the difficulty of assembling a large group during the summer it would be more effective if he assumed responsibility for making the necessary consultations and preparing a draft report, which he hoped to have by early September.<sup>16</sup> The executive committee apparently took no exception to this. The anticipated large group of planners had now become a small group of advisors. Reining and the others may not have fully understood how this would change the dynamics of the project.

---

<sup>14</sup> Honey laid out his ideas in a letter to Stover, Aug. 19, 1965, A CGEPA draft of the proposal to Carnegie dated Nov. 5, 1965, seems to presume Honey's involvement. Copies of both in CGEPA files.

The fact that Honey's ideas about the project--in effect his application--were expressed in a letter to Stover, not Reining, may help explain later misunderstandings. Honey later said: "When, later, I began to sense that Reining and Stone felt my report had missed their mark, I remember wondering whether they had read my views as expressed in the latter to Carl." Honey letter to Laurin L. Henry, Sept. 5, 1991.

<sup>15</sup> Honey's credentials, especially the influence he could be expected to have with the foundations, may have seemed so attractive that the CGEPA leaders did not give serious thought to his views about the project as expressed in his letter to Stover--if they saw it at all. Honey's later recollection was that it was pretty clear from the beginning that he would have principal responsibility for the report. "I rather doubt I'd have taken on the study if the intention had been made known to me that I was to be a scribe for a committee." Honey letter to Henry, cited above. It should have been obvious to the CGEPA leaders that committing most of their grant funds to hire a senior staff person precluded financing several meetings of a large planning group.

<sup>16</sup> Memorandum, Honey to Reining, "Notes for Discussion at April 12 CGEPA Meeting," April 5, 1966; from CGEPA files.

After his meeting with CGEPA leaders at the annual meeting, Honey prepared a memo on the scope and substance of the project which he distributed to the executive committee and a few others who would comprise the advisory committee, with comments invited.<sup>17</sup> This was followed up by a two-day working meeting with the advisory group in late June.<sup>18</sup> By this time Honey was well into the work. He studied letters and memos from CGEPA members and others from whom he had solicited advice; interviewed notables in public administration; visited several CGEPA programs, including a trip to California where he met with Fritz Mosher on his studies of professions and the public service; met with several deans of “other professional” schools; interviewed a few university presidents and foundation officers; and spent some time in Washington for meetings with both executive and legislative officials. In the latter stages he was aided by Pethtel, who was now at ASPA headquarters, and by staff of the International City Management Association (ICMA) who provided data on local government. He mailed a draft report in late August and met with the advisory committee to review the draft in New York City on September 6.

### Draft Reflects Changes in Project Orientation

At the September meeting of the advisory committee CGEPA leaders came to full realization of how much their project had changed, from their initial conception to Honey’s draft. The proposal Reining sent to Carnegie in December 1965 reflected CGEPA’s long-standing interests in a straightforward way. It asked for a grant to plan a subsequent major study of graduate education for public administration. The presumed focus of both the planning exercise and the study to follow was on the public administration schools and programs, with two main problem areas presumptively identified. One was the number, geographic distribution, and resources of those programs in relation to needs and demands on them. The other was the great and confusing diversity of missions, approaches, curricula, and organization status of the schools and programs.

But the initial focus on graduate public administration as represented in CGEPA had changed--perhaps in reality already had implicitly changed even before the final proposal was presented, but without its being reflected in that document. Honey’s letter to Stover back in August had suggested a much broader approach: Think of public administration in context of the whole public service, which included many occupations and professions not ordinarily associated with public administration; then look at how the universities as total institutions were meeting the public need as broadly defined;

---

<sup>17</sup> This memo was referred to in the appendix to the project final report, but no copy has been found for this history. Its content, if known, might shed light on whether the CGEPA leaders were entitled to be surprised, later, by the approach Honey had taken.

<sup>18</sup> Honey’s agenda for this meeting was laid out in “Memorandum, John C. Honey to Members of CGEPA Advisory Group for the Carnegie Study,” June 22, 1966; copy from CGEPA files. This document, at least as read in retrospect, was in sufficient detail to be quite indicative of what was to come.

and finally, assess the existing and potential place of public administration in that dimension of the universities' mission.

A similarly broad approach had been suggested (perhaps amounting to a mandate) by Frederick Mosher of Carnegie in his letter to Reining after the grant award:

*My colleagues have suggested that it may be a mistake to limit the consideration ...solely to the problems of graduate public administration per se. They hope instead that the graduate programs will be looked at in the context of training for the public service in general, and in particular in terms of the question of the role of the schools in the proper undergraduate, pre-service, or in-service training programs for the majority of administrators who come to their job from professional or educational backgrounds other than formal training in public administration.*

In the letter Carnegie also gave notice that it did not consider itself committed to support whatever proposal for a larger study might emerge from this ostensible planning grant, and in fact seemed rather to hope that such a proposal would not be made:

*You may find that the report of this group could in itself go a long way toward clarifying, and perhaps taking a reasoned position on, the issues with which such a study might be expected to deal. Given the possibility that rather major steps in this field may be taken soon by both government and by other foundations, it could be that the quicker, but still definitive, look that this group can take at the range of problems described in your proposal will prove to be more timely and useful than will be any subsequent study.<sup>19</sup>*

Honey's draft report was consistent with Mosher's suggestions and his own ideas as set forth earlier. He began by sketching the changing governmental scene in the U.S., emphasizing the challenges arising from many new concerns and commitments both at home and abroad; "public affairs" therefore had to comprehend virtually all of government and many things beyond it. In this perspective, "public service" denoted a myriad of persons, occupations, and professions, in all sorts of political and legal statuses, at all levels of government and in many public sector related organizations. Honey then examined the universities, which in their complexity touched public affairs and the public service at numerous points, and concluded that higher education was not dealing adequately with the public service, either in concept or actual services. Against this broad background, he discussed the graduate programs in public administration and public affairs, and found most of them quite inadequate to fulfill or take the lead in discharging their universities' public service responsibilities. He attributed this in part to higher education's failure to accord public administration a proper role and the

---

<sup>19</sup>Frederic A. Mosher, Executive Associate, Carnegie Corporation, to Henry Reining, Jr., letter, Feb. 18, 1966; from CGEPA files. The impending "major steps" by government Mosher referred to will be the principal subject of a subsequent chapter.

necessary resources, but he also dwelt at considerable length on the limitations and weaknesses of the teaching programs: arguments about conceptual approaches, unfulfilled (and, he strongly implied, unwarranted) claims to professionalism, and a generally narrow subject-matter leading to undue emphasis on traditional management and staff services.

Turning from analysis, Honey's draft made a number of ambitious public and educational policy recommendations that reflected the broad scope of his inquiry. Perhaps responding to cues from Carnegie that discouraged thought about further studies, they were of a sort that might have been expected from a major study of the sort CGEPA originally had in mind (but in retrospect look a bit presumptuous coming out of a \$15,000 planning grant and a one-man, six-month reconnaissance). He began by suggesting a national commission to review and propose measures for improving the quality of the public service in the broadest sense. More specifically, he proposed college scholarships for high school graduates to study politics and public affairs; a large number of fellowships for graduate and professional study for public service careers; a great expansion of support for advanced study by persons already in public service; a national internship program for students at various levels; special government experience internships for faculty teaching in the public affairs area; and grants to universities for curriculum experiments and enrichment of instruction pertaining to all kinds and levels of public service--undergraduate education, graduate public administration, and the public affairs dimensions of other professions.

Getting closer to the central interest of the CGEPA sponsors, Honey recommended a national program to increase the numbers, enhance the resources, and improve the quality of schools and programs in public affairs. Such an effort, which should involve government at all levels, along with educational institutions and perhaps private business, might include new physical facilities, support for research, teaching experimentation and enrichment, and advisory services to new or expanding programs.

Partially responsive to CGEPA's proposal to produce a plan for a major, authoritative study. Honey's draft discussed needs for further study, but he did not produce a plan for one large project focusing on the graduate public administration programs, as CGEPA had envisioned. Instead he proposed two major and several minor inquiries. First priority should be a very broad examination of how the nation's universities were defining and meeting their overall public service responsibilities. A second study, building on the explorations of Fritz Mosher at Berkeley, should be a study of the professions and professionalism in public service, with emphasis on defining and meeting the educational needs for the public policy and managerial roles many of the "other professionals" would eventually assume. Other studies recommended included an assessment of education about politics and public service in secondary schools and colleges (including a look at some recent programs intended specifically to prepare students for participation in politics); an examination of national workforce planning for public service needs; evaluation of methods and effectiveness of government in-service

training; a study of public attitudes toward the public service; and a study of how other nations educate for the higher civil service.<sup>20</sup>

Considering the number of times Honey had signaled the approach he would take, it is difficult to understand why the CGEPA leaders were surprised by the character of the draft report, but apparently they were--and badly disappointed, too.<sup>21</sup> At the September 6 advisory group meeting to review the draft, criticism was a bit muted by the presence of Carnegie and Ford foundation representatives, who must have liked what they saw better than the CGEPA people,<sup>22</sup> but Reining and the others made their unhappiness evident, both in the meeting and in private comments to Honey. Stone, even after having his say in the meeting, sent Honey a long follow-up memo, with copies to the whole advisory group, which led off by saying: "After I finished the first 28 pages I literally felt sick."<sup>23</sup>

Why were they so disappointed? They could not really disagree with much of what Honey actually said, and the draft did include recommendations about CGEPA's central interest in enlarged government and university support of graduate public administration. But, perhaps taking a cue from Carnegie, Honey had not produced what the CGEPA leaders had expected as the outcome of his inquiry: a proposal for a large, foundation-supported project with the implicit purpose of making a case for such support.<sup>24</sup>

How had Honey got off CGEPA's track? Part of the problem, Reining and others thought, was that by starting with such a panoramic view of public affairs and the universities, Honey had lost public administration, as they knew it, in the big picture. They thought he should have started the other way, with an analysis of the potentialities and needs of the public administration programs and the measures needed to build them up, and then, from their perspective, looked at relationships with other professions, the whole universities, and the government.<sup>25</sup> Another main problem for

---

<sup>20</sup> A copy of Honey's first draft of Higher Education for the Public Service was found in Bowen's files.

<sup>21</sup> Honey's later recollection was that he got his first inkling of the sponsors' unhappiness with the draft when Stone came to him before the meeting to say that the advisory group wanted to begin with an executive session, without his presence. Honey letter to Henry, Sept. 5, 1991.

<sup>22</sup> The tone of the meeting also might have been moderated somewhat by the leadership of Ferrel Heady, who had now succeeded Reining as CGEPA chairman. Heady did not think as badly of the report as some of his colleagues, and his personal style tended to be more diplomatic and conciliatory than Reining's. Telephone interview with the author, Aug. 22, 1991.

<sup>23</sup> Stone memorandum to Honey, "Comments on CGEPA Draft Report," Sept. 14, 1966; copy from Stone's files.

<sup>24</sup> Honey later said: "I knew with a certainty that neither Ford nor Carnegie would be interested in a narrow study that might be viewed as a self-serving vehicle for generating financial support, public or private, for schools of public administration." Honey letter to Henry, cited above.

<sup>25</sup> For Reining's full critique, see "A Reversal of Emphasis," *Public Administration Review (PAR)*, Vol. XXVII, No. 4 (Nov. 1967), pp. 334-337.

the critics was that Honey had dwelt too much on the field's dubious status as a profession and the intellectual and institutional weaknesses of the teaching programs; he had not sufficiently emphasized that some of the programs--at least the leading professionally oriented schools--did have appropriately broad views of the field and its mission in the university and therefore should be supported and held up as examples for others. Honey's draft, Stone said, did not "create a challenge to do the constructive things that need to be done and create confidence that we do know enough about how to do them to warrant major financial investments." The action recommendations, Stone feared, were so broad as to create a danger that any new resources that might be invoked would be diffused throughout undergraduate and graduate education, including the law and business schools which would exaggerate their interest in public service for this purpose, leaving the deserving public administration programs still on short rations.<sup>26</sup>

### Revisions and Issuance: The Honey Report

In response to comments at the advisory group meeting and received in writing afterward, Honey made a number of revisions. He inserted a summary of the action and research proposals in the front of the document, so that readers would not get lost in his long lead-in discussion of public affairs and the universities. The proposed national commission on the public service was more narrowly specified as a commission on public service education. While holding to his basic analysis of the limitations of the public administration graduate programs, he added material on the qualitative contributions their graduates were making to the public service, and to indicate that some of the best schools did stand out from the prevailing weaknesses and were striving toward the wider role in the universities that he advocated. A recommendation about doctoral fellowships in public administration (an alternative to the elusive NDEAs) was added. Attending to a very practical concern of the deans, Honey also recommended that governmental or other externally financed fellowships should include awards to the universities to cover actual costs of education over and above tuition rates. After distribution of these revisions<sup>27</sup> and another round of written comments from advisory group members Honey put finishing touches on a final draft and sent it out for clearance by the advisors, apparently in a "without objections" procedure; the advisors did not meet again as a group. The finished report was transmitted to Carnegie with a letter from Ferrel Heady on November 1.

Although responsive to many of the specific points raised, Honey's revisions did not change significantly the overall tone and content of the report; most of the text stood as originally drafted. It was now clearly Honey's report, so identified both in Heady's

---

<sup>26</sup> Stone memo to Honey, Sept. 14, 1966, cited above.

<sup>27</sup> Honey memorandum, "Revised Report on Higher Education for the Public Service," Sept. 30, 1966; copy from files of Don Bowen.

transmittal and on the cover of the printed version that was soon distributed within CGEPA and to other relevant persons in ASPA, the government, and the foundations.<sup>28</sup>

## REACTIONS AND EFFECTS OF THE HONEY REPORT

To their credit, the CGEPA leaders, despite their disappointment with the Honey Report, did not attempt to hide or suppress it, but gave it wide distribution in the academic public administration community and relevant governmental and foundation circles. Immediate practical results of the Report are hard to detect, but it had important effects because it stimulated discussion and thought in the public administration community that would lead CGEPA and other leaders to a more realistic assessment of where they stood, and to a rethinking of strategy for moving the field forward that would lead to the re-casting of CGEPA into NASPAA. In the long run, the Carnegie Corporation achieved a lot with \$15,000.

### Reactions and Short-Run Effects

The original sponsors of the project that had led to the Honey Report, especially Reining and Stone, felt that their project had failed. Although he had proposed a number of further inquiries, Honey had not produced a plan for an authoritative national study of the graduate public administration programs that might produce a definitive statement of what the mission, content, and organization status of such programs should be and what the nation should invest in them. The Carnegie Corporation officers who had financed and monitored the study saw no need for further action; as they had hinted early on, they chose to let the Report stand for whatever others might make of it. In that narrow sense, the outcome represented a miscarriage of grantsmanship, a failure of project management. CGEPA leaders had let their project get away from them. Honey had not written as their advocate, but as the foundation analyst he recently had been. The hurt was deeper than just organizational, almost personal. Reining, Stone and others sought recognition and affirmation of their field and their lifetime commitments to it. The outcome signified that academic public administration's bid to be taken seriously by its highest national reference group, the major foundations, had failed. The episode was a bitter reminder of public administrations' modest place in the national status hierarchy of disciplines and professions.

Did the Honey Report influence public policy? Perhaps, to a limited degree, by picking up and giving wider circulation to ideas that were percolating in Washington at the time. On several items that he recommended there was already movement in the federal government. (The following chapter of this study will deal in some detail with CGEPA's involvement in these matters.) The Report can not be said to have precipitated top-level

---

<sup>28</sup> The printed version is identified on the cover as Higher Education for the Public Service: A Report for The Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Prepared by John C. Honey, November 1, 1966.

decisions: President Johnson had made a public statement favoring such measures while the Report was in preparation. Some of the administration's legislative proposals of the next year were consistent with, but much narrower than the Honey recommendations. In the congressional consideration of the most important of these proposals, federal fellowships for graduate public administration, Honey was not brought forward to testify, nor was the Report cited as authority or entered into the record, presumably because CGEPA and other advocates feared that his "big picture" approach would not seem enthusiastic enough. At least the Report's balanced and judicious approach had not, as Stone feared, served to undermine a good idea. In a vague sort of way, perhaps for the small group of men involved in federal policy who were aware of it, the Report served to validate their belief that this was an important subject, deserving of the cautious support they were prepared to give it. The Report may also have helped bring attention in the academic community to some policy ideas they were prepared to welcome but had not until then perceived as serious possibilities.

### Discussion of the State of the Field

The most important effect of the Honey Report was to stimulate discussion and new thinking in the public administration community about the state of the field, particularly its educational component. The gist of these discussions was captured in a special edition of Public Administration Review (PAR) which printed the Report in full, along with nine separate commentaries and related articles.<sup>29</sup> Except for one skeptic, Harvey Sherman, who detected special pleading and issued a Scotch verdict,<sup>30</sup> the commentators seemed to agree on the basic point of a national need for more, and better supported, education for public affairs. From the perspective of Princeton, Rufus Miles advocated a broad public affairs leadership approach,<sup>31</sup> while from a rising institution in the Midwest, James Banovetz called for a sharper focus on development of managerial expertise,<sup>32</sup> and onetime engineer and experienced consultant Herman Pope

---

<sup>29</sup> *Public Administration Review*, Vol. XXVII, No. 4 (Nov. 1967).

<sup>30</sup> Harvey Sherman, "Some Questions About the Question," *Ibid.*, pp. 337-339. His point was that as a public administration professional he would welcome additional support to his field, but he did not think that Honey had demonstrated why that field was more deserving of support than many others. A long-prominent practitioner, then at the New York Port Authority, Sherman always enjoyed playing the role of hard-headed realist in discussions of professional matters, especially when engaged with academics

<sup>31</sup> Rufus E. Miles, Jr., "The Search for Identity of Graduate Schools of Public Affairs," *Ibid.*, pp. 343-356.

<sup>32</sup> James Banovetz, "Needed: New Expertise in Public Administration." *Ibid.*, pp. 321-324. Heading a new program at Northern Illinois University, Banovetz was one of the young professors beginning to be active in CGEPA.

concurred and urged attention to the skill needs of middle managers and specialists without prior administrative training.<sup>33</sup>

The PAR symposium brought out criticisms of the field, such as those of J. Kenneth Mulligan, a high official of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, an agency whose policies were of particular significance for the universities. Mulligan complimented Honey for not glossing over “uncomfortable facts,” chief of which was that “Public administration, by any commonly accepted criteria, is not a discipline or a profession.” Also relevant was the “curriculum disarray” of the schools, their “slight impact...on public management,” and the dominance of practitioner organizations [read “ASPA” here] by “administrative specialists” rather than top managers. Mulligan chided the educators for “defensive responses” to Honey’s findings, their lack of “forceful advocacy” for relevant legislative proposals, and their failure to address “the crisis now confronting public administration” resulting from “the growing chaos in intergovernmental relations and the accelerating trend toward the take-over of public administration by private administrators.”<sup>34</sup>

In this discussion, some of the senior academics refused to be apologetic. Reining, while professing (unconvincingly) to agree with much of Honey’s Report, insisted that in both his analysis and his recommendations, Honey had the priorities in reverse order, and that in any subsequent inquiry it would be necessary to “keep foremost the needs of the field of professional education known as public administration.” He went on to dispute some of Honey’s findings about the narrowness of curriculum and outlook of the schools.<sup>35</sup> Paul P. Van Riper of Cornell, a prominent public administration scholar not part of the CGEPA leadership, must have given that group some comfort. He insisted that the strategic importance of public administration was not to be judged from its small size. Van Riper argued that while Honey--or university presidents or foundation officers--could take an Olympian view of the governmental scene, the total public service, and the universities in all their complexity, such an approach served to diminish the present and potential contributions of public administration. In reality, the public service was not and never would be central to the interests of liberal arts colleges, or political science departments, or other professional schools. Political science might continue to teach public administration as a branch of its discipline, but serious education for public service required something more professional in content and spirit.

---

<sup>33</sup> Pope was director of Public Administration Service, a non-profit consulting group based at the famous 1313 center in Chicago. PAS was active in states and localities and several foreign countries for many years, before the big national management consulting firms showed much interest in government business.

<sup>34</sup> J.Kenneth Mulligan, “A View from Washington,” *Ibid.*, pp. 328-330. Mulligan was the head of CSC activity in the area of training, therefore an important shaper of policy on the role universities might play in federal employee training. His skepticism about public administration’s claim to be a profession and the schools’ aspiration to a preferred position in federal personnel policy and access to federal employment did not abate with passing years and was reiterated in an interview with this author, Nov. 12, 1992.

<sup>35</sup> Henry Reining, Jr., “A Reversal of Emphasis.” *Ibid.*, pp. 335-337.

Van Riper and Reining both insisted that only public administration, defined broadly and in professional terms, was equipped by concept and attitude for the crucial job of clarifying and leading the university in fulfillment of its public service responsibilities, integrating the contributions of many disciplines and professions for that purpose. This concept of leadership and integration was the defining contribution of public administration in government itself, despite the small proportion of officials who identified themselves with the field. Taking the same line that Stone had advanced earlier, Van Riper asserted that the need was not for more analysis; enough was known already to justify vigorous action to strengthen public affairs education. Van Riper even ventured to snap at the hands that might provide such nourishment by criticizing the foundations for limited investments in public affairs education, particularly as compared to what they had put into business education in recent years; if the foundations had not been so faint-hearted in the past, there might have been no need for a Honey Report.<sup>36</sup>

The idea of professionalism and concern about professional status recurred in the discussion. Honey, having concluded that the study of public administration was not a discipline and its practice was not a profession, had in effect advised the schools to make modest claims, strive to improve academically, and make themselves useful as ubiquitous facilitators in higher education and government. Reining and others insisted that how outsiders labeled practice in the field was irrelevant. The schools rested on an amalgam of disciplines and in turn served as educational underpinnings for an essential social and political function; in those respects, at least, they were professional schools, and their future had to be in further development of that concept.<sup>37</sup> Stephen K. Bailey, dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse and one of the most thoughtful observers, likewise refused to be immobilized by status anxieties. While fully recognizing the limitations of many of the schools and lesser programs, and their numerically small contribution to the public service, he pointed to their unique orientation and the high demand for their graduates, and concluded that they were useful to the nation and it was important to support and improve them. Although warning against “meretricious professionalism,” Bailey considered it desirable to move toward professional status as rapidly as it could be done through soundly based steps to improve both education and practice.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Paul P. Van Riper, “Hit ‘Em Harder, John, Hit ‘Em Harder,” *Ibid.*, pp.339-342.

<sup>37</sup> Reining had stated this view at some length in a paper that Honey must have seen while developing the Report. “Henry Reining, Jr., “Education for Public Administration: A Statement of the Case for the Interdisciplinary Professional School”; a paper delivered at San Diego State College, April 28, 1966; copy from files of Don Bowen.

<sup>38</sup> Bailey’s opinions quoted here were expressed in a letter to James E. Webb, then president of ASPA, who had invited suggestions about advancing professionalism in the field. Letter, June 21, 1966; copy from Bowen’s files. Honey, who was working on his report at the time, saw the letter and apparently was influenced by it; his Report’s analysis of the schools’ narrowness and uncertainty of mission closely followed Bailey’s. Honey did, though, take issue with one of Bailey’s suggestions, which was that ASPA consider sponsoring some kind of credentialing process for practitioners. Honey letter to Bailey, June 22, 1966. Although professional credentialing had been suggested occasionally, recently by Fritiz Mosher, it was never taken up seriously by the CGEPA schools.

Although CGEPA insiders were disappointed by the Honey Report, for many academic public administrationists, especially those in small programs that did not have separate school status, it provoked something of an awakening. To faculty members preoccupied with narrowly based teaching, the Report and subsequent debate presented an enlarged view of the field, both intellectually and in its potential role on the campus. The idea of an enterprise transcending public administration as they knew it--a broad public affairs program serving various clienteles both on and off the campus, interacting with other disciplines and professions, and taking the lead in university public concerns--was highly attractive. Until about this time, most of the professors who participated in CGEPA had talked vaguely about professionalism but had been cautious about pursuing its implications or prescribing it for others, in deference to colleagues laboring in political science departments where such ideas were unpopular. By the time debate about the Honey Report died away, few in CGEPA doubted that education for the public service must become broader in substantive content and professional in attitude. There also was an increasingly prevalent view that achieving such education required a department, school, or other entity organized for that specific purpose, although many who shared such thoughts could see no immediate way to act on them in their existing organizational situations.

While CGEPA leaders faulted the Honey Report for not accentuating the positive, there was one set of readers, not particularly concerned with the statesmanship of program management, who saw it quite differently. The following a year a conference of young faculty members and graduate students at Minnowbrook, near Syracuse, was invited to use the Report as a baseline for their generation's assessment of the state of the field. Most of these young scholars found both the Honey Report and the state of the field seriously deficient. They criticized the Report for not discussing serious intellectual issues about the substantive teachings of the schools, and for seeming to assume that the purpose of academic public administration, even if broadly conceived, was essentially to sustain and make workable the existing social and political system. For public administration's version of Sixties radicals, the Honey Report became shorthand for a declining old order, as they went forth from Minnowbrook calling for a distinctly New Public Administration.<sup>39</sup>

For CGEPA and the public administration schools and programs generally, the outcome of arguments about the Honey Report was an implicit consensus to stop worrying about whether others considered them professional and just try to act as if they were. If things like the Honey Report were not going to provide, or lead to, authoritative external validation, it was up to the educators themselves to reform, to overcome difficulty, and assert an enlarged role in higher education. If the schools

---

<sup>39</sup> The Minnowbrook conference report, containing the initial and probably most influential formulation of doctrine of what became an influential movement in the Seventies, was published in Frank Marini, Toward A New Public Administration (San Francisco, Chandler Publishing, 1971). The movement can be said to have contributed to an enlargement of the field's social and political--and to some degree psychological--dimensions, but public administration as a field would remain generally committed to "working within the system."

made the right move, recognition and resources might then follow. In this way, the Honey Report was an important impetus to reform. How the CGEPA and other leaders went about this in the next few years will be told in chapters to follow.

#### STILL SEEKING THAT GREAT VALIDATING STUDY

Despite the CGEPA leaders' disappointment with the Honey Report, their interest in a comprehensive, authoritative, and affirming study of graduate public administration was not exhausted. When it became clear that the Carnegie Corporation was not interested in a follow-up project, they regrouped for another try with the Ford Foundation (which had been kept informed all along as a possible target for the next proposal). Such an effort seemed timely, even urgent. The Johnson administration had just made legislative proposals for federal support to public service education, but Congress was not acting, and perhaps a strategically timed study would help to get things moving. The CGEPA chairman for 1967-68, Dean O. B. Conaway, Jr., of SUNY-Albany, appointed a new committee and moved rapidly to develop a proposal which was submitted to Ford in May, 1967. This proposal, although incorporating some ideas from the Honey Report, was more sharply focused on CGEPA's central interests of establishing a national need, evaluating existing public administration and related programs, and making the case for enlarged support, including aid from the federal government. As before, CGEPA did not seek to conduct the study itself and proposed an outside evaluation nor involving any public administration organization or interested university; its recommendation was that the Foundation itself undertake direct sponsorship, as it had earlier with a study of business education.

Ford officers professed interest in CGEPA's idea but hesitated, perhaps cautious about direct involvement with a topic of current legislative interest, or just waiting to see what Congress would do. Although Conaway pressed the matter in a meeting with foundation officers in August and a follow-up letter in December, the application was still pending when CGEPA assembled in March, at Cambridge, MA, for the 1968 annual meeting. Conaway professed optimism that Ford would eventually approve it.<sup>40</sup>

At this time a new player entered the game. Present at Cambridge was George A. Graham, a former Princeton professor, Ford Foundation, and Brookings Institution officer, now executive director of the recently established National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA). Graham was well known in the field for, among other things, authorship of a landmark study of education for public administration back before World War II. As he began to work up a program of projects for which NAPA might find external financing, he developed a plan for a study of public administration education.

---

<sup>40</sup> No copy of CGEPA's 1967 proposal to Ford has been found, but its essence was restated in Conaway's followup letter in December. O. B. Conaway, Jr., to William Watts, Program Officer, Ford Foundation, Dec . 8, 1967. Watts replied Jan. 18, 1968, assuring Conaway of the foundation's interest and urging patience. Copies of both letters from the files of Don. Bowen. See also Minutes, CGEPA Annual Business Meeting, March 27, 1968.

An early draft was discussed at Cambridge and circulated in the public administration community; a revised version went to the Ford Foundation in September, 1968.

The surviving documents do not record a specific decision but it appears from events that by that time CGEPA had effectively yielded precedence to NAPA in dealing with Ford about an education study; there is no record of further CGEPA representations to Ford on the subject.<sup>41</sup> (CGEPA leaders of that 1968-69 year, under the chairmanship of Brewster Denny, of the University of Washington, were preoccupied with federal lobbying, with plans for overhauling CGEPA itself, and a project on a different subject they were discussing with Ford.) Beyond Graham's personal credentials, NAPA, constituted as an organization of elders and sages of the field, seemed in many ways an appropriate body to make a sympathetic but somewhat detached examination. There was the further point that an early draft of NAPA's plan referred to developing criteria for evaluating individual university programs.<sup>42</sup> This was a matter CGEPA had always shied away from, partly because of its sensitivity with the smaller, weaker program members, but also on the assumption that judging particular programs was the sort of thing best left to external authority. NAPA looked like an appropriate body for that role,

At the next CGEPA annual meeting, at Fort Lauderdale in May 1969, Graham appeared to describe the NAPA proposal which was still unfunded. He came again to an executive committee meeting in November to report that he was beginning work on parts of the study, using other funds, but would need more money, hopefully from a foundation grant, to carry it through as planned. Such money was not immediately forthcoming, and NAPA moved slowly on the subject for two more years. NAPA eventually did receive some financing from Ford (although not on the scale originally sought) and mounted a substantial effort in 1971. The resulting report, issued in 1973, addressed constructively many of the schools' interests and would have a significant impact on CGEPA's successor organization, although not exactly in the way originally contemplated.<sup>43</sup>

In summary, after several years of effort, attempting to use the philanthropic foundations as financier and reference group, the public affairs schools still had not

---

<sup>41</sup> In a telephone interview with this author, Sept. 26, 1991, Conaway recalled that at some point in 1968 he had concluded that Ford was never going to finance the study proposed by CGEPA and recommended that they support NAPA. NAPA had launched in 1967 as a satellite of ASPA and in its earlier years shared office space in ASPA headquarters, so there was ample opportunity for coordination among Graham, Bowen, and the CGEPA leaders.

<sup>42</sup> An early draft of Graham's plan, dated Feb. 8, 1968, presumably the one circulated at Cambridge, was headed "Criteria for Guidance in Evaluating University Postgraduate Programs in Management and Public Administration." This draft evidently was aimed at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, (NASA); NASA director James Webb had been instrumental in founding NAPA, and NASA grants and contracts financed much of NAPA's early activity. A later version of Graham's proposal, now reoriented toward the foundations, was simply headed "Higher Education and Public Administration." Copies of both from files of Don Bowen.

<sup>43</sup> Richard L. Chapman and Frederic N. Cleaveland, Meeting the Needs of Tomorrow's Public Service, (National Academy of Public Administration, January 1973).

found their authoritative external validation--an impartial, prestigious, authoritative summons to the government and universities in support of greatly expanded and improved public administration programs.

## Chapter Five

### **FEDERAL PARTNERSHIP, LIMITED**

During the mid-Sixties years, while the leaders of the Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration (CGEPA) were dealing with the U.S. Office of Education and the Carnegie Corporation on the project that led to the Honey Report, and then engaged in debate about the Report's findings, they were at the same time aware of, and to a degree seeking to influence, promising developments in the federal government. For a time, it appeared that the university schools and programs of public affairs and administration could be on the verge of a new status with the federal government, something approaching the virtual partnership with the national administration that some of the schools' spokesmen had long advocated. The new relationship might include both expanded participation by universities in the training and career advancement of federal employees, and substantial federal aid in various forms to graduate education in the schools. In the end, though, many of the possibilities never materialized, for reasons that will be discussed below, and the most desired prize--direct federal support to graduate education--remained a promise unfulfilled.

### **PRESIDENTIAL PROMISES**

Realization of the hopes of some of the more ambitious CGEPA leaders seemed not impossible around 1965. The federal government's interest in national public service capability had increased during the Kennedy administration, due in large part to the leadership of John W. Macy, Jr., a longtime important figure in the public administration community, who became chairman of the Civil Service Commission (CSC). As described earlier (See Chapter Two), Macy's efforts had produced two important initiatives in 1963: the program coordinated outside the government by the National Institute of Public Affairs (NIPA), which sent about 60 federal officials annually for graduate study at selected universities; and the CSC-operated Executive Seminar Centers, which offered a program of two- or three-week short courses to which federal agencies sent employees on a reimbursable basis.

After Lyndon B. Johnson's 1964 election as President in his own right, Macy was given additional duties at the White House as presidential personnel adviser and recruiter of political executive appointees. With this new access, and with the active collaboration of Roger Jones at the Bureau of the Budget, Macy pushed employee career development and public service education on the administration's agenda. The President was not unreceptive. Compared to presidents before and after him, Johnson was considerably more interested in career service (at least as he understood it), as well as anxious to show support for education and win applause from a university world which he thought never fully appreciated him.

In May, 1966, public affairs education received the sort of benison devoutly wished for by all interest groups: a presidential speech, on its territory, on its subjects, containing

not mere generalities but apparent commitments to policies long sought. At a conference at Princeton to dedicate the new building of the expanded Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Lyndon Johnson discoursed on the contributions of higher education to the nation's well-being, called attention to the large number of prominent academics in his administration, pointed out the importance of attracting talented people to public service, and finally came to the pay-off:

*I have asked Chairman Macy...to head a task force which will survey Federal programs for career advancement. I have asked him to study an expanded program of graduate training which, with the help of the universities, can enlarge our efforts to develop the talents and broaden the horizons of our career officers.*

*I also intend next year to recommend to Congress a program of expanded opportunities for those who wish to train for the public service. We will assist:*

*Students planning careers in Federal, state, or local government*

*Colleges and universities seeking to enrich their own programs in this field*

*State and local governments seeking to develop more effective career services for their employees.<sup>1</sup>*

Johnson's speech (presumably mostly the product of Macy) touched on key points in CGEPA's long-standing wish list and gave reason to believe that great gains for academic public administration were at hand. Efforts to bring those hopes to fruition would mark the peak of CGEPA activism. But the results in the end would be disappointing. CGEPA's efforts would be unevenly applied, the government policies that emerged were not quite what Johnson's words had seemed to imply, and problems of timing and untoward political events emerged. Despite the President's encouraging words, the reality was that his years of greatest power had been spent on Great Society programmatic legislation, not administrative strengthening. Also significant would be the sequencing: the administration intended first to deal with its own employee development policies, whose implications for the universities were not entirely clear; then in the next year the President would back legislation for what the public affairs schools had most wanted: direct federal aid to their students and their programs. But by then it would be 1967, in a rapidly changing political environment--urban riots, opposition to Vietnam--and late in the day of Lyndon Johnson.

---

<sup>1</sup> From text in the Washington Post, May 11, 1966.,

## FEDERAL CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND THE UNIVERSITIES

CGEPA's constituents had always been interested in federal training policies and practices, at the least because of their presumed effects on the attractiveness of federal employment, and in turn on the attractiveness of studying public administration. In the Sixties the schools saw a more direct interest: the possibility that an enlarged federal commitment to training and career development would include significant direct participation by university public administration programs. At least some of the CGEPA programs already were involved in training in various ways, and a fuller development of such activity was part of the concept of what visionaries like Reining and Stone were beginning to call the "comprehensive" school of public affairs. Such hopes had been nourished in the early Sixties by the rising national concern and respect for higher education, the friendliness of Macy and other key federal officials toward CGEPA and its parent, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA, of which Macy was a former president), the Civil Service Commission's preachments to the rest of the government about more investment in training, and the NIPA and Executive Seminar Center initiatives mentioned above. Johnson's statement at Princeton about "an expanded program of graduate training" to be done "with the help of the universities" suggested new dimensions of university involvement. What did he (or his speechwriter) really mean? And how did it actually work out?

### Short-Term Training: Possibilities Unexplored and Passed By

It is important to note that Johnson at Princeton did not mention a form of training that actually comprised the largest part of federal training effort: what the government called "short term training," ordinarily delivered in seminars and short courses lasting from one to four weeks. While the bulk of such training was on technical or specialized topics of agency-specific interest, a considerable amount dealt with broader management and policy processes on which the universities presumably had expertise to offer. A few schools involved in CGEPA did offer such programs, either on an open subscription basis or by contractual arrangements with particular agencies, and most of the others were interested, at least in principle. Such activity would be consistent with the renewed concern for adult education and "life-long learning" that was creeping onto the agenda of higher education. At least a few CGEPA programs envisaged rather large-scale training operations that would contribute to their institutions' adult education missions, enhance visibility and establish useful contacts with government agencies, and perhaps bring extra revenue to help support their graduate programs.

However, for university-based short-term training to be widely attractive to government agencies and a major activity for the CGEPA schools, serious problems on both the government and university sides would have to be overcome. Government decisions about such matters were decentralized among a myriad of agencies, which made them difficult for the universities to find and, when found, highly variable in content and intermittent in timing. To make participation in such training fully attractive to universities it would be desirable to get the opportunities on a stable basis and sufficiently concentrated to enable orderly scheduling and commitment of faculty

resources. But federal agencies usually resisted making long-term commitments, partly because of their own stop-and-go budgetary problems and partly because they preferred to schedule training projects at their own convenience and to pick and choose among universities and their faculty experts. The Civil Service Commission, while encouraging more training in principle, also generally propounded the doctrine that agencies' first resort should be to their own resources, and external providers should be sought only when in-house resources were unavailable or inappropriate. Although it was reasonable to assume that on many subjects the universities had talents superior to the in-house resources, the CSC did not particularly encourage the agencies to use universities for short-term training and made only slight efforts to help agency training officers and university programs find each other in the unorganized market.

While to the universities the federal government might seem unfathomably complex, from the viewpoint of government training officers the universities were not easy to deal with, wedded as they were to rigid academic calendars and full of red tape of their own. The institutional structure and culture of universities was difficult for government people to appreciate and did, indeed, tend to impede their serious engagement in government training. In most universities, organizing non-credit education for external clients was relegated to special centers, bureaus, summer sessions, divisions of continuing education, and the like, which put it beyond the immediate responsibility and administrative reach of the graduate program directors who represented their institutions in CGEPA. Separate systems of budgeting and faculty time allocation kept non-credit and regular academic teaching apart. Even when such structural obstacles could be alleviated, as they sometimes were in separately organized schools or institutes of public administration, prevailing faculty status, incentive, and reward systems often made it difficult to mobilize regular faculty members for such activities--assuming that regular faculty had the skills for this kind of teaching, which was not always the case.

Such institutional impediments were deep in everyone's consciousness, obviously not easily remedied in the short run. So it turned out that despite a fair amount of talk in the 1960s about more university involvement, neither in the government nor in the CGEPA leadership was there any serious effort to tackle the sort of institutional change that might have made the CGEPA programs major participants in the greater bulk of federal management training. Historically and by name and charter, CGEPA was primarily interested in graduate study--semester courses, academic credits, and degrees--and that concern dominated its attention and effort. Most CGEPA participating institutions were unprepared to get seriously into government training unless it could be delivered in more or less conventional academic form. Absence of official institutional involvement, however, did not prevent individual faculty members from "moonlighting" as short-term lecturers in government-run programs; this became a profitable sideline for professors with good government connections.

In the middle and late Sixties, possibilities for serious participation in federal short-term management training drifted away from the universities. The development of the Civil Service Commission's Executive Centers reflected the underlying realities. The first ESC, opened at King's Point, NY, in 1963, was an almost immediate success.

Federal agencies found it convenient to fit their promising employees into the ESC's schedule of two-week courses. However, the idea that promising employees would go through ESC's cycle of ten courses and thereby get something like an equivalent to the NIPA academic year program was dissipated fairly early by the realization that most agencies, rather than sending selected employees through all or most of the ESC program cycle, preferred to spread the experience more widely, sending more people for just one or two programs. Thus the ESC soon became essentially another short-term program, somewhat enriched by the academic credentials of its trainers and the occasional imported lecturers. The CSC found the ESC system financially workable and programmatically manageable, providing flexibility and substantial control of program delivery. At least an appearance of academic quality could be provided by professors brought in as individually hired lecturers for a day or two at a time, without the necessity of contracts or other institutional relationships with their home universities. With King's Point a success, a second ESC was opened in 1966 in Berkeley, near to but having no operational connections with the University of California,<sup>2</sup> and there would later be a third at Oak Ridge, TN. Once those centers were open, it was essential for the CSC to keep the classes relatively full in order to generate the funds to keep the operations going. Thus the CSC had a bureaucratic interest in pushing the operating agencies to use the ESCs rather than, say, encouraging them to use universities. Rather curiously, the universities, at least as represented in CGEPA, did not seem to perceive the ESCs as alternatives to themselves, even if the federal agencies did. CGEPA seems to have paid little attention as such federal policies were evolving. Indeed, many of the CGEPA leaders were enthusiastic supporters and occasional consultant-lecturers in the ESC programs.

With respect to short-term training, then, Federal use of the universities for such training did not cease, but neither did it grow much, in a period of rapid increase in all kinds of training activities. Whether more could have been done to expand it, and what the consequences for both university programs and government agencies might have been, must remain in the realm of probably fruitless speculation.

### Long-Term Training

As compared to the difficulties in short-term training, the outlook for university participation in government long-term management training, usually referred to as "executive development" or "executive education," was considerably brighter. Prominent in sight of the CGEPA schools was the NIPA program, which was developing satisfactorily from their point of view. In 1966 that program was in its third year, with about 60 federal employees placed at eight different institutions; early administrative wrinkles had been mostly ironed out, and the NIPA fellows were proving satisfactory or better graduate students. The federal agencies were providing an adequate supply of

---

<sup>2</sup> It appears that the Berkeley ESC, at least in its early days, had relatively close informal relations with public administration faculty members at California and other West Coast institutions, some of whom had urged the opening of a center in the West and promised cooperation. However, those relations were individual rather than institutional and would wither in time.

nominees, although some agencies were beginning to grumble about the high cost, in both time and money, and agency processes of selection and post-training career planning for these expensively educated individuals remained erratic. The fact that the University of Chicago and Stanford had withdrawn from the program, while the School of Public Administration of the University of Southern California had been added, suggested some retreat from NIPA's early high-toned academicism and an accommodation with schools oriented to professional education, but the overall list of participating universities and the individual student courses of study undertaken continued to reflect, if not an overriding commitment to liberal arts, at least a disdain for "nuts and bolts" administrative training. Other institutions beyond the chosen eight watched the NIPA experience, considered themselves fully appropriate to participate, and hoped that the program would expand to include them. When Johnson at Princeton spoke of "an expanded program of graduate studies" which would "develop the talents and expand the horizons of our career officials" it was presumed that he was talking about an expansion of NIPA-type programs.

For the university public administration programs, NIPA had a significance beyond its obvious benefit of providing a cadre of well-qualified, fully supported students. Expansion of such a program would address one of the long-standing problems of public administration education: its failure to connect adequately with specialists and professionals from other fields who usually got the top government jobs, while the public administration graduates tended to wind up in administrative and staff services. If a mid-career tour at a public affairs school could be established as the norm and expectation for high-potential federal professionals of all sorts, those schools would have a major new mission and clientele, perhaps as important as educating pre-entry students and more satisfying because it would give access to an elite population at or bound for the top.

But Johnson at Princeton had put his reference to graduate training in the context of an assessment of federal career development activity, including both short- and long-term. Indeed, one assessment of university programs for that purpose was going on even as Johnson spoke, and another at a much higher level was about to begin. And by the time the latter inquiry was done, and its recommendations put in motion, the possibilities for university involvement were considerably narrowed.

### The NIPA-OE Study: Another Honey Report

In 1965, NIPA was interested in an evaluation of its program to date and seeking to establish an additional role for itself as a center of information and experience on public executive development. To those ends, NIPA joined with the U. S. Office of Education (mainly Ward Stewart) to co-sponsor a national study of university programs for public executives. The plan was to assemble data through an OE national survey, from which would be developed both a register of existing programs and an analysis of conditions and trends--an approach similar to the one that had led to the Stewart report on graduate degree programs in public administration back in 1961. OE made its new survey in the summer of 1965, but by the time the responses were in Stewart had new

duties at OE that prevented him from producing the analytical essay. To complete the study, NIPA and OE agreed to retain John Honey; this is what Honey had been doing just prior to his hiring by CGEPA for the graduate education study described in the previous chapter.

Honey's report for NIPA and OE was exploratory rather than definitive, but it touched issues and sounded themes that would recur in discussions of public executive development in succeeding years (as well as in his CGEPA exercise immediately following).<sup>3</sup> He began by sketching the growth of executive training programs, noting some of their principal differentiations by purpose, duration, content, clientele, and locus of university responsibility. While generally positive about the benefits of such programs, he also pointed out many problems and issues, for both government and the universities. On the government side, it was evident that the agencies were performing less than ideally in their processes for selecting participants and assigning them afterward in ways to take advantage of their training. On the university side, Honey noted some of the problems of organization, faculty utilization, and financing that tended to complicate the conduct of programs for non-traditional clienteles, especially on a short-term basis. Presuming that the need of executives was for some mixture of intellectual broadening, enhanced self-understanding, managerial development, and expertise in a policy field, Honey dwelt at length on what he considered an unsettled question: Were programs with such objectives ultimately compatible with traditional graduate school emphasis on research and disciplinary specialization? Although noting evidence of high quality in some of the short-term programs, such as the one offered by the Brookings Institution (which was classified as "university-related" for this purpose), Honey gave most of his attention to the longer-term programs. He cited other studies to the effect that long-term full-time programs had been shown to produce measurable change in participants, but short-term programs had not.

Honey's assessment reflected NIPA's emphasis on broadening executives through liberal education. He seemed to assume that this was most likely to be provided in rather traditional academic settings. Although noting that the school of public administration or public affairs, where it existed, would be the university's "logical repository" for executive education, he did not pursue the implications of that statement by examining the ability of such schools to achieve an appropriate balance of general and professional education.

Honey recommended and predicted continued growth of university-based executive development, particularly in light of President Johnson's Princeton speech, which had come just as he was wrapping up his report. He noted a need for continuing appraisal of the basic interests of all parties, program evaluation more searching than was provided by "participant happiness numbers," more program experimentation, a national clearinghouse of experience and data, and foundation support for experimental and

---

<sup>3</sup> Ward S. Stewart and John C. Honey, *University-Sponsored Executive Development Programs in the Public Service*; U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Publication OE-56023, 1966.

innovative programs. Perhaps reflecting Honey's temperament, as well as the restraints of a government publication, it was a cautious and balanced report. It was basically approving of university efforts and suggested some future roles for both NIPA and OE, but it was hardly a trumpet call for immediate rapid expansion of federal patronage of university-based training programs.

The Foreword to the OE-Honey report acknowledged the aid of CGEPA, but that help appears to have been merely to endorse the project and encourage member institutions to respond to the OE questionnaire. There was no evidence of contribution by CGEPA or its leaders to the interpretive essay. Their attention at the time was elsewhere.

### The Presidential Task Force

The OE-Honey report does not seem to have attracted much attention from federal policy makers, but soon afterward came another project that, seen historically, would be highly consequential for both federal training and the national landscape of public administration education. This was the Presidential Task Force announced by Johnson at Princeton. Assembled and chaired by John Macy, this group examined the federal system for training and education of administrative, professional, and technical employees, with particular emphasis on executive development. The task force looked at government practices for identifying, assigning, and tracking the careers of employees with high potential, and the various ways of providing them with appropriate training and developmental experience, both within the government and in higher education.

In one sense, higher education was well represented on the blue-ribbon group, which included two university presidents along with several notables who had had academic careers prior to reaching high positions in the government and other institutions. But neither the task force nor the list of their alternates who presumably did most of the work included anyone directly from a public affairs school or program, or who had ever been a professor of public administration.<sup>4</sup> Neither ASPA nor CGEPA made an institutional submission to the task force, but in response to its invitation two individuals who headed CGEPA member programs submitted papers: Donald C. Stone,

---

<sup>4</sup> The two presidents on the task force were Jerome H. Holland of Hampton Institute, a historically black institution, and James H. McCrocklin of LBJ's alma mater, Southwest Texas State. Distinguished ex-academics included McGeorge Bundy, recent presidential national security adviser and one-time Harvard dean, now president of the Ford Foundation; John W. Gardner, Secretary of HEW, former president of the Carnegie Corporation and a professor of psychology; Robert D. Calkins, president of the Brookings Institution, former foundation executive and professor of economics; Evron Kirkpatrick, executive director of the American Political Science Association and former professor of poli sci; and Charles Schultze, director of the Bureau of the Budget and former professor of economics. Macy himself was a former university vice president. Also included were two personnel experts from industry and a representative of the AFL-CIO. The alternates included James M. Mitchell of Brookings (for Calkins) and Roger W. Jones of the BoB (for Schultze); both of these men were leading public administration professionals who had many connections and were frequent lecturers in university programs (Jones was especially close to Princeton) but neither was a fully credentialed academic or had ever held a regular faculty position. Listing from *Investing for Tomorrow*; Report of the Presidential Task Force on Career Advancement; U. S. Civil Service Commission, 1967.

of the University of Pittsburgh, currently active in CGEPA, and Earl H. DeLong of the American University in Washington.

For different reasons, neither of these papers served to advance the interests of the CGEPA programs. Stone tried to ride the rising tide of national concern with urban problems touched off by recent riots in the ghettos. He called for a sweeping national public-private movement to reorient everything--public opinion, culture patterns, governmental institutions, the entire education system--from the inheritance of the nation's rural past to the new realities of an urban society. In that framework he recommended massive government and foundation investments in appropriate university programs to provide research, pre-entry education, post-entry training, and other services needed to cope with the new urban crisis. Central to that effort should be federally financed centers of graduate education in urban administration, including generous fellowships. The need was for a "hard-headed, comprehensive partnership program *fully comparable and twenty times as large as the complex of land-grant colleges, experiment stations, and extension services developed for agriculture*" (italics added).<sup>5</sup> This apparently was just too much for the task force, whose report did not pick up on Stone's urban theme or embrace any of his recommendations.<sup>6</sup>

DeLong's paper would have dismayed his CGEPA peers had they seen it, because it was a vigorous argument for very limited federal use and support of university training programs, especially in their existing form. DeLong based his case on a strict definition of the essential interests and responsibilities of both the government and the universities. He saw the universities in danger of being flooded with carelessly chosen government-supported students and trainees for whom the universities would be asked to do inappropriate things that would not help the government much but tend to undermine the quality of higher education. Most pre-entry professional education, DeLong thought, should be the responsibility of the individual, not the government. Employees might in some cases be appropriately sent to universities for updating in clearly established fields of professional or technical knowledge, but new kinds of university programs, not conventional degree programs, were needed for that purpose. Most administrative training that the universities were invited to provide amounted to little more than vestibule orientation or updating in government processes, both of which should be done in-house. DeLong's severest strictures were applied to executive development, which he considered an ill-defined concept generally pursued by inappropriate means. Programs for civilians under that heading were compared unfavorably with the military's system of service schools and staff colleges, which prepared officers for their next higher level of responsibility without the encumbrance of course credits and degrees. He saw little evidence that executive capacity could be

---

<sup>5</sup>Donald C. Stone, "Career Development for Administrative and Professional Personnel to Serve an Urban America"; paper for the Presidential Task Force on Career Advancement; from Stone's files.

<sup>6</sup> The only evidence of Stone's impact on the task force was its explicit rejection of one of his minor recommendations, which was that government fellowships should include an award to the universities above and beyond official tuition rates, so as to reflect the actual cost of education. *Investment for Tomorrow*, p. 50.

imparted in formal academic programs. “If these executive students have carried out some profit from their academic graduate programs in public administration, it has come from the failure of the universities to maintain the quality of their own intentions.” DeLong did admit a possible role for universities in “horizon broadening” for highly selected individuals at mid-career, but the need of such persons was essentially for adult liberal education, not graduate or professional degrees. In this connection he spoke favorably of the NIPA experiment, but he did not urge its expansion or wide emulation. If the government was serious about executive development it should create facilities of its own, including a capstone institution for civilian executives, all run according to the government’s needs, not academic conventions.<sup>7</sup>

There is no way to know whether DeLong convinced or changed any minds on the task force; more likely he told them things they were already prepared to hear. His position on the relative merits of in-house and government-based training was difficult to challenge on empirical grounds because of the paucity of good evaluative and comparative studies. By taking such high ground DeLong invited the government officials on the task force to position themselves as responsible conservators of government interests and resources, and challenged the present and former academic members to defend high intellectual and academic values. The CSC staff serving the task force presumably were happy to have a strong recommendation, coming from an academic, of the in-house training establishment to which they were strongly committed. At any rate, the task force’s report was consistent in many respects with DeLong’s contribution.

---

<sup>7</sup> Earl H. DeLong, “A Philosophy of Training and Education for the Federal Service,” Memorandum for the Presidential Task Force on Career Advancement, Sept. 1966; copy in the library of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (successor agency to the Civil Service Commission).

American University was a member and DeLong attended at least some CGEPA meetings, but he was never of the inner circle, perhaps because of his heretical views and acerbic personal style. His was an extreme and no doubt minority opinion, but it is useful to note that the views of Reining, Stone, et. al. did not represent the entirety of the public administration professoriate. DeLong’s position was especially striking considering that he headed a program in the nation’s capital with a potentially large clientele of federal employees.

DeLong opened his paper with “a candid introduction” recognizing that his ideas, if fully realized “would destroy a substantial part of the business of several Washington educational establishments,” but he thought that “something like this may be required to make real universities out of these schools.” He thought it better to speak out rather than to “sleep on the issue until our criteria of academic quality and purpose have been drowned in a deluge of Federal trainees.” The passion of civil servants for degrees had “devalued” education and “inflated” the significance of government-sponsored training. Universities had lacked “intellectual conviction” and undertaken inappropriate tasks “for reasons of financing or from a misguided sense of public service.” The executive development function “should not be left or turned over to the academic establishment. Very particularly, this objective should not be attempted by support of such persons in the traditional styles of academic degree programs.” Up to now, “the universities could hardly have failed more completely” in that purpose. Government should give more support to adult liberal education for those headed for the top, but: “It is time for the universities to break loose from their fossilization of graduate program concepts and to provide a university-worthy concept of horizon-stretching and inclusiveness which would meet this need.” Further: “The federal government should do everything to discourage, and nothing to encourage, the notion that a formal academic label is even an advantage, let alone a requirement, for federal executive selection.”

To be sure, the task force was faithful to its auspices in that it was in general positive about training, and recommended expansion of career development efforts. However, its approach was cautious and on the whole conservative. The report endorsed the existing doctrine of primary responsibility for training in the operating agencies, with the CSC in a role of leadership and monitoring. The CSC's growing role as organizer and provider of inter-agency training (to the extent that the agencies were willing to pay for it) was endorsed--perhaps the most important thing in the report from CSC's point of view. Throughout the report ran an emphasis on rationalizing training policies in terms of agency missions and needs, and economical use of funds and resources.

As to the role of higher education, which Johnson had seemed to emphasize at Princeton, the task force took a conservative line. Rather than seeking to maximize university participation, the report emphasized concern about costs, as well as the need to shelter what it referred to as "hard pressed" institutions from undue federal demands. Starting from the old training/education dichotomy, the task force recommended a sharpening of the distinction between developmental activities best done in-house and those to be sought in higher education. Although the task force leaned to more in-house programs for professional updating and conversion of specialists into managers, the universities should be invited to develop innovative (and, presumably, non-degree) programs for that purpose. The most important university contribution would be to provide disciplinary and professional education, mostly pre-entry, plus horizon-stretching experiences for career officers in preparation for top positions. The latter presumably was a reference to NIPA-type programs, which were not cited by name; the context made it clear that such programs should be limited to a relatively few carefully selected individuals. Departing somewhat from DeLong's extremism, the task force noted that federal assistance to employees for graduate study, perhaps even leading to degrees, might be appropriate in some cases, but such support would have to be justified in terms of governmental requirements. Assisted individuals should bear part of the cost if possible. The report spoke favorably about the increasing number of employees taking personal initiative to pursue graduate study on a part-time, after-hours basis, at their own expense.

Perhaps feeling a need to say something more positive to the universities, the task force recommended expansion of the practice of giving faculty members non-competitive appointments of up to a year in federal agencies. This was justified for the government by the fresh thinking that academics might bring to the agencies, and by the contacts that might aid in recruiting graduates.

In contrast to its caution about university participation in federal training, the task force gave a strong endorsement to the CSC's inter-agency training institutions, including the Executive Seminar Centers. Also specifically approved was the concept of a new residential institution for top-level federal civilian executives.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The preceding paragraphs represent a reasonable gloss of *Investing for Tomorrow*; this author requests excuse from specific page citations from the 69-page report.

## Policy Implementation

Events and decisions about federal training in 1967 and 1968 confirmed the tendency to relegate higher education to a secondary role, and were played out in developments of later years that can be conveniently noted here.

Shortly after the presidential Task Force on Career Advancement made its report, a presidential Executive Order gave sanction to its principal recommendations. The Order reiterated the importance of training, the primary responsibility of operating agencies to provide it, and the leadership role of the CSC. As recommended by the task force, the Order specifically authorized the CSC to determine needs for inter-agency training and to “either conduct such training or arrange for agencies having the substantive competence to do so.” Colleges and universities were not mentioned; their participation was legitimized only by a brief authorization for agencies to “use non-Government training resources as appropriate.”<sup>9</sup>

Along with the Executive Order, the White House issued a statement in which the President called public attention to the progressive steps contemplated and embraced one of the task force’s key recommendations. He announced that he had directed the Civil Service Commission to “establish a center for advanced study for executives in the upper echelons of the Civil Service.” This institution, he said, would “call upon leaders in the academic community and in other fields of endeavor to assist in providing our top executives with the best training possible.”<sup>10</sup> With this fresh mandate, the CSC pushed ahead to expand the Executive Seminar Centers, as previously noted, and to establish its capstone institution, the Federal Executive Institute (FEI).

The idea of a “civilian staff college,” an institution for senior civilian executives more or less comparable to the military’s war colleges, had been discussed in federal personnel circles, and generally supported in academia, for at least twenty years. The CSC had been working on plans for some time, and planning intensified after LBJ’s announcement in early 1968 that he would not run for reelection. Macy and his colleagues, and presumably LBJ as well, wanted the institution in operation by election day, to reduce the chances of its being caught in the transition between administrations or suspended by an incoming president. They made it, by three weeks, and the FEI opened in October 1968.

The evolution of the FEI, from planning, to implementation, to early operation, to maturation provides another illustration of drift away from involvement of universities in federal career development. The CSC’s early planning had generally assumed that to provide an academic environment and enrich its program, the FEI would have some kind of a university relationship, although it remained indefinite whether this was to be

---

<sup>9</sup> Executive Order #11348, April 20, 1967.

<sup>10</sup> White House Press Release, “Statement by the President Upon Signing an Executive Order on Training Employees of the Federal Government,” April 20, 1967.

achieved by its location, or by participation of one or more universities in its program, or both.<sup>11</sup> Macy took personal control of the decision, and after discussing possibilities with several institutions concluded that he wanted a university site and relationship that offered the intangibles of an academic community and possibilities for cooperation but retained full government control of the FEI's staff and program. The right combination of relationship and available facility was found in Charlottesville, and the CSC leased the once-prime but now obsolescing Thomas Jefferson Inn, adjacent to the University of Virginia. The first director of the FEI, Frank P. Sherwood, had been a professor at the School of Public Administration of the University of Southern California, and most of the other initial faculty had academic credentials and experience. The initial eight-week residential program developed by Sherwood and the faculty had academic content and some degree of traditional form, in that it included lectures and seminars, but these were in a context of analysis of each individual executive's needs for personal growth and adaptation to change, and the environment was contrived to achieve intense interpersonal relations of faculty and participants.

In its early years FEI had fairly close relationships with UVA, and to a lesser extent with other universities. These connections were fostered with the aid of a grant from the Ford Foundation (arranged by Macy) to UVA, which financed and released a UVA public affairs faculty member part-time to serve as designated university liaison and supplementary faculty member at FEI, and to administer a program that brought visiting faculty, student assistants, and interns from UVA and other institutions to FEI for varying periods of time. Separately from the Ford grant, UVA occasionally hired FEI faculty to teach courses in their specialties. Many of these activities, however, were precarious and when the Ford money ran out after three years the relationships gradually declined. For several years FEI continued to recruit a few UVA faculty members to offer seminars, sometimes on a fairly regular basis, and to draw on relationships with faculty members from UVA and other institutions developed through the Ford program as a source of recruiting replacements for its full-time faculty. These latter academic relationships, however, were on a contractual basis between the individuals and FEI and not a matter of organic or institutional programmatic collaboration. As time went by, FEI's sponsorship, purposes, clientele, and tighter direction from Washington led to differences in program content, scheduling, and

---

<sup>11</sup> I am obliged to J. Kenneth Mulligan, who was CSC director of training, and William McDonald, the CSC staffer most involved in FEI planning, for access to several FEI planning papers, and their recollections in a lengthy interview in 1991.

operating style that increasingly separated it from UVA and the public administration/public affairs schools, not to mention the remainder of conventional academia.<sup>12</sup>

When Johnson at Princeton spoke of “an expanded program of graduate training” for careerists the CGEPA schools quite naturally thought--or at least hoped--that he meant something like the NIPA-sponsored program of a year’s graduate study for selected mid-career officers. Events following the Presidential Task Force left them disappointed. In early 1967, Representative John Brademas of Indiana, who had been in touch with some of the university public affairs educators and knew that the Johnson administration was developing training proposals, introduced a bill touching on several of the policy areas under consideration, including graduate study by federal employees. The bill would authorize sending up to one percent annually of federal employees in grades 11-13 to graduate school, continuing on full salary and benefits and with all educational costs covered, including tuition and an additional cost of education reimbursement to the universities. This would have, in effect, federalized and enormously expanded the NIPA program. However, the administration was reluctant to see training policy with that degree of specificity, and certainly not on that scale, written into legislation. It declined to support the Brademas bill and soon thereafter introduced its own package of intergovernmental and training legislation, which contained no provision for federal employee fellowships. Brademas abandoned his bill and supported the administration’s proposal.<sup>13</sup>

By 1968 it was clear that the public affairs schools were not going to receive a great bonanza of full-time, generously financed, federal employee-students. General expansion of federal training did bring a modest increase in such students in the next few years, but well within the presidential task force’s recommendation that such

---

<sup>12</sup> The preceding paragraph is based on the experience of the present writer as UVA liaison to FEI under the Ford grant and for several years thereafter as a contractual part-time faculty member at FEI. It was indicative of the difficulty of achieving relationships suitable for institutional cooperation between academia and government, that when the Ford money ran out the UVA administration was willing to fund the liaison position only on such a limited basis that the position was insignificant. Like most other institutions, UVA preferred to look away while its faculty moonlighted rather than undertake working out an institutional collaborative relationship. At the time, the UVA public administration/affairs program was within, and considerably restrained by, an academic department of government that was generally conventional in style and uninterested in arrangements that might facilitate cooperation or derive benefits for its own faculty and students from the FEI. Over the years, the relationship with UVA has provided various amenities and psychic benefits to FEI faculty and its executive participants, but the relationship has remained essential superficial. Sherwood and a number of others FEI’ers (including this writer) have collected their recollections (generally with a more benign view of the UVA relationship than the one presented above) in Frank P. Sherwood, ed., *The Early Years of the Federal Executive Institute: Theory, History, Reflections* (iUniverse, 2010).

<sup>13</sup> The Brademas bill was H.R. 5989, 90th Congress. The idea of supporting as many as 1% annually of employees in the designated grades was, of course, unrealistic, but the administration displayed no interest in having such authority to support its own scaled-down program. Sufficient authority was deemed to exist in the broad terms of the 1958 training act to justify participation in the NIPA program. The CSC’s preference was to rest on that act and not encourage legislation that would open the details of training policy to annual appropriations committee scrutiny; training was seen as too vulnerable to be risked under close legislative review and the vagaries of political weather.

investment remain limited to a selectively chosen few. The main vehicle continued to be the NIPA showcase program, highly valued by its participants and by the handful of universities they attended. (The prominence of this set of universities in CGEPA (and later in NASPAA) could possibly explain why those organizations never made any particular efforts to persuade the government to expand the program or distribute the participant students more widely.) When the foundation money ran out in 1970 and the NIPA organization closed down, the CSC assumed responsibility for making an annual call for nominees from the agencies and brokering distribution of nominees among the participating universities. The CSC also went so far as to rule that the chosen universities were providing something more than or different from regular graduate studies, thereby justifying payment by the sponsoring agencies of fees above standard tuition rates. However, the CSC put no money into it beyond the small administrative cost of soliciting and placing the nominees--and rarely, if ever, put its own employee in the program. When the CSC took over it renamed the program "Education for Public Management," and in the succeeding years the program took on an increasingly managerial flavor, as the NIPA vision of enlightening young princes by exposure to the liberal arts gave way to the Nixon administration's emphasis on management, the desire of employees for degree credentials, and the growing concern of sponsoring agencies for costs and justifying evaluations. During the later 1970s, the interest of both the CSC (now the Office of Personnel Management (OPM)) and most of the operating agencies in long-term university training gradually declined. The last vestiges of a centrally promoted, government-wide program were wiped out by the Reagan administration, leaving the few agencies who sponsored occasional employees for long-term university programs in public management (mainly the defense agencies) to deal directly with whatever universities they chose.

### Summary and Speculation

Federal decisions about employee training and education in the 1966-68 period established government policies of long duration. Those decisions also were significant for the subsequent development and configuration of public affairs education in the university world--largely in the negative sense of eliminating what might have been a directly shaping influence on the content, growth, and distribution of university programs.

As previously noted, events and non-events of this period effectively closed the door on any possibility that short-term management training of federal employees would become a major activity for the public administration programs. Occasional university programs for federal employees continued, usually by contract with particular agencies, but generally sporadically and on a small scale. Most university-based short-term training was attuned to the state and local government market. Faculty members were more apt to participate in federal training as individual consultants to government agencies than in programs sponsored by their universities. Affirming the training/education distinction, emphasizing primary reliance on government facilities, and encouraging the CSC's enterprises for interagency training--these developments served to limit severely the market that federal employee training might have created for higher

education. Did the fact that the market remained so small explain why the universities never seriously undertook to reform their ways of doing things so as to compete in it? Or was the causation the other way around? Training has never approached, much less challenged, academic degree instruction as a major function of schools of public administration.

With respect to graduate instruction, it is interesting to speculate what might have occurred if the federal government had attempted a large expansion of the NIPA innovation, as seemed to be implied in Johnson's Princeton speech. (This was the mid-Sixties, remember, when many things still seemed possible.) A quantum increase in federally sponsored full time students, as contemplated in the Brademas bill, certainly would have sped up growth and enhanced prosperity of the public administration schools and programs. But that could hardly have been an inconsequential phenomenon. Would the growth have been large and sustained enough to result in a significant reorientation of the mission of those schools? Would the schools have responded creatively with programs better suited to the mid-career needs of "other professionals" than their existing graduate degree programs? And would such adaptations have maintained appropriate quality, or resulted in watering-down and institutional degradation (as DeLong would have predicted)?

Speculating further, it seems likely that greatly expanded government support of full-time graduate study would have raised policy questions about the distribution of those students and the eligibility of institutions to participate. Would the government have ventured to designate "approved" programs, with the academic and possibly political issues such choices might arouse? Would the bait of federal approval or patronage have pushed the universities collectively toward consideration of program standards much sooner than eventually occurred? Alternatively, would the government have permitted a free market for institutional entrepreneurship and employee-student individual choice? And what distribution of students might have resulted from that process? No doubt some employees would have selected a graduate school on the basis of personal and geographic convenience. But the promise of full government support would have greatly expanded the possible choices for many students, perhaps resulting in a clustering at the more prestigious institutions. Such clustering could have hastened the development of something like twenty or twenty-five large, well-supported, prestigious, and presumably qualitatively superior schools. That was not an unreasonable goal for the public affairs educational field in the late 1960s--indeed, as we shall see below, it was exactly the initial prospect sketched by both the CGEPA leaders and the Office of Education as they testified in support of the Johnson administration's legislative proposal for direct federal aid to programs and schools of public administration.

But all this must remain in the realm of speculation, because the federal government escaped the choices that might have been required in a policy of concentrating graduate study support on selected employees at approved universities. Instead, it adopted policies, more *de facto* than explicit, of decentralized decisions, broad distribution of training opportunities among many employees, and dispersal of employee-students. Aid for graduate study would be parceled out widely, and not very selectively, largely in the

form of released time and tuition reimbursement--policies that relied on employee initiative (rather than agency selection), cost sharing, and part-time study at institutions adjacent to the site of employment. Such policies in coming years would strengthen the demand for graduate public administration at a great many previously unheralded and regionally oriented institutions, resulting in a rapid increase in the number of such programs in the country--and in the membership of CGEPA and its successor. Part-time graduate study, already common, by the 1970s would be the prevailing mode of pursuit of professional master's degrees in public administration, with many consequences for the character of student and faculty life in such programs. With shackles of traditional degree requirements for full-time residential study removed, off-campus programs, some of them far distant from parent institutions, would prosper. And the quality of such programs would become a major concern and motivator of developments in CGEPA and its successor organization, NASPAA.

### FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

One reason why the graduate public administration programs were passive as they were being relegated to a secondary role in federal employee development is because their attention at the time was on a greater prize: the possibility of direct federal aid for regular graduate study. On March 17, 1967, President Johnson kept the promise made at Princeton ten months earlier. In a message to Congress on "The Quality of American Government" he proposed a pair of new programs. The first was for grants to universities in support of graduate education for public service. The second would provide grants to state and local government for employee training and other measures to strengthen their personnel systems. As the heading of the presidential message suggests, this was initially conceived as one broad national effort, but when the administration's advisers and planners got into the specifics it appeared that the things they wanted to do cut across so many jurisdictions, in both the executive and legislative branches, that it was deemed best to divide it into two programs, with separate authorizing legislation.<sup>14</sup>

#### The Education for Public Service Bill

For a relatively simple bill, the one that eventually became the Education for Public Service Act had a long and fairly tortuous history. Although Johnson announced his proposal in March of 1967, the administration was not actually ready for legislative action because John Macy, always overloaded and running behind, was entangled in negotiations with executive agencies and on the Hill to work out the separation of the university grant and the intergovernmental personnel schemes. The latter, especially,

---

<sup>14</sup> Johnson's message of March 17, 1967, and the texts of the administration's two proposed bills, were incorporated into the record of subsequent congressional hearings. U. S. Congress, House of Representatives, *Higher Education Amendments of 1968*; Part I, Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, 90th Congress, 2nd Session. Much of the narrative draws on this document, which may be referred to as *Hearings*.

required dividing and some reallocation of functions between the Department of HEW and the Civil Service Commission, with related complexities of legislative committee jurisdiction. Not until late in the year was the administration ready with a plan that more or less satisfied everyone. In the meantime, the education proposal had been at a standstill. The congressional committee that would handle it was busy with other matters, so the bill carried over into the next session. Early in 1968 it was taken up by the Education Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, chaired by Edith Green of Oregon, a lady notable for doing things in her own time and her own way.

By this time, Green and her staff had decided that education for public service would not be handled as a stand-alone bill but would be spliced into broader higher education legislation that was a must that year because several existing important programs were time-limited and would expire unless reauthorized. Thus Education for Public Service became part of the Amendments of 1968 to the Higher Education Act of 1965, along with student loans, work-study programs, and cooperative education. Tying education for public service to the broader legislation at first seemed to its supporters a setback--it precluded quick and definitive action because the omnibus bill had enough complications and controversial features to occupy the committees for most of the session. Although the public service proposal had support from the Office of Education (OE) and the public administration community, and no concerted opposition, it remained hostage to political misfortune in what was shaping up as a very turbulent year. When hearings opened in February 1968 the outlook was not good. Urban riots and campus demonstrations had disturbed the country and the Congress, thrown the administration off balance, and weakened support for Johnson's domestic programs. The costs of Vietnam were coming home in several ways. Money for domestic programs was tight. The administration had not withdrawn the education for public service proposal, but no officials outside OE seemed to be active on its behalf.

Although several different education for public service bills had been introduced, the one taken up by the House Education subcommittee was essentially the administration's bill. Representative John Brademas of Indiana became the principal sponsor.<sup>15</sup> Its provisions, mostly drafted by OE after consultation with CGEPA, were simple and quite in line with what CGEPA and the schools had been advocating. Title I of the bill (later relabeled Part A) authorized a program of grants or contracts with institutions of higher education "or combinations thereof" in support of planning, developing, improving, strengthening, or carrying out graduate or professional programs to prepare individuals for careers in public service. Among the specific purposes for which grants could be

---

<sup>15</sup> As noted earlier, Brademas had had his own bill, which he abandoned in favor of the administration's bill, which he introduced on April 5. Later, during the summer of inactivity, apparently for reasons of prestige and jurisdictional control, both the chairman of the full committee and subcommittee chair Green had introduced their own bills; these became the initial forms of legislative action, although the content was essentially that of the administration's proposal. Through the twists and turns of legislative process the nominal sponsorship and bill numbers changed several times, and the bill that eventually passed would officially be a Senate bill, but through it all the content remained essentially the administration's proposal as drafted by OE.

awarded were program expansion, training or retraining faculty, development of curriculum materials, and research on curriculum and teaching methods; grants for construction of facilities were specifically precluded. Title II (later Part B) authorized the award of fellowships to be allocated among university programs, after a finding that the program had as a principal objective the education of persons for the public service, and that the program was “of high quality.” Universities receiving the fellowships must pledge to award them only to persons demonstrating serious intent to enter public service, and to continue to encourage recipients to do so upon completion of their studies. (The latter language incorporated CGEPA’s objective to steer awards to professionally oriented public affairs and administration programs, and away from law, business, or traditional academic programs lacking a clear public service focus.) Fellowships could be awarded for up to three years of full time study. The awards were to include stipends “consistent with the prevailing practice under comparable federally sponsored programs,” thus elevating public administration students to the same financial league as recipients of National Science Foundation and other relatively generous awards. Each fellowship would carry reimbursement to the host institution of \$2,500 a year to cover tuition and other costs of education, thus avoiding (at least for low-tuition institutions) the “hidden subsidy” to the government that Stone and others had complained about. (The \$2,500 figure later was amended to the “consistent with prevailing practice” language used in the stipend provision, thus adding more flexibility.) In both the program support and fellowship awards, the principle of “equitable distribution” throughout the country “among programs of comparable quality” was to be observed.

### ASPA and CGEPA Push the Bill

Having finally got “its” bill before Congress, CGEPA became active in an unprecedented way to move it to passage. They had the help of the entire public administration community, mobilized by ASPA Executive Director Don Bowen, who had been working since the time of President Johnson’s initial announcement to make sure something really happened. Bowen was well-informed, persistent, cooperative with the administration and the congressional committees, and deliberately low-keyed to avoid attracting other academic interests that might try for part of the public service action. (Public administration leaders of the time really were afraid of being shoved aside by the law and business schools, and their perception of the power and prestige of those interests, as compared to public administration, was not unrealistic.) In the bill-drafting stage Bowen made sure that OE knew what the CGEPA schools wanted, and during the year of delay after the bill’s introduction he kept in touch with committee staffs and OE officials, meeting with the latter in late December 1967 to discuss strategy for the coming session. When the hearings opened, Bowen had a sheaf of supporting letters from CGEPA institutional representatives to give to the subcommittee, and a little later a resolution and letter signed by everyone at the 1968 CGEPA annual meeting were provided. Throughout the hearings and later during the mark-up and conference committee stages, Bowen would follow events closely, make suggestions to committee staff, and prompt CGEPA members to write their congressmen--particularly if they were on the relevant committees.

When the hearings opened on February 20, 1968,<sup>16</sup> HEW Assistant Secretary Don Simpson made the initial presentation, backed by OE staff. He emphasized the national need for expert government administrators and other professionals, especially in state and local governments. He cited Bureau of Labor Statistics projections and other studies going back to the Municipal Manpower Commission reports which showed that by 1975 there would be need for 2.9 million new administrative, technical, and professional employees in state and local government and 900,000 in the federal government. Expansion of educational programs in public administration was crucial in meeting this need (without any specificity about how many of that 3.8 million might be from that field.

Subcommittee members' responses to the initial presentation were generally friendly. The first questions were to clarify what was meant by public administration and why it was not being taken care of in other federal student support programs. Simpson had to strain a bit to explain why, with money tight and some other education programs cut back in Johnson's recent budget, it made any sense to launch a new program. A few members were incensed and took the opportunity to berate the administration for a recent change in draft policy, which would sharply reduce graduate student deferments--and if the graduate students were going to be drafted, where would students come from for a new program? Everyone understood, of course, that draft policy was not something that an assistant secretary of HEW had anything to do with, and Simpson danced around both the money and student shortages by emphasizing the importance of the need and the desirability of getting the thing authorized and started, even if only in a small way, in anticipation of better times ahead. (A reflection of the time: an underlying presumption that most of the students would be male, and no one thought to say on the record that while men might be drafted, women students would still be available.)

Administration witnesses were followed immediately by O. B. Conaway, Jr., of SUNY-Albany, then chairman of CGEPA, and Brewster C. Denny of the University of Washington, chairman-elect (due to take over a month later). They discussed the important contribution but limited capacity of the schools of public administration to produce the numbers and kinds of people needed. Conaway said that although about 100 institutions offered some kind of a program in public administration, it was his considered opinion that there were no more than 10 "really substantial" institutions for public service education in the country. Most of the others simply lacked the faculties and resources to offer "first rate professional training." In response to a question, he estimated that of the existing schools, at most only four or five were adequately financed to reach appropriate levels of size and quality.

Both the OE and the CGEPA testifiers emphasized the high demand for, and shortage of, public administration graduates. Citing CGEPA's most recent data, Conaway said

---

<sup>16</sup> Key documents and initial testimony of administration and CGEPA witnesses are in *Hearings*, pp. 193-315.

there had been 670 graduate degrees awarded the previous year, many of them to part time students already in service, and some to students who had gone on to further study, leaving about 500 available for placement. He quoted the objective authority Henry Reining to the effect that California alone could have absorbed the entire national output. He and Denny stressed the need for fellowships to attract able students to the field in competition with other well supported fields and lucrative career choices. There was enough idealism in the nation's youth to draw students to public service, they said, if the government would do its part by recognizing their commitment and supporting their education. Denny observed that most of the new Great Society programs were resource-consuming in terms of governmental expertise; now it was time for resource-producing measures.

Questions arose about the amount of money and how it would be distributed. The presidential message and draft bill called for authorization of \$10 million the first year and open-ended authorization thereafter. Assistant Secretary Simpson said that HEW was projecting growth to about \$41 million in the third year, but admitted, when pressed, that those numbers had not been cleared with the Budget Bureau. Observing that \$10 million would not have much impact if spread among the 100 (more or less) existing programs, he called attention to the "combination of institutions" language in the bill and suggested the possibility of concentrating on 15 or 20 "regional centers" in which several institutions might cooperate. Conaway dodged the inter-university regional centers suggestion but supported the idea of concentrating resources in the early years if funding was to be limited. He suggested a first goal of 20 adequate programs, which he defined at first as programs with at least 100 full time students and annual budgets of \$1.5 million; adding \$400,000 or \$500,000 to the budgets of the top twenty schools (excepting the few already adequately funded) would bring most of them up to an appropriate level of quality and have a measurable impact. Later in the discussion one subcommittee member asked about enrollments at Conaway's and Denny's own schools and, on hearing the answer, observed that by the 100-student criterion neither of them would be a strong candidate for money. Denny quickly shifted gears and said he assumed that Conaway had meant 100 *graduates* a year, and, perhaps fortunately, the matter was left hanging. During the remainder of the legislative process there would be no further discussion of regional centers and very little on the general question of distribution. It was difficult for CGEPA leaders who came from established and sizable professional schools to urge concentration of funds without appearing self-serving at the expense of their have-not colleagues. Rising consciousness in CGEPA of differing short-run interests of the large and small programs would make organizational positions on this and other matters increasingly sensitive.<sup>17</sup>

A few days after the opening hearing, Stephen K. Bailey appeared before the House subcommittee in his dual capacity as dean of the Maxwell School and president of ASPA.

---

<sup>17</sup> Conaway would later recall that his testimony and other activity on behalf of the education for public service bill had not satisfied either the large or the small programs in his constituency. At the CGEPA annual meeting shortly after the hearings, one small program representative greeted him with, "Well, thanks for nothing." Telephone interview, Sept. 26, 1991.

With Rep. Brademas feeding him friendly questions, Bailey reviewed the national need for administrative expertise, the work force projections, and various provisions of the bill, but his main contribution was to raise advocacy of the bill to a higher plane of idealism and political significance. With characteristic eloquence, he discussed public service as a form of citizenship and the necessity of drawing the best young people into such service; this was especially important now as a countervailing force to the fragmentation and dissent that threatened the nation. He concluded:

*Unless Congress helps our educational institutions to attract and prepare outstanding young people for modern public service careers, the great hopes and purposes of our Government cannot possibly be achieved.... In the long run, the legislation before you may spell the difference between success and failure for what is surely "the last best hope on earth."<sup>18</sup>*

The next month, Brewster Denny, who had by then taken over as chair of CGEPA, testified on the companion bill before the Senate subcommittee. He repeated most of the arguments made in the House, with additional emphasis on public service opportunities as a constructive alternative to the misplaced idealism that was roiling campuses that spring.<sup>19</sup>

After the hearings, the education for public service proposal seemed to languish for some months, as the nation became engulfed in turmoil and, when they could get down to business, the respective subcommittees struggled with other aspects of the complex higher education legislation. However, Bowen, Denny, and others remained attentive and persistent, and their efforts and eventual success will be recounted in a later chapter.

#### THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL BILL

The third element in President Johnson's broad scheme for public service improvement, announced in principle in 1966 and made specific in a legislative proposal in 1967, was federal cooperation with and assistance to state and local governmental personnel systems. The proposed Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA), to be overseen by the Civil Service Commission, had several parts: exchange of federal and state-local technical personnel resources and services in such areas as training, recruiting, and examining; federal grants for a similar range of purposes; temporary exchange or assignment of personnel between the federal and state or local government

---

<sup>18</sup> Bailey's testimony is in *Hearings* at pp. 316-326. Brademas inserted it in the *Congressional Record*, March 1, 1968, pp. E-1408-09.

<sup>19</sup> Denny appeared before the Subcommittee on Education, Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare, March 28, 1968. A copy of his prepared statement was found in CGEPA files; no hearing record has been located.

(on terms very favorable to the latter); and other measures--including a few restrictions--intended to strengthen merit principles and applications.<sup>20</sup>

A part of the IPA scheme that particularly caught CGEPA's attention was a provision for federal grants for partial support of graduate fellowships for state and local employees. The idea was that state and local agencies would select promising employees for graduate training and commit to keeping them on regular salary and benefits while in school, and a federal grant would cover a fourth of the salary and most of the other costs, including books, travel, and an allowance to the educational institution to cover tuition and "other costs of education." This extension of the NIPA idea, if the states would embrace it, had the potential to produce a big increment of fully supported graduate students, but it required such a radical step-up from prevailing state training practices that the university people hardly knew whether to take it seriously. In any event, the IPA was calculated to produce a significant increase in state and local training of more conventional kinds, which might expand opportunities for university participation. This was of particular interest to the institutions that already had institutes or bureaus with established programs of service to state and local governments. CGEPA leaders, although certainly favoring the intergovernmental personnel proposal, gave less attention to it than to the other education for public service bill, and tended to follow the lead of other elements of the public administration community who spoke through ASPA. ASPA in turn coordinated with and generally deferred to friendly organizations with more political muscle such as the International Public Management Association (ICMA) and the several national organizations representing the states, counties, and cities--an aggregation generally referred to in this era as "the PIGs" ("public interest groups").

The idea for what would become the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) owed as much to legislative as to executive branch thinking. Johnson's proposal was in considerable part a response to pressure generated in a Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, chaired by Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine, which had been actively concerned for several years about administrative problems in the federal grant system. Muskie actually had introduced preliminary versions of what would become both the IPA and the Education for Public Service Act before the administration was ready with its proposals. When the administration finally worked out the jurisdictional and other problems (by splitting the two ideas, both legislatively and administratively, as we have described above) and sent up its bills in early 1967, the Senate subcommittee acted promptly on the intergovernmental personnel part. At Senate hearings that year, such public administration regulars as Bowen, Stephen Bailey, Ferrell Heady, and Donald Stone testified in support. Apparently as a result of such representation, the subcommittee added a provision of direct interest to the universities: Institutions of higher education would be eligible for exchange of personnel with the federal government on the same basis as states and localities, thus opening the

---

<sup>20</sup> Since it was initially presented as a companion to the Education for Public Service bill, the administration's initial draft of the intergovernmental personnel bill was printed in the *Hearings* on the former bill cited above.

possibility of universities augmenting their faculties with temporarily loaned federal executives, and of faculty members getting experience through temporary service in federal agencies. (Perhaps it should be made clear that in this context “exchange” did not necessarily mean one-for-one swaps; the prevailing mode would be simply a temporary assignment from one level of government to another, with the details of timing, cost sharing, or reimbursement worked out by negotiation between the agencies involved).

With Muskie pushing, the Senate passed its version of the IPA in 1967. But the House bill (because of its early twinning with the education proposal) wound up in Edith Green’s Education Subcommittee, where it was an unrecognized stepchild and languished for over a year. Late in 1968, after the subcommittee had completed work on the higher education programs, it got around to hearings on IPA. John Macy appeared to explain and support the bill on behalf of the administration, and to review points of disagreement between what was before the House and what had already passed the Senate.<sup>21</sup> But it was late in the year and late in the Johnson administration, and a feeble effort all around. The intergovernmental personnel proposal fell into the hole that the Education for Public Service Act escaped: it remained in committee and lapsed with the 90th Congress.

That would not be the end of it, however, and CGEPA’s interest in its revival will be touched on in a subsequent chapter, although the eventual fruition would not come until after CGEPA had been reformed into NASPAA.

### THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION FELLOWS

As we have seen, most of CGEPA’s involvement in Washington events of the middle Sixties produced no immediate gains for public administration education, but there was one exception: the Public Administration Fellows. Although not of the highest priority or significance, this modest enterprise enhanced CGEPA’s status as a going organization and brought worth-while benefits to member institutions and their faculties.

The importance of actual governmental experience in the background of public administration teachers has always been part of common wisdom in the field. Concern about the scarcity of such experience in faculty recruits increased during the 1960s, as faculties expanded to handle growing enrollments, and the program directors and senior professors (many of whom cherished and perhaps by now somewhat romanticized their administrative roles in the New Deal or WWII) saw many young people starting to teach with little more than graduate school experience.

The idea of a program to encourage and assist the rising generation of teachers to have practical experience appeared early in CGEPA’s history. Something of the kind was

---

<sup>21</sup> CGEPA files contain a copy of Macy’s testimony to the House subcommittee but are almost bare on CGEPA activity on the IPA in 1967 and 1968. We know about testimony of Bowen and others in the Senate subcommittee in 1967 only from references to it when action resumed in the next Congress.

mentioned at the Civil Service Commission's conference with agency and university leaders at Princeton in 1961, but nothing came of it at the time. It was an item on Reining's agenda for CGEPA in 1965-66. By then there were more or less relevant program models. The American Political Science Association had a Congressional Fellows program, which placed doctoral students and young teachers for a year in legislative offices. There was also the prestigious White House Fellows, which brought outstanding young people from business, academia, and the military services into temporary positions in the Executive Office of the President and on the staffs of federal department heads.

The subject came up at the CGEPA 1966 annual meeting, although apparently not in a prominent way; the minutes of the business meeting and executive committee meeting that followed recorded discussion of several items from Reining's agenda, but nothing specific about government experience for faculty members.<sup>22</sup> However, two Civil Service Commission staff members who attended the conference heard something that led them to report to their chief, John Macy, that CGEPA was interested in some kind of a Washington experience program, perhaps tying into the White House Fellows. Shortly afterward, Macy wrote to Ferrel Heady, the new CGEPA chairman, to pursue the matter. His initial understanding was that CGEPA's interest was in "placing graduate students in intern-type positions." For this, he did not think the White House Fellows an appropriate vehicle, since that was for people with more experience. He suggested a separate program for public administration "in which outstanding graduate students can serve a year's internship in the Federal service as a basic part of their foundation preparation into fields of teaching or the public service itself." Macy went on to sketch a possible program. He could encourage federal agencies to commit 20 to 25 positions for this purpose, to be filled on an annual rotating basis. The jobs would be in "actual work situations," in which the intern "would have the opportunity to participate actively in an important program of Government which would give him insights into the way the public service operates, from policy decisions to administrative implementation." If CGEPA would join with the CSC in sponsoring the program and establish a selection process, the CSC would provide appointing authority for federal agencies to place the nominees. While in residence in Washington, the interns could also participate in "an academic study program as an extension of their on-the-job experience."<sup>23</sup>

CGEPA responded quickly to Macy's offer and designated Brewster Denny to join with Bowen in discussions with Macy and others at the CSC. In several meetings during the

---

<sup>22</sup> Minutes of these meetings, April 12, 1966, are in CGEPA files.

<sup>23</sup> John W. Macy, Jr., to Ferrel Heady, April 23, 1966; copy from Bowen's files. Macy's initial idea was of something closely resembling the pre-World War II NIPA program under which Macy himself and a considerable number of other prominent administrators of his generation had first come to Washington.

summer and autumn of 1966, Macy's idea of a graduate internship program was converted into something of higher priority for CGEPA,<sup>24</sup> a faculty experience program.

The program as announced jointly by CGEPA and the CSC early in 1967 was for "faculty fellows" rather than "graduate interns," although something of the earlier idea was retained in that advanced doctoral students, especially if they had had teaching experience, also would be eligible. In terms of academic fields, eligibility was defined broadly to include almost any aspect of public affairs, public policy, or public management; although the main targets clearly were present and future public administration teachers, persons in such related fields as city and regional planning, foreign affairs, criminal justice, and education administration could be (and occasionally later were) nominated. The program retained Macy's initial emphasis on placement in responsible positions, not mere passive observation posts or special research slots. Instead of Macy's idea of a somewhat formal academic program, which would have been irrelevant for persons already at faculty level, the program would have a "related experience" component in a series of meetings or seminars for the fellows arranged by CGEPA. In a crucial decision that made it possible for CGEPA to provide staff for its responsibilities, CSC agreed that agencies hiring the fellows would be required to pay CGEPA a \$650 "training fee" for each participant.

CGEPA announced the program to its member institutions and set up a screening process. Nominations had to be made by a CGEPA institutional representative, although nominees could come from any appropriate institution, and the CGEPA people were encouraged to pass the word to non-member institutions in their regions. CSC reviewed the records of nominees approved by CGEPA's screening and set the grade and pay level at which each nominee was eligible for appointment; the ratings seemed generous in most cases, which served to encourage approved nominees to remain interested and seek appointments. In theory, an approved nomination and CSC rating did not guarantee an appointment, because there were no specified positions reserved for the fellows; locating appropriate positions was a shared responsibility among CSC staff, CGEPA, the personnel offices of agencies inclined to be helpful, and especially the fellows themselves, who were encouraged to pursue their own interests and shop around Washington after being declared eligible. During the screening and placement process some eligibles would drop out to accept academic appointments or for other reasons, but by one means or another, every eligible who persisted would eventually be placed.

The first year's announcement was hastily prepared and issued fairly late in the 1966-67 academic year, but talking it up at the CGEPA annual meeting that spring and a little personal recruiting by CGEPA leaders produced a respectable number of nominations, and the first class of eight fellows took up Washington appointments in September 1967. With the creative work done, Denny, who by then had become CGEPA chairman-elect and was busy with the organization's lobbying efforts, handed the

---

<sup>24</sup> A graduate internship program of course would have been welcome, but something on the scale Macy envisaged would have made hardly a dent in the national population of graduate students, but could be visible and significant in the realm of young p.a. faculty members.

activity over to a committee chaired by Laurin Henry (this writer) of the University of Virginia, and that group supervised the program for the remainder of the CGEPA years.<sup>25</sup> As the program shook down, the committee as a whole established selection policy and reviewed nominations; Henry and Ray Pethtel, who had joined the ASPA staff the previous year, arranged a series of meetings in which the fellows shared their agency experiences and met occasionally with senior administrators and other interesting figures of the Washington scene; and Pethtel kept in touch with CSC staff, scouted agencies for placement opportunities, counseled eligibles looking for placements, and provided occasional hand-holding to fellows having adjustment difficulties. In the third (1969-70) year of the program Pethtel moved on to other ASPA assignments and was succeeded in the CGEPA staff role by Francis K. Cholko.

The first class of eight fellows was followed by thirteen the second year. In the third year there were only five, after half of those selected dropped out before placement. This apparently reflected a combination of attitudes in academia toward the Nixon administration and the availability of many attractive teaching jobs that year. Fearing that the program was in jeopardy, the CGEPA committee made adjustments for the following year, such as getting the announcements out earlier in order to catch attractive candidates before they got deeply into the job market. Committee members themselves approached potential candidates and urged CGEPA colleagues to encourage both junior faculty and advanced doctoral students to apply. By this time favorable reports about the experiences earlier participants were having had begun to filter back to the campuses, which provided reassurance and helped to stimulate interest. The number of nominees picked up again, and eleven fellows were placed in the fourth year. Classes would generally number in the low teens for most of the 1970s.

Each year the CGEPA committee continued to fine-tune its announcements and selection policy to the realities of academic life and the job market. Everyone agreed that the program was a good idea and attractive in many ways, but it turned out that to produce a class of fellows large enough to sustain the program sometimes required compromises with the original purpose and assumptions about the target audience. The ideal candidate was someone with doctorate completed, a few years of teaching experience, and a faculty position to which he or she was expected to return. Nominees of that kind were usually easy to place, because of their maturity and what they had to offer, and, probably because they got the best positions, seemed to have the most rewarding experiences. But most years it was not possible to assemble an entire class of that caliber. People in established faculty positions often had competing attractive alternatives for what they might do in a year's leave of absence. Assistant professors on the tenure track had to weigh the benefits of Washington experience, which might be beneficial in the long run but unlikely in the short run to add to their bibliographies, against the conventional academic points that might be gained from a year's leave for

---

<sup>25</sup> In addition to Henry, other members of the early Public Administration Fellows committee were James Banovets (Loyola and later Northern Illinois University); Robert Boynton (American University); O. B. Conaway, Jr., (SUNY-Albany); Brewster Denny (University of Washington); Conley Dillon (University of Maryland).

research and writing--or, without a leave, just staying home and continuing to teach and write. The CGEPA committee especially valued candidates who were already over the tenure hurdle, but faculty at that level often had institutional roles that were hard to shed, or family responsibilities inhibiting a temporary move to Washington. For all these reasons, experienced and well-established nominees were never numerous enough to make an entire class, which had to be filled out with less than ideal candidates. These might include assistant professors not making the tenure cut and looking for dignified exits and new career starts; doctoral candidates with little or no teaching experience; and perennial ABDs and various sorts of academic rolling stones unlikely ever to return to teaching. The CGEPA committee did not consider appointments necessarily wasted on such types; although generally more difficult to place, they usually did well enough on the job, and if they might eventually return to teaching somewhere, the purpose of the program would be satisfied.

CGEPA leaders understood from the beginning that some of the fellows might not return to academia, at least not immediately. A fellow who had been so useful that the agency wanted to turn him or her into a regular hire was at least a sign of a successful placement that reflected well on CGEPA and the university of origin. From the agency viewpoint, the possibility of recruiting from this high-class group was at least a partial answer to the question of what the agency was getting in exchange for committing effort and money to a temporary employee. But here CGEPA and government interests had to differ to some degree. A little "leakage" into continued government employment might be inevitable and tolerated, but too much of it would subvert the purpose of providing faculty with Washington experience. It also would amount to breaking faith with deans and program directors who had been encouraged to nominate their promising people in expectation of getting them back.

In the earliest years of the program, Potomac Fever seemed a real problem. In the first three classes, only a little over half of the participants returned immediately to teaching, most of the others remaining in federal employment and a couple going to research and consulting organizations. The CGEPA program committee responded in several ways. They rewrote the program announcement to emphasize the attraction for established teachers; they asked nominators to indicate whether their candidates were in good standing and expected to return to the institution of origin; they tried to judge whether nominees were serious about teaching and not just angling for permanent jobs in Washington; and they tried to spot and screen out the perennial ABDs who had not made much progress on dissertations and were unlikely to do so while holding a job in Washington. As the program matured, more discriminating nomination and selection processes seemed to alleviate the no-return problem. Also, the committee's anxieties began to be relieved by evidence that some of the early fellows who had stayed in Washington were beginning, after two or three years, to look for teaching jobs; eventually the roster of ex-fellows included a considerable number of fellows who had remained in Washington for a time but later returned to good teaching and research careers.

The experience of fellows and their employing agencies was generally mutually satisfactory. Although the positions available changed with changing agency situations and the varying talent available, most agencies that took fellows thought it worth their effort and some were in the market for fellows year after year. An occasional placement went sour because the job offered turned out to have been misrepresented or misunderstood, or because the fellow brought unreasonable expectations or inappropriate skills for the work assigned. In these few cases rescue operations and reassignments usually were arranged. A CSC survey of the first three classes found that all but two or three of the 26 fellows had been satisfied with their agency situations, and only one thought that the year had been an all-round disappointment.

In addition to contributing to the careers of many individuals, and presumably to the overall competence of the nation's public administration teaching corps, the fellows program added considerably to the stability and stature of CGEPA. In a small way CGEPA was now an organization with an operating activity, more than just an annual talk-fest. The possibility of participating in the program was a benefit that CGEPA institutional representatives could cite internally to justify the annual dues payment. For ASPA and CGEPA the income from the training fees, a modest amount by later standards, was an important addition to ASPA's always strained headquarters finance, and for the first time enabled the assignment of a staff member principally to CGEPA business.<sup>26</sup>

To summarize, the hopes of CGEPA leaders of the middle Sixties for major foundation and federal support of public affairs education were largely unrealized, but successful establishment of at least one operating program became an important step toward the programmatic stature and financial self-sufficiency that would be achieved under CGEPA's successor organization.

---

<sup>26</sup> The preceding account of the Public Administration Fellows program is based in large part on the writer's experience as chair of the committee, bolstered by a couple of documents from CGEPA files: (1) a committee report prepared for the 1969 annual meeting and (2) "Perspectives on the Public Administration Fellows," which summarizes the first three years' experience and findings from the CSC survey.

## Chapter Seven

### **TOWARD A MORE EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION**

We turn now more specifically to developments in the Conference on Graduate Education for Public Administration (CGEPA) in 1968-1970. In this period a succession of unusually energetic leaders continued to press the case for federal aid to public affairs education. They achieved what at first seemed great success, then saw the benefits denied by the turn of larger political events. At the same time they were giving serious attention to issues in their field and the state of their organization itself, leading to plans to reform CGEPA into a more effective organization. As this planning proceeded it anticipated requirements and a structuring of membership based on declared standards for participating university programs--a matter that CGEPA had previously refrained from addressing decisively because of sensitivities arising from wide differences among member programs.

#### **NEW ENERGY IN 1968: THE CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCE**

CGEPA's 1968 annual conference in Cambridge, MA, March 25-27 (just before the annual conference in Boston of its parent organization, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA)) was an important turning point for the organization. At Cambridge, CGEPA attained new levels of participation, seriousness, and enthusiasm and identified goals that would lead to a changed organization two years later.

The 1968 meeting occurred in a relatively quiet interlude in a historically turbulent year. There were student strikes and anti-Vietnam demonstrations in California and elsewhere around the country, but such events were no longer novel. President Johnson's announcement that he would not seek re-election, which would energize the year's presidential campaign, was just ahead; the Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert Kennedy assassinations, each touching off new waves of protest and violence, were soon to follow. Then came the national party conventions, especially marked by violence around the Democratic meeting in Chicago, and the November election of Republican Richard M. Nixon over Democrat Hubert H. Humphrey.

CGEPA attendance reached a new high at Cambridge, for a combination of reasons. Under the leadership of that year's chairman, Dean O. B. Conaway, Jr., of SUNY-Albany, the program was well-planned, featuring respected people addressing serious issues, and well-announced in advance--not always characteristics of earlier annual conferences. The news that legislation for federal aid to public service education was under serious consideration had reached the campuses and stimulated interest in learning more about its possibilities. Attractive also were the location in a hotel on the edge of Harvard and the prospect of interaction and a look at the impressive new quarters of the prestigious local hosts, the John F. Kennedy School of Government (successor to Harvard's old Graduate School of Public Administration). Total attendance at Cambridge was 78. Fifty of the 72 university programs on CGEPA's mailing list were represented (compared to 36 at Berkeley the year before). This also

had been advertised as a joint meeting with CGEPA's sister entity, the Conference on University Bureaus of Government Research (CUBGR), and a dozen members of that group showed up and hived off for sessions of their own part of the time. (A few individuals came to Cambridge representing their universities in both organizations.) Sixteen miscellaneous other attendees included people from government agencies, foundations, related public affairs associations, ASPA staff, and a few members of the first class of participants in a new CGEPA program, the Public Administration Fellows.

The conference opened with a general session on a familiar topic, "New and Expanding Programs," a show-and-tell about university programs being established or reorganized, and their various approaches and problems. Later on the first day Conaway and the incoming chairman, Dean Brewster Denny of the University of Washington, reported on their representational activity: lobbying on the Education for Public Service bill, negotiation with the Ford Foundation about a Honey Report follow-up, and work with the Civil Service Commission to establish the Public Administration Fellows program. The next morning, after a keynote speech by Mark Keane, executive director of the International City Management Association (ICMA), who emphasized the mutual interests of educators and practitioners and urged the schools to strive for professionalism, the group divided into six concurrent workshops on important issues. These sessions were well prepared and long enough for serious talk about what might be done through CGEPA about their respective subjects. The workshop topics and their leaders, most of whom had provided advance papers, were:

*Meeting Government's Manpower Needs*

Robert F. Wilcox, San Diego State College

Growing public employment demands for college graduates and possibilities of meeting those needs with expanded undergraduate public administration programs.

*Public Affairs Education and the Professional Schools*

Frederic C. Mosher, University of California, Berkeley

Public administration's problems as a profession and in establishing a role as provider of a public affairs dimension in the education of other professionals.

*Academic Standards in Expanding Programs*

Donald C. Stone, University of Pittsburgh

Is it time to establish standards for public administration education? Preliminary suggestions about content of standards, and issues about their scope and source of promulgation.

*Organization for Public Administration*

Nathan B. Grundstein, Case Western University

Public administration's increasing separation from political science, and the conceptual and organizational problems arising therefrom.

*Public Administration and Urban Affairs*

James M. Banovetz, Loyola University

Can public administration encompass urban affairs without losing its core ideas and identity? Can it afford not to try?

*Public Administration and Policy Research*

Robert J. Mowitz, Pennsylvania State University

Should public administration teaching and research be unified or organized separately on campus? Implications for the kind of research that might ensue; the university's posture on public policy issues. A joint session with CUBGR.

These were, of course, not new subjects, but represented more serious cuts at perennial questions. What was new at Cambridge was the comprehensiveness of the program, and the enthusiasm displayed in the report-out general session after the workshops, for making CGEPA a more active agency for further study and appropriate action on these matters. Expansion of undergraduate programs, if linked to graduate programs, was approved. With respect to urban affairs, it was agreed to recommend that ASPA, not CGEPA itself, should develop a sub-group around that interest in effort to keep both its academic and practitioner adherents in close relation to public administration. Looking to the future, the meeting approved a recommendation that CGEPA "develop capacity" (a familiar aspiration) to maintain a clearinghouse of information on developments in its constituent universities, provide consultative services to individual institutions, and "explore and study the needs for new professional degrees, accrediting requirements, and professional licenses." (The latter was a somewhat opaque reflection of points in Mosher's paper on linkages with other professions.) Most important for the future was a resolution that CGEPA "study the development of appropriate academic standards for public administration programs." No specific recommendations emerged from the workshops on research and on relations with political science, those topics apparently considered either too hard or handled under other headings.

The meeting dealt with a few other matters, illustrative of CGEPA common grist. It approved continued effort in support of the Education for Public Service legislation, and further pursuit of a foundation grant for a Honey Report follow-up; admonished members to encourage their students to join ASPA; declined to take a position for or against member programs' advertising in "Peterson's Guides to Graduate Study"; welcomed a report that several Colorado institutions had formed a state-level association for public affairs education; and voted down a proposal to separate CGEPA meetings from ASPA annual conferences by scheduling them in autumn. Finally, Henry Reining, past chairman once removed (and serving again as head of a nominating committee because Ferrel Heady, who would have had that duty, had ascended to higher academic administration and was no longer participating in CGEPA), brought a report

of much import for the organization's future: Don Stone was tagged as chairman-elect, in anticipation of serving in 1969-70.<sup>1</sup>

Donald C. Stone brought to the CGEPA leadership unusual attributes of experience and personality. He was unusual among the public administration deans and directors in that his background was more professional than academic; he did not have a Ph.D and had never been a regular professor. After one of the earliest available graduate educations in public administration, at the National Institute of Public Administration, he had gone into local government, then municipal research and professional associations for city management and public works. He entered federal service in the 1930s as assistant director of the Bureau of the Budget, then after the war was director of administration in the Marshall Plan organization. After leaving federal service he was for several years president of Springfield College in Massachusetts, an institution that emphasized public and international service, then became the founding dean of Pittsburgh's School of Public and International Affairs. From this background he felt entitled to speak to both government and higher education leaders about the importance of public service education, and he did so speak frequently, boldly, lengthily, and sometimes hyperbolically (nuance was not in his toolkit). His attention ranged from big pictures to dogged pursuit of detail. He was notably persistent and conscientious in applying himself to whatever subject engaged him--an idealistic, abstemious, latter-day puritan. He would be the central and probably indispensable figure in the movement to create out of CGEPA a more effective organization to advance the public service he deeply believed in.

At the close of the Cambridge meeting, CGEPA's chairmanship for the 1968-69 year was assumed by Brewster Denny, who brought to the task high energy, good connections and confidence about the realms of politics and the foundations, and fresh ambition for what CGEPA might become. Denny also provided a viewpoint somewhat different from that of his predecessors, all of whom had had long identification with more or less traditional public administration, in that his doctorate was in international relations and Russian studies from the Fletcher School, and he had spent time as a congressional staffer before returning, as a scion of one of Seattle's first families, to establish the public affairs school at the University of Washington. He had already made his mark in the CGEPA leadership by successfully negotiating the Public Administration Fellows program, as described in an earlier chapter. His year as chairman would be devoted mainly to advancing the cause of federal aid to public service education, as will be described a little later in this chapter. Meanwhile we pick up on the other major carryover from Cambridge, the work on standards led by Stone.

---

<sup>1</sup> The preceding account of the 1968 annual meeting is based on minutes found in CGEPA files, along with program announcements and copies of most of the workshop papers. With respect to nominations, the practice had been that the three previous past chairmen constituted a nominating committee, the most recent one as chair; Heady being unavailable, the duty fell back to Reining. The practice illustrates the continuity and how closely held leadership of CGEPA was.

## FORMULATING STANDARDS IN 1968-69

Don Stone's working paper and leadership of the workshop on standards at Cambridge had given him unquestioned proprietorship of that subject, and after the meeting he pushed ahead in his typical energetic fashion to carry out the meeting's resolution for further study. On the basis of the Cambridge discussion he quickly produced a revised and expanded version of his initial offering and circulated it as a Workshop Report to the executive committee and those who had participated in the workshop.<sup>2</sup> After receiving comments on that, he used the material in a new paper on standards which would be used by Denny and Stone in their legislative efforts and distributed to the CGEPA membership in preparation for the 1969 annual meeting.

### The Meaning and Purpose of "Standards"

An examination of the context, content, and evolution of Stone's 1968-69 paper is important because it became central to decisions leading to the creation of NASPAA.

The concept of "standards," as it began to be discussed in CGEPA, was imprecise and seemed to mean different things to different people--and often to the same people at different times for different purposes. To some, the term indicated a dimension of quality, a difficult to define but nevertheless perceptible degree of academic excellence, rigor, and learning. Others saw standards as an instrument of "standardization," i.e., agreed-on substance or characteristics of what an education or degree in public administration should contain. Still others, perhaps recognizing the difficulty of defining either inherent quality or essential content, thought mainly of identifying external and more or less objective characteristics and resources necessary for a respectable university program for public service education.

CGEPA meetings in early years had occasionally discussed standards, but there had been no appreciable sentiment for pushing the subject to the point of having CGEPA actually specifying or proclaiming standards that member programs ought to maintain or aspire to. Beyond the problems of definition, there was the reality of enormous differences among member programs in their content, organizational setting, size, and aspirations, not to mention distinctions of academic reputation and pride ranging from Harvard to Neonatal State. But by the middle Sixties several things had brought at least some individuals in CGEPA leadership to the point of willingness to tackle the standards question. The experience of the Honey Report and the critiques of government officials had reminded them of the perception, in external circles that controlled public policy and higher education priorities, that their field suffered from a lack of quality control and consistency of product; the diversity that some extolled might actually be a

---

<sup>2</sup> The first re-formulation of the paper, attempting to incorporate comments received at the workshop, was headed "Workshop on Academic Standards and Expanding Programs: Report by the Chairman", dated April 25, 1968, and distributed to workshop participants and a few others on May 2. The further revised version, now just "Standards for Expanding Programs in Public Administration," was dated September 27, 1968 and sent out to all CGEPA members, along with other materials pertaining to the 1969 annual meeting, on December 17. Copies of both papers from CGEPA files.

weakness. Practitioner colleagues in such organizations as ASPA and ICMA were beginning to urge the schools to deliver a product that would support their wish to be seen as professionals. Recent proliferation of new graduate programs, particularly the part-time, weekend enterprises of far-off institutions with no prior reputations in public administration--or, for that matter, much of anything else--aroused suspicions among the established institutions that these innovative programs were delivering cheap degrees and bringing ill repute to the field. And now, when the federal government was finally contemplating a response to their long assertions that the nation needed many more trained administrators, and at least some circles of higher education leadership seemed sympathetic, there arose the practical question of how added resources might be applied. How and by what criteria should federal money be distributed? If a university leadership contemplated a venture into or significant expansion of public affairs education, what would be the characteristics of an appropriate enterprise it might try to create?

To the successive chairmen of CGEPA, all of whom after 1962 (except for Heady) bore the title of dean and headed entities identified as schools of public administration or affairs, the answers to the latter questions were clear: schools of the kind they headed were the enterprises best able to deliver the appropriate, professionally oriented education, and only by increasing the number of such schools, and by providing added resources to expand and round out the activities of the existing ones, could the national need be met. Some of the representatives in CGEPA of programs of lesser size and status would fully concur and look forward to added resources and upgrades that would elevate them to the same condition. But many, perhaps most, of the CGEPA members were not prepared to give anything like exclusive endorsement to the idea of the separate professional school, for reasons that might be practical or academic, or both. Even if they embraced the idea of professionalism and aspired some day to see their own programs elevated to school status, many of them could see little possibility of that happening in their particular institution in the foreseeable future, and therefore in self-protection, if for no other reason, had to oppose designating the independent professional school as the only valid form of program. The public administration professor in a good department of political science, who graduated two or three or a half-dozen students a year with a p.a. specialization within a master's in poli sci, might aspire to an expansion that would bring more students and permit more specialization, perhaps offering the MPA degree instead of just the MA, but in the meantime he could see his graduates getting jobs and doing well in the public sector and felt no need to apologize for what he was doing, as far as it went. Representatives of that kind of program--and they were numerous in CGEPA--were likely to become apprehensive about talk about standards that might declare or imply that their kind of activity was inherently second-class. Indeed, some of the old-line professors from such programs had their own reservations about the intellectual quality of what went on in some of the ostensible professional schools and would have endorsed Steve Bailey's warning against "meretricious professionalism."

As the leaders of CGEPA approached the subject of standards they had a problem that was both practical and political--the latter in several senses of the word. They had to

find a way for CGEPA to talk about standards that held out the idea of the independent professional school as the norm without alienating members who were afraid of being directly or by implication declared inferior because they were not in that league. To encourage federal aid they had to provide Executive officials and Congress a reasonably clear and coherent view of what such aid should promote or accomplish, and who should receive it. If aid should become available they wanted to make sure that it would be distributed both efficiently, i.e., concentrated enough to have noticeable impact (rather than dissipated widely to no discernible effect, as Congress was wont to do with aid programs), and correctly, i.e., to reputable programs clearly committed to education for careers in the public service. This meant a need for CGEPA standards that would in turn influence federal guidelines toward the independent schools but not so completely as to leave all other programs without hope of federal aid. Stone's approach to the problem was to avoid direct talk about quality, to disavow any intent for CGEPA to evaluate particular programs, and to propose standards that could be stated as organizational and resource requirements for universities that might wish to establish an adequate program.

### Stone's Initial Formulation of Standards

Let us now take a closer look at Stone's paper of 1968-69, which discussed standards in terms highly influential of all that was to follow. The document he took to Cambridge in March 1968<sup>3</sup> was brief, only two pages in outline form, and opened in a tentative way:

What would seem to be reasonable minimum standards for an effective and influential school or center of public administration or public affairs? Are the following relevant? How would you modify them?

He suggested four principal criteria:

A specially designed graduate curriculum with a professional (applied or operational) focus, multi-disciplinary in character and covering one or more public service fields.

A faculty headed by a dean or director with at least 5 full-time persons drawn from different disciplinary or professional backgrounds and qualified by education and/or experience to deal with the inter-face of public policy, program administration, and environment.

A minimum of 30 full-time students enrolled in one or more professional degree programs.

An organizational posture in the university free from the curricular or budgetary domination of any single discipline, and of sufficient status to

---

<sup>3</sup> "Council Graduate Education for Public Administration, Workshop C: Academic Standards in Expanding Programs, March 1968." From CGEPA files.

enable the school or center to provide university wide leadership in public affairs.

In a second section the paper suggested several additional criteria, some of which elaborated on the first four:

Several disciplines were named as appropriate for the proposed multi-disciplinary faculty: all of the principal social science, plus mathematics and “the communicative arts.”

Equal status on the campus with, and programmatic links to, other professional schools.

A doctoral program, in addition to the professional master’s degree.

Full control of its own admissions and degree requirements.

Enrollment of at least 100 (although not necessarily all full time), with fellowship support for at least half of them.

A continuing education or training program.

A research and government advisory program.

Appropriate physical facilities.

A specialized library.

Budgetary support of at least \$300,000 annually.

Later in the paper Stone inquired (without suggesting answers) whether it would be appropriate or feasible to develop standards for admitting students and for recruiting faculty, and how the standards suggested above might apply to the distribution of funds under the proposed Education for Public Service act.

In this initial version of his paper, Stone seemed to assume that although CGEPA could discuss standards, it might not be the appropriate body to actually finalize and promulgate them, and suggested either ASPA or the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) for that role.

### Response and Revision: Program Categories

Something of the response of CGEPA members at Cambridge to Stone’s questions and tentative answers can be gauged by noting the changes and new material worked into the version he prepared as a Workshop Report after the meeting. Evidently there had been little disagreement with his suggestions for the specified narrow purpose of

describing ideal characteristics of a large public affairs program. Most of his principal and additional criteria were carried forward verbatim, except that the specific budgetary figure of \$300,000 was eliminated in favor of simply “Annual Budgetary Underwriting.”

It was obvious, however, that the workshop discussion had brought out the gulf between the ideal large program as described and the existing reality for most CGEPA members. At that time perhaps as few as a half-dozen, and certainly not more than ten or twelve programs in the country, came fairly close to meeting the basic and additional criteria. For the majority--small programs, resource-poor, embedded in and under the control of political science departments or business schools--the proposed standards of size, resources, organizational and programmatic autonomy, and multi-disciplinary faculty and curriculum went far beyond anything they could see possibilities of attaining. A fortunate few might be able to cite such standards to pry improvements out of their university administrations, but on most campuses pressing such demands would risk getting the proponents branded as dreamers and trouble makers, and their existing programs confessed as inferior.

In his post-conference revision, labeled a “Workshop Report,” Stone tried to handle this problem in a couple of different ways. For one thing, he sought to reassure anxious members with disclaimers about just what these standards purported to measure and the uses for which they might be put. In a series of ambiguous statements he seemed to deny that the proposed standards had anything to do with inherent academic quality. “It was agreed that while qualitative and substantive factors were important, they should not become part of any set of guidelines.” And later: “While recognizing that the identification of desirable goals and criteria might be utilized to evaluate a program, the purpose of the group was not to encourage any system of certification or the establishment of standards as such that could be used to judge the quality of a university program.” (Had someone dared to say “accreditation”?)

Stone’s most important response to the reality gap, however, was to introduce the idea of categories of programs. The workshop had recognized, he reported, that there were different kinds of programs, with different goals, to which different criteria could apply. Such differences “would not reflect upon [a given program’s] merit by application of any arbitrary set of standards, criteria, or requisites.”

The report then identified and sketched briefly four categories of programs. The first was identified as “Comprehensive Schools” (evidently the first use of that term in the CGEPA-NASPAA lexicon). Most of the characteristics outlined in Stone’s first version of the paper were bundled under this heading. This would be an institution “capable of making a significant contribution to a range of public administration fields--a school which would have national prestige and wide influence within its university.” The criteria were being spelled out to “help elicit support...from university administrations and trustees, government agencies, professional associations, foundations. and the public generally” for schools wishing to achieve the highest status. Even with their comprehensiveness, such schools might differ considerably in purposes, curriculum, and areas of specialization.

Stone next recognized a category of “Well-Established Specialized Programs,” narrower in scope and purpose than the Comprehensive Schools. They would include:

- Programs based on or organized under a single field, such as political science;
- Programs which feature a single field selected from the broad spectrum of public administration areas or fields;
- Programs which focus on a specific set of analytical tools or processes.

In this category would fall “a considerable number” of “well-established programs with sufficient resources to command a faculty and student body of good quality.” Stone noted that the workshop had not attempted to specify further the characteristics of such a program, and that would be a task for the future.

The paper then recognized “Developing Programs.” Here would fall the “newer or less developed programs...which, for lack of resources, must begin modestly.” It also would include “programs which have been announced or initiated for some considerable time which have not attracted sufficient resources, faculty, or students to enable them to be included as mature or well established programs under category 2.”

Finally, Stone professed to find a category of “Non-Programs,” which he identified as “non-programs conducted by non-faculty leading to non-degrees.” Here would be “programs which consist of announcements of a program without any resources to fulfill it or publication of a bulletin that gives a title, lists only courses already taught elsewhere in the university, designates a person occupied with other tasks or a committee as head of the program. It has no faculty and does not recruit or enroll its own students or award a degree.”

Stone noted that only the characteristics of the comprehensive school had been discussed in detail in the workshop, most of the material on the others being “supplied gratuitously by the chairman.”

He also reported that members had agreed that although CGEPA might play an active role by discussing and perhaps suggesting the requisites or criteria to be included in any guidelines, some other entity, such as the Academy (NAPA) “would be in a more objective position to formulate any formal report or statement.”

On the delicate question of how the identification of categories might relate to the distribution of federal aid, Stone’s report reflected a majority sentiment at Cambridge for broad eligibility, but he stated it in a way that made his categories relevant: “The consensus of the group was that guidelines under discussion here should not be used as a basis for the allocation of developmental or other types of assistance with the one possible exception of fellowships.” He explained the exception by noting that since the bill provided that fellowships could be only for study in recognized or approved programs, only programs in his categories 1 and 2 could qualify. However, if there were

federal funds “to help programs achieve a basis of merit,” then those in category 3 might qualify for that kind of aid.

With respect to students and faculty, the report suggested that the workshop group had backed away from any consideration of qualitative standards. Instead, there was a call for a “national system” of support to attract talented students into public affairs--an endorsement of the pending Education for Public Service bill, with additional references to the proposed intergovernmental manpower bill and more government support to employees’ graduate study under the Training Act. With respect to faculty, a shortage of faculty of quality was viewed as a serious obstacle to developing the kind of expanded programs recommended, making strengthening doctoral programs to produce such faculty of “highest priority.” Enrollment of experienced practitioners into doctoral programs was suggested as a way to step up production of appropriate faculty.

### Standards Formulation as of 1969

Stone’s expansion of his 1968 conference discussion paper into the Workshop Report described above was distributed to the workshop participants and CGEPA executive committee during the summer, with further comments invited. With those received, and authorized by the conference’s request for further work on the subject, Stone produced a new version that abandoned the workshop report format and became his own paper on standards, looking toward 1969.

This new version, evidently completed in September, opened with a preamble discussion of the great national shortage of trained administrators: now only 500 graduates a year but 5,000 needed. The preamble also suggested an intended audience broader than CGEPA itself; it was offered as a “guide...for the use of persons concerned with initiating or expanding a school or other center.” It is not clear how deliberately it was, but in this version Stone eliminated his earlier disclaimer of any intent to “encourage any system of certification” or judge the quality of individual programs.

In the main body of the paper, Stone’s principal contributions--the idea of categories and spelling out the characteristics of a comprehensive school--were retained with only a few modifications. At the beginning of the discussion of comprehensive schools, he spliced in new material, which he attributed in a footnote to Henry Reining, elaborating on the objectives of such schools:

Educationally, to upgrade whatever talent there is now in public service professionals;

Assistance to agencies at all levels to meet their in-service and on-the-job training needs more adequately: diagnosis, design, and evaluation of programs, training of trainers, preparation of training materials;

Applying research to help solve current problems and to devise a better product, i.e., more effective governmental services of all kinds;

In basic research to take a deep look at the political, social, and ethical processes of our own and other cultures and civilizations, and to come up with more satisfactory explanations and rationalizations.

For such purposes (again according to Reining), schools of public administration:

...Must be interdisciplinary enough to bring the findings of all the social sciences to bear on public problems; inter-professional enough to get into all the live functions, be these highways, health, or education; and empathic enough with the public executive to identify responsibly with him, to help him improve himself and to prepare those who will replace him.

Beyond adding Reining's aspirational material, Stone modified his discussion of comprehensive schools only in a few respects. He raised the point about control of its own admissions and evaluation of student progress up from the Additional to the Basic criteria. He provided a little more detail on the fields that might be represented in an interdisciplinary faculty, and the other professional schools with which public affairs might collaborate as equal partners. The point about budgetary resources was sharpened to discourage bootstrap and soft money ventures: "Annual budgetary underwriting through endowment income or appropriations, sufficient to fulfill the above criteria, without undue dependence on ad hoc contracts and grants."

In this version of the paper, only the requirements of the comprehensive schools were elaborated upon. No doubt indicating where his interests really were, Stone made no attempt to expand earlier descriptions of Categories 2 and 3, the Other Specialized and the Developing programs. Category 4 he re-titled from Non-Programs to the perhaps less provocative Ad Hoc Courses, and sharpened the discussion to make it clearer who he was thinking of. These would be ventures based on "addition of a few public administration courses to some other curriculum such as political science, law, or business administration or a collection of courses offered by different departments or schools." Finally: "Such offerings, even though given the label of a public administration program do not fulfill the criterion of a professional curriculum leading to a professional degree, and thus are excluded from consideration."

Left unchanged was the earlier suggestion that programs in Categories 1, 2, and 3 might be recipients of federal developmental aid, but only those in 1 and 2 should be eligible for fellowship awards. Also unchanged was the deference to ASPA or NAPA as suitable authoritative bodies to actually issue standards.

Stone's 1968-69 paper, at minimum, served the broad purpose of opening and pushing forward the discussion of standards. Introducing the idea of categories and the concept of the comprehensive school served his more direct purpose of distinguishing and describing his ideal arrangement for public service education, while purporting to deal objectively with the others. But in lacking detail it dodged the hard questions of

what would make a small program meritorious enough for Category 2, or when a new program would be developed enough to move up from Category 3. It attempted to soften the inherently invidious idea of categories by contradictory assertions that the categories did not purport to measure quality, but then had to fall back on vague references to quality as the saving characteristic of Category 2. It left unsettled basic questions about the relative standing of the independent schools and the smaller programs, in the field at large and in CGEPA itself--issues that would arise sharply when a slightly modified successor document was proposed as a constitutional foundation for upgrading CGEPA into NASPAA.

#### FEDERAL AID: PROGRESS AND FRUSTRATION

When Denny assumed the CGEPA chairmanship at the close of the 1968 Cambridge meeting, he and Conaway had recently testified in House of Representative hearings on the federal aid to public service education bill, and in coming days he would appear by himself at the Senate hearings. Then the legislation seemed to stall, amid the distractions of that eventful, chaotic, tragic spring and early summer. After it became an "education" bill and thus not in his direct area of responsibility, John Macy seemed to have forgotten it, and to the extent that he had time for academic projects concentrated on establishing as his legacy the Federal Executive Institute. Nevertheless, Denny and ASPA director Bowen continued to press the aid-to-universities legislation with their contacts in the relevant committees. Denny also took advantage of another opportunity. Invited to a meeting with White House staff to advise on plans for what would become the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas, Denny pointed out the relevance of that legislation to this legacy of the president.<sup>4</sup> We do not know if the congressional committees really got a nudge from the White House--they were almost bound to deal with the matter eventually because of its involvement with the broader higher education legislation also at stake--but in any case movement did occur. The legislation was voted out of the House committees on July 9, and the Senate committee on July 11. The Senate passed its version of the bill by unanimous consent on July 15. The full House, after brief discussion led by Rep. Brademas, passed its version, 389-15, on July 25. A conference committee was appointed to reconcile the two versions, now spliced into the Higher Education Amendments of 1968.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Actually, Denny had completed his consultations about the LBJ school and left the White House when he realized he had forgotten to mention the pending legislation; he hastened to a phone booth and managed to reestablish contact with one of the staff he had been meeting with, to make his pitch for the aid to schools bill. He told this story in a memo recounting the history of CGEPA and ASPA efforts on behalf of the Education for Public Service bill (copy from the files of Don Bowen) and repeated it in a letter to this writer, October 25, 1991.

<sup>5</sup> ASPA director Bowen reported on the legislative situation in a memo to those who had been active on the subject, Aug. 9, 1968; this was either accompanied or shortly followed up by a chronology of legislative history and a comparison of the House and Senate versions, evidently prepared by Ward Stewart of the Office of Education. Copies from Bowen's files.

Then came another hiatus as Congress recessed for the national party conventions, in which the Republicans nominated Richard Nixon and the Democrats chose Hubert Humphrey, the latter in a tumultuous convention accompanied by violent clashes between police and demonstrators on the streets of Chicago. When the conference got back to work, only a few discrepancies needed to be ironed out of the education for public service part. Emphasis on the needs of state and local governments had succeeded so well in the Senate that its bill authorized only assistance to study for service at those levels; the conference broadened it to include all public service. Bowen had managed to get into the House bill an authorization for grants or contracts with scholarly and professional associations, which might have led to direct participation by ASPA or CGEPA, but the Senate bill had not included this and the House receded. Provision for a national advisory committee was taken out when the House conferees protested there were getting to be too many advisory committees for various parts of the education legislation. A Senate requirement of a 10% university match to all grants was eliminated. As to levels of funding, the conference agreed to authorize \$340,000 in planning money for F.Y. 1969 (which by this time had already started), and operations at levels of \$5 million in 1970 and \$13 million in 1971. Along with other titles of the higher education legislation, the authorization was for only three years, so that reauthorizing legislation would be required in 1971. The House accepted the conference report on September 24, and the Senate likewise on October 1. President Johnson signed the bill into law on October 16, 1968.<sup>6</sup>

The process had been tortuous, and CGEPA did not get quite everything it wanted, but the basic authorization was sound from its point of view, and crippling amendments and extraneous provisions had been avoided. In retrospect, it was fortunate that the proposal, after being passed over by the congressional committees in 1967, had been handled in 1968 along with reauthorization of other higher education programs, such as work-study and student loans, that were popular and enjoyed bipartisan support. Education for Public Service itself had had no particular opposition, but by 1968 the momentum of the Great Society was spent, the administration's support was tepid, and a new program initiative was lucky to have squeaked by in an election year. It seems unlikely to have survived the political turmoil and legislative fatigue of that year if it had had to stand alone.

### Influencing the Guidelines

The Education for Public Service legislation achieved a long-standing goal of CGEPA, but its activity on the subject did not, could not, end there. As students of public administration are supposed to know, passing an authorizing law does not by itself put a program into motion. The agency responsible for executing the law must develop plans, which in many cases are in the form of publicly issued guidelines to establish processes

---

<sup>6</sup> The conference report summarizing the legislation and the changes was Report No. 1919, House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 2nd Session. The bill that passed was identified as S. 3769, which became Public Law 575, 90th Congress, the higher Education Act of 1965 As Amended. The public service part was Title IX of that legislation, and the authorized program generally referred to thereafter as "Title IX."

and govern the decisions of its administering officers, as well as to provide essential information to the parties intending to participate or benefit from the program. Sometimes those interested outside parties are consulted or given opportunity to participate in some way in developing guidelines. And always, before the program can operate there must be separate legislation appropriating funds. With respect to Title IX (as the Education for Public Service law was now generally referred to), CGEPA was active and influential in shaping the guidelines. Not so effective in securing the appropriation, as will be seen shortly.

Officials of the federal agency responsible for Title IX, the Office of Education (OE) of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) had been thinking about implementation well before the law was finally passed. Although the agency did not get any of the planning money that had been authorized for the current (1969) year, OE staff pushed ahead in anticipation of an operating appropriation for F. Y. 1970, for which President Johnson would submit a budget just before leaving office. OE set up a rather formalized process, which went on during the presidential election-to-inauguration transition period and wound up in the early months of the new Nixon administration. The process centered on an inter-agency planning group, into which were fed suggestions and comments from interested parties at several stages. ASPA and CGEPA apparently were recognized and treated as the principal interested parties, as they were kept informed throughout and may even have advised on the planning process itself. The first step in the process was OE's promulgation in December of a list of questions and issues, such as how broadly or narrowly to construe "public service," the relative priorities to be accorded the act's principal instrumentalities of program support grants and fellowships, and the kinds of program support projects to be favored.<sup>7</sup>

Having probably influenced the questions, CGEPA then provided answers. Brewster Denny responded on behalf of ASPA and CGEPA in a lengthy letter with detailed and forceful comments that answered and went well beyond the specific questions asked by OE. His statement sought to firmly steer the new program toward public service education as understood in CGEPA. He used language parallel to that in Stone's paper on standards,<sup>8</sup> with a perhaps even stronger bias toward the independent schools. For example: "A school or program obviously must have as its primary purpose public service as a career," with "curriculum, special programs, faculty recruitment, everything the program does clearly pointing in this direction." He would not completely restrict awards to "self-styled schools of public administration," but he would not extend

---

<sup>7</sup> On Oct. 31, 1968, Assistant Secretary Simpson of HEW sent a letter to Bowen of ASPA discussing the agency's plans for implementation, with two different draft versions of the questions to be promulgated. The letter seemed to suggest that there had been prior consultation and specifically invited further comment; copy from Bowen's files.

<sup>8</sup> Although Denny's suggestions were grounded on Stone's paper, they differed in one respect. Stone's and other work on standards increasingly tended to use the terms "professional" or "professionally oriented" to denote the distinguishing characteristics of an appropriate program. Denny avoided the definitional problems that might arise from that usage and simply emphasized the purpose of education for the public service or public careers; the OE guidelines, when they came out, did likewise.

eligibility to “any and all graduate and professional programs” some of whose graduates might possibly end up in public service. Excluded would be “one- or two-man institutes or ‘programs’ operating as parts of political science departments or law schools.” The definition of eligibility should include “all the major schools of public affairs and public administration...that operate as independent, or nearly independent schools, with their own dean or director and with a discretely identifiable faculty,” as well as three or four special graduate schools of international affairs. As between program support grants and fellowships, he recommended early emphasis on fellowships, as likely to have the greater impact. Denny’s insistence on education pointing toward public service careers no doubt would have been approved throughout CGEPA, but he was on dangerous ground in his deprecation of small programs in political science departments, which was the status of a considerable number of CGEPA’s constituents at that time.

Going further, Denny pointed out that administration of Title IX would require judgments about the quality of individual programs, and suggested the implications of that necessity: “I think that the deans and directors of schools preparing for public service in the United States are now more or less agreed that we must move toward some kind of an accreditation system....” Referring to Stone’s standards paper, which had just been distributed, he said: “There is already circulating among the members a careful and thoughtful statement which developed out of our last meeting which could form the basis for further discussion of the accreditation issue.” He offered further consultation from CGEPA if OE wished to take up the accreditation question.<sup>9</sup>

To the best of our knowledge, this was the first open assertion by anyone in a CGEPA leadership position that public affairs education was, or should be, moving toward accreditation. Here he was far beyond the prevailing opinion, much less any authorizing action, of the membership. A few of his fellow deans might have agreed but hesitated to say so, considering the proposal premature; but others at that level certainly would have disagreed, and the suggestion was anathema to the main body of CGEPA representatives at that time. Stone’s Workshop Report from the 1968 meeting had indicated a concern that discussion of standards might somehow lead to external judgments about individual programs, and although that point had been removed when his project moved from workshop report to his individually responsible paper, Stone, to the best of our knowledge, never advocated anything like formal accreditation. He might, perhaps, have failed to recognize the implications of what he was doing, but he would continue to insist that his purpose in promoting standards was not to characterize individual programs but to provide guidance and targets for those who wished to improve them. It would be several years until CGEPA’s successor organization could bring itself to enact a statement of standards, and several more years to evolve a program for their application in an accrediting process. In view of that history, it is interesting to speculate what

---

<sup>9</sup> Letter, Brewster C. Denny to J. Wayne Reitz of the Office of Education, Jan. 7, 1969; copy from Bowen’s files.

might have happened if OE had taken up Denny's offer, thus forcing the accreditation issue in CGEPA in 1969.<sup>10</sup>

Although Denny's letter purported to be the official statement of ASPA and CGEPA, it was by no means the only input to OE from closely associated public administration interests. Other individuals and organizations weighed in with advice consistent with CGEPA's position. After the initial round of written comments, OE proceeded with a series of consultations and meetings with individuals and groups both inside and outside government. Then, closing the circle even tighter, to help shape the final product OE retained several consultants who had been leaders of ASPA or NAPA or CGEPA--and some of them all three. These included John Perkins, Lloyd Short, Stephen Sweeney, and York Willbern.<sup>11</sup>

Not surprisingly, the OE guidelines that emerged closely followed the ASPA-CGEPA recommendations. To be eligible for grants, university programs must demonstrate strong commitment to preparing students for leadership or management roles in public service. Such commitment would be indicated by existence of an "identifiable...core faculty committed to the public service," as evidenced by its members' backgrounds and interests. The program's curriculum should show "a coherent pattern of courses, supplemented, where possible, by experience in the practical work of government." The guidelines hedged a bit on the touchy question of the organizational status of the program unit, but clearly leaned toward some kind of separate specialized entity: "Grants or contracts will normally be administered through an internal unit committed to the purposes of the Act, such as a program or school of public affairs, or school of public administration." After defining eligibility, the guidelines went on to specifics. Under Part A of the title, awards might be for either pump-priming in relatively new programs offering "groundbreaking or pilot proposals of an especially imaginative or innovative nature," or for expansion of "demonstratively productive on-going programs." Under Part B, grants could be made to universities for fellowships they would award for up to two years of full-time study, with priority to master's degree programs oriented to service in state and local government. In one omission from CGEPA's wish list, nothing was said about possible awards for doctoral study.

---

<sup>10</sup> The current president of the National Academy of Public Administration, John D. Millett (at the time chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents) also offered NAPA's assistance to OE in developing criteria for establishing the eligibility of programs to receive federal aid. This was not taken up either. The offer was consistent with NAPA's efforts at the time to launch a major study of education for public administration, which many in both NAPA and CGEPA thought would serve as the basis for standards to be issued by NAPA. As we have noted elsewhere, the education study was late starting and never fulfilled that role, but it would be influential later in influencing NASPAA to act on standards.

<sup>11</sup> During this process, John L. Chase, who apparently was the principal OE officer working on the guidelines, was in close touch with Bowen, inviting him to some of the meetings and sending him copies of working drafts. The senior consultants engaged by OE may have been nominated by Bowen; alternatively, they could have been recruited at the suggestion of Ward Stewart of OE, who knew all the senior people in public administration. Bowen's files included letters from Chase dated Feb. 25 and April 9, 1969, both with draft material attached.

In April 1969 OE distributed a finished version of the guidelines to all interested parties. John Chase of OE attended the CGEPA annual meeting in Ft. Lauderdale in May, where he distributed copies and discussed prospects for funding. The document was, however, still not officially promulgated but labeled "DRAFT--UNOFFICIAL." It would remain in that status for five years.

### Funding Suspended

After CGEPA's success in getting the Education for Public Service legislation passed and having the program guidelines written virtually to its specifications, its power ran out. The reason the guidelines were not made official was that OE really did not have a program to announce. By the time the guidelines were ready it was almost certain that the program would not begin operating that year because there was no appropriation for it. The Act had authorized \$5 million for F.Y. 1970. If all had gone well, that amount would have been included in the budget that President Johnson submitted just before leaving office, appropriated by legislation in the spring, and available for awards after July 1, 1969--presumably in time for the universities to use the money in the 1970-71 academic year. Johnson's budget, reflecting the tightness of money caused by the growing demands of the Vietnam war and the Great Society legislation, proposed only \$3 million for Title IX. Disappointing, but still significant for the schools if it had become available.

But, of course, this was a presidential transition year and, as customary at such times, one of the first acts of the incoming president was a review of the budget left by the predecessor. Richard Nixon came to office with ambitious but still vague notions of administrative reform, but in any case suspicious of the works of his predecessor, hostile to the federal bureaucracy, and, like virtually all Republicans, pledged to economy. Title IX, a program not yet even in operation and whose constituency did not count for much in Nixon's political calculations, was an obvious target. The new administration's proposed budget revisions completely eliminated the item.

That spring Bowen and others tugged at whatever strings they could reach on the Hill in an effort to get something appropriated, even a token for planning just to keep the program alive. The CGEPA annual meeting in May, where Chase appeared and distributed the guidelines, voted a resolution demanding Title IX funding which was sent to all the appropriate places in both Congress and the Executive branch, but to no avail. The administration was impervious and at such times Congress, even when controlled by the other party, as this one was, tends to be deferential to an incoming president. The appropriations committees complied with the administration's request

and struck the item. For the time being, Education for Public Service was legally intact but dead in the water.<sup>12</sup>

### BUILDING MOMENTUM: THE 1969 CONFERENCE

Building on the good meeting in 1968 and an unprecedented amount of interim activity by the chairman and executive committee, CGEPA's 1969 annual meeting, at Fort Lauderdale FL, May 17-19, was another well prepared session. The program committee, chaired by Dean Marver Bernstein of Princeton and including Stone among its members, decided to build on Stone's interim work. They announced the meeting under an overall theme: "Conference on Developing Standards for Graduate Education for Public Administration." Borrowing language from the latest version of Stone's paper, which had been distributed to all members, the announcement declared that two broad questions had emerged from the discussions at Cambridge and since:

What criteria or goals should guide our aspirations for education in public administration/public affairs?

What are the essential elements of a substantial professional school, center or institute?

The announcement asserted that with the passage of the Education for Public Service Act, many universities were contemplating or had already committed to establishing or upgrading programs, making the need for standards to guide such developments "imperative and urgent."

There exists no record of the 1969 conference's complete proceedings, but apparently Stone's paper was discussed in the opening general session, but only in a general way without conclusions reached or conference action upon it at that time. In order to accommodate interests in a range of subjects, the program was organized in three major

---

<sup>12</sup> The only satisfaction CGEPA got from Congress that spring was a statement in the report of the Senate appropriations committee to the effect that although the administration's wish was being complied with this year, Title IX was important and should be funded the next year. This apparently resulted from Denny's access to the committee chairman, his home-state senator, Warren Magnuson. CGEPA would refer to this later in its effort on behalf of Title IX, but the Nixon administration was not impressed and for several years Magnuson was unable to make good on the declaration.

working sessions under other headings into which standards could be introduced obliquely:<sup>13</sup>

Educational Strategies for Public Affairs

(Issues about curriculum and approaches being taken in recently expanded and reorganized schools, especially policy analysis)

Students

(Old concerns about attracting and financing students--the need for more fellowships--and new questions about student power and participation in program governance.)

Increasing CGEPA's Influence in Improving Education for Public Affairs

(Strategies, priorities, and resources for strengthening CGEPA, including but not confined to possible definition of standards.)

In a closing plenary session, the conference returned to what should be done about the various matters previously discussed. The discussion of standards apparently had been thorough and favorable enough that Denny, Stone and the other leaders considered the ground prepared for an important move. The executive committee presented a resolution which, at least on its face, committed CGEPA to a vote on what was bound to be a touchy subject:

*That the Chairman...appoint a broadly representative Task Force to prepare a proposal for the establishment of Standards for graduate programs...for presentation to the Council for action at the 1970 meeting;*

*That for this purpose the Task Force should attempt to develop effective collaboration with the National Academy of Public Administration;*

*That the Task Force is instructed to give full consideration to Dean Stone's memo on Standards;*

---

<sup>13</sup> Conference program announcement and schedule from CGEPA files.

This program structure did not satisfy all elements. After the program was distributed, James Banovetz of Northern Illinois University, who was supposed to be on the program committee but apparently had not participated, wrote to Bernstein (with a copy to Stone) to complain that the interests of new and expanding programs were not adequately reflected, and a special session was added under that heading. Stone's reaction to this is interesting and revealing. He commented to Bernstein that he had no objection if *Banovets* wanted to organize a special session, and went on to comment: "Indeed, if representatives of such programs meet separately from those concerned with the larger and established operations, it might be beneficial all around." This seems a bit stiff since guidance to new and expanding programs had been set out as a principal rationale for the discussion of standards. It indicates that regardless of the rhetoric, it was mainly the larger programs that were pushing the subject of standards and felt increasingly in "ownership" of CGEPA. Letters, Banovetz to Bernstein, April 2, 1969; and Stone to Bernstein, April 23, 1969; copies from Stone's files.

*That the suggested schedule calls for an interim report by October 1, 1969, comments by members by November 1, 1969; and final report by February 1, 1970, for distribution to the members.*<sup>14</sup>

From minutes of the plenary, it appears that this and other proposals for “action” were approved by general assent, without anything like a recorded vote. Whether anyone voiced doubts, or whether the bulk of the membership realized the importance of their declaration of intent is unclear. At any rate, this key resolution gave Stone and the other leaders the mandate they wanted, with a specificity of method and schedule unprecedented in CGEPA affairs. However, it by no means encompassed the interests of all members. Some of these interests were rounded up by Reining in a three-prong proposal for other things CGEPA should undertake:

That CGEPA should mount a national program to recruit more minority group students...into schools and programs of public administration and secure funding for the programs, including not only fellowships, scholarships, and other financial assistance but also institutional support....

That CGEPA should establish a national clearinghouse to help place graduates ...in a more systematic way rather than in the fragmentary and incidental manner such assistance is now provided by the national headquarters staff....

That CGEPA should establish a national clearinghouse for faculty recruitment....

This language, of course, incorporated long-standing ambitions of Reining, going back to his agenda of 1965, as well as putting in a plug for Title IX and reflecting a new (at least for CGEPA) concern about minority students. Members discussed it sympathetically but Reining himself acknowledged that the faculty and student clearinghouses were well beyond existing resources of the organization. The minutes noted: “It was felt that more assistance should be forthcoming to the Council, but that Council efforts could not be undertaken due to the staff situation in the headquarters office.” All this, of course, tended to build sentiment for a move to strengthen CGEPA.

The reference to headquarters resources reflected both long-standing problems and current financial difficulties at ASPA. Ray Pethel, who had provided most of the CGEPA staff work since 1966, was having to cover more ground and the CGEPA business seemed to be in disarray. The business meeting heard complaints about the mailing lists, procedures for billing dues, and confusion about the status of various institutions in CGEPA. And capping the complaints: “One member noted, on behalf of the members, a general dissatisfaction with the headquarters office in that there was no staff member present during the Business session. It was requested that this matter be mentioned in the minutes.” In the absence of staff, Stone himself (who probably was the member who raised the point) took notes and later produced the minutes.

---

<sup>14</sup> CGEPA Annual Business Meeting, May 19, 1969, Minutes.; from CGEPA files. Not merely the content but the incorporation of action deadlines into the resolution reflects the hand of Stone.

The nominating committee, in addition to confirming Stone as the incoming Chairman, proposed Robert F. Wilcox, of San Diego State, as chairman-elect. He, along with outgoing chairman Denny, would serve on the executive committee, along with some new additions reflecting the increasing diversity of institutions and interests within CGEPA. These included Alan "Scotty" Campbell, the new dean at Syracuse, representing the traditional center of the field; John P. "Pat" Crecine, of the University of Michigan, who had been noticed during the meeting for the confidence of his assertions that the policy approach in the new program at Michigan represented the only way of the future; and Edmund P. Gullion, dean of the Fletcher School at Tufts, one of the group of specialized international affairs schools to which Denny and Stone felt some affinity and hoped to bring more of into CGEPA.

### STONE'S REMARKABLE YEAR

Toward the end of the Fort Lauderdale meeting, Don Stone assumed the CGEPA chairmanship for the 1969-70 year. It would be a year of more intense activity than had been seen in that role before, during which several things of immediate importance were accomplished and hitherto vague intentions hardened into what amounted to a strategic plan for the reform of the organization itself.

#### Stone's Work Program

Stone had been thinking ahead, and immediately upon taking the chair announced what he called the CGEPA Work Program for the coming year. It was an ambitious plan to not only fulfill the mandate about standards, which had just been voted, but to deal with many of the other programmatic ambitions and organizational concerns that had been expressed at recent meetings. It would involve participation of many members in an array of task forces, committees, and individual assignment, plus an unprecedented amount of coordination and staff support at the center.

Central to the Work Program were three task forces, each with several members. The first, headed by chairman-elect Wilcox, was on CGEPA Operations. This group was to "review the organization, operations, by-laws, functions, program coverage, membership qualifications, budgetary support, and dues schedule." It also was to consider relationships of CGEPA with ASPA and other elements of the organizational family. The goal was "to produce a plan of action which will greatly strengthen the organization and operations of CGEPA and extend its influence and services."

The second task force, chaired by Henry Reining, was on Standards. This group got the mandate of the Fort Lauderdale resolution "to formulate a more definitive set of standards or criteria for guidance in the development and operation of schools." As described in the Work Program, the project would try to observe the resolution's instruction to cooperate with NAPA, although, perhaps because of delay in NAPA's education study, which had been expected to establish a foundation for standards, the

earlier deference to NAPA as the proper body to issue standards was modified, and Stone now suggested that “co-sponsorship of a more fully developed set of standards...would seem most appropriate.”<sup>15</sup>

The third task force was on Students, to be chaired by Lloyd Musolf of the University of California, Davis. This group’s main assignment was supposed to be to explore ways to increase public administration enrollments, especially through more fellowships and other forms of support. The central question here, of course, was federal aid and whether Title IX was going to be funded, but it does not appear that this group was expected to engage directly in the lobbying effort. Stone and others on the executive committee were already active in that respect, and it seems unlikely that he would have appointed a Californian who was not able to be often in Washington if he had expected to devolve that responsibility. The task force of course could play a useful role in mobilizing membership support for what the leaders were doing. Concerns expressed in the recent meeting about increasing minority enrollments, and the new question of student participation in the governance of programs were referred to this group. Also referred were a couple of more mundane problems. Could there be a regime of “inter-school comity” in the observance of common deadlines for the offering and acceptance of fellowships and other awards, thus easing a common irritant in the administration of graduate programs caused by prospective students who had received and accepted offers continuing to receive--and possibly accepting--awards from other institutions? The group also was asked to negotiate with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, whose new small fellowship program seemed to be “out of step with the university admission and fellowship calendar.”

In addition to the three task forces, the Work Program had several other elements, which can be summarized as follows:

--*Vigorous efforts to secure federal support* by seeking funding for Title IX and securing passage of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act.

--*Continue the Public Administration Fellows Program.* After two years of operation, this activity was overseen by a continuing committee chairman and would require relatively little attention from Stone and the executive committee, although it consumed a considerable amount of staff time.

--*Revive the annual survey* of member institutions’ enrollments, degrees awarded, and other information. This had lapsed after a couple of rounds in the hands of ASPA-CGEPA staff, and Tom Davy, who had conducted it when the Fels Institute at Penn was providing most of the secretariat work, had agreed to take it up again.

---

<sup>15</sup> George Graham of NAPA was at Ft. Lauderdale, as he had been at Cambridge the year before, to describe the ambitious study of education for public administration that NAPA was trying to get funded. CGEPA leaders were still respectful of NAPA’s potential role but, as Stone’s memo indicated, less willing to wait, as they began to see standards as a key issue in their aspirations for CGEPA itself. It is interesting to speculate how the whole matter of standards and eventual accreditation would have developed if NAPA had been able to move decisively in 1968 or 1969.

--*Bring the list of member programs and their representatives up to date*, which would require tackling the problem of institutions behind on dues, and establishing an orderly process for bringing into affiliation new programs.

--*Explore the possibility of a national clearinghouse of information* about member universities' programs, awards, internship opportunities, and job vacancies.

--*Increase communication and relationships*, with appropriate federal agencies and other professional and non-governmental organizations.

--*Increase student participation in ASPA*, by encouraging students to join and exploring ways to increase their involvement at the local chapter level.

--*Increase involvement of CGEPA institutions in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences*. This was a special interest of Stone, who had been active in that organization in past years.

--*An active Executive Committee*, with at least one mid-year meeting.

--*Plan the 1970 Annual Meeting*, where the products of the task forces and all these other activities would be brought together and subject to formal action.

Stone made most of the appointments to the task forces and other elements of the Work Program before leaving Fort Lauderdale or the immediately subsequent ASPA meeting in Miami. Implicit in all this was a more active CGEPA chairman than any in the past, and Stone was prepared for it. He was scheduled to retire from his deanship in the summer and would be on sabbatical for the fall semester, so he had time to commit. In the event, he made frequent trips to Washington, working with staff and making contacts on CGEPA interests, and from wherever he was he produced a steady stream of communications. As the year went on he kept in touch, advised and prodded his forces, took on more and more tasks personally, and kept the CGEPA members informed in a series of Circulars that reported on developments and transmitted documents of interest.<sup>16</sup>

### Title IX and Administrative Reform

That spring, while Denny and ASPA director Bowen worked their congressional contacts in hope of getting Title IX into the appropriation bills despite executive opposition, Stone began efforts to lift that opposition by persuading the Nixon administration that public service education was a logical fit with the president's still rather unclear intentions about administrative reform. In June, he wrote to Robert

---

<sup>16</sup> Stone's report and Minutes on the Ft. Lauderdale meeting, plus his document laying out his Work Program, comprised Circular #1, dated June 1969, from which most of the preceding is taken. From CGEPA files.

Mayo, the budget director, to convey the CGEPA conference resolution and add some ideas of his own.<sup>17</sup> Title IX, he argued, should not be viewed as just another aid to education, but as an investment in strengthening the government process itself. For that reason, responsibility for its administration probably should be taken out of the Office of Education and transferred to one of the central management agencies, like the Civil Service Commission. In any event, Stone urged, it was not too late to get into the 1970 appropriation at least a little planning money, so that both the Office of Education and the universities could use funds to good advantage when they might become available in future years. It does not appear that his letter was ever acknowledged.

Nixon's ideas about administrative reform became a little clearer in August, when he announced the first of several proposals in an approach that became known as New Federalism.<sup>18</sup> A central idea was to redistribute responsibilities between the federal government and the states, reserving a few functions that had to be national, especially income transfer programs, to the federal government, and decentralizing many others, especially those that involved community and social services, to the states and localities. State financing of added responsibilities was to be accomplished by broad block grants, federal revenue sharing, or giving the states exclusive access to certain kinds of taxation. Broad grants could be capped and the states would do things more efficiently, resulting in lower overall federal spending and reduction in the numbers and power of the federal bureaucracy and its interest group and congressional subcommittee enablers. The most striking proposal in this opening round was a radical welfare reform measure developed largely by Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a prominent Democrat who had been brought into the administration as a White House adviser on urban affairs. Although one might tell from this first round the prevailing direction of the policy wind, nothing was said at this time about the administration's intentions with respect to higher education, which left a little room for CGEPA still to hope about Title IX.

### Membership Details and Policy Issues

An element of the Work Program to which Stone devoted early effort, with considerable success, was to clean up the CGEPA membership and mailing list. He was aided in this by a new ASPA staff member, Francis Cholko, a recent graduate student, who had been hired mainly to assist with the Public Administration Fellows program (and mainly supported by the training fees paid to ASPA by agencies who took Fellows under that program). The way Stone tackled the mailing list reflected both his abhorrence of disorder and his understanding that policy could be made in details. The principal list of members more or less in good standing was now referred to as the

---

<sup>17</sup> Letter, Stone to Robert P. Mayo, June 24, 1969; copy from Stone's files. The Bureau of the Budget of course was the point at which the administration directly engaged the congressional appropriation process. It did not take the Nixon administration to turn the BoB against Title IX; the bureau had long been institutionally hostile to what it considered undue proliferation of small grant programs.

<sup>18</sup> For a sympathetic account of Nixon's administrative efforts, see Richard P. Nathan, *The Administrative Presidency (1983)*; Nathan was in the middle of those events as an assistant director of the budget.

Roster. Stone insisted on alphabetizing it by universities rather than the names of their representatives in CGEPA, to accentuate the idea that membership was institutional, not individual. He and Cholko also developed complementary lists: dues-delinquent member institutions, new programs not yet members, individuals known to be studying or planning new programs at their institutions, key government officials, foundation officers, research organizations, relevant academic and professional societies, and a select list of senior statesman in public administration--all these to receive appropriate mailings about public affairs education and the activities of CGEPA.<sup>19</sup>

The Roster project got into the ticklish question of membership status and dues. The condition of the files made it no small task for Cholko to look into the status of all the institutions with some history of involvement with CGEPA, bring the list of institutional representatives up to date, and get the dues billing on a current basis. Stone had to make decisions about institutions of uncertain status. Wide distribution in September of the preliminary Roster of institutions and representatives yielded not only many corrections but a number of past-due payments and even a few voluntary reassessments from programs whose pride apparently required them to recognize that they were paying less than others of comparable size and status. By November there was an updated Roster of 56 members considered in good standing. On supplementary lists were other institutions in various states of uncertainty: 5 who were ASPA agency affiliates but not paying the additional CGEPA dues; 2 new programs that had shown interest but not yet completed affiliation by sending in dues; 4 institutions with some degree of prior CGEPA involvement that apparently had not been billed for some time; and 7 that had been billed repeatedly and were now being dropped for non-payment (probably the first time that decisive step ever had been taken). The main list of 56 showed 24 universities assessed at the annual rate of \$300, 31 at \$150, and 1 anomaly at \$100, for total annual dues revenue of \$11,950. Additional information provided to the executive committee showed that of the 56 considered in good standing, 53 were either fully paid up or only slightly in arrears because of slippage in the billing cycle; only 3 were in arrears more than six months.<sup>20</sup> The updated Roster (without the details of dues assessment) was distributed later to all participating institutions and, with a few late additions, served as the list of those eligible to vote in the upcoming annual meeting.

Work on the Roster and questions from Cholko about how to deal with institutions that either had inquired or seemed likely prospects for CGEPA got Stone into more serious issues of membership policy. What exactly should be said about eligibility for membership and the process of affiliation? The CGEPA founding resolution back in 1959 had said that membership in the Council would consist of the deans and directors of specified kinds of programs, with the further specification that membership was “on

---

<sup>19</sup> Memorandum, Stone to Executive Committee, “Categories and Status of Member Institutions,” and enclosure “Proposed Classification of Institutions and Individuals,” August 1969; from CGEPA files.

<sup>20</sup> The updated Roster, with a heading “For Executive Committee Use Only: Current as of 11/10/69,” was distributed for the November Executive Committee meeting. A subsequent version, without the assessment details, went to all institutions as Circular #6, February 18, 1970.

an institutional basis.” Clearly, individuals became eligible for participation by virtue of their positions in affiliated institutions. But exactly who, or what entity, was the *member*? Over the years, usage had become blurred so that in varying situations “member” might refer to the parent university, or the public affairs school or program, or the program head. A casual affiliation process contributed to this mushiness of usage. Joining CGEPA had been simply a matter of someone showing up at a meeting, identifying himself as the representative of a program that considered itself relevant to CGEPA’s purposes, and arranging for dues to be paid. CGEPA had no way of knowing how much institutional commitment--or even knowledge of the affiliation--stood behind the initiative of the self-identified representative. Believing that a membership list that included a number of the nation’s most prestigious universities would carry more weight, Stone sought to emphasize the idea of institutional affiliation.

As Stone worked on the Roster he became more aware of the prevailing vagueness about just what kinds of programs ought to be in CGEPA. The academic explosion of the Sixties had produced many entities that could be broadly identified with public affairs but did not much resemble the traditional public administration programs that had been affiliated since the beginning and still constituted the core of CGEPA’s membership. What about programs that by curriculum or title or both were identified with such fields as urban studies, foreign affairs, city and regional planning, law enforcement, and so on? Or university-based research and training entities that did little or no regular course teaching? A few inquiries had come in from this miscellany, which obviously was a rich field for membership expansion if CGEPA could cultivate it, but how far beyond “graduate public administration” was it desirable to go? Like most CGEPA leaders, Stone was inclined to define “public affairs” fairly broadly with respect to substantive interests and specializations. He was leery, though, about other professional fields like law and business that some day, especially if serious federal money became available, might claim a public affairs interest, soak up the money, and enter and dominate CGEPA or render it irrelevant. He also was concerned--indeed, incensed--by what he had called the “non-programs” that seemed to exist mainly on paper, usually had no separately identifiable faculty, resources, or degrees of their own, and offered no public service preparation of a professional sort distinguishable from general academic, disciplinary studies. Then there were the “far-off-campus” enterprises that were professional enough in purpose and clientele but existed without resident faculty or supporting university resources on the site. Should such programs, no matter how dubious, be encouraged or permitted to affiliate, thus diluting CGEPA membership and perhaps allowing some institutions to use the fact of that membership to pretend to something they were not?

Taking a preliminary swipe at some of these issues, Stone drafted for discussion with the executive committee a document setting out eligibility requirements and procedures for affiliation that might be sent out to prospective members.

## Energizing at Mid-Year: Reform Plans Emerging

Stone rallied his troops and reviewed the status of the Work Program in a well-attended executive committee meeting in Washington, November 10 and 11; also attending were representatives of the task forces and others invited in for particular topics on the agenda.<sup>21</sup>

Bob Wilcox was present to report that the Operations task force was well into its work. They would be recommending a major reform of CGEPA, with written by-laws (none had ever existed, as far as they could find), and probably a new name to signify a new departure for a more inclusive, programmatically active, organization. Wilcox distributed a rough draft of by-laws providing for institutional memberships representing a wide span of substantive interests and approaches to public service education. Specific requirements for membership eligibility were yet to be determined, although it was assumed that there would be some minimum criteria and that member programs would have to be categorized or classified in some way. Until more was known about the structure or classification of members, it was not possible to be specific about dues, although they probably would have to be higher than at present to support the kind of activity and services envisaged. Also unsettled was what could be said about “relationships with other organizations,” which presumably referred to the new entity’s connection with NAPA and ASPA and other elements of the ASPA family like CUBGR and a new entity devoted to training--a matter just then of interest to the ASPA council (as will be discussed later in this chapter).

Henry Reining was not present and apparently had not sent anything in writing from the task force on Standards, but Stone, who had been in touch with him, led a discussion of the issues and probable nature of its report. (He had earlier prompted Reining with an 8-page, single-spaced memo, “Suggestions regarding the statement on Standards and Criteria,”<sup>22</sup> much of which would eventually be incorporated in the task force report.) He commented now that the Standards report “would be used as a guide to develop minimum criteria for membership, and that the report should probably serve as a protocol for the proposed by-laws. The two documents are clearly interdependent.” He acknowledged the sensitivity of classifying or categorizing members, and “emphasized the need to avoid any connotation of ‘second-class citizen.’” He thought this could be handled by using non-evaluative labels: “terms such as ‘sustaining member,’ ‘participating or institutional member,’ and ‘undergraduate member’ might be used, thus enabling the specialized programs to have first-class status.” The minutes recorded no specific dissent from this approach but noted: “A point was made of the fact that the

---

<sup>21</sup> The account of the November 10-11, 1969 executive committee in the next few pages is primarily from unusually detailed minutes of that meeting that were later distributed to the entire CGEPA membership as Circular #5, December 1969. The minutes were signed by Cholko as secretary, but the keeping and dissemination of such a complete account, unprecedented for CGEPA, reflected Stone’s passion for order and thoroughness--and no doubt his input and review during their preparation.

<sup>22</sup> Memo, Stone to Reining, Oct. 17, 1969; from Stone’s files.

‘smaller’ programs currently holding membership in CGEPA represent a majority of the total membership.” In light of future events, the implications of this point might well have been explored further.

Preliminary consideration of membership criteria led to a discussion in the executive committee of how important it really should be, in establishing eligibility, for a program to have discrete organizational status or an independent reporting relationship in the university structure. Some apparently argued that a program’s curriculum was more important than its organizational status in denoting a truly professional purpose, and wasn’t that the point, after all? The minutes reported a statement that probably reflected Stone’s bottom-line position on the matter: “While it might be somewhat artificial to make ‘reporting’ a fixed criterion, some appropriate way is needed to fix responsibility.” But questions of what exact purposes were served by the various criteria lingered. Later, under a different topic, a statement was recorded: “Any ‘standards’ should be used to the best advantage to increase the quality of public affairs/administration education, not the exclusiveness of CGEPA.”

Anticipating future linkage of the reports on Operations and Standards, Stone moved to coordinate their development. Wilcox said that he hoped to have a final meeting of his task force in California the next month. Stone proposed to make this a joint meeting of Wilcox, Reining, and himself, with such other members of the executive committee and the two task forces as could attend. Wilcox agreed, and it was arranged with Reining shortly afterward.

The record of these discussions shows clearly that by this time Stone, with the support of Reining and Wilcox and apparent assent from the rest of the executive committee, had fixed onto the idea that adopting standards and reforming CGEPA were mutually supporting steps: each would help achieve the other if brought together in a single act. It is also clear that in their enthusiasm for this elegant solution to CGEPA’s weaknesses they gave insufficient attention to the political reality of the short-run situations and interests of a majority of their members.

Incidental to these discussions, the executive committee approved Stone’s draft “Method of Applying for Membership in CGEPA,” for interim usage pending the contemplated reorganization.

Jim Banovetz reported to the executive committee on behalf of Musolf and the task force on Students. This group had reached agreement on most of the matters referred to it, although it was not recommending much that was specifically actionable. Student participation in program management should be punted back to the individual institutions, as a matter best left to local option. As for inter-school comity, the idea of standardized practices and fixed schedules for recruiting and fellowship awards “would be most difficult at this time to sell.” They were working on the idea of a CGEPA brochure that could be distributed widely to help recruit students into public administration programs, but had found that more difficult than it might seem because of differences in program approaches and target clienteles. They had looked at the HUD

fellowship program and confirmed that it was out of step with normal academic processes; they were recommending representations to the agency that its fellowship awards be made through participating universities rather than directly to individuals, and the awards be announced no later than February 1. The executive committee approved these ideas, and Banovetz, who was already an outside member of HUD's fellowship committee, undertook to present them to the agency. Ivan Richardson, of California State-Fullerton, had been asked to work on student participation in ASPA, but there was nothing to report as yet.

On the central issue of student support, the task force could do little more than reiterate CGEPA's long-standing demand for a major national fellowship program, such as might develop from Title IX if it could be funded. Stone added a report on his lobbying efforts, including his letter to the Budget Director back in June. The outlook was not good, but there remained some basis for hope about future years because the administration was still studying the overall approach to higher education it might take. The new budget to come in January would indicate whether last year's suspension of the Title IX request had been just a transitional measure or would be continuing policy. The visits the committee would be making to administration officials a little later in the meeting might yield some indication of their intentions.

In connection with student support, Stone reported a recent contact with a Ford Foundation officer who "would like CGEPA consideration of the desirability of a fellowship program for black students for study in public administration." His colleagues received this news enthusiastically and authorized him to follow up. There was brief discussion of how such a program might be administered--grants through the universities, it was hoped, rather than directly to students. (This lead was one that would pan out, leading to a program providing crucial programmatic and financial substance for the nascent NASPAA.)

Davy had a draft of a new survey questionnaire that had been revised once and seemed almost ready to go, but by the end of the executive committee meeting enough matters had come up on which more information was desired that the questionnaire was sent back for another round of revision.

A considerable amount of the executive committee's November meeting pertained to the Work Program's goal of improving external relationships. Mark Keene came in to discuss ICMA's interest in closer ties with the schools, and to invite CGEPA's participation in a recent movement among several public service-related organizations to create a consortium for cooperation on training and related matters. It was agreed that CGEPA would appoint someone for liaison with that development. (Subsequently, Stone asked M. W. H. "Bill" Collins of Georgia to create a task force for the purpose. Collins was already a virtual consortium in himself, being a member of the CGEPA executive committee, chairman of CUBGR, a prime mover in the recent creation of a new ASPA-related entity to deal with training, and involved in several other ASPA-related matters.) George Graham came in to report that NAPA's study of p.a. education had been partially funded and would proceed, still with the thought of producing

guidelines or recommendations for strengthening graduate programs. That led to a discussion of the study's implication for what CGEPA might do about standards, and the desirability of some kind of coordination, but from other decisions being taken at the meeting the Standards task force was clearly on track for some early actions, and NAPA contributions to standards would have to catch a moving train.

Stone hoped to use the executive committee meeting as an occasion for establishing relations with the Nixon administration, and to that end he had arranged a series of meetings, sandwiched into the committee's own sessions, with administration officials. The idea, of course, was to make some of the new people aware of CGEPA's presence and interests, and in the process put in plugs for Title IX. In the middle of the first day the committee trekked across town for a luncheon with Robert Hampton, who had succeeded Macy as chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Hampton was friendly but could not say much about Title IX, which was out of his bailiwick. He did, though, provide the encouraging news that the administration would give a qualified endorsement to the revived intergovernmental manpower bill that had not passed the previous Congress. After lunch the CGEPA delegation had an unsatisfactory session with several people from the Commission's training division and a few agency personnel officers who had been rounded up for the occasion. The educators heard little about increasing the government's use of university training facilities, and a lot about the impossibility of having government-wide training policy and how difficult the universities were to work with. (And no doubt the educators' response to those messages served to strengthen those opinions on the government side.)

The second day, the executive committee had a meeting at the White House with Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Moynihan told them that he hoped to get something on program implementation and the public service into the president's January 1970 annual messages, and invited suggestions. The CGEPA group of course brought up such immediate measures as funding Title IX and passing the intergovernmental personnel bill. Stone promised more long-range suggestions, which he provided the next month in a 19-page memo on public administration and the urban society. Among other points, he urged upgrading Moynihan's position as an individual adviser into a regular agency, an Office of Urban Affairs in the Executive Office of the President, to take the lead in a national program of administrative reform; such a program should include both reform measures inside the government and programs to develop appropriate academic underpinnings in university urban policy research and professional public service education.<sup>23</sup> (Such ideas, we now know, ran counter to the power dynamics around Nixon, and Moynihan himself would soon be gone from the White House.) Nixon's state of the union and budget messages in early 1970 would incorporate many of the administration's ideas about decentralization and block grants to replace categorical grant programs, but still nothing on education for the public service, and the freeze on Title IX remained for a second year.

---

<sup>23</sup> Letter, Stone to Moynihan, Dec. 5, 1969, and attachment "Suggested Agenda for Creating a Livable Urban Society"; copy from Stone's files.

In this round of visits the executive committee also met with an old friend, Roger Jones, then a senior adviser at the Bureau of the Budget. Jones was sympathetic but not in position to do anything about the agency's policy on Title IX. He did suggest that they might get in touch with James M. Hester, president of New York University, who had just been asked to head a task force of advisers on the new administration's overall approach to higher education. Stone would follow up almost immediately with a letter to Hester about the national need for enhanced administrative competence. Despite the need, Stone pointed out what he characterized as tiny and scattered federal support for education in public administration and policy, contrasting this with generous public underwriting of education in other areas of national commitment, such as agriculture, health, and space exploration.<sup>24</sup> His letter produced belated thanks from an Office of Education official who apparently was providing support to Hester,<sup>25</sup> but would have no discernible effect on the task force.

Before adjourning, the executive committee confirmed dates for the 1970 annual meeting: April 4-6, immediately preceding the ASPA annual conference in Philadelphia. Steve Sweeney had been asked to scout locations (and would soon report reservations made at the Princeton Inn, a much-favored small hotel adjacent to the Princeton University campus). The committee agreed to devote most of the meeting time to CGEPA reform, revolving around the task forces; much of the usual CGEPA program activity--reports on new approaches in member programs, developments in Washington, etc.--could be deferred if necessary to CGEPA-sponsored niches in the ASPA conference.

### Preliminary Membership Policy Anticipates Standards

Shortly after the executive committee meeting Stone made a report to the general membership about the meeting and other developments. Attached was a copy of the membership policy and procedure document that had been cleared for provisional use.<sup>26</sup> This paper is interesting because it illustrates Stone's understanding of how policy can be made in "mere" procedural decisions, and anticipates much of what would become permanent policy under NASPAA.

The preamble described CGEPA as "an association of schools, centers, institutes, and programs of professional education in public affairs and public administration." Further: "Its membership is thus institutional, not individual." Then came an inclusive list of the various fields and aspects of public affairs that might serve as a basis for affiliation with CGEPA. The document went on to state criteria for membership

---

<sup>24</sup> Letter, Stone to Hester, November 17, 1969; copy from Stone's files.

<sup>25</sup> Letter, J. Wayne Reitz to Stone, February 24, 1970; copy from Stone's files.

<sup>26</sup> CGEPA Circular #5, and attachment, "Method of Applying for Membership in the Council for Graduate Education for Public Administration," dated December 1969; from CGEPA files.

eligibility in terms that incorporated Stone's ideas about standards and were intended to discourage the "non-programs":

Institutions are invited to submit applications for membership if they have established or are formally committed to (a) a discreet (*sic!*) and specially designed graduate professional curriculum in one or more major areas or fields of public affairs and administration; (b) a significant instructional capability to implement such a curriculum and related research and advisory services; (c) a cadre of full-time students; (d) assured means of financing; and (e) other evidences of a solid program.

Attached to the policy statement was an application form asking the institution to list its relevant degree programs, numbers of full-time and part-time students in each, fellowship and assistantship support available (numbers and amounts of awards), and numbers of full-time and part-time faculty. There was a question as to whether the program had "specific financing or assured budgetary support." Also requested was a narrative about the program's purposes, curriculum, special fields of interest, research activities, relationships with other programs in the university, library resources, placement practices, and plans for faculty and staff expansion and future development. Finally, as evidence of genuine institutional commitment, the application asked for sign-off by both the program director and some higher university administrator.

It appears that only a handful of programs were admitted to CGEPA through this process during the latter part of the 1969-70 year. By the time the policy document was issued, attention of the CGEPA leaders and staff was concentrated on the impending plans for reorganization, and the membership expansion effort that had been talked of earlier was largely in abeyance. But the document is significant as reflecting emerging views of what membership in the association should entail, and it would serve, in only slightly modified form, to establish membership policy well into the NASPAA period.

#### ASPAA FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

In the latter part of 1969, while internal task forces planned an overhaul of CGEPA, Stone and other leaders were also involved in external discussions, largely defensive, about the future of CGEPA and its place in the ASPA overall organization. These talks had been precipitated by the ASPA council's action in November, 1968, to authorize a new ASPA-related entity that would come to be known as the Council on Continuing Education and Training in Public Administration (CCETPA). The initiative for CCETPA came from a group of academic people led by Bill Collins of the University of Georgia. Collins was active in both CGEPA and the Conference of University Bureaus of Governmental Research (CUBGR)--in fact, chairman of the latter--but he felt that neither of those groups was serving the rising interest in non-credit government training or in position to respond to the new possibilities that would be opened if Senator Muskie's intergovernmental manpower bill should pass. The ASPA council had approved the new entity as requested but with obvious reservations about crowding in the ASPA organizational landscape. It simultaneously established a committee, with

representation from CGEPA, CUBGR, the still unnamed training interest, and the council itself, to review and make recommendations about the future status and relationships among these groups. Denny, Stone, and Wilcox (past, present, and future chairman) represented CGEPA on the coordinating group.

### The Musolf Report

The coordinating effort got off to a lame start. At first, Collins himself was appointed to chair it--which seems a little odd, in view of his multiplicity of possibly conflicting interests. There is no record of anything he had done in that role when, in May 1969, apparently because he had just been elected chair of CCETPA at that group's organizational meeting, he surrendered the earlier hat to Lloyd Musolf of California, Davis (who that year also, as we have seen, had responsibilities within CGEPA). The committee on coordination had been asked to report to the December 1969 meeting of the ASPA council. When that time came, Musolf for various reasons, including his late start on the assignment, had been unable to assemble the committee for a meeting, but he had consulted with some members by correspondence and telephone. Most of the members must have minimal interest, because Musolf indicated receipt of contributions from only four of the ten members (it was not clear if he counted himself among the four), and that circulation of his draft report had elicited comments from only one. Nevertheless, Musolf presented to ASPA a rather lengthy and thorough document that reviewed the background leading to the committee's appointment, discussed the rationale and history of the three subject groups, noted important points that had come up in his explorations, and concluded with several recommendations.

For historical purposes, the Musolf report is interesting because of its delineation of tensions at that time within the university-related part of ASPA's membership, and of opinions about the future of CGEPA held both inside and outside of that group's inner circle. Why had leaders of CUBGR, like Collins, felt a need for CCETPA? Because the history of CUBGR, as Musolf characterized it, was largely one of futility. It met for only a few hours each year, usually on the sidelines of an ASPA or American Political Science Association conference. Meetings tended to be poorly planned and poorly attended. Its principal recent accomplishment had been a decision to rename itself the Council on University Governmental Research, partly in hope of attracting university researchers not involved in bureaus, and partly because CUGR would be easier to remember and pronounce than CUBGR. It was still a group in search of a program and most likely, if it ever found one, to emphasize research over the training activities that some of the bureaus engaged in. Nor, thought Musolf, was it likely that CGEPA could adequately serve the training interest. Constitutionally, CGEPA was an organization of deans and directors of graduate programs, and those degree programs were bound to be its primary interest. There was no real place in CGEPA for participation by other faculty members, including those who might be engaged in training, and it made no place for undergraduate education.

The assertion that CGEPA was not giving appropriate attention to non-credit training was denied by Denny and Stone, who insisted that many of the graduate schools were

conducting vigorous training programs--or would certainly do so if the government was disposed to take advantage of what they had to offer--and that in any case the imminent new and improved CGEPA would surely have a place for the university-based trainers. But, according to Musolf, many university people were not optimistic about CGEPA's welcome to the trainers. He also pointed out that although the movement for CCETPA had originated with university people, there was also strong interest among the government training officers, for whom neither CGEPA nor CUGR had a place, and the involvement of that constituency would be essential for the desired development and coordination of government-university training relationships to occur.

If, as it seemed to Musolf, ASPA needed separately organized activities for all three of these constituencies, how could they be coordinated? He reported the existence of at least some opinion that all three should be subordinated to a broad ASPA committee on the public service. That, of course, was what Denny and Stone (Wilcox does not seem to have taken much part in this) were most afraid of. Musolf concluded that whatever its theoretical merits, the idea of such consolidation was too late and politically impossible in view of the gathering momentum of CGEPA. Therefore, Musolf's report recommended continuing the three separate organizations, putting CCETPA under the leadership of practitioners but with strong academic participation, admitting undergraduate and community college degree programs to an enlarged CGEPA, and encouraging CUGR to "explore tasks beyond its present minimal role." The report specifically noted dissent by Denny, who thought that both training and research interests could be adequately served by the CGEPA of the future, making both CUGR and CCETPA superfluous. That also was the gist of Stone's final communication to Musolf, which apparently arrived too late to be acknowledged in the written report.<sup>27</sup>

Musolf presented his report to the December 1969 ASPA council meeting, which was also attended by Stone and Collins. The council had other pressing concerns at the time and did not grasp the matter firmly. Its minutes noted, vaguely, that "consensus was that further study needs to be given to the role of ASPA in response to the growing manpower needs as they apply to the future of federal, state, and local governments," which might have been meant to indicate acceptance of CCETPA as a continuing entity. The council discussed but backed off from a suggestion by member Harlan Cleveland for a series of head-knocking meetings with leaders of the three groups. The council finally voted to keep the matter under continued study, with the ASPA president, past-president, president-elect, and one additional member of the council to "serve as a special committee to consider how ASPA should respond to the manpower problem, either through its existing organizations or through rearranged groups."<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> This discussion of the Musolf report is based on the document headed "Memorandum to Council of ASPA, From Committee on Development and Coordination of CCETPA, CGEPA, and CUGR," Nov. 26, 1969; obtained from ASPA files. Denny's views and dissent are recorded on pp. 6-7 of the document. Stone's views were contained in a memo to Musolf, "Interrelationships of CGEPA, CUGR, and CCETPA," Dec. 1, 1969; from Stone's files.

<sup>28</sup> ASPA Council Minutes, Dec. 12-13, 1969; from ASPA files.

As far as can be determined, the special committee never functioned, and the coordinating impulse died away. The idea of harnessing the three groups as if they were somehow of equal significance and status was unrealistic from the start. CGEPA was in an ascendant phase, with a growing constituency, and its leaders were of no mind to be coordinated by anyone. Beyond that, the ASPA council had more urgent matters to deal with, including both financial and political problems that were rapidly coming to a head and would very nearly tear the organization apart at the upcoming annual meeting.

The subsequent history extends well beyond the period of this study, but future events would show that the Musolf report had been correct in its presumption that CGEPA (and its successor organization) would always have its primary interest in graduate degree education and never do much in the realm of either training or research. But correct, too, were those who doubted that CUGR or CCETPA would ever amount to much. Both of those entities lingered on into the 1970s, occasionally showing sparks of life but generally demonstrating the mysterious survivability of organizations with an idea but no program, until they eventually petered out, their constituents to a limited degree absorbed into NASPAA.

#### ASPA and NAPA

The Musolf Committee's charge to study coordination had not included the National Academy of Public Administration, but that organization, too, was at the time a complicating factor in the affairs of both CGEPA and ASPA. As we have seen, CGEPA's discussion of standards had begun in 1968 with an assumption that in the end NAPA would be the appropriate body to issue standards, and perhaps apply them in particular situations, too. CGEPA continued in a cooperative and deferential posture toward NAPA in this matter, as indicated by the resolution at the 1969 conference, but the NAPA study that was expected to provide underpinning for the standards lagged, while CGEPA developed its own momentum. By 1970, there was no inclination by CGEPA leaders to wait for NAPA. The idea that Stone and others had come to, of in effect adopting standards as a basis for restructuring the CGEPA membership, provided justification for pushing ahead.

NAPA and its relationships with ASPA also affected the staff service CGEPA was able to get from ASPA. Although NAPA had been launched under ASPA auspices (its founding members were ASPA ex-presidents), it had been from the beginning a separate entity with its own staff. However, it shared an office suite with ASPA and depended on ASPA for a number of administrative and financial services. ASPA was supposed to be reimbursed for these services from income received by NAPA as overhead charges on the study projects that NAPA was undertaking for NASA and other federal agencies. In this period there was growing dispute between the leaders and staffs of ASPA and NAPA about the basis and amount of charges levied against NAPA and its contractual projects, and the division of overhead revenues derived from those projects. Changes in these arrangements during 1969 (a first step toward complete separation of the two organizations) left ASPA considerably short of its anticipated revenues and in financial difficulties requiring staff reductions. This meant less ASPA services available to

CGEPA, just as that organization was expanding and looking toward a more active future. The need for better staffing and possibly a changed relationship with ASPA (few at the time were thinking, and no one was talking, of a total separation) were among the factors driving the leaders of CGEPA as they approached major decisions about its future.

### Title IX Stalemate

In the closing weeks of Stone's remarkable 1969-70 tenure there was another round in the long struggle for Title IX funding. As already noted, the efforts of Stone and others throughout the year, including his expostulations to Pat Moynihan, had not succeeded in getting Title IX into the Nixon budget for fiscal 1971. The administration's annual messages in early 1970 had references to administrative reform and an anticipated but still unspecified overhaul of the federal approach to aid to higher education.

Trying to latch on to the administration's rhetoric, in March 1970 Stone wrote a second time to Budget Director Robert Mayo. He argued that funding for Title IX and passing the pending intergovernmental manpower bill, thereby enhancing administrative resources at all levels, were essential to "the otherwise laudable proposals of the President to delegate more functions and to channel funds through tax-sharing and grants-in-aid to the states and local governments." He went on to recommend that the government establish a general policy of including in the appropriation for every major program an "educational and research component" devoted to improving methods of implementation and upgrading relevant personnel.<sup>29</sup>

A few days later, the administration announced its plan for higher education reform. In a message to Congress, President Nixon proposed a major reorganization of federal programs in that area. The central feature would be creation of a National Foundation for Higher Education (presumably in some parallel with the federal foundations for the arts and the humanities) which would receive applications from and make grants to universities for programs of academic improvement and innovation in fields that the institutions themselves would propose. Among the possibilities mentioned was "the university turning toward new programs in ecology or oceanography, education or public administration." Title IX and most other categorical university grant programs, including the National Defense Education Act, were to be repealed and their functions consolidated under the proposed foundation.<sup>30</sup>

The next month the Budget Bureau acknowledged Stone's communication in a letter from Assistant Director Richard Nathan. Nathan suggested that CGEPA get behind the foundation proposal and reminded that: "The President's message and the language of

---

<sup>29</sup> Stone to Robert P. Mayo, March 12, 1970; copy from Stone's files. Stone cleared a draft of this letter with the CGEPA executive committee and made the communication explicitly in the name of CGEPA.

<sup>30</sup> Quotation from White House press release, March 19, 1970.

the legislation indicate the expectation that public service education would be one of the Foundation's high priority areas."<sup>31</sup>

Despite such statements, Stone and his colleagues seriously doubted that the foundation and block grant approach would do much for public administration, as it would require the field to compete for priority within each institution--the wrong arena, they always insisted (going back to the discussions with the Office of Education over implementation of NDEA).<sup>32</sup> As it turned out, the issue was mooted for the time being. The congressional committees, protective of their jurisdiction of individual grant programs, never embraced the national foundation proposal and Title IX remained on the books as an authorized but for the time being unfunded program. The fight to get an appropriation for it would continue, and eventually succeed, after CGEPA became NASPAA.

---

<sup>31</sup> Nathan to Stone, April 20, 1970; from Stone's files. Nathan was one of the principal architects of the administration's broad New Federalism effort, which included proposals to consolidate categorical grants into block grants in many different fields. Although Nathan's background was in political science and public administration, Stone and others considered him an apostate and doctrinaire and a principal obstacle to the rescue of Title IX. Nathan later would defend and expand on the theory underlying this approach in *The Plot That Failed: Nixon and the Administrative Presidency* (1975).

<sup>32</sup> Actually there were many aspects of the New Federalism that Stone and his colleagues, at least in theory and to some degree in practice, might have favored. The executive committee's visit to Moynihan in November 1969 led to a discussion about several small grant programs of some interest to the schools--housing, law enforcement, etc.--that seemed almost as much trouble as they were worth and perhaps CGEPA should endorse their consolidation. The committee backed off from such a step after contemplating the reality of the number of separate pieces of legislation that would have to be amended and the fear that even if consolidation could be achieved the result would be highly visible and equally vulnerable. Anyway, they had to insist that Title IX, properly considered, was not an education but a governance measure.

## Chapter Eight

### **NASPAA FOUNDED: THE PRINCETON CONFERENCE**

The Conference on Graduate Education in Public Administration (CGEPA) met at Princeton, NJ, April 4-6, 1970 in the midst of turbulent--some felt almost revolutionary--times. For the past several years, a movement of dissent, protest, and demand for change had been building in the nation, pursued at first through peaceful agitation and demonstrations, then increasingly by civil disobedience and violent acts that sometimes brought brutal police responses. The salient issue was the war in Vietnam, but demands were now broadened to express grievances over racial injustice, inequality, economic power, and most forms of social and political authority. Nowhere was the spirit of protest sharper than on college and university campuses; many of the CGEPA attendees had come from institutions riven by student strikes and sit-ins and bitter faculty disputes over how to respond to these challenges. And worse was shortly to come. President Nixon's announcement later that month that he was taking the war into Cambodia, followed shortly by the shooting of demonstrating students at Kent State in Ohio and Jackson State in Mississippi, would produce an explosion of outrage throughout the academic world, so that by the middle of May hundreds of institutions were virtually shut down.

Although public administration faculty, students, and practitioners tended to be politically moderate and seldom in the forefront of conflict, the mood of protest had reached CGEPA's parent organization, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). Trouble was brewing in anticipation of ASPA's annual conference that would open in Philadelphia immediately after the CGEPA meeting. Longstanding concerns about management of ASPA's finances and services had been joined to restlessness among many, especially younger, members who felt that the entire organization and its program were rooted in the past and too complacent about the status quo in all things. A movement had developed to challenge the national leadership, and there were threats of disruption or a walk-out and "counter-conference" to discuss "real" issues, which might lead to a break-up of ASPA altogether.

It was telling of the political moderation--perhaps one could even say detachment--of key CGEPA leaders that despite strife all around them they had pushed ahead with plans for the Princeton meeting to achieve a major make-over of the organization. They saw little if any connection between what they were trying to accomplish and the contentions within ASPA, much less the broader issues of academic authority and national politics. This was perhaps so in a narrow sense, but in retrospect it appears that the outcome at

Princeton was not unrelated to the contemporary disposition to suspect and challenge authority of all kinds.<sup>1</sup>

## THE TASK FORCE REPORTS

Upon arriving at Princeton the CGEPA executive committee decided to put the proposals to reform the organization at the top of the agenda, deferring other business until later. First would be presented for explanation and general discussion the report on Standards and Criteria, followed by the report on CGEPA Operations; then in reverse order the recommendations contained in the reports would be brought up for official action. One of Stone's Circulars back in February<sup>2</sup> had given the members some idea of what was coming, but they now had before them the full reports with all the crucial details.

### Standards and Criteria

Henry Reining's task force on Standards and Criteria, with encouragement and contributions from Don Stone, had made an ambitious attempt to produce a report and recommendations that would accomplish several things:<sup>3</sup>

--- State convincingly the national need for more, bigger, and better graduate programs in public affairs and administration, and indict both government and higher education for failure to meet that need.

--- Make a case for the professional school of public affairs as the essential vehicle to meet that need.

--State the need for a more effective organization of academic public affairs interests than CGEPA had been.

--- Define the substantive scope of "public affairs" broadly, so as to stake out organizational territory and invite affiliation by a wide variety of university programs likely to be compatible with the essential goal of improving education for public service.

---

<sup>1</sup> A very minor historical note on the changing times. CGEPA's gathering at the venerable Princeton Inn marked a new high in the class and comfort of its meeting sites. CGEPA would be the last meeting booked into that well-known establishment. After CGEPA the Inn would be closed for remodeling to house Princeton's first class of undergraduate women, to arrive in the fall.

<sup>2</sup> CGEPA Circular #6, February 18, 1970; from CGEPA files.

<sup>3</sup> CGEPA Task Force on Standards and Criteria, "Objectives, Arrangements, and Requisites for Professional Education in Public Affairs and Administration: A Statement of Standards and Criteria for Membership in the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration," January 1970. Copy from CGEPA files.

--- Raise aspirations and guide development of the field by stating the ideal characteristics of public affairs educational programs of various kinds and sizes;

--- Identify and specify minimum criteria for membership in various classes of membership in the proposed new organization; and

--- By so specifying membership criteria, in effect establish standards for graduate programs.

The document that Reining distributed as back-up to his presentation was in a form not likely to help his purposes. It was long: 42 pages in all. It was rough: poorly reproduced and hard to read. It was unfinished: labeled "Discussion Draft, January 1970", with many scratched-in corrections and amendments, and blanks for facts and figures still to be added. It was tedious: for example, two pages of single-spaced itemization of all the program titles, approaches, specializations, administrative functions, and related fields that might be encompassed within public affairs. And, completely aside from its tendentious substantive thrust, full of detail, such as numbers of faculty and students required for various membership classes, that invited quibbling.

In presenting his report, Reining dealt lightly with the early, hortatory sections whose arguments were familiar to his audience, and concentrated on identifying proposed categories of membership in the new organization and specifying criteria for each. The principal categories were Members and Subscribing Members, distinguished essentially by the university's level of commitment to public affairs. Each of the categories or classes was analyzed along a number of dimensions (mostly familiar from Stone's papers) by listing several desirable characteristics under a heading, then specifying a few of these as minimum criteria for that particular class of membership. For example:

Curriculum. The academic program of the unit should:

- . Be determined by the unit, subject only to general university officers and academic councils;
- . Be specially designed--not merely a minor additive to other courses, or a collection of courses given under a new program label;
- . Have a multidisciplinary content with an applied, operational, or implementation focus;
- . Lead to one or more professional or graduate degrees;
- . Draw upon whatever disciplinary and professional instructional inputs may be needed;
- . Entail a majority of courses taught by faculty members whose primary responsibility is to the unit.

*The minimum qualifying criteria for Membership in the Association are criteria (2), (3), and (4).*

In similar fashion, desirable and minimum requirements for Member status under other criteria were set out. The minima included such general characteristics as being part of an accredited, degree-granting institution; being a program dedicated to education, research, and service in the public sector; being concerned with administration “or with planning or analysis related to administration,” either broadly or in a particular public sector function or field; and having “a dean, director, or other appropriately designated head.” Member programs must have a qualified graduate faculty of at least 8, of whom at least 3 must be full time, and have a student body of at least 30, with 15 or more full time. The program must also encourage faculty research and public service, respond to public sector requests for advisory and training service, and encourage faculty participation in professional societies and conferences. Finally, a Member program must have adequate physical quarters, library resources, and a budget “under its own control.”

Subscribing Members, under the proposed criteria, could be either “comprehensive, multi-disciplinary professional schools,” with status in the university comparable to other major professional schools, or, alternatively, academic entities with similar scope of resources and program but not enjoying full school status, such as divisions, centers, or departments. In either case, Subscribing Members’ programs were expected to be larger and more complex than those of Members. They should embrace a variety of programmatic or functional interests in the public sector, be “headed by a dean or director,” and ideally (but not absolutely necessarily) “recognized and utilized as the ‘prime mover’ in university concerns for public policies, governmental affairs, public service issues, and intergovernmental matters.” A Subscribing Member’s curriculum must lead to “one or more” professional master’s degrees, and preferably include a doctoral program. The ideal faculty would be a body of 50, with at least half full time. There must be a minimum of 80 students, at least half full time. Subscribing Members would be expected to have research, training, and public service activities (all described in considerable detail). Resources, in addition to appropriate classrooms, office space, and libraries, should include “one secretary for every two full time senior faculty members,” and minimum budgetary support of \$150,000 annually.

In addition to identifying and stating standards and criteria for Member and Subscribing Member graduate programs in the proposed new association, the task force report identified and sketched briefly requirements for three other special kinds of program that might qualify for Member status: urban and regional planning programs, undergraduate degree programs, and university-affiliated public sector training and research units not awarding degrees.

Questions and brief discussion after Reining’s presentation danced around the edges of a few of the standards or criteria recommendations. Questions were asked about the rationales for some of the specified numbers of faculty and students, and whether sub-

baccalaureate programs, such as those in community colleges, were contemplated for membership. Then the conference turned to the Operations task force report, with its more detailed description of the proposed new association and its by-laws.

### Operations: The Case for a New Organization

Compared to the Standards report, Robert Wilcox's Operations report<sup>4</sup> was a tidier and more winning document. Although as long as the other report, it was well-written, clearly organized, neatly reproduced, and bound with covers. The background material was clearly distinguished from the parts proposed for formal adoption, which mainly consisted of the new by-laws.

The report began with a review of CGEPA history, using generous excerpts from the old "Brief History" document, then recapitulated the developments, such as the growth in numbers of programs and their enrollments and the recent passage of Title IX, that led to interest in a stronger organization. Next came the task force's adopted statement of the educational context of CGEPA (or a successor) and its mission: an essay on "The Nature, Scope and Purpose of Education for Public Administration," by Fred J. Tickner, of SUNY-Albany. This piece emphasized the idea of professionalism and its implications for the goals, context, clientele, and requisite resources of public administration education.

The report analyzed CGEPA's resources, especially its limited finances, based on information assembled for the executive committee earlier in the year. The dues of CGEPA institutions currently added up to about \$12,000 a year, while ASPA's budget for direct and special services to CGEPA was \$5,700. However, this did not mean that CGEPA was amply financed, or that ASPA was making money from CGEPA--in fact quite the opposite. The confusion arose from misunderstanding about the Agency Affiliation fee. Despite the intention back in 1966, when the existing fee was voted, that the \$150 annual minimum CGEPA membership was to be *in addition* to a prerequisite \$150 Agency Affiliation fee, that rule had not been effectively applied. In fact, a majority of CGEPA members (31 out of 56) were paying only \$150 a year. If one assumed that the first \$150 of annual payment was to cover the services provided to agency affiliates, then only the institutions paying at the \$300 level were generating revenues applicable to CGEPA, and the rest were free riders. On the basis of this calculation, CGEPA was not paying its way within ASPA, and any increase in activities or services to members would certainly require more revenue.<sup>5</sup>

For the proposed new association the task force suggested a new dues scale related to the size of the program, beginning at a minimum of \$200 a year and going up to \$450

---

<sup>4</sup> CGEPA Task Force on Operations, "Report," April 4, 1970; copy from CGEPA files.

<sup>5</sup> Left out of this calculation was the \$600 Training Fee received for each Public Administration Fellow. That payment was in fact generous for the amount of staff time spent on the program, making for CGEPA "earnings" of several thousand dollars a year which helped to support the ASPA staff person assigned to CGEPA affairs.

for the large programs, those amounts understood to *include* ASPA agency affiliation membership. An appendix showed that dues at such levels would be comparable to those of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, and considerably less than many other academic-professional organizations.

### Proposed By-Laws

The final section of the Operations report consisted of proposed by-laws for the new association, with explanations interpolated at several points.

Article I - Purpose began by naming a new organization, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). Its purpose would be “to foster in the United States and internationally the establishment, strengthening, and effective conduct of schools, centers, and programs of public affairs and administration.” Within a spectrum of subject-matter interests (sketched in broad terms), the Association would “promote and assist in the development of higher standards of interdisciplinary education, research, and training for the public service.” In so doing, the Association would cooperate with a number of named institutions, including ASPA and its several elements, the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), and the principal international organizations in public administration and local government. A disclaimer that the Association would not “commit its members on questions of public policy nor take positions not immediately concerned with its purposes” was added. All this was uncontroversial, if a bit wordy, and followed closely the language of the “Method of Applying for Membership” document that had been developed for CGEPA by Stone and issued provisionally earlier in the year.

Article II - Membership opened with familiar language and then took the significant step of cross-referencing and making membership eligibility contingent on compliance with a proposed Standards document. It began:

*Membership in this Association will be open to (a) appropriately designated academic units (college, school, division, department, center, program, institute) offering graduate instruction in a degree-granting institution having a substantial commitment to the achievement of the purposes of this Association, offering discretely identifiable professional curricula in one or more significant aspects of public affairs and administration and meeting the applicable conditions set forth in the “Statement of Standards and Criteria for Membership in the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.”*

Then the proposed by-laws introduced the concept of categories or classes of membership originally developed by Stone. Institutions meeting minimum criteria set forth in the Standards could be Members. But beyond that:

*Academic units which (a) fulfill or have the declared purpose of fulfilling the minimum requirements of a comprehensive multidisciplinary professional school as*

*defined in the Statement of Standards and Criteria,” and (b) pay the prescribed differential dues, will be known as Subscribing Members.*

The difference between regular and subscribing members were left to be spelled out later in the by-laws. As a transitional measure, institutions declaring intent to meet the criteria for either class of membership but unable to do so at the outset could be carried as Provisional in the desired category for up to five years. The intent, Wilcox said, was that existing CGEPA members would be grandfathered into whatever category each might choose to declare. After that, decisions with respect to the initial eligibility and status of institutions applying for membership, or ending any member’s provisional status, would be made by an Executive Council. That body also was empowered to terminate a membership for non-conformity with the by-laws or other aspects of the standards, or for non-payment of dues.

The proposed by-laws introduced a new concept of recognized sub-groups of the membership based on their substantive interests and specializations.

*Members of this Association having interests and goals in common (as, for example, international affairs and development, urban planning and/or studies, community social action and development, research or continuing education or undergraduate education) will be encouraged to group themselves into Sections of this Association. By so doing they may advance their common interests, plan special programs and conduct such business as they wish at annual meetings, in addition to joining in the general sessions and deliberations.*

Any ten member institutions could organize a Section, subject to approval of the Executive Council. It was explained that in addition to accommodating recognized special interests within the existing membership, Sections would provide a place and provide a basis for recruiting into NASPAA some of the widely varied academic programs mentioned earlier in the by-laws that could be construed as within public affairs but not identified with traditional public administration. It also would be a place for CUGR and CCETPA, if they could be persuaded to come under the new umbrella.

Article III - Officers provided for a President, a President-Elect, and a Vice President, elected by the members for one-year terms, and five Executive Council members, serving two-year terms on a staggered basis. Here is where the difference between Members and Subscribing Members began to come in. The President, the President-Elect, and at least two of the Council members must be from Subscribing Member institutions. An explanatory note added: “The assumption behind reserving these offices for units paying subscribing dues is that they make an extraordinary contribution to the Association and therefore should be assured of at least a minimum voice in the Association’s affairs.” That the “minimum voice” would ordinarily be a majority on the Executive Council was achieved by a subsequent provision adding to that body the most recent past President, making five of the nine from Subscribing Member institutions. The certainty of that majority was blurred a bit by a following provision authorizing the

Executive Council to expand itself by adding up to three chairmen of Sections that might be organized; presumably those chairs might be from either class of members.

Article IV - Committees provided for three standing committees, plus such additional committees as might be created by the Executive Council.

The interests of both classes of member institutions was hedged in the proposed nominating process, which was to be carried out by a Nominating Committee consisting of the two most recent past Presidents (who must be from Subscribing members), the Vice President (expected ordinarily to be from a regular Member institution) and one additional person “who shall not be head of a unit holding Subscribing membership.”

A committee on By-Laws, to be appointed by the President with the approval of the Executive Council, was authorized to “receive and consider proposals affecting the by-laws...and submit recommendations regarding amendments...to the Executive Council.”

Perhaps most important was to be a committee on Standards and Criteria. This was to consist of the President-Elect, the Vice President, and five other heads of member institutions appointed by the President with the approval of the Executive Council. This group would be responsible for developing and recommending to the Executive Council such future amendments as might be appropriate to the Standards document that was being recommended by the Reining task force and expected to be created as part of the NASPAA founding Act. This document would be a standing official statement of the Association, setting forth the “objectives, arrangements, and requisites for professional education in public administration,” as well as criteria for membership in the Association, and such other requisites deemed desirable to develop academic programs of high quality.

Article V - Annual Conference provided for an annual conference and official business meeting of the Association, to be attended by the head (or designated alternate) of the program unit at member institutions. Each appropriately designated member representative would have one vote in the business meeting. Responding in a very limited way to the criticism that restricting annual conferences to just one representative per institution made for too small meetings and did not adequately represent the multiple interests within the larger institutions, or the interests of faculty members generally, the by-laws opened annual meetings to up to two heads of subdivisions of member programs, but only if those subdivisions were of sufficient substance to qualify for NASPAA membership in their own right. Such additional representatives might participate but not vote: one institution, one vote.

The key functions of the annual conference, which only the designated representatives of member institutions in formal business meeting could perform, were election of officers, and approving amendments to the Standards document and the By-Laws. We have noted above how provisions with respect to officers guaranteed the presidency and, at least at the outset, a majority of the Executive Council to the larger programs who would be Subscribing Members. Provisions further assuring the power of Subscribing

Members now were applied to the amending process. Recommendations for amendments to the Standards would go from the Standards Committee to the Executive Council, which could put them on the agenda for requisite approval of the membership in annual meeting. (It was not clear whether such amendments could get to a vote in annual meeting only by action of the Executive Council or if by some kind of parliamentary action they could be brought up regardless of the Executive Council.) In any case, the interests of Subscribing Members were protected: “Changes in the Standards and Criteria may be adopted by a majority of all members present, provided that the standards and criteria applicable specifically to members paying subscribing dues shall be adopted only by a majority vote of such members present.” With respect to By-Laws amendments, such amendments must be proposed in writing to the Executive Council and available to the membership at least 60 days before the annual meeting, which could then put them to vote at the annual conference. As in the case of Standards amendments, it was not clear whether the Executive Committee would have an effective veto on By-Laws amendments by preventing them from coming to a vote, but in any case the process was sufficiently conservative to prevent off-the-cuff amendments arising from the floor in annual meeting. Then there was an ultimate assurance of Subscribing Member power: “These by-laws may be amended or repealed by majority vote of the membership at the annual conference *provided a majority of the Subscribing Members vote in the affirmative.*” (Italics added.)

### By-Laws Debated and Amended

The task force reports and proposed standards and by-laws having been presented and discussed in a preliminary way, the agenda was for the group to take formal action in two steps: first adopt the by-laws, then complete the act of creation by adopting the standards and criteria. Although the initial motion was on the by-laws, the two documents were so inextricably linked that it was impossible to keep the discussion separate, and the ensuing debate dealt more or less simultaneously with both.

On the basic idea of transforming CGEPA into a new, more inclusive, better resourced, and hopefully more influential organization there was virtually no argument. Also taken more or less for granted was that the new entity would be affiliated with ASPA. The issues were on its character and structure.

In this debate, the differences in viewpoint and self-interest between the large and the small programs that had long existed in CGEPA came fully into the open. Although program size was the principal basis of cleavage, there also was a somewhat cross-cutting difference between those advocating a strong commitment to professionalism and others who remained indifferent or skeptical about the idea of professionalism in this context and clung to more traditional academic values and objectives. As has been shown, the proposals being considered embodied the ideas of the representatives of a handful of the larger programs organized as professional schools, who had dominated the CGEPA leadership in recent years and, believing themselves the appropriate and entitled custodians of the future of the field, intended to continue to do so in NASPAA.

These proposals now for the first time came under the full scrutiny of people from programs of different kinds and sizes--who, it soon became apparent, were the more numerous of those present. In the ensuing discussion, customary deference to the leadership and personal appreciation of the commitment and labors over the years of people like Reining and Stone soon gave way to strong attacks on their proposals, sometimes in righteous extravagant rhetoric of the sort that academics in faculty meeting mode can produce. Stone, in the chair, tried to maintain a posture of impartiality and succeeded for the most part, although he could not avoid being occasionally brought into the discussion to explain and try to defend what was, more than anyone else's, his own handiwork. Robert Wilcox, the at least nominal author of the by-laws draft, after making the initial presentation and sensing resistance, seems to have retreated to a compromising stance, leaving the main burden of advocacy for both the key documents to Reining, who could seem pugnacious even in ordinary conversation and was more comfortable in verbal free-for-all.

It is impossible here, both for reasons of space and the availability of records, to make a full and orderly recounting of all the arguments made and decision points reached in a day and a half of discussion during which, despite Stone's efforts to maintain parliamentary order, the situation often became confused with proposed amendments, amendments to amendments, motions to table, calls for the previous question, and other complexities of Roberts' Rules. We can only attempt to summarize what the main arguments were and the ultimate key decisions.

At bottom, and never quite fully faced or resolved, was a disagreement on what standards--or at least these standards--were supposed to be all about. Most of those present shared the assumption that, first and foremost, standards were meant to be guarantors of academic quality. That was a state hard to define but the indicators had generally been such things as admissions requirements, the breadth and depth of the curriculum, the stringency of degree requirements, the rigor of demands on students, and the pedigrees, publications and other attainments, and academic reputations of the faculty. Such indicators were hardly touched on in the proposed document; instead, an undefined professionalism seemed to be the objective, and standards were specified in such matters as numbers of faculty and students and the organizational status of the program in the university--things that told little about quality as commonly understood in academia.

No, said Stone and others, you misunderstand. These are not that kind of standards; they do not purport to address quality in the sense you are talking about. These standards are indicators of the nature and depth of an institution's commitment to public service education, whether its effort is commensurate with the declared purpose and what ought to be the university's responsibility for meeting the public need. Making an authoritative statement and setting up processes that will hold institutions to appropriate fulfillment of their commitments is what NASPAA should be all about.

Leaving that issue unresolved, critics questioned some of the details of the standards. Did it really matter whether the public affairs instruction was in the context of a

separately organized school or as one of several programs in an academic department? And those numbers: must they be so specific and rigid? How could one really say that it took 80 (rather than 60) students and 8 (rather than 6) faculty members to make an adequate program. On the question of organization, defenders of the by-laws argued on the basis of experience that substantial autonomy was required for a program to be free to pursue its distinct purposes; experience had shown that appropriate professionally oriented and multidisciplinary instruction was unlikely to be achieved within a traditional academic department. As to the numbers, it was admitted that they were in a sense arbitrary, but there must be some minimum points of critical mass and institutional support. Besides, if CGEPA had been right about the size of national need for public administration graduates, 100 or even 200 dinky little programs wouldn't meet it. Standards that recognized the need, declared by a national authoritative body of the sort it was hoped NASPAA would be, would help institutional representatives make their case back home. University presidents and trustees needed to be told to get serious: they could not do it on the cheap.

Most representatives of the small programs remained unreconciled to Stone's view of what standards were for, and to basing them on some of the proposed criteria. In their view "standards" inevitably had to connote "quality," and they could not see it being assessed in the proposed way. They had their own idea of what quality was, and most of them were confident of already possessing it in adequate measure. The small, political science-based programs were not the only ones in that position. They were joined in their opposition by some representatives of larger programs that would have easily met the minimum and might well have qualified as comprehensive schools and become Subscribing Members. Program heads from high prestige eastern institutions, secure in status and confident about what they were doing, saw little to gain and perhaps dignity to lose if they were to be judged by standards emanating from Pittsburgh and Southern California.

Discussion of the standards was more than just speculative, of course, because of their link to membership eligibility and status. To qualify for membership in NASPAA an institution would have to meet the minimum criteria for Member status. Those criteria included several requirements such as minimum numbers of faculty and students, program autonomy, and multidisciplinary faculty that a considerable number of the CGEPA members, especially those still in political science departments, clearly could not meet. The plan to grandfather everyone in, and if necessary carry some in provisional status for up to five years, gave them little comfort. Most of them could not see much chance of within five years undergoing the growth and change in status in their universities that would enable them meet the minimum criteria, much less ever reaching the favored Subscribing--or as some persisted in calling it, full--membership status. What if they couldn't meet the minimum criteria after five years? Would they then be thrown out? Wilcox said that the provisional status idea had been intended to encourage newly established programs to join; as a matter of common sense, he couldn't envisage any original members being removed on that basis; if it ever came to that point, surely something would be worked out. That reassurance did not fully satisfy

some of the dissenters. Why should they take that risk, especially in view of the way the new executive council, which would be making such decisions, would be constituted?

The proposal for two classes of membership, and especially the provisions designed to guarantee preponderant influence of the Subscribing Members, drew the heaviest fire from the critics. As the discussion worked its way through the articles of the by-laws and the various provisions for special leverage for the Subscribers were pointed out (“revealed,” some said, evidence of a cunning plot, a constitutional coup by that little group of deans) the discussion became particularly intense. Defenders of the by-laws pointed out that, in addition to paying higher dues, the comprehensive programs, although few in number, had a high proportion of faculty members in the whole field and were producing more graduates than all the other programs put together. Since such schools clearly did dominate the field in that sense, as well as representing the direction of the future, it was just and appropriate that they should have the leadership of the new organization. The small programs, of course, had in mind a different kind of democracy: One member, one vote, all of equal status, as it had always been in CGEPA.

As the group worked through, considered amendments, and took test votes on various sections of the by-laws, it became clear that on key points the leadership group that had developed the proposals were outnumbered by the critics and soon in retreat. A series of decisions radically amended the proposed by-laws. To oversimplify a messy parliamentary process, the key decisions were as follows.

First, the provisions giving preferred status to Subscribing Members in the presidency, the executive council, the nominating process, and the voting on standards and by-laws were gradually stripped out. All institutions in NASPAA would be politically equal. Incidental to this process, the office of vice president, which had been a sop to the ordinary Members, became superfluous and was eliminated.

Next, the Membership article was revised to eliminate the category of Subscribing Members, as well as the concept of Provisional status. All existing CGEPA members would be eligible to become Members, and new institutions could be admitted if, in the judgment of the Executive Council, they met the requisites of the Standards and Criteria document. The only suggestion of membership categories was separate references to graduate programs, undergraduate programs, and non-degree research and training programs, but these were not distinctions of status: once in, all would be equal.

Then, the crucial linkage between Standards and Criteria and membership eligibility was eliminated. After a tentative but somewhat confused decision to this effect had been made, Henry Reining moved for reconsideration and was defeated by a vote of 13 in favor and 23 opposed (leaving perhaps as many still confused and not voting). This was taken as decisive. The Minutes recorded: “In reflecting on this matter, the Chairman [Stone] reaffirmed that the outcome of the roll call vote was that the question of membership is not tied to standards and criteria.” Membership eligibility, it appeared, would require merely adherence to the general purposes of the association set forth in the opening article of the by-laws, as might be interpreted by the Executive

Council. With this decision, the term “criteria” became irrelevant and was eliminated throughout the text. In effect, this left an organization committed to developing and promoting standards, which might include issuing a statement of standards, but such document would depict a state of grace to be desired and worked for but without compelling force on existing or future members.

Other decisions about the by-laws were of secondary importance. The part of Article I calling for collaboration with other academic and professional organizations was reduced to a statement of intent and the list of named organizations eliminated as detail inappropriate to a constitution. Membership of undergraduate programs was approved in principle, subject to further definition by a task force to be appointed. Language about the annual meeting was tinkered with, somewhat unsuccessfully, in an effort to open attendance to faculty members and others beyond the designated program heads, while preserving the one institution-one vote rule in formal business meeting. Accepted without particular discussion was affirmation that secretariat services, including handling of funds, would be provided by ASPA. Seeking more clarity than in the past about distinguishing NASPAA funds within ASPA operations, there was a requirement for an annual budget to be developed by the president and executive council in conjunction with the ASPA executive director and approved by the members in the annual meeting. The president, with the approval of the executive council and concurrence of the executive director, was specifically authorized to negotiate for grants and contracts.

A final vote on the by-laws as amended put NASPAA into formal existence. The next order of business was dues. The task force had recommended a scale based on enrollments, starting at \$200 annually for the smaller programs and going up to \$450 for those with over 100 FTE enrollments. This was called a piker’s opening by representatives of some of the larger programs, who insisted they wanted a really active organization and were prepared to pay for it; they raised the ante to a \$500 minimum and \$750 top rate. The small programs had no objection if the large programs wanted to pay more, but they insisted that \$500 was far too much for them. Finally a dues scale was compromised, beginning at \$250 for programs with up to 25 FTE students and going up through several steps to \$750 for programs with 125 or more FTEs. It also was stipulated that regardless of size all independent schools headed by a dean would pay at the \$750 rate. In all cases, the amounts stated would include ASPA agency affiliation and services (whatever those might be).

Taking a breather from contentious issues, the meeting then heard from the Task Force on Students. In the new spirit of “listening to the students,” chairman Lloyd Musolf began by introducing two students brought over from Princeton’s MPA program who talked about their goals, academic experiences, and ideas about improved programs. Musolf then presented (orally, no written report) four recommendations from the Task Force:

The 1971 annual meeting should devote particular attention to student-related topics, including recruitment, minority students, financial aid, and program

governance.

NASPAA should work with the Civil Service Commission to produce a brochure to provide undergraduates with information about public service careers, the nature and variety of graduate training available, and sources of information about public service education and careers (such as ASPA and NASPAA).

NASPAA should support legislation providing forgiveness for all or part of federal-backed student loans if the borrower 's first five years after graduation were spent in public service.

NASPAA should apply to a foundation for funds for a special graduate fellowship program for minority students.

The recommendations were approved unanimously. The latter point, on minority fellowships, gave formal sanction to discussions with the Ford Foundation, which Stone had reported were ongoing (and which would bring important results for NASPAA in the coming year).

### Deferring Standards

The Standards Task Force report and recommendations remained to be disposed of. The actions that had been taken on the by-laws made it clear that there was insufficient support in the meeting for NASPAA to begin its life with a declaration of standards of the sort proposed, even if those could now be only aspirational, without direct bite on anyone. Time was short, and after the rancorous debate that had occurred no one had stomach for another detailed discussion and attempt to amend the document to make it acceptable to the majority present. Anyway, there was no urgency. The by-laws as adopted no longer rested on the standards in any significant way. With Title IX in limbo and CGEPA's ideas incorporated in the guidelines should it ever come to life, the need for formal standards to influence federal policy had receded. A motion was made and approved to receive the Task Force report and refer it to the new executive council and committee on standards for such consideration and future action as they might propose. That outcome avoided rejection and kept the document intact but left it to the leaders of the future to judge if, when, and in what way active discussion of standards should be resumed.

### New Officers and First Year Program

Election of the first NASPAA officers maintained continuity with the past. A nominating committee assembled under the new by-laws proposed Robert Wilcox of San Diego State, who had been chairman-elect under the old structure, for President, and he was unanimously accepted. In a balancing gesture, Laurin Henry of Virginia, who had been critical of the proposed by-laws during the debate, was named for

President-elect.<sup>6</sup> Stone was confirmed for the past president slot on the new executive council, and other council members who would have continued for a second year in CGEPA were elected to one-year terms: Crecine of Michigan, Gullion of Tufts, and Campbell of Syracuse. New executive council members for two-year terms were Claude Hawley of John Jay College, City University of New York; and Clyde Wingfield of Southern Methodist.

In closing, Wilcox assumed the chair and announced plan for the coming year:

Don Stone had agreed to serve in an informally created position as Coordinator of Programs. He would continue, as he had in the previous year, to be a frequent presence at ASPA headquarters, working with staff and keeping the membership informed through the series of Circulars.

Henry Reining was inviting representatives of the comprehensive schools to a meeting in Los Angeles to consider constituting themselves a Section, as provided by the new by-laws.

Wilcox planned to establish task forces on Student Participation, Government-University Relationships, Undergraduate Programs, and the Environment and Community.

New brochures, one describing NASPAA for potential new member institutions, and another for students about public service education and where to find it, would be developed and issued.

With that the meeting ended and most of those present caught a train for Philadelphia and the ASPA conference.<sup>7</sup>

#### PERSPECTIVES ON PRINCETON

So what happened at Princeton? Looking first at the negatives, it was a severe setback and disappointment to the CGEPA leadership of the recent past--Stone, Reining, Denny, and their less salient allies like Conaway and Wilcox. Their effort to create a strong association, in which the independent professional schools would move the field forward by applying to other programs a discipline of requisites for membership and status based on their own characteristics and aspirations, had failed. Busy with plans and overlooking hints of trouble ahead, they apparently were surprised and unprepared

---

<sup>6</sup> I think my visibility and identity as a small programs spokesman was established during the debate on the by-laws by an outburst: "Why, Leonard D. White himself couldn't qualify for first class membership in the kind of outfit you are talking about." LLH

<sup>7</sup> The preceding account of the Princeton conference is based on Minutes taken by ASPA staff and distributed (after editing by Stone), from NASPAA files, and aided by my own memories of active participation. LLH

for resistance arising in a body that in the past had generally gone along with its leaders and made most of its decisions by consensus.

How had the plan gone wrong? For one thing, the foundation document of the enterprise, the proposed statement of standards and criteria, was not well drafted for the multiple purposes it needed to serve. Of necessity, it had in the first instance to convince a body of academics that it was an appropriate prescription of the requisites of education for the distinctive purpose of preparation for public service. But it spoke only broadly about the kinds of things that academics traditionally associated with “standards” and were accustomed to dealing with, such as curriculum content, degree requirements, and faculty qualifications, while making heavy use of concepts like “multidisciplinary” and “professional” that were less familiar and to some degree arguable. Then, beyond its immediate, internal audience, the document was intended (primarily intended, Stone always said) to speak to government and university leaders about the commitments and resources necessary to achieve programs adequate to the national need. The document did not succeed in keeping these two purposes and the details appropriate to each separated in the view of its readers, and the CGEPA program heads were drawn into arguments about disputable matters like the necessity for organizationally independent schools, minimum numbers of faculty and students to comprise an adequate program, and even details like secretarial services. As academics, most of the CGEPA participants could not get it out of their heads that a document about standards had to be somehow about quality, and they were being asked to approve one that at best spoke only directly to quality as they understood it. It was just too much for a group that had always recognized diversity and was instinctively leery of standardizing anything.

Beyond the limitations of the documentary foundation, Princeton was a failure of organizational strategy and politics. It seems likely that if the standards had been presented simply as an aspirational document, a suggestion of goals to be sought for, those concerned by some of the specific requirements would have swallowed their reservations and gone along. But basing membership eligibility for the new organization on the standards, leaving programs presently unable to meet the minimum criteria either outside the organization or in a limbo called provisional, and by implication less than first rate, was a big step for which Stone and the other leaders had not adequately prepared their constituents. Apparently assuming that their own view of the need for this step would be understood by all, they made no special efforts to sell it in advance, much less take the ordinary political precaution of counting the likely votes. Then they took a second step too far by writing into the proposed document several features to guarantee that leadership--indeed, control--of the new organization would come from the comprehensive schools. For more or less natural causes, heads of those schools had been accorded that leadership in the recent years of CGEPA and presumably would have continued so in NASPAA, but trying to force it with constitutional provisions aroused the ire of those not from comprehensive schools, further assuring collapse of the whole enterprise.

Constitutionally, the reform effort had ended with something that was little more than a re-named and more elaborately organized CGEPA.

The outlook, however, was by no means altogether negative. It is important to note that while rejecting the idea of tying membership eligibility to the standards, and having classes of membership, the CGEPA majority was not rejecting all the goals expressed in the document. There was no disagreement about the purpose of encouraging of larger, better-resourced graduate programs, with broader curricular content and a generally more applied--call it professional if you wish--approach. The majority was simply insisting on latitude to choose the targets and pathways most relevant and available to themselves and to work toward them as opportunities might arise in their own institutions, rather than being subject immediately to external evaluation based on formalistic criteria.

The disagreement about organizational strategy did not signify disagreement about the need for more effective collective effort to advance the field. To the contrary, the events leading up to Princeton, and even the excitement of the meeting itself, seemed to have the effect of stimulating interest in the possibilities of a new organization. The blowup at Princeton had not destroyed the morale and cohesion of the group. The debate had no doubt raised temperatures and blood pressures for a time, but as academic conflicts go, it ended in only moderate rancor. Stone and Reining had been defeated on key features of their plan, but they were not personally rejected or driven out. Stone's offer to continue work at headquarters, and the general willingness to have him do so, was evidence of a desire to heal wounds and get on with the task of establishing an organization that would find other acceptable ways to improve and promote the growth of graduate public affairs study.

So there emerged from Princeton an entity with a new, more attractive, and certainly more pronounceable name, a broadened financial base, and a much larger potential membership if all the new approaches and specialized programs somehow involved in public affairs could be brought in. NASPAA inherited assets in the form of good connections at working levels of several federal agencies, one active cooperative program (the Fellows), and important status as representative and spokesman for public affairs education in the government and professional circles.

Despite--or perhaps in some sense because of--the current widespread turmoil on university campuses, the longer-term outlook for public affairs studies was propitious. That the field was expanding rapidly there was no doubt. Reports from all sectors were of growing enrollments in existing programs and additional institutions entering the field with new degree programs. With reasonable leadership, NASPAA might ride this wave to survival and organizational growth. With wise and effective leadership, it might even enhance the wave.

One additional negative factor was yet to be added. With CGEPA buried and NASPAA born, most of those attending at Princeton moved on to the ASPA national conference at Philadelphia. It proved the most eventful and contentious meeting in that

organization's history.<sup>8</sup> Perhaps because the ASPA leaders had belatedly acceded to some of the demands of dissidents and woven their plans for a "counter-conference" into the regular program, the disruptive demonstrations most feared did not occur. However, the atmosphere was tense and the discussion on and off platforms often bitter. In the business meeting on the closing day, the officers and council members proposed by the nominating committee were defeated by an opposition slate. The next day, when the new council and officers took over, Don Bowen, who had been executive director for eight years, resigned. His departure would be soon followed by much of his staff; Fran Cholko, who had been handling CGEPA affairs, left in June. For several months ASPA would be in an almost derelict state, with deep divisions on the council, a leaderless and depleted staff, membership and revenues falling, and a financial crisis looming. In this setting, the new NASPAA, bound to ASPA with several kinds of ties, would have to make its way.

---

<sup>8</sup> The buildup of tensions in ASPA and events at the Philadelphia meeting are summarized in Darrell Pugh's history of ASPA: *Looking Back-Moving Forward* (ASPA, 1988), pp. 66-72.

## EPILOGUE

From a beginning under difficult circumstances, NASPAA survived and fairly soon stabilized and thrived.

For the first three years, most of the effort of NASPAA officers was to get the new entity organized and operating. They concentrated on services and programs that succeeded in retaining the allegiance of the old CGEPA constituency and adding a few new members, while largely avoiding the issues that had been divisive at the founding conference at Princeton. Then, in the fourth year, they returned to the question of standards for graduate programs and brought it to a widely supported decision, setting NASPAA on a course that would lead to its present-day character.

### STABILIZATION AND EARLY SUCCESS

In the early months after Princeton, Donald Stone, in his temporary improvised role as program coordinator, filled in at ASPA-NASPAA headquarters for the California-based president Robert Wilcox and the unavailability of senior staff. With the limited staff help he could muster, he produced a series of circulars that announced the decisions at Princeton and reported on steps to establish the new organization and other Washington developments, including his activity in support of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, which finally passed that year, and futile efforts to get an appropriation for Title IX federal grants for public service education. Stone's circulars and other activity spread the word about NASPAA not only to old CGEPA members but also to an expanded list of potential member universities and connections in the government, the foundations, and related professional associations. By the end of the year, with an energetic new staff assistant in place, the membership roll had been shaken down by ascertaining the intentions and status of all on the old list and there was a solid roster of member institutions in good standing, paid up on the new dues scale; a functioning secretariat was now handling correspondence and responding to inquiries with a new printed brochure about NASPAA.

Stone's most important accomplishment in this period, giving the new association an enormous boost, was to complete negotiations that had been going on since the previous year with the Ford Foundation about a minority fellowship program. In January, 1971, Ford awarded NASPAA (through ASPA as its financial agent) \$1 million for a four-year program of Urban Administration fellowships for minority graduate students. With the aid of a policy board that included outside minority professionals, NASPAA distributed the funds among universities with appropriate MPA programs that had demonstrated commitment to increasing minority enrollment; the universities then awarded the fellowships, mostly to African-Americans but also to a considerable number of Hispanics and a few Native Americans. In 1972 was added a somewhat smaller program of fellowships for minorities in public administration with a health administration specialization. This was funded by the federal Office of Economic Opportunity. Later there was a two-year extension of the Ford program. For most of the Seventies there

were, at any given time, about 100 minority students widely distributed among U.S. universities (mostly but not entirely NASPAA members) with well-funded fellowships received through NASPAA. This gave NASPAA a prominent role in a substantively important national effort to expand educational and professional opportunities for minorities. These fellowships, as well as the continuing Public Administration Fellows program, which placed faculty in temporary assignments in federal agencies, showed NASPAA as a functioning organization with programs and services of high interest to current and potential member institutions.

The fellowship programs also brought crucial funds for NASPAA administration. The allowances for administration in the Ford and OEO awards, added to the fees paid by federal agencies for the Public Administration Fellows, were sufficient not only to manage those programs but also to substantially underwrite headquarters operations generally; by the middle of 1972 there were two full-time staff persons, plus a secretary, on the ASPA staff but dedicated full-time to NASPAA. These were all young recent graduate students, whose energy and creativity went far to compensate for inexperience. The services in these roles of Joseph Penbara, James Crawford, and especially Don Blandin, who served under various titles as NASPAA staff director from 1972 until 1977, deserve to be remembered. By 1974, income from operating programs, combined with increased dues payments, made NASPAA financially self-sufficient, with its own budgets and funds clearly delineated within the ASPA headquarters operation.

#### NASPAA MEMBERSHIP GROWS WITH THE FIELD

During this time, growth of the academic sector that NASPAA represented and served greatly enhanced NASPAA's opportunities--only by serious leadership failure or mismanagement could it have failed.

According to CGPEA and NASPAA surveys, national headcount enrollment in relevant masters degree programs, which had been a little under 4,000 in 1966-67, and in 1970-71 (NASPAA's first year) stood at 7,877, reached 19,731 in 1974-75. Masters degrees awarded, which had been 670 in 1966-67, and 2,130 in 1970-71, totaled 4,586 in 1974-75. The preponderance of this growth was in MPA or equivalent professionally oriented degrees. Back in the Sixties the ratio of MPAs to "other" master's degrees (such as in political science with a public administration specialty) had been roughly 2/1; in 1972-73 it was just under 4/1, and by 1974-75 it was almost 6/1.

In the late Sixties and early Seventies the number of graduate programs (and potential NASPAA members) offering public affairs and administration degrees grew but at a rate much smaller than the growth of enrollments. Way back, in 1959-60, a landmark U.S. Office of Education survey found 94 masters programs offering some kind of training in public administration. NASPAA, in 1970-71, could find only 125, and in 1974-75 it identified 138, although its surveys probably missed some who were not NASPAA members. Since the mid-Sixties the number of separate professional schools of public affairs or administration had doubled, from 13 to 29 in 1974-75. In the latter

year there were also 24 such programs in business schools or departments, 35 in public administration/affairs departments, institutes, and the like, and 52 in political science departments. In the early Seventies, even as the bulk of national enrollment growth was elsewhere in MPA programs, the number of political science departments offering some kind of a public administration-oriented degree or specialization continued to grow.

Actual memberships in NASPAA grew at a rate roughly paralleling the increase in relevant university programs. At the founding meeting in Princeton there had been 60 voting members. By the first annual meeting, in 1971, the number had increased to 77. In 1974 there were 128, and in 1975, 156. These modest numbers show the failure of the idea of Stone and other founders, incorporated in the ambitious scope of membership declared in the founding act, that NASPAA might take in a wide variety of academic programs--or already organized groups of such programs--so as to become a grand coalition of academic interests with some connection to the public sector. After compiling lists and mailing out brochures there was no effective way to reach most of those groups, and in the short run at least, NASPAA had little to offer or attract people like the social workers or the civil engineers. In the first couple of years, direct overtures were made to two groups that did seem to have more affinity, the city planners and a struggling association of academic programs in urban studies; the idea was to bring them aboard as NASPAA sections. Those talks got as far as exchange visits of delegates to each other's conferences, but in the end the impulse to professional differentiation was too strong and those associations stabilized and went their own way. NASPAA membership continued to consist almost entirely of academic programs with a core interest in public management, now increasingly augmented by policy analysis, and sometimes related policy interests in areas like the environment, international development, and urban studies. In the early years there was some question whether the revamped and new programs emphasizing a policy analysis approach would stick with NASPAA, but in the end most of them did, and as time passed an increasing number of member programs would have some variant of "policy" in their orientation and titles. Perhaps it was just as well that the imperial notion failed: great diversity of subject-matter interest would have compounded the difficulty of getting the organization to focus on standards.

The early NASPAA officers provided high continuity with the past. Wilcox, Stone, and half of the executive council were carryovers, filling offices they would have held had CGEPA continued. Wilcox's successor for 1971-72, Laurin Henry of the University of Virginia, was pushed into the leadership stream at Princeton, but he had served CGEPA as chair of the Public Administration Fellows committee, was a longtime member of ASPA, and knew all the players. At the end of that year there was an odd circumstance that the president-elect, Claude Hawley, of John Jay College, CUNY, had died during the year, leaving that position vacant. M. W. H. "Bill" Collins, of the University of Georgia, an inveterate accumulator of offices and committee portfolios throughout the ASPA system, was moved directly from the executive council to the presidency for 1972-73. After that, there began to be a little change in the origins and outlook of the leadership. Collins's successor, Clyde Wingfield, president of Baruch College, CUNY, became

president for 1973-74 after two years on the executive council; he was present at Princeton but relatively new on the scene at that time and did not have long background in ASPA and CGEPA. Nor did his successor for 1974-75, Thomas Murphy of the University of Maryland. And by then there were moving into the executive council, some “new men” with quite different backgrounds. Charles Bonser of Indiana University and Clinton Oster of Ohio State, both soon to be NASPAA presidents, had had no involvement with CGEPA or even ASPA, and in fact had come to public affairs deanships after experience in business schools. They, along with Alan “Scotty” Campbell of Syracuse (and briefly the LBJ School) would lead NASPAA to what perhaps had been its destiny from the start--accreditation and complete separation from ASPA--in the middle and late Seventies.

### STANDARDS AVOIDED, THEN ADOPTED

How the early NASPAA dealt with the issue of standards for graduate programs, beginning with how they might relate to criteria for membership eligibility, needs to be told at some length. During NASPAA’s first three years the question of standards was left on the back burner. Getting organized and setting up the fellowship programs took priority in the leaders’ attention. Equally important was the reluctance of the early presidents and a majority of the executive council to risk reviving the antagonism that had arisen at Princeton. Don Stone, though, was an exception, and in the first year, in his positions as program coordinator and executive council member, he pressed the subject in two ways.

First and always, Stone insisted that if NASPAA was to achieve its fundamental purposes, membership in it should *mean* something: that its policies should serve to identify adequate, reputable graduate programs and in some way distinguish them from entities and activities that were not. (By the latter, as noted several times in earlier chapters, he meant feeble, low-producing programs dangling from interdepartmental committees or buried in business schools or political science departments, generally offering little in the way of distinctly professional instruction and not leading to the MPA degree; he also included among the unworthy some of the off-campus enterprises serving entirely part-time students with pick-up part-time teachers and reputations for easy degree requirements.) Stone pressed his point when he brought to the new executive council a draft of procedures for institutions applying for membership in NASPAA and rules for the council to apply in its responsibility for admitting (or presumably not admitting) new members. Although the Princeton meeting had rejected tying eligibility for NASPAA membership to the elaborate statement of standards proposed by Henry Reining’s task force on Standards and Criteria, Stone pointed to passages that had survived in the by-laws that provided a basis, if not for barring the inadequate programs altogether, at least for sorting new applicants into categories so that membership rosters would make appropriate distinctions. The by-laws text, in describing the kind of association NASPAA would be, had used headings (a) to indicate graduate degree programs and (b) to denote research and training institutes and centers and “other education” programs--the latter words

slipped in at the last minute at Princeton to make a possible place for undergraduate programs. Whether the (a) and (b) separation had originally been intended as anything more than a convenient textual ordering device was unclear, but Stone now proposed to use it substantively as a basis for distinct categories of membership. By-laws language under (a) included phrases that came from far back in Stone's writing on standards, like "appropriately designated units" and "professionally oriented graduate programs." Stone now proposed to elaborate these ideas into a statement of minimum requirements for graduate degree programs to qualify for membership category (a); teaching programs not so qualifying could be admitted but relegated to catchall category (b). Institutions applying for membership would be asked to state the category in which they were applying, and the executive council would review the applications to make sure that incoming members were properly categorized and so listed on the membership roster. Using language straight out of Reining's task force report, Stone suggested that to qualify for (a) an applicant would have to be an "organically distinctive degree-awarding academic unit with a discretely identifiable professional curriculum," with a full-time program head, at least three full-time faculty, and at least 20 full-time students. "Surely, he said, "if a program doesn't have these fragments it doesn't have anything within our constitutional context."

Stone's proposal had the potential to re-ignite the controversy that had flared at Princeton. A considerable number of existing members still operating in political science departments would have failed the test of an "organically distinctive...unit." Beyond that, the insistence on a body of full-time students seemed to ignore the reality of trends in the field toward a preponderance of part-time enrollments and would have relegated a considerable number of reputable programs to the catchall category along with the fly-by-nights. The council, while grateful to Stone for all that he had done and reluctant to challenge him directly, simply could not go there and let him down as gently as possible. They went along with Stone to the extent of directing the application material to be revised to identify the two categories and require applicants to state in which they were applying. But it did not approve Stone's proposed detailing of criteria for the two categories; applicants would have to make what they could of the by-laws language and the council would review cautiously on a case-by-case basis. The council then approved admission of four institutions in category (a) and two in category (b). The (a)'s included at least two that probably would not have met Stone's proposed criteria. One was a small and apparently quite undifferentiated public administration activity in a political science department, and the other was a degree program sponsored by an interdepartmental committee--one that Stone had specifically cited in his memo as a dubious case.

At the same meeting the council also delegated decision authority on individual cases to the president, so that applications and the responsibility to make categorical classifications would not come to the council unless the president chose to refer them--which it appears he never did. Within a few months the staff was effectively making those decisions and accepting all comers. Need to expand the membership had trumped the idea of categorical distinctions, or even of seriously examining the worthiness of applicants. The categorical distinction on the application forms lingered for a while and

then disappeared without notice. The (a) and (b) members were never separated on NASPAA published membership rosters; doing so would have required categorizing all the old members that had been grandfathered in at Princeton--a task of odious distinctions no council was about to touch. The Princeton principle of an open association with minimal (Stone would have said virtually no) standards of admission and no distinctions of status among members was sustained.

Another standards-related matter arising in NASPAA's first year in which Stone was deeply involved began with the question of what to do with Henry Reining's task force report on Standards and Criteria, left over from Princeton. It ended in what might have been an important constitutional decision about the fundamental purpose of the organization. At Princeton the task force report had been heavily criticized for its detailed, prescriptive approach and rejected as a statement of requirements for membership, but as a statement of standards it had been neither approved nor rejected, just "accepted" for future consideration. However, the new by-laws declared advancement of standards a fundamental purpose of the association, and to that end provided for a committee on standards whose duty was to develop, for the approval of the executive council and the membership, a "statement of objectives, arrangements, and requisites for professional education in public affairs and administration." In the new executive committee Stone proposed that the task force document be brushed up to reflect the discussion at Princeton and taken to the first annual meeting for adoption by vote of the membership. It was not clear if having been before the membership at Princeton had given the document some sort of advanced standing, or if it would have to cleared through the standards committee (which at that point had not even been appointed). Stone volunteered to undertake a re-draft and bring it back to the council, which could then decide how to proceed. President Wilcox, president-elect Laurin Henry, and most of the council were cautious about the whole business of standards and quite willing to leave the hot potato in Stone's hands for a while; Stone's being in charge of the matter provided an excuse for not making any appointments to the standards committee that entire first year.

Stone's report in one of his circulars to the membership that he was working on a revised document that probably would come to a vote at the first annual meeting brought several caustic letters from people who thought that not only the paper but the whole idea of formal standards had been rejected in effect, if not by specific vote, at Princeton. His drafts, circulated and commented on in the council, went through several versions, as he responded to comments and gradually altered the prescriptive tone and eliminated much of the detail that had been controversial in the original document. He finally produced a long paper that restated ideas he had been putting forth for a decade about the government and society's need for an effective public service and deploring the failure of both government and higher education to make the necessary investments to provide it. He made the case for professional education in comprehensive schools of public affairs but not in a way that insulted other organizational forms and approaches, and although he did slip in a few numbers to suggest what he considered a minimal scale of an effective program, they were well buried in his broad, almost philosophical, discussion. Such an essay was not in the

form of an organizational statement on standards, and anyway, by that time the council was definite in not intending to take anything like that to the membership for a vote. Wilcox added a foreword thanking Stone for his contribution to discussion of a serious matter and commending it to the public administration community. NASPAA published the 68-page document as "The Response of Higher Education to the Administrative Needs of the Public Service," A Working Paper by Donald C. Stone. It was distributed at NASPAA's first annual meeting without creating any particular excitement but never voted on or given any further standing as a NASPAA official statement of standards.

At that first annual meeting, in Boulder, Colorado, in April 1971, NASPAA took a further step away from adopting standards. During the year the council had been accumulating a list of discrepancies and errors in the by-laws that had slipped through the process at Princeton. At Boulder, these textual clean-ups were referred to a hastily assembled by-laws committee, but along with them went a suggestion far more portentous. The council proposed removal from the by-laws of the language that seemed to commit the association to issuing statements of standards. The committee approved, and in the official business session the package of by-laws amendments was endorsed by the membership without a recorded vote or notable dissent. Clearly, the temper of the leadership and most of NASPAA participating university representatives at that time was to de-emphasize standards and build an organization that would justify itself by providing representation and services and benefits. Midway in the second year, a standards committee was finally appointed, which then spent a year and a half in rather futile discussion of just what its mission should be. If the hasty decision at Boulder had stuck, NASPAA might have become a quite different organization from what it is today.

While it seemed to almost everyone prudent, after Princeton, to let the question of standards rest for a while, the subject was too important--too integral to the purpose of the organization--to be neglected indefinitely. By 1973, developments both within NASPAA and in its relevant environment served to return standards to the agenda in a way that would lead to an important and unified decision. Diplomatic conduct of the first three presidents had soothed ill feelings lingering after Princeton. Leaders like Stone and Reining, whose proposals had been controversial, were no longer active on the scene. Growth of membership and success with things like the minority fellowship programs had engendered enthusiasm for the organization and trust in the leadership. In 1972-73, when president-elect Clyde Wingfield began to speak in the executive council of the need for inquiry into what he, rather cautiously, called "the state of the art" of public administration, no one undertook to discourage him, although the interest did not take serious form right away.

Meanwhile, several external influences were pushing the university program leaders to think anew about standards. NASPAA efforts to improve relations with federal agencies, in hope of gaining more support for the schools and enthusiasm for their products, were not yielding much. A Civil Service Commission study of its relations with academia did not produce recommendations for increased use of universities for executive training, and it specifically rejected the idea of credentialing or a special

recruiting category for public affairs graduates, on the ground that it was not clear enough what they were supposed to know or be prepared to do. High officials of the Office of Management and Budget (former Bureau of the Budget) told NASPAA that in those elite circles there was a general perception that public administration graduates suffered by comparison with business school products in their preparation for serious management work. Indeed, NASPAA leaders of the time were much concerned about competition from the business schools, which had been expanding their interests into the public sector. The business schools' organization, the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, was pushing its accreditation program for business programs, and some of its leaders were talking about offering accreditation to public affairs programs able or willing to adapt their programs to meet AACSB standards.

For NASPAA perhaps the most important precipitating event was completion of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) long-planned and deliberately-executed study of education for public service. At a conference in July 1972 and in a final report issued in January 1973, the universities heard the sort of thing they had been hearing at least since the Honey Report of 1966: Their output suffered from a reputation for inconsistency of preparation and wide variability of quality. NAPA urged a strong effort in which practitioners and other organizations in the field would join with the schools to improve the quality of instruction and develop standards that would justify the claim of professional education. Such talk at national levels and in the practitioner community was definitely penetrating the universities, where, along with growing enrollments, an increasing number of programs were being upgraded and modified into professionally oriented schools and departments.

Responding to all this, as Wingfield assumed the presidency at the NASPAA conference in San Diego, in March 1973, he and the council took to the membership a resolution authorizing the president to reconstitute the standards committee and charge it to "gather information necessary to enable the Association to work toward the development of guidelines for academic programs" and make a report before the 1974 annual meeting. This bland resolution did not pass without debate. Diversity of programs was recognized and celebrated. Some questioned whether it was possible to do anything about shoddy programs (which had been much discussed just prior) without a leveling effect on those already of high quality. Others demanded to know if this was the first step toward accreditation. The leadership, including some who probably certainly hoped so, denied that it was. The policy line was that this would not commit NASPAA to anything; it was about *information* that might *enable* the development of *guidelines* should the membership *choose to proceed* after receiving a report; and in any event there would be nothing to require any action or response from individual programs. With this assurance, a solid majority supported the resolution. It would be NASPAA's last significant open argument about the need for standards.

Wingfield provided assurance of a serious and respected effort by persuading Frank Sherwood, who in that same year was also president of ASPA, to chair the reconstituted standards committee. Sherwood had just announced that he was resigning after five years as founding director of the Federal Executive Institute and would be establishing a

new teaching center in Washington for the School of Public Administration of the University of Southern California, where he had earlier been a faculty member. Equally importantly was the appointment to the committee of Ernest Engelbert, director of the public administration program at the University California, Los Angeles. Engelbert, who also had just been elected to the executive council, informed his colleagues that since he had a sabbatical coming up and was planning some work on curriculum issues, he would be willing to spend most of the coming year on the project. He would need a little money to supplement his sabbatical partial salary and enable him to make frequent trips to Washington. This offer was received with enthusiasm; the ASPA executive director undertook to find the money (later secured in a \$10,000 special grant from the Ford Foundation) and the council directed NASPAA staffer Don Blandin to provide administrative support .

Frequently consulting with committee members and the executive council, Engelbert developed a plan for a broadly based project designed to gain wide support, and especially to reassure those who had criticized earlier proposals for standards for being too top-down, prescriptive, and detailed about matters not directly relevant to academic quality. He would build standards from the ground up, so to speak, in a way that would withstand challenge on intellectual grounds. It would begin by establishing clarity about desired outcomes, which he called “competences”: things than an MPA graduate should be expected to know and be able to do. From that he would build back, consulting the academics, to define the curricular and experiential inputs to impart and insure the desired competences in graduates. Then might come some attention to the faculty and organizational and resource “requisites” to provide the necessary education. He summarized this intellectual framework on a big spreadsheet he called the matrix of competences, with areas of knowledge down one side and columns of desired competences across the top, the intersections making boxes to be filled in with possible courses of instruction or other educational experience.

With committee approval, Engelbert set out, with remarkable energy and enthusiasm, to tap a wide range of opinion about what NASPAA and the schools could and should do, incidentally filling the boxes on the spreadsheet. He collected information in interviews and surveys of both practitioners and academics; he enlisted help, often in the form of specially arranged meetings, with representatives of all the major public administration and related organizations, such as the association of city managers; he looked into the standards and credentialing practices of other academic and professional organizations. By late autumn he had a matrix that had grown to several overwhelming pages of cross-matched inputs and outcomes. In perspective, it seems doubtful that Engelbert’s matrix exercise and dutiful consultations told the NASPAA leaders a great deal that they did not already know. It appears from the committee and executive council records that from the beginning they were pretty well agreed about the kind of report and recommendations they would make. But the approach served to legitimate the outcome and generate confidence that the entire governmental-public administration world expected and would support NASPAA in moving forward.

After another round of discussions in the standards committee and the executive council, Engelbert drafted a report. The early part covered familiar ground with a thorough review of the reasons improvement and reform were needed: the field's lack of respect, on many campuses and in the government; many programs inadequately resourced; wide differences among programs in academic premises and approach; the challenge of adapting to the needs of part-time students; inconsistency of rigor and quality among programs, and the problem of shoddy programs. Something must be done, but what? Converting NASPAA into a "full-fledged accrediting association" had been considered but rejected. There was a legitimate fear that accreditation would result in "over-standardization and conformity at the expense of program innovation and creativity"; accreditation would be "an undesirable system to impose and perhaps impossible to implement." The committee's preference was for a voluntary approach that placed responsibility for improvement on the individual institutions. To support that process NASPAA should offer guidelines suggesting goals to be achieved rather than requirements to be imposed. While aiming to assure a base of essential competence in graduates, the guidelines would be broad and flexible, leaving room for many differences in approach, specialization, organizational status, and delivery systems. The guidelines would, however, be "committed to fostering a professional emphasis rather than a liberal arts emphasis." While guidelines for undergraduate and doctoral degrees might at some time be appropriate, the initial proposal would be for programs offering the MPA or equivalent, considered a first professional degree.

The committee report concluded with the bulky text of a proposed NASPAA statement of what were now referred to as "guidelines and standards." The core was adapted from Engelbert's matrix and spacious enough to make places for all intellectual interests and approaches. Five major "divisions of knowledge" (political, social and economic context; analytical tools; individual and organizational behavior; policy analysis; and administrative/management processes) were cross-matched with four major categories of competences (knowledge, skills, public service values, and behaviors). While they might differ greatly in emphasis, all programs should provide at least some grounding throughout this large space, through appropriate combinations of course work and experience--the latter to be obtained through internships, involvement with professionals and their organizations, or prior experience. The delicate matter of minimum duration of study was hedged; it began with a nod to the most traditional and demanding program requirements, saying that ordinarily two academic years of full-time study would be required for students without prior experience, then softened it by allowing that the time might be reduced for those with "strong undergraduate preparation" or prior experience, and concluded that in no case should the master's degree be awarded for less than a calendar year (or equivalent) of course work, plus an internship for those lacking experience.

While some had hoped to see standards that would virtually outlaw the far-flung off-campus programs, the guidelines, on the whole, treated them sympathetically, recognizing the reality that an increasing part of the field's clientele were "unconventional" adult students who were not being served otherwise and probably could not be accommodated in traditional settings and formats. Universities sponsoring

such programs were warned to make investments in faculty and other resources to assure the necessary quality, and that course requirements and faculty contact hours should be same off-campus as in regular residence. But then the point was given away with an acknowledgement that in addition to conventional courses, instruction might also occur in such formats as intensive semesters, weekend sessions, and the like.

Finally, the proposed guidelines got to the old touchy question of program organization and jurisdiction and dealt with it in language closely following Stone's earlier documents. While no single organizational model could be prescribed, it was essential to have a discrete organizational unit--school, department, or whatever--with autonomy comparable to the institution's other professional schools and sufficient to assure that it could deliver appropriate professional instruction. This meant a unit with an identifiable head and essentially controlling its own admissions and degree requirements, budget, and faculty hiring and promotions. Unlike earlier standards proposals, these guidelines did not specify program size in terms of minimum numbers of students, but it got to the point with a statement that to cover the matrix and provide essential contact and oversight of students, "a minimum program" would need a faculty of "not less than five full-time persons." In appropriate situations, especially for larger programs, the unit's faculty might be supplemented by instruction from other schools and departments or the participation of professionals, but in any event qualified faculty strength should be adequate to cover the matrix and any advertised specializations and serve the student population.

After a couple of Engelbert's drafts had been circulated and commented on, Sherwood and the standards committee cleared the report for distribution to the NASPAA membership in April 1974, about a month before the annual conference.

Meanwhile, the entire public administration community had been, in effect, converging on NASPAA. NAPA, keeping its education report of the previous year alive, in early February 1974 convened a summit conference of public administration and governmental organizations to talk again about professional education. Engelbert attended and participated actively on behalf of NASPAA. The outcome, the so-called "Belmont Agreement," was essentially that the profession would get behind the schools in their quest for growth, support, and status, and the schools would do their part by upgrading their programs so as to justify the claim of professionalism. The first step would be establishing standards to guide the improvement. So confident was Engelbert by this time that he virtually committed NASPAA to acting.

The "Guidelines and Standards for Professional Masters Degrees in Public Affairs and Administration" came before the NASPAA membership at its fourth annual conference, in Syracuse in May 1974. To the proposed resolution adopting the statement of standards, the executive council added a proposal for implementation. While member institutions would be completely free to make of the standards whatever they might choose, the association commended the document to members to use as guidelines in self-studies of their own programs. If requested, NASPAA would suggest appropriate

external advisers to assist in self-studies. In any event, NASPAA would publish a list recognizing programs that had completed self-studies.

In the plenary session the NASPAA leadership showed a united front in support of the resolution, but emphasized that everything was voluntary. Member institutions would be completely free to embrace the guidelines or ignore them, and if they decided to make self-studies they could proceed in any way they chose. It was not a difficult vote. By this time forces both within and external to NASPAA had created enthusiasm for improvement among many, persuaded the majority, and quieted the doubters. The resolution to adopt the guidelines and the cautious plan of implementation passed in a voice vote, no dissents noted. Amid assurances from the leadership that no such thing was intended or ever likely to occur, the foundation for accreditation had been laid.

### AT LAST, FEDERAL AID

In its early years NASPAA continued to lobby unsuccessfully for the Education for Public Service program, which had been authorized by Congress in the closing months of the Johnson administration, largely through the efforts of CGEPA and ASPA, but denied funding by the incoming Nixon administration. Late in 1973, sensing that the administration's clout on Capital Hill had been weakened by Watergate revelations, NASPAA and friends gathered forces for a new push. ASPA executive director Seymour Berlin assembled new data about the need for trained administrators at all government levels and talked to his counterparts in other professional associations and the organizations representing state and local governments in Washington, resulting in letters to the relevant committees requesting that the subject be reopened. When the 1974 legislative season got under way the next spring, Don Bowen, former ASPA director now heading a public administration program at the University of Arizona, testified in House subcommittee hearings and later spent several weeks in Washington, calling on each appropriations committee member, making friends with their staffs, and handing out data sheets. At the same time, he and Berlin wrote and telephoned to ASPA and NASPAA members requesting that they not only write or call their congressmen themselves but try to stimulate supporting letters from university presidents and state and local officials.

NASPAA's lobbying first succeeded with Rep. Daniel Flood of Pennsylvania, the cognizant appropriations subcommittee chairman, who was brought to see that this moribund program of which he had barely been aware had beneficial possibilities for institutions in his district--and moreover would be a useful precedent in his longstanding effort to get federal money for the study of mining! With Flood tentatively convinced, Brewster Denny of the University of Washington, who had been a key figure earlier in securing the authorizing legislation, went to work on his friend Sen. Warren Magnuson, the Senate appropriations chairman, and stimulated a flow of letters and phone calls from the Northwest. The campaign for supporting letters continued for weeks, and made a significant gain when the several associations representing higher education in Washington, the so-called Dupont Circle group, added their support to that

of the public administration and governmental associations. The matter remained in suspense through that hectic summer and autumn of impeachment resolutions, Nixon's resignation, and pardon, but eventually there emerged an appropriation bill containing \$4 million for Education for Public Service, signed by President Gerald Ford in December.

Even then, events nearly succeeded in snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. President Ford, attempting to whip inflation by reducing federal expenditures, tried to use the rescission process under the new Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974 to knock out a large portion of the funds that had been appropriated for higher education, including all of the public service program. This fight went on through early 1975, but eventually Congress, whose assent was required in the rescission process, refused to go along with the administration, and in March 1975 the availability of \$4 million was assured. The Office of Education had already dusted off and updated the program guidelines that were written under heavy CGEPA influence back in 1969, while NASPAA chipped in with fresh advice to make sure the process remained on track. As soon as the money became certain, OE made a program announcement to start an application process so that awards could be made in time for use in the 1975-76 academic year. In June, the \$2.3 million available for institutional grants for program development was distributed among 58 institutions out of the 150 applying. \$1.7 in fellowship money went to 52 institutions out of the 123 applying, providing for a total of 264 individual fellowships. A later analysis showed that NASPAA member institutions had been relatively successful in the competition. Of the 107 NASPAA members that applied, 52% received awards, as compared to a success rate of only 26% for the non-members. Eight of the top ten institutions in dollars received were NASPAA members, most of them historically prominent in NASPAA affairs. For the next several years, funding on that scale would continue to flow to the public administration and public affairs schools, with a shifting emphasis to fellowships rather than program development awards.

With the adoption and start on implementation of the program standards, and success in getting federal funds for its constituents, NASPAA had become securely established.



## APPENDIX

GROWTH OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PUBLIC  
AFFAIRS AND ADMINISTRATION, 1953-1975Part I: Enrollments By Levels and Special Categories

Survey	<u>All Masters Programs</u>			<u>All Doctoral Programs<sup>w</sup></u>	<u>Minorities</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<u>Full Time</u>	<u>Pt. Time</u>	<u>Total Masters<sup>z</sup></u>			
PACH-Martin 1952-53						
Stewart 1959-56			2,400 (est.)	450 (est.)		
CGEPA 1966-67	1,310	2,620	3,930	528	400 <sup>x</sup>	600
NASPAA 1970-71	3,413	4,464	7,877	829	560 <sup>x</sup>	1,131
NASPAA 1972-73			12,000 <sup>y</sup>	1,000 <sup>y</sup>	1,323	1,743
NASPAA 1974-75	7,443	12,288	19,731		3,034	3,965

w Includes DPA, Ph.D. in PAA, Ph. D. in other fields with PAA specialization.

x Includes Blacks only; data on other minorities unavailable.

y Interpolated from total estimated enrollment of 13,000.

z Includes both MPA and similar programs and other masters programs, principally in political science, with public administration or affairs specialization.

GROWTH OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PUBLIC  
AFFAIRS AND ADMINISTRATION, 1953-1975

Part II: Degrees Awarded

<u>Survey</u>	<u>MPA and Equiv.</u>	<u>Other Masters<sup>x</sup></u>	<u>Total Masters</u>	<u>DPA</u>	<u>Other Docs.<sup>y</sup></u>	<u>Total Docs.</u>
PACH-Martin 1952-53			256			15
Stewart 1959-60						
CGEPA 1966-67	440	230	670			70
NASPAA 1970-71			2,130			91
NASPAA 1972-73	2,282	585	2,827			150
NASPAA 1974-75	3,920	666	4,586	39	82	121

x Principally MA's in political science and other disciplines with PAA specialization; a few identified as PAA but other than MPA.

y Includes both Ph.D. in PAA and Ph.D. in other disciplines with PAA specialization.

GROWTH OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PUBLIC  
AFFAIRS AND ADMINISTRATION, 1953-1975

Part III: Programs and Organizational Location

Survey	Prof. Schools		PAA Depts. Institutes, Centers, & Misc.	Poli. Sci. & Equiv. Depts.	Total Programs Reporting	Total Instits. Reporting
	Pub. Aff. & Admin.	Comb. Bus. & PA				
PACH-Martin 1952-53	8 <sup>w</sup>	3	32	76	119	105
Stewart 1959-60					145 <sup>x</sup>	83
CGEPA 1966-67	13	9	8	25	53	
NASPAA 1970-71					125	
NASPAA 1972-73	25	17 <sup>y</sup>	23	36	101	
NASPAA 1974-75	29	24 <sup>z</sup>	35	52	138	134

w Includes 2 identified as schools of "government."

x Includes 94 masters programs, of which 21 were MPA; includes 49 doctoral programs, of which 4 were DPA, remainder Ph.D. in either PAA or related field with PAA specialization.

y. Includes 6 combined with business "departments."

z. Includes 14 combined with business "departments."