

1981

Center for the Study of Administration: Professional Education for Mid-Career Managers in Government

Nova University

Follow this and additional works at: https://nsuworks.nova.edu/hsb_pgcoursecatalogs

 Part of the [Business Commons](#)

NSUWorks Citation

Nova University, "Center for the Study of Administration: Professional Education for Mid-Career Managers in Government" (1981).
Huizenga Postgraduate Course Catalogs. 195.
https://nsuworks.nova.edu/hsb_pgcoursecatalogs/195

This Program Overview is brought to you for free and open access by the NSU Course Catalogs and Course Descriptions at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Huizenga Postgraduate Course Catalogs by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FOR MID-CAREER MANAGERS IN GOVERNMENT

Samuel Humes and George A. Graham

John M. Clarke, Director
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION
NOVA UNIVERSITY
1981

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FOR MID-CAREER MANAGERS IN GOVERNMENT

Samuel Humes and George A. Graham

John M. Clarke, Director
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION
NOVA UNIVERSITY
1981

NOVA UNIVERSITY

Nova University was chartered by the State of Florida in 1964 as an institution for graduate study and research in science and technology. In 1970 Nova joined with the New York Institute of Technology in an educational consortium. Nova is non-sectarian, non-profit, and practices a policy of non-discrimination.

Nova was accredited in 1971. In 1974 its accreditation was reaffirmed for ten years by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the official accrediting agency for institutions of higher education in the southeastern states.

The off-campus programs, including the National DPA Program for Administrators, were specifically re-examined by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges in 1980, and the accreditation was re-affirmed. Nova has pioneered in the development of new, off-campus programs for persons in mid-career. Its research programs are directed toward the solution of public problems of immediate concern to mankind.

Nova University has programs leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree in the behavioral, life, and ocean sciences. The Juris Doctor is offered in law. The Education Specialist degree is offered in education, both on campus and in an off-campus format. The Master of Science degree is conferred in administration and supervision of educational systems, biochemistry, counseling and guidance, computer science, elementary education, exceptional child education, experimental oncology, gifted child education, learning technology, microbiology, reading, and visiting teacher education. The Master of Arts degree is offered in elementary education, exceptional child education, early childhood education, reading and secondary education. A number of degrees are offered in an off-campus format: the Doctor of Education in elementary and secondary school administration; in community college education; and in vocational, technical, and occupational education; as well as the Doctor of Public Administration and the Doctor of Education in early childhood education. At the Masters level the University also offers, in an off-campus format, degrees in public administration, human resources management, and business administration.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

Five years of experience in developing a new educational program have demonstrated that it is an effective way of bringing professional education in public administration at the graduate level within the reach of mid-career administrators in public and community service. Since there is considerable interest in the program among persons in government who have risen to positions of administrative responsibility, and who have no opportunity to avail themselves of traditional modes of study, this report has been prepared. There is also interest in the Nova program among other educational institutions, some of which have found it worthy of emulation. In addition, state agencies, concerned with maintaining the quality of educational opportunity for citizens of the United States who are residents in their jurisdiction, have a proper interest in the Nova Doctoral Program for Administrators. For all these, this report is offered as a brief introduction.

For all who would know more, we invite a closer acquaintance through an examination of the curriculum and of our records, discussions with graduates and with faculty, and visits to on-site course conferences and to the workshops at Nova University. All Nova faculty and administrators welcome the opportunity to discuss the program, and can explain the processes and the very considerable problems of providing instruction and creating an effective learning environment for a largely decentralized body of student participants. Despite the admitted difficulties which are to be found in making such a program run smoothly, the person who chooses to examine it thoroughly is sure to be impressed by the enthusiasm for the learning experience shown by all participants — both student-participants and preceptorial-faculty. This shared enthusiasm for a vital learning experience, perhaps more than anything else, best characterizes the program, and sustains it.

Samuel Humes
August 1978

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The first edition of this report was prepared more than two years ago by Dr. Samuel Humes, then Director of the Program, who organized and launched it, and by George A. Graham. The purpose was to record, briefly, the experience of the first five years. This edition is an up-dating to reflect two additional years of experience.

Although changes are being made in the continuing development of the program — and this has been the policy of the D.P.A. Program from the beginning — the main features of the program remain, having well stood the test of time. New units have been added in Sequence Two and Sequence Three (and additional units may be added in other sequences as needed). Sequence 7 has also undergone revision, to better achieve the purposes of the sequence. New editions of the curriculum statements for Sequences 1, 2, 3, and 6 have been prepared, and, in some cases, enlarged.

Our good fortune continues in having a faculty of national preceptors of high competence, long experience in the program, and strong interest in making it the best possible educational program for mid-career administrators. In the combination of administrative experience, mastery of their subject matter areas, and commitment to serious professional education, we believe they are unique. They have proved to be highly effective teachers and we cannot exaggerate their contribution to the program. This preceptorial faculty has been enlarged to provide additional backup for our senior preceptors, and to cover new elements in the program. For most teaching assignments, however, we have preceptors available of substantial experience in the program, many of them from the beginning.

The prime purpose and objective of the program remain the same — to provide a rigorous professional education in public administration of the highest quality to mid-career ad-

ministrators actually employed in public service. This is a sharply defined objective, a limited target; but the group we seek to serve is of critical importance.

If there has been any change, it is in our consciousness of the characteristics of this target population, persons trained as specialists who have become managers. In the United States, governments long have chosen most of the managers from specialist ranks. There is no evidence that this practice will change in the foreseeable future. For the most part, D.P.A. participants have proved to be men and women who already have advanced degrees, beyond the baccalaureate. They have entered government as specialists, and have been promoted to positions of managerial and administrative responsibility. They seek a broader knowledge of public administration than they have derived from their specialist education and experience, and they are searching for skills and methods to fulfill their integrating leadership roles. Making public managers out of specialists is a process of conversion. No greater challenge in professional education exists.

The Nova National DPA Program for Mid-Career Public Managers is designed to aid that process. In doing so, we have the great satisfaction of helping men and women in government to meet the challenge of their broader responsibilities with full effectiveness, both in serving the public interest, and in finding the personal fulfillment of work well done — and intelligently done.

John M. Clarke, Director
Center for the Study of Administration
Nova University
February, 1981

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FOR MID-CAREER MANAGERS IN GOVERNMENT

The National DPA Program for Administrators at Nova University is a program of study and instruction for mid-career administrators in public and community service who are in positions of managerial responsibility. It leads to the degree of Doctor of Public Administration, not Doctor of Philosophy. The distinction is significant — the program is designed to enhance the professional competence of practicing administrators, not to prepare young would-be scholars for research and teaching. Nor is it an MPA program for inexperienced young people intending to enter the public service.

Origin and Purpose of the Program

The selection of this objective in 1973 was deliberate. American public administrators in the higher levels are drawn largely from the ranks of specialists who in time move out of their specialist roles, in which they have worked as individuals, into positions in which they direct, and are responsible for, the work of others. Most specialists so “promoted” have little or no opportunity to prepare themselves for their broader, more diverse, and different responsibilities. Usually they have had no opportunity to engage in systematic professional study or instruction in *public* administration. The National DPA Program for Administrators was designed to meet the needs of this archetypical group of administrators in local, state, and federal governments.

The program is especially timely and appropriate because of the phenomenal growth in the administrative functions of government during the past half century, with the consequent substantial increase in the need for competent managers in the public service. The complexity and interactive effects of the new and more ambitious programs and the striking advance of science and technology applicable to public problems, add new

dimensions to public administration. The technical problems are complicated further by the paradoxical escalation of public goals and simultaneous decline of public confidence and social consensus. Managers in government today have an overwhelming need to learn from the experience of others and to share in the accumulated knowledge of administration. They need all the help they can get in order to maximize the effectiveness of government in all its functions — service, remedial, and regulatory. The nexus today in the triad of problems, goals, and actions is the public administrator.

A 1973 report of the National Academy of Public Administration, *Meeting the Needs of Tomorrow's Public Service*, emphasized the urgency of the need for professional education for public administrators in the unstable conditions of the changing world; it also noted "the generally feeble response" to this need "at the graduate level" of university education. The report concluded (among other things) that pre-entry preparation of an administrator can never be adequate for long, and that his professional education must continue. It emphasized the challenges faced by the administrator which require "thorough understanding of the administrative process" (including the entire political, economic, social, and juridical context of which it is a part). The administrator must have a "base of analytical skills which are both policy and process oriented" sufficient "to make him capable of understanding, using, and specifying the products of analysis." These qualities must be complemented by "an appreciation for, as well as minimum skills in, interpersonal relations, supervision, leadership, and coordination" and "an awareness of the nature and intensity of pressures . . . to which he must react." Possession of this skill, knowledge, insight, and wisdom is an ideal to which all public administrators can aspire. But is it attainable, especially for the person who is already in mid-career in government, "bearing the burden and heat of the day"? If it is to be attainable, surely the active administrator must have assistance.

The Academy's report, and the consensus which it reflected among senior members of the public administration community, may be regarded as a take-off point for the Nova National DPA Program for Administrators. The program is an

integrated plan of study (not a collection of courses) specifically designed to provide effective assistance to public administrators in their continuing professional education. It can be understood and properly evaluated only if that purpose is kept in mind.

Most public administrators in positions of responsibility do not find it feasible either to attend evening classes over long periods of time or to take leave from their jobs for study in residence on a university campus. Nor are they able to sustain purely independent study over long periods. The mode of instruction employed in the National DPA Program for Administrators provides a more practicable and acceptable regime for serious sustained study, and is a direct response to the challenge of the Academy's report.

The Format and Philosophy

Student participants in the program meet together in clusters of from fifteen to twenty-five with two instructors (a preceptor and the cluster director) for two-day "course conferences" at intervals of four or five weeks. There are twenty of these two-day course conferences in the first six of the nine sequences of the program, three in four sequences, and four in two sequences.

The program provides a "curriculum statement for each sequence which introduces the subject of study, reviews developments in the field, points up issues, comments on the literature, and sets the assignments for all units of the sequence. The program also provides, and physically puts into the hands of the student participants, most of the required reading for the nine sequences, between fifty and sixty books and more than twenty-five additional documents. (The required reading assignments are changed at times.) These materials are supplied well in advance of the course conference at which they are to be considered.

Participants are required to prepare a paper (commentary) for each unit of the sequence along lines set in the curriculum statement and to send it to the preceptor in advance of the course conference. The commentary serves two purposes. It makes it necessary for the participant to react to the ideas or data presented in what he reads and also to consider their

applicability to the kind of public administration in which he is involved. The commentary also gives the preceptor an idea of the respective reactions of the several participants, alerts the preceptor as to their concerns and conceptions (or misconceptions), and is useful in planning the ensuing course conference.

For the first six sequences, the course conferences are conducted in a metropolitan area in or near which most of the participants in the cluster are employed. (A few participants in almost every cluster have come considerable distances to attend, some from as far as five hundred miles.) The course conferences are held on Friday and Saturday in a conference center or motel having adequate conference facilities. The time of meeting makes it possible for the participants to avoid being away from the office for more than one day at a time every four or five weeks. The close association of participants and faculty for two full days on twenty weekends makes it possible to utilize both the informal contacts and the formal conference sessions for purposes of learning.

The course conferences are traditional in the sense that student participants meet together with instructors in face-to-face seminar-type discussions. Participants learn from their reading, from their efforts to react in writing, from their close and sustained contacts with faculty, and from each other. The sharing of experience, attitudes, and ideas among mid-career employees of local, state, and federal governments engaged in many different functions is important, and the sharing increases as the program progresses.

The program is non-traditional in that the curriculum, the books, and the faculty are brought to the students. In a real sense the university goes to the student, rather than the student to the university. The program also reverses the traditional relationship in that the student provides the laboratory, or real life clinical experience. The instruction does not have to provide the laboratory or clinic or to simulate the real world; the students are practitioners living in the laboratory and are themselves actors on the real world stage of public administration.

The University's function is, first, to put the participant in touch with the experience of others and the organized knowl-

edge applicable to public administration which has been therein accumulated. Its function, second, is to stimulate and aid participants to react to and understand this shared experience, so that they can be more effective in learning from their own experience as well as that of others. The learning process is not complete until a person can generalize perceptively about what he has experienced (directly or vicariously) in such a way that he can share it with others. What a person cannot explain, he does not fully understand. Or to put it positively, one begins to understand what one can explain to others.

The format of instruction changes after the sixth sequence. For the three remaining sequences — designated A, B, and C — participants go to Nova University in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, for week-long workshops. Participants from all clusters come together here for essentially the same seminar-type sessions with faculty and each other. Curriculum statements and required reading materials are distributed well in advance. Papers are prepared and presented, and are subjected to both peer group and faculty criticism. The workshops are held in spring, late summer, and early winter (usually May, August and December). Workshop A usually follows Sequence Three; Workshop B follows Sequence Six in the second year of the program; and Workshop C comes at the end of the third year.

The Sequence Curriculum

The curriculum organization for the nine sequences (twenty onsite course conferences and three workshops in Fort Lauderdale) is based roughly on roles or functions of the manager in public administration. This concept cannot be too narrowly interpreted, however, since a number of sequences have a double function. Although the explanation of the sequences has changed at times, they may be roughly described as follows:

1. Political Partner (and the context of political power and political ideas).
2. Policy Formulator (and the policy imperatives which constitute a current dynamic context).
3. Information User (and the methods and facilities for the meaningful use of relevant data).

4. Organizational Coordinator (and the realities of intra-organizational behavior).
5. Resource Mobilizer (and the uses of authority, money, and people).
6. Program Mover (and the art of putting it all together).
7. Workshop A. Program-Project Developer (The approach and techniques of problems analysis and project development).
8. Workshop B. Systems Changing (The problems of structural and institutional obsolescence considered in the light of the experiences of other nations).
9. Workshop C. Public Administration and the Public Administrator Viewed in Historical Perspective (The basic and recurring issues of public administration and how they have been treated in doctrine and practice over time).

There have been changes in the required reading and the materials supplied for each sequence from year to year. A list of materials which have been used most regularly among the seventy-five to ninety books and documents supplied to participants is appended. As new and more appropriate materials become available, they are added or substituted in the reading list.

The function of providing these materials has been assumed by the program deliberately, so that participants in the program are saved the time, expense, and frustration of ordering the books from publishers, going to book stores, searching in libraries, only to find the books too late to be useful.

Every participant has the materials at hand on his own desk and in his own study. He can underline and make marginal notations in the books if that is his style, and, at the end of the program, he has a basic working library in public administration. Although the program cannot make the work easy, it tries in this way to make it possible for participants to do the work required in the program with no wasted time.

What Participants Do

Participants do a substantial amount of writing throughout the program. The commentaries for each course conference have been mentioned; each of these runs from fifteen to thirty pages, and must be submitted in advance of the course conference. In Sequence Three, participants prepare, in addition to the commentary, an exercise of considerable importance, the development of a management information system for use in their own agency.

Participants also prepare additional documents of a substantial character during the course of the program. The first of these is a problem/case study, a report on the handling of a critical incident or the making of a significant decision. The case study must provide the information necessary for the reader to perceive and understand the problem and the circumstances of the case sufficiently to be able to make an intelligent decision, if the issue is unresolved, and to evaluate the decision made, if the action has been completed. These cases are taken from the working experience of the participant and are due during the first sequence.

A longer paper is a job-related Analytical Report which treats a relevant experience, identifies and defines the problem clearly, develops the alternative courses of action for dealing with it, weighs and selects the best solution, prepares a plan for implementing the decision, and carries it through to completion (or evaluates the action taken if the power to act lies outside the participant's authority). This report is now prepared in connection with the Seventh Sequence, Workshop A, and is in part a training exercise preparing for the major Applied Research Project, which is the treatment in similar fashion of a more significant and complex problem.

In most cases, the participant takes as the subject of the project a genuine problem within his own jurisdiction. Not infrequently this is a pressing problem and one that he can act upon or get his organization to implement when the analysis has been completed and the plan of action prepared. The projects go through several stages: a proposal outlining the study to be made, followed by the investigation, analysis, and final report. Both proposals and reports are reviewed and must be approved by the program's central faculty at Nova.

The commentary for Sequence 9 (Workshop C) differs from those of the preceding sequences in that it is a single paper for the sequence — an administrative history of an agency, organization, or program in which the student participant is involved. It is based largely on an examination of files, records, official documents, and interviews with persons directly involved in the events described. Like the case study, the Sequence 9 commentary is prepared from original sources and may for the first time make the historical record available to others.

Learning from experience is not necessarily automatic. These two papers by participants are intended to increase their alertness as to relevant data, to sharpen their perceptiveness as to underlying themes and basic issues, and to strengthen their ability to make valid judgments. At a minimum, the Sequence 9 commentary is intended to heighten the consciousness of mid-career administrators of the significance of the administrative processes and institutions of which they are a part.

Writing based upon reading (commentaries), analysis (reports on projects), and historical investigation (case study and Sequence 9 commentary) are not all that participants "do" in the program. In the twenty course conferences and in the three workshops, students actively participate in the discussions. They are required to be present at all course conferences and workshop seminars and to enter actively into the discussions. Preceptors give no formal lectures, but lead the discussions and of course at times make the principal contribution to clarification of the issues, enrichment of the content, or critical evaluation of ideas presented by participants. An important part of the educational philosophy of the program is that people learn more by what they try to explain to others and by trying to formulate their interpretive, critical, and evaluative ideas so that others may understand them than they learn from what they are told. (There is obviously a function for attentive listening in participation; for without it, communication breaks down. Fostering the art of listening is in fact an objective of one unit of the program, but listening alone is not enough.)

The policy of the program is not to permit participants to sit silently in group sessions. They must involve themselves, actively sharing their experience with others, as peer group

critics of the papers and ideas of others, and offering their own ideas and interpretations for critical comment by others. In this educationally profitable exchange, the preceptor and cluster director, of course, make the most important contribution. They set the tone, keep the discussion on the more important aspects of the subject, and provide the authority of expert knowledge and extensive experience in applying the test of validity to ideas and information under discussion. The point is that participants must expose their ideas orally in face-to-face discussions with faculty and peers, as well as in the extensive written work. For mature men and women, rich in experience in government, this is an effective learning process.

Finally, the participants take two examinations; a six-and-a-half hour comprehensive written examination, following the sixth sequence, and an oral examination before a three-member faculty committee after all other requirements in the program have been completed.

All things considered, the students in the National DPA Program for Administrators are aptly described as participants.

Despite the decentralized character of instruction in two-thirds of the program, there is no lack of meaningful student-faculty interchange. Not counting the informal discussions during the course conference weekends and workshops, which are also useful educationally, participants meet face-to-face with faculty in planned conference and seminar sessions of small groups totaling some four hundred hours during the program.

Evaluation

The performance of participants is evaluated systematically throughout the program. The commentaries of every unit in every sequence are read, graded, annotated, and returned to participants by the preceptors. The participation in course conferences is graded by both preceptors and cluster directors. Case/problems, reports, and projects are reviewed and evaluated by the Nova central faculty in Fort Lauderdale in both the proposal stage and the final report stage. Unsatisfac-

tory proposals are returned with comments; unsatisfactory project reports are reviewed and returned for revision, sometimes repeatedly.

Preceptors and resident faculty members submit questions for the comprehensive written examinations, which are prepared and graded by the resident faculty in Fort Lauderdale. Answer papers are numbered, and not identified by name, to avoid the possibility of bias in evaluation, and the individual questions or parts of the examination are graded by three or more persons, not by one faculty member alone.

Oral examinations by three-member committees of the resident faculty last for one-and-a-half to two-and-a-half hours. The typical examination runs nearly two hours. On occasion, cluster directors and non-resident preceptors participate as additional committee members in the oral examinations.

The emphasis throughout the program and also in the examinations is on the ability to apply what has been learned, in ideas, concepts, or data, to problems and processes of public administration, and on the ability to use analytical skills in addressing problems of policy or operations.

Faculty

For each unit of each sequence, a senior preceptor is responsible for preparing the curriculum statement for that unit, selecting the required reading, and defining the commentary and exercise requirements. (A central Nova faculty member is senior preceptor of one unit and/or has a coordinating function for the sequence.) The preceptor also is the active teacher in charge of the conduct of course conferences. The preceptor is highly qualified in the subject matter of the unit and is, with few exceptions, experienced in government.

For each cluster, instruction is provided by two persons: the preceptor and a cluster director. Preceptors move from one cluster to another, teaching in their sequence or unit as the cluster comes to it. In sequences 3, 6, 7, and 9, the same person is usually preceptor in three units. In other sequences, a preceptor teaches only one unit of the sequence, with three preceptors covering the three or four units. The difference is dictated by the subject matter of the sequences.

The cluster director is a resident in the area in which the cluster meets, and continues with the cluster throughout the

program. His functions are both administrative and instructional. He makes all arrangements for cluster meetings; he is an important channel of communication between the DPA central staff and the participants; and he distributes the curriculum statements, books, and other documents supplied to the participants. He gives initial screening to case studies and proposals and reviews Applied Research projects, which participants then send in for evaluation by the central DPA staff. He is a guide and counselor, as needed, to the participants. He participates in the course conferences as required by the preceptor, frequently as a discussion leader when the cluster is broken into smaller groups. Finally, the cluster director is responsible for the Friday evening seminars centering on specific management problems and featuring consideration of public administration cases as well as research methodology. These seminars continue through the third year of the program.

The preceptor is in charge of instruction in each course conference. He has read and evaluated the commentaries before the conference; he makes the instructional plans for the conference; and he may or may not involve the cluster director in the conference, depending on the nature of the material and the methods of instruction selected. The preceptor and the cluster director usually meet on the evening before the course conference and make plans for the conference. The cluster director, who remains with the cluster month after month, briefs the preceptor on the characteristics of the group and provides any information which will aid the preceptor in the course conference.

Both the preceptor and cluster director grade the participants on performance in the course conference. The preceptor grades the written commentaries. Grades are reported to Nova after each conference.

The senior preceptor, for each sequence or unit, prepares the curriculum statement, selects the required readings, and sets the commentary task and exercises. The senior preceptor also has the lion's share of preceptorial assignments. There are two or three additional preceptors for each unit who also are highly qualified in the subject and who take some of the preceptorial assignments.

The preceptors are chosen for their expert knowledge of the field in which they teach. Most of them also are active currently in public administration as practitioners or have had extensive experience in government. Only two or three of some fifty presently active national preceptors have not had significant experience in public administration. The combination of expert knowledge and experience in responsible roles in government makes for easy understanding between preceptor and participant. Ten of the preceptors also are experienced university teachers. (It may be noted that the practitioners serving as preceptors have proved to be fully as effective teachers as currently active university faculty members.) A list of the more active preceptors is appended.

Persons participating in the program as preceptors have a variety of current affiliations. Seven are faculty members of the Center for the Study of Administration of Nova University (in addition to the National preceptors described above). Ten others have full active or emeritus status in other universities, private (seven) and public (three). Of these ten, only two have not had extensive experience in government.

Thirty or more preceptors have significant experience in the Federal government, and fifteen in the local or state governments, or both. (There is an overlap.) This is a rich background to complement the expertise of the preceptors in their respective fields, and makes for easy communication between faculty and students. In part because of the compatibility of interests and a shared background, the course conferences have proved to be effective learning experiences, interesting and stimulating to both faculty and student participants.

University Base

The National Doctoral Program for Administrators is offered by the Center for the Study of Administration of Nova University. The director and faculty of the Program have had freedom in developing the program. This has permitted experimentation and innovation. Rapid changes have been possible when needed, without long delays. In other words, the Center and the Program are substantially autonomous, and there has never been any constraint in the design of the program or interference in its execution.

An important guidance and review function is provided by the Advisory Board which consists of some two dozen persons drawn from other university faculties and the public service. (The Board serving in 1980 is appended.) It is the University's policy to utilize this Board (and others similar to it) for close scrutiny and continuing evaluation of educational programs. Although the Board's status is technically advisory, it is consulted on all important questions of policy and has great influence. The eminence of the members, their interest in advancing professional education, and their commitment to making it possible for active mid-career managers to obtain the best in professional education — all these give the Board great authority. The Board, which is kept informed through frequent reports, meets at least once a year for a day-long review of the program. The Advisory Board's advice is taken seriously, and on issues on which there is a Board consensus, its position has never been rejected by the program staff.

The University provided financial support for the program in its first year. Since then the program has not drawn on University funds, but has received overhead services (e.g., space, utilities, print shop, library) for which it has made reasonable contributions.

Present Status (February, 1981)

Since November 1973 forty-seven clusters have been organized. Thirty-three have completed all sequences, and fourteen are active in the sequences 1 through 9. As of February 1, 1981, 269 participants had completed the program and earned the DPA degree. Approximately 21 were in the process of completing papers and preparing for the final oral examination.

Persons who unconsciously perceive this program as a Ph.D. program that is preparing young persons for research and teaching may think that the number of doctorates is large and may fear a flooding of the market, but this fear is unwarranted. The Nova participants are practitioners who expect to advance and continue in government as more effective, responsible administrators, and they are doing so. In all, their total number will never be more than miniscule among public administrators who are at mid-management levels.

The prospect is for not more than fifteen or sixteen clusters operating at any given time, each beginning with from seven-teen to twenty-five participants. The attrition following the comprehensive written examination (after Sequence 6) has tended to be about one in three. The attrition for all causes at all stages of the program has been considerably higher. Eighteen to twenty clusters approach the upper limit of the program. To attempt to instruct a larger number would overburden the select group of experienced preceptors who have the combination of qualities needed and who have proved their effectiveness as teachers. A larger number of participants would also make it difficult to maintain a consistent viewpoint and uniform criteria in the Nova central faculty, which reviews and assesses case studies, project proposals and reports, and Sequence 9 commentaries. Since these documents are criticized in detail and frequently returned for revision, the student — faculty relations are extremely close. There is an upper limit to which the numbers of students can rise without loss of faculty unity and close personal relations with individual participants. The program avoids the limitations of both independent study and mass education, and is committed to maintaining this kind of personal direction of instruction.

Reflections on Seven Years

Some obstacles and hazards are remembered. One is the inherent logistic difficulty of putting all the pieces together precisely for every participant and every cluster in the highly decentralized instructional plan. Books, participants, preceptors, and cluster directors — all must come together in more than a dozen places precisely on time. Assessments (grades) must be reported. Case studies, analytical reports, and administrative histories must be reviewed, annotated, and returned for revision. Participants in a dozen different clusters, each on its own schedule, must be accommodated in the same workshop three times a year. This coordination, requiring exact timing and depending on factors which are not always controllable, is not easy, and, regrettably, it has not always been accomplished smoothly.

Skepticism about a new program of fresh design in the educational world (which is institutionally, if not ideologically, conservative) is inevitable. This attitude is expected and ac-

cepted, since all educational programs should be judged on their merits — the old as well as the new. What was unexpected was the extent of spontaneous hostility, instead of skepticism, and a persistent unwillingness to consider the facts and to judge the program on its merits.

Such reactions to the program are regrettable, not only because they betray the ideals and intellectual standards of the academic world from which they come, but also because the anxiety which prompts the hostility is so unnecessary. Traditional campus-based instruction in public administration is not threatened by the National DPA Program for Administrators. This fact should be recognized as it becomes clear that participants in the program are not persons who will ever be candidates for study in residence, or for three-nights-a-week after-hours instruction. Experience to date seems to indicate that the interest of the mid-career administrators who are participants in the Nova program, actually stimulates the market; younger colleagues catch fire from their older associates, and become interested in going back to school themselves. Many of these younger men and women can fit evening courses on campus into their schedules.

The logistical problems and fraternal hostility, however, weigh lightly in the scales when balanced against the benefits which the program enjoys. It is disheartening, nevertheless, to find critics from the university world, putting form above substance, and educational procedure above educational impact, in judging an educational program. And it is depressing to see a transparent defense of turf offered as a defense of standards. If the traditional university is threatened, it is by internal weakness and loss of its own creative intellectual vitality, and not by new unconventional off-campus programs to advance the professional competence of mature men and women.

1. The program is fortunate in the expert and experienced men and women who constitute its active teaching faculty. They speak with authority and understanding, and they know how to listen both critically and empathetically. They have proved to be highly effective teachers who in the aggregate have an intellectual authority in public administration that few residential faculties could reasonably be expected to match. The range of background and experience which they possess is

an educational asset. Each participant is directly involved during the program with at least eighteen or nineteen preceptors, each of them from two to six days. The intimacy of this involvement with a faculty of wide-ranging experience has had benefits which all participants have recognized.

2. The present richness of the literature relevant to public administration is also a great asset. It has been possible to select from a broad spectrum of sources — books, monographs, articles, and public documents which are relevant and rewarding for the public administrator. (How different from the situation only a half century ago!) It has been possible for senior preceptors to make their selection from this literature and then to supplement the chosen reading with a curriculum statement which introduces and opens up the whole subject, making formal lectures unnecessary.

3. A tremendous asset is the fact that the participants are actively engaged in administration. They are living in the laboratory and/or clinic of real world practice. Scientists can easily understand the effects of this situation on learning. Participants have a basic body of direct experience and impressions against which to apply the ideas of others and the hypotheses, doctrines, and principles which are to be found in the relevant literature. The University's function is to put practitioners in touch with this body of ideas and data and to help them to apply it. This is a much less difficult task than trying to simulate the real world of administration in the classroom. The experience which participants have in administration prior to and during the program makes it possible for them to grasp quickly the ideas about administration which are presented in this program and to understand them thoroughly. This is an advantage which inexperienced students do not have.

4. The makeup of the clusters also has proved to be an educational asset. Participants come from all levels of government and from many different functions and departments, with a sprinkling of persons from quasi-governmental organizations. The common element is managerial responsibility. In this situation, participants learn from each other. This is the testimony of every cluster. The benefits are so clear that Nova has always declined to organize a cluster comprised of persons from a single agency. Too much would be lost by doing so.

5. The personal involvement within the clusters month after month for the two-day course conferences provides an exceptional opportunity to study and practice effective group behavior. This opportunity has not always been fully exploited, but additional guidance is now being provided in the early course conferences which should speed up the learning process and permit it to go much farther. In learning to see their colleagues more perceptively, participants also begin to see themselves in a new light. The self-image is inevitably modified by learning how one is regarded by others, especially if there is a group consensus. This self-awareness can be invaluable.

6. During the program, participants have an opportunity not only to learn from others but to review, analyze, and interpret their own experience more perceptively and with a better perspective. In the end, they may have a better idea of how far they have come, where they are, and where they may be going professionally. They should more nearly understand themselves as administrators, with their own strengths, weaknesses, and tendencies.

7. Finally, in going through the program in company with a diverse group of other practitioners, challenged by a variety of preceptors, and digging into the problems both of substantive policy and organized administration, participants get a better idea of the whole administrative process and the interlinked governmental institutions of which they are a part. They can better perceive their own critical roles today. They begin to understand that some basic issues of today have been faced by others before them in a different context, and that there is a continuity of administrative experience despite changes in the economy, technology, and ways of living. They can see that they are carrying burdens which others have carried before, and that they must prepare for others who will surely follow after them.

Participants come to understand that the major problems of society are seldom solved finally in a mathematical sense, and that the changing goal of progress, which Western civilization (and now the whole world) has pursued for so long, is approached not by a great leap into a golden age but by successive steps. They can see also that each of these steps, no matter how small, is important.

In a world in which it is increasingly evident that men succeed or fail together, and that the most advanced peoples will be dragged down by the least advanced unless the least advanced are enabled to pull themselves up, responsible public administrators must recognize the fact that their collective competence, institutional memory, and integrative skill are essential elements in national progress and survival. Without anyone's ever intending it to be so, it is clear that today more depends upon government than ever before and that in government more depends upon administrators. Public administrators may not stand high in social status in the American culture, but no group exceeds them in societal importance. Public administrators can well be proud of their function, but humble in facing their responsibilities.

APPENDIX A

A PARTIAL LIST OF MATERIALS WHICH HAVE BEEN SUPPLIED TO PARTICIPANTS

SEQUENCE 1

- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Intergovernmental Perspective*, Winter 1978, Vol. 4, No. 1, Washington: 1978
- Dahl, Robert A., *Democracy in the United States: Promise and Performance*, 4th ed., Chicago: Rand McNally, c1976
- Dahl, Robert A., *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*, New Haven: Yale University Press, c1961
- DeTocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America*, Vol. 1, New York: Random House, c1945
- Eddy, William B., ed., et al., *Behavioral Science and the Manager's Role*, Washington, D.C.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, c1969 (Sel. Reading Series 9)
- Fairfield, Roy P., ed., *The Federalist Papers*, 2d ed., Garden City New York: Doubleday, c1961, 1966
- Lowi, Theodore J., *The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy, and the Crisis of Public Authority*, New York: W. W. Norton, c1969
- Schattschneider, E.E., *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*, Hindale, Illinois: Dryden Press, c1975
- Truman, David B., *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*, 2d ed., New York: Knopf, c1951, 1971

SEQUENCE 2

- Brzezinski, Zbigniew, "U.S. Foreign Policy: The Search for Focus", *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1973, pp. 708-727
- Bundy, William, "Elements of Power", *Foreign Affairs*, October, 1977, pp. 1-26
- Garvey, Gerald, *Energy, Ecology, Economy*, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., c1972
- Ginzberg, Eli and Solow, Robert M., ed., *The Great Society: Lessons for the Future*, New York: Basic Books, c1974
- Kneese, Allen V. and Schultze, Charles L., *Pollution Prices and Public Policy*, Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, c1975
- Miles, Rufus E., Jr., *The Department of Health, Education and Welfare*, New York: Praeger Publishers, c1974
- Owen, Henry and Charles L. Schultze, eds., *Setting National Priorities: The Next Ten Years*, Washington, D.C. Brookings Institution, 1976
- Rivlin, Alice, "Social Policy: Alternate Strategies for the Federal Government", Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, c1974
- Ukles, Jacob B., "Policy Analysis, Myth or Reality", *Public Administration Review*, May/June, 1977, pp 223-228
- Wilson, James Q., *Thinking About Crime*, New York, Random House 1975

SEQUENCE 3

- Melville, Keith, "A Measure of Contentment", *The Sciences*: New York Academy of Sciences: December, 1973

Public Administration Review, Symposium Issue March-April, 1969, "PPBS Re-examined"

Rivlin, Alice, *Systematic Thinking for Social Action*, Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution, c1962

U.S. Congress, Senate. Committee on Government Operations. Subcommittee on National Security & International Operations. *PLANNING — PROGRAMMING — BUDGETING* Hearings. Ninetieth Congress. First Session. 1967. Part 1 with Charles L. Schultze.

Wallis, W. Allen, & Roberts, Harry V., *"Nature of Statistics"*, New York, MacMillan Publishing Company, c1971

SEQUENCE 4

Bailey, Stephen K., "Ethics and the Public Service", *Public Administration Review*, V. XXIV, N.4, December, 1964, pp. 234-243

Barnard, Chester I., *The Functions of the Executive*, 30th Anniv. ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Havard University Press, c1968

Beckhard, Richard, *Organization Development: Strategies and Models*, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., c1969

Bennis, Warren, G., *Organization Development: Its Nature, Origins and Prospects*, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., c1969

Cathcart, Robert S., and Samovar, Larry A., *Small Group Communications: A Reader*, 2d ed., Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., c1974

Cupps, Stephen B., "The Emerging Problem of Citizen Participation," *Public Administration Review*, Sept./Oct., 1977, pp. 478-487

Fox, Elliott M., ed. and Urwick, L., ed., *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parket Follett*, 2d ed., London: Pitman Publishing, c1973

Luft, Joseph, *Group Processes: An Introduction to Group Dynamics*, 3d ed., Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., c1970

Nord, Walter R., ed., *Concepts and Controversy in Organizational Behavior*, Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co., c1972

Simon, Herbert A., *Administrative Behavior: A study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. 3d ed., New York: The Free Press, c1976

Waldo, Dwight, ed., *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence*, New York, Chandler Publishing Company, c1971

SEQUENCE 5

Bach, G.L., *Making Monetary and Fiscal Policy*, Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, c1971

Davis, Kenneth Culp, *Discretionary Justice: A Preliminary Inquiry*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, c1969

Ecker-Racz, L.L., *The Politics and Economics of State-Local Finance*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., c1970

Gellhorn, Ernest, *Administrative Law and Process in a Nutshell*, St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company c1972

Mansfield, W., ed., *An Affirmative Action Proposal*, Chicago: International Personnel Management Association, c1974 (Public Employment Practice Bulletin 6)

- Maxwell, Joseph, *Financing State and Local Governments*, 3d ed., Washington, D.C.: Brookings, Institution, c1977
- Public Sector Labor Relations Trends and Developments*, Lexington, Ky.: The Council of State Governments, c1975
- Shafritz, Jay M., *Personnel Management in Government: Politics and Process*, New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., c1978
- The United States Budget in Brief Current Fiscal Years*, Washington, D.C.: GPO
- U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Executive Manpower, *Considerations in the Identification of Managerial Potential*, Washington, D.C.: GPO, August, 1973
- U.S. Civil Service Commission, Bureau of Executive Manpower, *Suggestions for Individual Development Planning*, Washington, D.C.: GPO, October, 1973

SEQUENCE 6

- Allison, Graham T., *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., c1971
- Bailey, Stephen K. *The Office of Education and the Education Act of 1965*, Syracuse, New York: Inter-University Case Program, Inc., c1966 (ICP Case Series: Number 100)
- Chapman, Richard L., and Cleveland, Frederick N., "The Changing Character of the Public Service and the Administrator of the 1980's", *Public Administration Review*, July/August, 1973, pp. 356-366
- Morrow, William, *Public Administration: Politics and the Political System*, New York: Random House
- Poland, Orville F., ed., "A Symposium on Program Evaluation", *Public Administration Review*, July/August, 1974, pp. 299-336
- Rourke, Francis, E., ed., *Bureaucratic Power in National Politics*, 2d ed., Boston: Little, Brown & Company, c1972
- Savas, E.S., and Ginsburg, Sigmund G., "The Civil Service: A Meritless System?" *Public Interest*, #32, pp. 70-85
- Schick, Allen, "A Death in the Bureaucracy: The Demise of Federal PPB", *Public Administration Review*, March/April, 1973, pp. 146-156

SEQUENCE 7

- Research and Development Directing: Research Program Formulation*, (Selected documents) Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Graduate Program in Public Administration, Nova University, March 1975
- Research and Development Directing: Development Program Formulation*, (Selected documents) Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Graduate Program in Public Administration, Nova University, March, 1975
- Research and Development Directing: Research and Development Evaluations*, (Selected documents) Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Graduate Program in Public Administration, Nova University, May, 1975
- Wirt, John G., Lieberman, Arnold J., and Levien, Roger E., *R&D Management: Methods Used by Federal Agencies*, Santa Monica, CA, Rand Corp., January, 1974 (R-1156-HEW)

SEQUENCE 8

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Governmental Functions and Processes: Local and Areawide: Substate Regionalism and the Federal System*, Vol. IV, Washington, D.C.: GPO, February, 1974

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Governmental Functions and Processes: Regionalism Revisited*, GPO, June, 1977
Bollens, John C., and Schmandt, Henry J., *The Metropolis: Its People, Politics and Economic Life*, 3d ed., New York: Harper & Row, c1975
Mathewson, Kent, ed., *The Regionalist Papers*, 2d ed., Detroit, Mich.: Metropolitan Fund, Inc., 1978

SEQUENCE 9

American Administrative Histories: Selected References, Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, 1975

Mosher, Frederick C., ed., *American Public Administration: Past, Present and Future*, University of Alabama, the University of Alabama Press, c1975

Mosher, Frederick, ed., *Basic Documents of American Public Administration: 1776-1950*, New York, Holmes & Meier, 1976

Public Administration Doctrines, Selected References, Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, 1975

Public Administration Review, Vol. 36, #5; Sept./Oct. 76 — Bicentennial Issue

APPENDIX B—FACULTY

(A Partial List)

Robert H. Baer, D.P.A. (Nova), Assistant Professor of Public Administration, and Director of Governmental Assistance Services at Nova.

Donald D. Barry, M.A., Ph.D. (Syracuse). Professor of Political Science and Chairman, Department of Government, Lehigh University. Formerly Travel Fellow to U.S.S.R., Inter-University Committee; Research Fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard University.

Richard M. Berry, M.A. (George Washington). Study Director, Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Ernest C. Betts, Jr., Principal Associate, Executive Management Service, Inc. Formerly Assistant Secretary for Administration and Budget Director, U.S. Treasury Department; Director of Budget and Deputy Director of Personnel, Department of State; Director of Personnel and Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Manuel J. Carvajal, Ph.D. (University of Florida). Associate Professor of Economics and Public Administration, Center for Public Affairs and Administration, Nova University.

Formerly Research Assistant Professor and Director, Latin American Data Bank, University of Florida.

Harold W. Chase, Ph.D. (Princeton), Professor of Political Science, University of Minnesota, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs.

Warren Cikens, M.P.A. (Harvard John F. Kennedy School of Public Administration), Senior staff member of the Brookings Institution, and Fairfax County Supervisor from Mt. Vernon District.

John M. Clarke, Ph.D. (American University), Professor of Public Administration, and Director to the Center for the Study of Administration — Nova University. Consultant/Employee to U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee.

Merrill J. Collett, M.S. (Syracuse). President of Executive Management Services, Inc. Member, Advisory Pay Panel for the U.S. Comptroller General.

Roy W. Crawley, M.A. (The George Washington University). Formerly Executive Director, National Academy of Public Administration and President, NAPA Foundation; Ford Foundation Representative to Venezuela; Director of Personnel, U.S. Agency for International Development; Senior Staff Member, Advanced Study Program, The Brookings Institution; Director of Administration, U.S. General Services Administration.

Alan L. Dean, M.A. (American University), Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Academy of Public Administration. Lecturer and consultant in public management and a member of the President's Council on Management Improvement.

Edward Flash, M.P.A., Ph.D. (Cornell). Associate Professor of Public Administration, Cornell University. Also Director of the Education for Public Management Programs at Cornell. Formerly Training Director, District of Columbia Government.

A. Lee Fritschler, Ph.D. (Syracuse University), Chairman, U.S. Postal Rate Commission. Lecturer, Brookings Institution, Government-Business Relations Program.

Ezra Glaser, M.A. (Columbia). National and International Consultant in the area of quantitative methods. Formerly Assistant Commissioner, U.S. Patent Office; Assistant to Assistant Secretary (Health and Science); Assistant to Assistant Secretary (Planning and Evaluation), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

John K. Gohagan, M.A. (Temple), Ph.D. (MIT). Associate Professor of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Program in Technology and Human Affairs. Associate Professor of Preventive Medicine. Faculty Associate, Center for Development Technology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.

George A. Graham, M.A., Ph.D. (Illinois). Professor of Public Administration, Nova University. Formerly Executive Director, National Academy of Public Administration; Director of Governmental Studies, The Brookings Institution; Professor of Politics, Princeton University.

W. Donald Heisel, M.A. (Cincinnati). Adjunct Professor and Acting Head, Political Science Department, Senior Research Associate, Institute of Government, University of Cincinnati. Formerly Personnel Administrator, City of Cincinnati.

Haakon Lindjord, M.A., Ph.D. (Princeton). Consultant, National Security Policy. Formerly Director, Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs, Department of State; Assistant Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President; Director, Policy Planning Staff, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs).

Harvey C. Mansfield, Sr. M.A. (Cornell), Ph.D. (Columbia), Professor Emeritus of Government, Columbia University. Formerly Assistant Professor, Yale University; Chairman, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, and faculty member, Stanford University. Administrative Officer, Price Executive and Historian, Office of Price Administration.

Robert S. Marsel, J.D. (University of California). Assistant Professor Nova Law School.

Kent Mathewson, M.S. (Syracuse). Formerly President, The Metropolitan Fund, Inc. Detroit; City Manager and Assistant Manager of five U.S. East and West Coast cities.

Albert A. Mavrinac, M.A. (Pittsburgh). Ph.D. (Harvard). Professor of Government and Chairman of the History and Government Department, Colby College, Maine. Formerly faculty member at University of Pittsburgh, Wellesley College and Harvard University; Chairman of Senator Muskie's reelection campaign committee, 1970; Professor, faculties of Law of the Universities of Rennes and Montpellier, France.

James M. Mitchell, M.A. (George Washington). Senior Staff Associate, The Brookings Institution. Formerly Director of the Advanced Study Program, The Brookings Institution; Associate Director, National Science Foundation; Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, and U.S. Civil Service Commissioner.

Herbert C. Morton, M.A., Ph.D. (University of Minnesota). Director of Public Affairs, Resources for the Future, Inc. Formerly Associate Commissioner, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Harold Orlans, Ph.D. (Yale). Senior Research Associate, National Academy of Public Administration. Formerly Senior Fellow, Governmental Studies Program, The Brookings Institution.

Emmette S. Redford, Ph.D. (Harvard). Ashbel Smith Professor, University of Texas at Austin. Formerly Assistant Administrator for Rationing, Office of Price Administration.

Richard L. Seggel, M.A. (Princeton). Program Operations Officer, Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. Formerly Associate Director for Administration and Executive Officer, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health (Policy Implementation), H.E.W.

Raymond C. Shreckengost, M.P.A. (American University), Office of Training C.I.A.

O. Glenn Stahl, M.A. (Wisconsin), Ph.D. (N.Y.U.). Currently engaged in writing, lecturing and consulting. Formerly Director, Bureau of

Policies and Standards, U.S. Civil Service Commission; personnel officer, TVA; Director of Personnel, Federal Security Agency.

Eldon E. Sweezy, M.A. (American University). Senior Associate, Institute of Public Administration; and President, Management Counsel, Inc.

John M. Urie, M.S. (Denver). Director of Finance, City of Kansas City, Missouri. Formerly, Finance Direc-

tor, City of Phoenix; Assistant City Manager, City of Tucson; Consultant, Public Administration Service. Member MFOA Executive Board and Past President MFOA.

David P. Walker, M.A. (Boston), Ph.D. (Brown). Assistant Director for Intergovernmental Structure and Functions, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Formerly Staff Director, U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

APPENDIX C—NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Dr. Guthrie S. Birkhead (Emeritus)
Dean of the Maxwell School of
Citizenship and Public Affairs
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Mr. Andrew W. Bradley, Director
Certified Public Accountant
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. Roy W. Crawley
Phoenix, Arizona

Dr. John H. Dale, Jr.
Department of Corrections, State
of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida

Mr. Alan L. Dean
Chairman, National Academy of
Public Administration
Arlington, Virginia

Mr. Lawrence P. Doss, Partner
Coopers and Lybrand
Washington, D.C.

Mr. George H. Esser, Jr.
President, National Academy of
Public Administration
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Abraham S. Fischler (ex
officio)
President, Nova University
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Dr. Lyle C. Fitch
President, Institute of Public
Administration
New York, New York

Dr. Nesta Mabyin Gallas
Associate Dean for Graduate
Studies, John Jay College of
Criminal Justice
New York, New York

The Honorable **Robert N. Giaimo**
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Bertrand M. Harding
Consultant, Central Intelligence
Agency, National Institute of
Public Affairs
Alexandria, Virginia

Dr. Walter G. Held
Professor, Public Policy and
Business Affairs
American University
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Eric Jensen
American Car & Foundry
Industries
New York, New York

Mr. Mark E. Keane, Executive
Director
International City Management
Assoc.
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Jesse Markham
Harvard Business School
Graduate School of Business
Administration
Boston, Massachusetts

Mr. Kent Mathewson
Austin, Texas

Mr. James M. Mitchell
(Vice Chairman)
Senior Staff Associate
Advanced Study Programs
The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Mr. John D. Montgomery,
Professor
John F. Kennedy School of
Government
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dr. Thomas P. Murphy
Special Assistant to the Secretary,
Department of HEW
Wheaton, Maryland

Dr. Emmette S. Redford
Asbel Smith Professor of
Government & Public Affairs
The University of Texas at Austin
Lyndon B. Johnson, School of
Public Affairs
Austin, Texas

Dr. Herb F. Reinhard
President
Slippery Rock State College
Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Mr. Phillip Rutledge, President
National Institute of Public
Management
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Alexandre Schure (ex officio)
President
New York Institute of Technology
Old Westbury, New York

Mr. Harvey Sherman
(Active Past Chairman)
Assistant Executive Director and
Director of Administration
The Port Authority of New York &
New Jersey, New York, New York

Dr. Stephen B. Sweeney
Director Emeritus and Fels
Professor, University of
Pennsylvania
Kennett Square, Pennsylvania

Dr. John J. Theobald (ex officio)
Dean, Graduate Studies
New York Institute of Technology
Old Westbury, New York

Mr. E. Robert Turner
President, ERT Associates
Boulder, Colorado

Dr. Phyllis A. Wallace
Professor of Management
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dr. Annmarie Hauck Walsh
Senior Staff
Institute of Public Administration
New York, New York

Mr. Graham W. Watt
Broward County Administrator
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Dr. York Willbern, Professor and
Chairman
Department of Political Science
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Ms. Dona Wolf
Advisor to the Chairman
National Credit Union Administration
Washington, D.C.



Nova University
3301 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314