

THE "NEW" PUBLIC POLICY PROGRAMS AND THEIR EFFECT ON THE PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

RICHARD W. CAMPBELL

University of Georgia

GEORGE E. RAWSON

University of New Orleans

Education in public administration and public policy experienced a period of exponential growth during the 1970s that is continuing into the 1980s. There has been a proliferation of graduate programs in public affairs as well as a growing number of undergraduate students majoring in political science with specializations in public administration, policy analysis or policy studies. Indeed, an increasing number of undergraduate programs offer bachelor degrees in these areas. (1)

This article focuses on graduate training for the public service. The MPA degree (Masters in Public Administration or Masters in Public Affairs) and the MPP degree (Masters in Public Policy) are widely recognized as the professional degrees providing preparation for management careers in the public service. (2) However, there is a lack of consensus in the field of public administration on what specifically should be included in such professional training. This

challenges prospective students who must try to assess the diverse course offerings and curriculum requirements associated with different programs in public affairs.

In the 1970s, the study of public policy emerged as a popular interdisciplinary field of study. The advocates of the public policy approach to scholarly inquiry and professional training have consciously disassociated themselves from traditional public administration research and education. This article is an attempt to distinguish traditional public administration programs from the "new" schools of public policy. Both the claim of uniqueness and the extent to which the public policy programs are unique have implications for a fundamental issue which has preoccupied those concerned with education for the public service: the identification of public administration as a profession.

A secondary purpose is to link the analysis of the two types of schools to the debate over the professional status of public administration. In order to give meaning to the above implications, it is necessary to discuss briefly public administration/public affairs as a field of study offering professional training for the public service and to trace briefly the recent development of the policy studies movement.

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: A PROFESSION?

Public administration is an ambiguous phrase which refers to a field of inquiry, the practice of administration and management in the public sector, and education for the public service. This ambiguity reflects "continuous academic controversies as to whether public administration is an art or a science, a discipline or a profession, a basic or an applied research field, an independent or an interdisciplinary field of knowledge." (Engelbert, 1975:3) Consequently, public administration education which traditionally grants an MPA degree is characterized by a growing diversity and heterogeneity, especially in light of the

recent proliferation of programs in public affairs. There are departments, schools, programs, and institutes in public administration, public affairs, and public policy/policy analysis, all claiming to provide training for the public service. Indeed, as Ernest Engelbert notes, there is too much diversity, causing government employees to lament the fact that the graduates of different programs vary greatly in their knowledge, skills, and competencies for public management. (Engelbert, 1975:10)

The curriculum content, institutional arrangements, and objectives of graduate programs in public administration and public affairs vary significantly from one institution to another. This variety is, to some extent, a function of the uncertainty which characterizes public administration as a self-conscious field of inquiry as well as the diversity of functions associated with conducting the business of government. Clearly, many public administration programs have developed without the guidance of a strong professional association reflecting agreement on an established body of knowledge. James Medeiros (1974:259) concluded that:

For the most part, graduate public administration programs apparently have been fashioned out of a loosely structured imitative technique whereby a particular university scans the experiences of selected universities and packages a hybridized version of its own. This has led to critical dispersal in program characteristics among sponsoring universities and a serious challenge to the profession to better standardize the expectations and requirements of the professional study of public administration.

Especially since the 1940s and the work of Herbert Simon, Dwight Waldo, Paul Appleby, and others, public administrationists have expended considerable energy debating whether the field is a discipline and/or a profession. In a recent article, Dwight Waldo speculates that the ambiguity and introspection will continue and suggests that public administration is

“increasing both in mass and diversity, without, however, moving decisively toward an agreed upon intellectual paradigm or well articulated ‘public philosophy.’” (Waldo, 1975:197; see also Golembiewski, 1977) The intellectual ferment and theoretical fragmentation contribute to a growing feeling that public administration cannot be considered a profession, despite appealing claims to the contrary.

Drawing heavily from the literature in sociology, Richard Schott developed a multi-dimensional definition of profession. Professions generally involve “a special technique” or a “specialized knowledge base,” extended training, “a sense of collegial responsibility, and the existence of a professional organization which has the power to insure the competence of practitioners and to enforce ethical standards.” With this definition in mind, he concluded that: (Schott, 1976:253)

As ennobling and attractive the aura produced by such references to professional public administration, they are misleading: public administration, as the practice of public management, is not now and has little chance of becoming a true profession.

William Goode suggests two factors which are “sociologically causal” in defining a profession: (1) lengthy training in a body of specialized, abstract knowledge and (2) a service ideal or orientation. (Schott, 1976:253)

For the purpose of this study, two of these points are especially relevant for explaining the non-professional status of public administration. First, Schott’s concern that there exists a “professional organization which has the power to insure the competence of practitioners and to enforce ethical standards.” The closest thing public administration has to such a professional organization is the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). This organization was founded in the early 1970s with the intention of

bringing some uniformity and focus to public administration education. NASPAA is concerned with improving the quality of graduate educational preparation for management positions in the public service. However, its role as a professional association has been somewhat constrained by the intellectual ambiguity referred to above. NASPAA's role reflects the diversity of educational approaches which characterize its member institutions. NASPAA, consequently, has refused to perform the standard-setting and approval functions one normally associates with traditional professions. In 1976, NASPAA issued guidelines in order to provide guidance in the creation and development of public administration and public affairs programs. However, it has played a less than aggressive role in implementing these guidelines. NASPAA has initiated a peer review of existing programs in public affairs, but this review is not part of a formal process of accreditation.

The second aspect of a profession that is of particular interest is Goode's notion of "lengthy training in a body of specialized, abstract knowledge." It is important in two respects. First, it implies a serious concern for the "profession's control over curriculum content and quality of its schools of training..." (Schott, 1976:253) As will be discussed below, the new schools of public policy exercise a greater degree of control over curriculum content than the traditional schools of public administration. Second, it contradicts the argument of many in the field that the practice of public administration requires a generalist education. Management is the essential function of the public administrator. The management tasks of government are diverse and, consequently, require public servants with a range of specific skills and competencies. A survey of public administrators in the United States reflects the range of skills perceived as necessary to perform effectively in the public service. (Murray, 1976:239-49) The most important skills in rank order include: (1) Communi-

cation skills (oral and written); (2) Budgeting; (3) Program evaluation methods; (4) Personnel techniques; (5) Labor relations; (6) Computer skills; (7) Economics; and (8) Accounting. (Murray, 1976:241) A number of skills related specifically to the study of organizational behavior were also perceived as important. These include: "Interpersonal skills, group leadership abilities, ability to persuade, sensitivity to environmental problems, and small group dynamics." (Murray, 1976:241)

Despite the demands for greater uniformity and standardization in public administration curricula, there is a fear that increased standardization will shift the balance to more specialized training. This worries some who see the need to train both generalists and specialists. (3) Consequently, the public administration "profession," through NASPAA, is a bit reluctant to become overly prescriptive regarding curriculum content of graduate training in public administration. Many see diversity and heterogeneity in public service education to be a healthy response to a diverse market. NASPAA's job, then, becomes one of maintaining diversity while minimizing the "confusion and controversy" which might accompany this diversity.

In the 1970s, a number of surveys were conducted in an effort to assess the commonalities and differences which characterize public administration/public affairs education in the United States. (4) The surveys reported overwhelmingly that there is little consistency in curriculum content among existing programs. In reporting the results of his survey, James Medeiros, (1974:255) concluded that "...we within the discipline have yet to decide what administrative traits we want reflected in our 'ideal' public administrator." He concluded that we still are engulfed in the generalist-specialist controversy. (Medeiros, 1974:255) In 1974, the NASPAA standards committee concluded that: (Guidelines and Standards, 1974:1-8)

TABLE 1
REQUIRED COURSES

<u>Courses</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Organization Theory	50%
Public Administration/Public Management	48
Public Policy	43
Public Finance/Budgeting	39
Quantitative Methods	38*

Source: A. Lee Fritschler and A.J. Mackelprang, "Graduate Education in Public Affairs/Public Administration: Results of the 1975 Survey." Mimeo (August, 1976).

*It is interesting to note that the 38% requiring quantitative methods is down from 66% in 1973.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

At the master's level, among programs purporting to train persons with capacities for public management, great variety exists with respect to program length, the range of subject matter to be offered, core requirements, the nature of specializations, and the use of practitioners as teachers.

In the most recent NASPAA survey, it was concluded that "...the data show that there is little consistency in core course requirements and (that) several programs have no core requirement at all." (Fritschler and Mackelprang, 1976:16; see also Mackelprang and Fritschler, 1975) Moreover, it is most interesting to note that the NASPAA surveys conclude that in 1975 there were fewer programs with core course requirements than in 1973. Table 1 lists the required courses identified by the survey and the percentage of respondent institutions which require a course in that area.

Clearly, the data suggest that there is no clear consensus among public administrationists about what constitutes the core subjects of public administration curricula, not to mention courses outside the core which should be offered. Consequently, public administration programs are diverse in their core course requirements, elective course offerings, and areas of specialization available.

Amidst this diversity, it is possible to identify three directions in education for the public service: (1) "traditional" programs in public administration/public affairs, which to a large extent are described above; (2) schools and programs of public management normally located in schools of business; and (3) public policy programs, also housed in a variety of institutional settings. In 1973, a Delphi exercise was conducted in an effort to articulate a vision of the "future of public administration." Emanuel Wald (1973:366-72) reported the conclusions of this experience and suggested that two distinct visions emerged: "conventional public administration" and "management and policy science."

These visions are each represented in the different directions of public administration education mentioned above. The first direction is described by the characteristics Wald associates with "conventional public administration," while directions (2) and (3) relate specifically to what Wald refers to as "management and policy sciences." "Conventional public administration" emphasizes an orientation toward understanding the organizational and political environment. The context for studying public administration in the future would emphasize organization theory, small group theory, role theory, and ideologies and movements as well as a concern for democratic values and the capacity for responsiveness to citizen demands and human needs. The core courses identified above in the 1975 NASPAA survey seem to reflect this particular vision.

The "management and policy science" vision reflects a concern for decision-making, systems, policy analysis, efficiency, and economy, as well as reliance on management science and the capacity to improve policy planning and implementation. (5) This latter vision seems to involve two specific directions (2 and 3 above), although they share a common belief that decision-making in the public sector ought to be more rational. First, there is a growing commitment in some schools of business administration that management is a generic process. Consequently, a number of schools of business have established public management programs which reflect this generic view and include the traditional rationalist orientation and concern for efficiency normally associated with schools of business. (6) Secondly, the public policy or policy studies movement involves a stronger commitment to rational decision-making techniques than is normally associated with traditional or "conventional" schools of public administration. However, it does not share the generic view of administration with the schools of public management, recognizing that administration in the public sector is distinctive from private sector

POLICY STUDIES MOVEMENT

The failure of the social programs of the 1960s to ameliorate the social problems of the time period produced a number of unanticipated and indirect consequences. Among these was a general dissatisfaction with the ability of government to cope with large scale social problems. One impact of this dissatisfaction was directed at public administration as a field of inquiry. Jack Walker (1976:90) makes this point well:

Graduate programs in public policy analysis were born in the late 1960's out of frustration both with the staggering ineptitude of governments struggling to launch new social programs and with the growing intellectual irrelevance of traditional courses in public administration.

Growing out of this belief in the "irrevelance" of public administration, a public policy or policy studies movement emerged. This movement manifested itself in three distinct but related manners. First, a number of books and articles appeared that encouraged social scientists to focus their work on society's problems. Charles O. Jones, for example, asserted that "students of politics should begin to employ their increasingly sophisticated tools of analysis so as to contribute more directly to social action." (Jones, 1970:5) Second, several journals appeared that focused directly on public problems and the policies directed at them, including Policy Sciences (1970), Policy Studies Journal (1972), and Policy Analysis (1975).

The most immediate manifestation of this dissatisfaction, however, was the creation of a number of graduate programs in public policy analysis. Beginning at the University of Michigan in 1968 with the reorganization of the fifty-year-old Institute of Public Administration into the Institute of Public Policy Studies, these programs promised potential graduate students something new and different from the

“traditional” training associated with the more established public administration programs. There was a strong feeling that “most of these programs had lagged behind the latest developments in social research, management science and economic analysis.” (Walker, 1976:91)

Following the establishment of the first public policy program at Michigan, there came a rapid proliferation of such programs at major universities across the country. Despite the geographical and structural disparity existing in these programs, they seemed united by a principal concern over “how to make public decisions vigorously and analytically on the basis of systematic quantitative evidence.” (Yates, 1977:364)

The public policy programs received a significant boost when the Ford Foundation provided several million dollars in support in the early and middle 1970s. (7) This funding decision reflects a conscious decision by the Ford Foundation to support the substantive focus of these schools of public policy as opposed to traditional schools of public administration. In a Ford Foundation letter in October, Robert Tolles (1976) emphasized the uniqueness of the school of public policy:

Compared with the traditional schools of public administration, which grew out of political science departments, the chief differences of the new public policy programs are their emphasis on problem solving, their multi-disciplinary approach to public policy, and their use of quantitative analysis.

In September of 1975, the Ford Foundation sponsored a conference attended by representatives from the major public policy programs. (8) There was both agreement and disagreement concerning different aspects of the various programs, a central point of concern being program curriculum and the nature of the product of the policy programs. However, there was a clear consensus on “their shared emphasis on analytical techniques.” (Yates, 1977:364)

The point is that the public policy schools have felt the need to distinguish their focus and orientation from the "old" programs of public administration. It is beyond the scope of this article to examine the reasons for this felt need. Rather, the purpose here is to explore what it is that is unique about the public policy programs and relate this schism in public service education to the larger issue of the professional identification of public administration.

UNIQUENESS OF PROGRAMS

The debate over whether graduate training in public administration ought to be oriented toward producing administrative generalists or specialists was also manifest in the creation and development of public policy programs. (9) The report of the Ford Foundation conference noted that "differences remain between the schools in their approach to public policy training. Some emphasize the training of policy analysts or systems analysts; others wish to train a knowledgeable consumer of analysis---a generalist." (Yates, 1977:365) It is argued that the public policy schools are training generalists in that they provide prospective public servants with analytical skills which can be applied in different organizational and policy contexts. Despite this claim, the curricula of the public policy programs exhibit a strong commitment to the important role of analysis in the making of public decisions. So strong is this commitment, that it leads one to ask whether or not the public policy programs can train administrative generalists or, alternatively, are the public policy schools training specialists in policy analysis?

Two aspects of the policy programs' curricula seem especially relevant in distinguishing them from traditional public administration programs: (1) level of prescription and (2) curriculum content. The programs examined were all two year programs. Students in all of these programs have very little discretion over their selection of courses. First year

course work is completely prescribed. (10) Although some discretion is generally provided the student in the second year, this is very limited because of internship requirements and, in some programs, the requirement to develop expertise in a policy area. This high level of prescription stands in contrast to that found in many public administration programs. As reported above, the NASPAA survey revealed "several programs (that) have no core requirements at all." Further, the authors' examination of nine established public administration programs indicates that, although certain courses are prescribed, required courses comprise a much smaller proportion of the student's total curriculum than in the policy programs. (11)

Curricula content for the several policy programs examined exhibits a high degree of similarity. Appendix A provides a list of first year courses for several policy programs. Although it is difficult to make generalizations from course titles and descriptions, this listing is very different from what one would find in a similar listing for MPA programs. In addition to courses which are directed at providing some understanding of the organizational and political environment, which is the substantive focus of the traditional MPA programs, the public policy curricula emphasize analytical/statistical techniques and macro/micro economics. Moreover, virtually all the courses related to the political environment tend to focus on the policy-making process. A reading of course descriptions indicates a specific concern with the processes of policy formation, implementation, and evaluation.

Required courses in statistical and analytical techniques are dominant, or at least more pervasive than courses which focus on the policy process. For example, the policy program at the University of Michigan has altered its mix of courses to favor statistical and analytical techniques. Originally, the eight courses required in the first year were evenly

divided between those which are intended to impart analytical and problem-solving tools and those intended to provide a "grasp of the political and organizational environment within which public policy is made." (Walker, 1976:93) Walker (1976:94) summarized recent changes in the curriculum at Michigan which reflect a shift toward greater emphasis on analytical techniques:

Changes of various kinds have been made in courses and degree requirements at IPPS almost every semester since the program was launched... Students now are confronted much more quickly with exercises in policy analysis---even before some of them have completed the elementary course in analysis techniques--- (T)he number of required courses on the political and organization environment of policy making have been reduced from four to two and a set of new courses on advanced analytical techniques (modeling and forecasting, policy evaluation, etc.) have been introduced. The policy seminars have never been entirely successful and fewer are being offered.

Perhaps even more important than this dominance of statistical/analytical technique courses over courses in the policy process is a near absence of courses concerning management and traditional executive and managerial functions. Indeed, the term management is used infrequently in course titles and the terms usually associated with the management function (e. g., budgeting, personnel, organization behavior) are virtually absent in course descriptions. Thus, those functions that serve as the subject matter of three of the four most frequently required courses in MPA programs (organization theory, public administration/public management, and public finance/budgeting) are virtually ignored in the policy programs.

The second year requirements for these programs continue the same emphasis of the first year. The typical second year consists of some combination of internship and workshop, with coursework generally

directed at aiding the student in developing expertise in a policy area. The management concern of the traditional public administration programs is sacrificed to provide the student an opportunity to apply the analytical skills received in the first year.

The uniqueness of the public policy program can be summarized as follows:

1. Public policy programs evidence a higher level of course prescription than traditional schools of public administration. The number of required courses, as a proportion of the student's total curriculum, is greater in the public policy programs.
2. Coursework in the public policy programs focuses more specifically on statistical and analytical techniques and in the policy process than in traditional public administration programs.
3. The number of courses designed to provide analytical and problem solving skills is greater than the number of courses specifically concerned with the policy process. However, it should be noted that a number of the skill courses are grounded in a special policy context.
4. The public policy programs generally do not offer the range of courses in management and the executive function that tend to dominate public administration programs.

Fundamentally, the uniqueness of the public policy programs is generally related to the level of prescription in terms of the number of required courses and the curriculum content with its emphasis on analysis. These differences are best exemplified by the separate programs in public policy and public administration offered by Harvard University. The John F. Kennedy School of Government offers both MPP and MPA degrees. In addition to the first year of prescribed courses in the policy program, the student must complete a summer internship and, in

the second year, a workshop. The remainder of the second year's work is comprised of "a set of electives that concentrate on a policy area of the student's choice" and "advanced courses chosen by the student on the basis of individual interests and needs." (John F. Kennedy School of Government, Official Register, 1978-1979:20)

On the other hand, the Harvard MPA program is characterized by a lack of curriculum prescription. Its high level of flexibility allows the student considerable latitude in constructing a program of studies consistent with one's needs and interests. This flexibility is manifest in the JFK School of Government catalog which states: "The Master of Public Administration (MPA) has no single, fixed course of study." (John F. Kennedy School of Government, Official Register, 1978-1979:34)

In conclusion, it should be noted that there are indications that many public administration programs are adding courses in statistical/analytical techniques and the policy process to their curricula. The Harvard MPA program again serves as a good example. In this program, a series of optional courses are available to the student that include two courses in "analytical methods," six courses in "economic theory and method," and four courses in "data analysis." (John F. Kennedy School of Government, Official Register, 1978-1979:35) The student in the public administration program is thus provided the opportunity to construct a program of study similar to that of the student in the policy program. The fact that such courses are optional for the public administration student while required for the public policy student, however, remains a crucial distinction.

A MULTI—PROFESSIONAL FIELD?

Education for the public service is characterized by considerable diversity and fragmentation. Preparation for management careers in the public service reflects an absence of consensus about the substantive focus of

its educational base and the skills and competencies which public service professionals need in order to function effectively and responsibly. There is a variety of degrees offered, in a number of different settings with very little curriculum uniformity or standardization. NASPAA has taken positive steps to encourage some consistency in curriculum content but is unwilling, or perhaps politically unable, to be even marginally prescriptive in its role as the major professional organization.

The uncertainty and controversy persist over whether the "profession" of public administration/public affairs is or should be training generalists or specialists. This has resulted in a fundamental tension in the field which underlies much of the diversity in curriculum content for graduate education in public affairs. "Traditional" MPA programs generally offer a curriculum which allows students to obtain a "generalist" education. Many of these same programs offer courses which permit students to develop specialties in specific staff functions such as budgeting, personnel, and financial administration, as well as specialties in specific governmental functions (policy areas) such as health policy, metropolitan studies, and education. Many public administrationists have argued that this diversity of educational approaches is a healthy response to the diverse needs of a complex market.

One need not challenge the diversity of educational approaches that characterizes public affairs education; however, the utility of referring to public administration as a profession demands serious scrutiny. In examining the uniqueness of the relatively "new" and "different" public policy programs, this article suggests that MPP recipients may have a more legitimate claim to professional status than MPA recipients. Traditional public administration as preparation for management careers in the public service is characterized by a lack of consensus on a "special technique" or specialized knowledge base. Conse-

quently, MPA programs generally permit considerable student latitude in curriculum design, requiring relatively few core courses. The products of MPA programs do not possess a relatively uniform knowledge base, which inhibits their claim to possessing specialized expertise.

In the public policy schools, on the other hand, there appears to be a more visible consensus on a specialized knowledge base. The schools of public policy are unique in that their curriculum content evidences a greater degree of uniformity and a higher level of prescription than exists in traditional MPA programs. This uniformity seems to indicate a high degree of consensus among scholars associated with the public policy programs regarding the specific content or training for the public service. In their view, curriculum ought to focus on the policy process and more specifically on providing graduates of the MPP programs with analytical and problem-solving skills. It seems that the public policy schools have a much more definite vision as to what the professional, or MPP-degree holder, will do after entering the public service. This vision reflects a normative position that the public decision-making process should and can be more rational. Consequently, the public policy schools seem to be producing policy analysts who are specialists in analysis. (12) The more defined and agreed-upon knowledge base would seem to suggest that policy analysis satisfies a fundamental criterion for being characterized as a profession.

However, it must be recognized that management in the public sector is a complex process which demands a diversity of skills and competencies. Analysis is important to the management function and critical to increased rationality in public sector decision-making. However, analysis is not the total management function. As suggested earlier, personnel needs of the public sector require individuals with a range of skills and competencies of which objective analysis is merely one type. In his discussion of the federal bureaucracy,

Hugh Heclo (1977) suggests that analysts (or reformers) are but one type of bureaucrat---the "partisans for more rational decision-making." However, there are also staff bureaucrats, program bureaucrats, and institutionalists, all with unique loyalties---not to mention different skills and competencies.

CONCLUSION

Dwight Waldo (1975) asked "whether public administration is (totally or by parts) a 'profession' for which curricula can be prescribed, educational programs accredited, and so forth." Richard Schott (1976) suggested that it may be dysfunctional to think of public administration as a profession and encouraged a search for a more useful framework for viewing the field. This examination of the uniqueness of the public policy approach to education for the public service suggests an alternative framework.

The practice of public administration can be viewed as a whole which is greater than the sum of its parts but fundamentally dependent upon the contribution of its parts. The parts would include staff functions such as personnel, budgeting, financial administration, and policy analysis as well as specific government functions such as health, education, and housing. Each of these parts would be viewed as a profession in the same way that policy analysis has been so viewed here. For example, in the area of health, there exist specific degree programs in hospital administration as well as health specializations in MPA programs. This educational training reflects the acquisition of special techniques and specialized knowledge which are specifically related to the delivery of health care services.

Also, to look at a staff function, many MPA programs offer specializations or "majors" in personnel with prescribed courses in personnel and collective bargaining which expose the student to a specialized knowledge base. Thus, personnel and health adminis-

tration can be viewed as emergent professions within public administration in much the same way that policy analysis can.

To respond to Waldo's question, therefore, public administration generically is not a profession; rather it is a field comprised of parts which can be referred to as professions. It may be time that we totally discard efforts to make public administration conform to traditional notions of a profession. Rather, efforts may more fruitfully be directed toward the development of professions within public administration viewed as a multi-dimensional field. A starting point might be the staff and governmental functions noted above.

APPENDIX A REQUIRED FIRST YEAR COURSES FOR PUBLIC POLICY PROGRAMS

John F. Kennedy School of Government (Harvard)

Analytical Methods

Economic Theory

Statistical Methods

Political and Bureaucratic Analysis

Managing Governmental Processes and Organization

School of Urban and Public Affairs (Carnegie-Mellon)

Economic Analysis (Micro/Macro Economics)

Economic Analysis (Cost Benefit Analysis)

Quantitative Methods for Public Management I

Quantitative Methods for Public Management II

Accounting/Computing

Historical/Cross Cultural Perspective

Physical Technical Systems

Organizational Analysis

(2 optional electives)

Graduate School of Public Policy (University of California at Berkeley)

Economic Analysis of Public Policy

Political and Organizational Aspects of Public Policy Analysis

Decision Analysis, Modeling and Quantitative Methods in Policy Analysis

Law and Public Policy

Introduction to Policy Analysis

Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs (University of Texas)*

Political Economy

Policy Process

Research and Management Skill

Policy Research Project

APPENDIX A [Cont.]

Institute of Policy Science and Public Affairs (Duke)**

The Application of Microeconomics to Public Policy Making

Politics of the Policy Process

Analytical Methods I: Decision Analysis for Public Policy Making

Analytical Methods II: Data Analysis for Public Policy Making

Ethics and Policy Making

Analytical Method III: Quantitative Policy Evaluation Methods

Public Policy Workshop

***All LBJ School courses are one year long**

****Core curriculum**

NOTES

1. The authors are indebted to Harry Brown and Martin Gabbard for their research support.
2. The MPA and MPP are the most common degree titles. A quick survey of the NASPAA catalog suggests the variety of degree titles offered.
3. Many programs in public administration offer a range of specializations in specific substantive areas, such as urban affairs, health, financial administration, science and technology, and so forth. Specialization is also an ambiguous term. There are specialists in specific staff functions such as personnel or budgeting as well as specializations in specific "functional" areas such as education and housing.
4. The major surveys were sponsored by the National Academy of Public Administration and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration.
5. The descriptions of the two views are partial descriptions. For a more detailed outline of the two views, see Table 1 in Wald (1973) page 370.
6. Stanford and, more recently, Yale come immediately to mind.
7. The institutions which received funds from the Ford Foundation included: the University of California at Berkeley, Carnegie-Mellon, Harvard, the University of Texas, Stanford, Duke, the University of Michigan, and the Rand Corporation.
8. Those institutions represented at the conference, in addition to those which had received Ford Foundation funding, were Princeton and Yale.
9. The information reported in this section is taken from catalogues, brochures, handbooks, and other material provided by the policy schools. The specific programs examined were the John F. Kennedy School of Government (Harvard), the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs (the University of Texas), Institute of Public Policy Studies (the University of Michigan), School of Urban and Public

Affairs (Carnegie-Mellon University), Institute of Policy Science and Public Affairs (Duke), and the Graduate School of Public Policy (University of California, Berkeley).

10. Students in the Carnegie-Mellon program do, however, have two optional electives.
11. The public administration programs examined were the MPA degree programs at American University, Indiana University, Ohio State University, Syracuse University, University of Georgia, University of Kansas, University of North Carolina, University of Southern California, and University of Virginia.
12. Policy analysts are not a homogeneous grouping. For a discussion of the diverse types of policy analysts, see Meltsner (1976). He discusses at some length the role of policy analyst suggesting that such analysts walk a fine line between providing objective analysis and being sensitive to the political environment in which they function.

REFERENCES

- Engelbert, Ernest A. (1975). "Recent Developments in Public Administration Education in the United States," prepared for the International Colloquium on PREPARATION BY WESTERN EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC SERVICE. Mons, Belgium.
- Fritschler, A. Lee and A. J. Mackelprang (1976). "Graduate Education in Public Affairs/Public Administration: Results of the 1975 Survey." Mimeo (August):16.
- Golembiewski, Robert T. (1977). PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AS A DEVELOPING DISCIPLINE. New York: Marcell Dekker.
- GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS FOR PROFESSIONAL MASTERS DEGREE PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS/PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (1974). Washington, D.C.: NASPAA.
- Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government. OFFICIAL REGISTER 1978-1979.
- Hecl, Hugh (1977). A GOVERNMENT OF STRANGERS. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Jones, Charles O. (1970). AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PUBLIC POLICY. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth.
- Mackelprang, A. J. and A. Lee Fritschler (1975). "Graduate Education in Public Affairs/Public Administration." PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW 35 (March/April):182-90.
- Medeiros, James (1974). "The Professional Study of Public Administration." PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW 34 (May/June):254-60.
- Meltsner, Arnold (1976). POLICY ANALYSIS IN THE BUREAUCRACY. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press.
- Murray, Michael (1976). "Education for Public Administrators." PUBLIC PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT 5 (July/August):239-49.
- Schott, Richard L. (1976). "Public Administration as a Profession: Problems and Prospects." PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW 36

(May/June):253-59.

Tolles, Robert (1976). Ford Foundation Letter, "Special Report: Making Government Work."

Wald, Emanuel (1973). "Toward A Paradigm of Future Public Administration." PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW 33 (July/August):366-72.

Waldo, Dwight (1975). "Education for Public Administration in the Seventies," in Frederick C. Mosher (ed.). AMERICAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE. University, Ala: University of Alabama Press.

Walker, Jack L. (1976). "The Curriculum in Public Policy Studies at the University of Michigan: Notes on the Ups and Downs of IPPS." URBAN ANALYSIS 3(2):89-103.

Yates, Douglas T. (1977). "The Mission on Public Policy Programs: A Report on Recent Experience." POLICY SCIENCES 8 (September): 363-74.