

3864

Primary Document

STUDY REPORT

GSPA Evaluation Group

Bill Brown
Ed Crane
Ted Earl
Al Mauet
John Ward

November 16, 1973

EXERPTS

- I.** Contents
- II.** Summary of Recommendations

Acknowledgements

While the members of the Study Group are grateful for the patient assistance of several faculty members over these many months, we wish to emphasize that we are fully responsible for any inadequacies in design, data processing, or interpretation.

Purpose

It is our hope that the materials prepared by the Study Group, and collected in connection with the study, will be of use to future examinations of GSPA, and will be readily accessible to anyone interested in them. It is for this reason that we have prepared the extensive Appendices.

CONTENTS

PRIMARY DOCUMENT

- I. Introduction
 - A. Previous GSPA Studies and Proposals: Where They Lead
 - B. Development of this Study
 - C. Review of Project Status
 - D. Scope of Project
- II. Comments on Methodology and Strength of Findings
- III. GSPA Strength and Weakness Ratings
 - A. Utilization
 - B. Methodology
 - C. Findings
- IV. Findings and Recommendations
 - A. Leadership and Mission; Structure and Reorganization; Integration
 - B. Improved Communication: Trust, Espirit and Community
 - C. Curriculum and Standards
 - D. Research, Publication and Public Service Library Collection
 - E. Careers, Employers and the Job Market
 - F. Alumni
 - G. Relations with Government
 - H. The Student Role
 - I. Admissions and Quality of the Student Body

APPENDICES

- I. Preliminary Planning Documents of the Study Group
 1. "Flow Chart," March 2, 1973
 2. "Prospectus: Organization Survey," March 12, 1973
 3. "Change in GSPA" / Discussion of Objectives, Student and Faculty Survey /, March 30, 1973
 4. "Schedule of Work," April 1, 1973

- II. Issue and Background Documents of the Study Group
 1. "Preliminary Survey--Internal Literature--Problems, Issues and Prospects," April, 1973
 2. "Educational Trends for the Public Service," June, 1973
 3. "Selected Annotated Bibliography: Education for Administrative Careers in the Public Service," May, 1973
 4. "Summary of Selected Programs in Public Affairs" (Courtesy of Dean Cowan)
 5. "Summary of the 1971-1972 Survey Report on Public Affairs and Administration Programs," June 30, 1972 (NASPAA)

- III. Faculty/Student Survey Background Materials
 1. Preliminary Tabulations of Responses
 - a. Student, May 30, 1973
 - b. Faculty, June 21, 1973
 2. Summary of Responses to Open-Ended Questions
 - a. Curriculum
 - b. Rating of Faculty
 - c. General Comments
 3. Cluster Analyses
 - a. Students
 - b. Faculty
 4. Master Position Control Document

- IV. Special Projects of the Study Group
 1. "Research and Public Service at GSPA," August 31, 1973
 2. / Proposed / Alumni Survey, August 31, 1973
 - a. Status Report
 - b. Survey: Alumni Opinions and Preferences
 3. / Proposed / Job Market Survey, November 8, 1973 / revised /
 - a. Status Report
 - b. Survey: Government Executives

- V. Computer Print-Outs of the Study Group
 1. Correlation Tables
 2. Cross-Tabulations

APPENDICES (continued)

- VI. Dean's Proposal for Reorganization of GSPA and Related Materials
1. "Academic and Administrative Reorganization of the Graduate School of Public Affairs"
 - a. "Discussion Notes for Administrative Review, Graduate School of Public Affairs"
 - b. Supporting Materials
 2. Memoranda of Academic Policy Committee
 - a. "Dean's Memo on School Reorganization," February 13, 1973
 - b. "Appointment of New Program Task Forces," February 26, 1973
 - c. "Program Task Forces" (membership), March 8, 1973
 - d. "Academic Policy Committee" (untitled; request for discharge from responsibilities), April 30, 1973
 - e. "Report of Task Forces," April 4, 1973
 1. "Program in American Politics, Public Policy, and Administration (PPA)"
 2. "Comparative and International Studies"
 3. "Undergraduate Education"
 4. "Social and Political Thought"
 5. "Methodology"
 3. Faculty Memoranda
 - a. "Suggested Questions to Ask Ourselves," (Balk), 1970
 - b. "MPA Program" (Balk), 1970
 - c. "Interpreting the Trends in SUNYA FTEs," (Adams), November 30, 1972
 - d. "Academic and Administrative Reorganization: The Cowan Proposal" (Balk), February 5, 1973
 - e. "Evaluating Faculty Quality" (Adams), March 5, 1973
 - f. "Task Forces on the Program in American Politics, Public Policy and Administration," March 15, 1973
 - g. "Technology and Policy--A Viable GSPA Program" (Adams), February 23, 1973
 - h. "Public Policy" (Adams), April 16, 1973
 - i. "Legislative Policy-Making" (Fiser), July 19, 1973
 - j. "Reorganization Notes" (Balk), August 1, 1973
 - k. "Public Policy--Toward A Definition" (Adams), March 20, 1973
 - l. "Productivity of P.A. Faculty" (Adams), March 7, 1973
 - m. "A Proposed Job-Oriented Integrated Public Administration Program Combining Undergraduate and Graduate Work" (V. Zimmerman), January 30, 1973
 - n. "Possible School-Wide Allocation of Resources" (Balk), March 23, 1973

VII. Assessment of the DPA (Doctor of Public Administration) and Ph.D. (Political Science) Programs

DPA

1. "Doctor of Public Administration (DPA) Program" [GSPA Self-Study

APPENDICES (continued)

2. Committee of Students and Faculty, Revised, January, 1972
2. "Review of the Doctoral Program in Public Administration"
/Mailich and Sherwood/, September, 1972
3. "Evaluation of the Doctoral Program in Public Administration"
/Graduate Academic Council/, May 9, 1973
4. "Review of the Doctoral Program in Public Administration"
(Cowan), November 30, 1972
5. "Annual Report, Department of Public Administration, 1972-
1973" (Axelrod), June 5, 1973

Ph.D.

1. David W. Minor, Northwestern University, January 6, 1972
2. Alfred Diamant, Indiana University, March 15, 1972

VIII. Papers Prepared for Airline House Conference on the Public Service:
Graduate Education for Public Administration, June, 1972

1. George A. Graham, "Perspectives and Problems"
2. Richard L. Chapman, "Achievements, Problems, Trends"
3. "Future Needs of Public Service"

IX. Student Publications and Memoranda

1. "Statement on Policy Regarding Student Participation in Affairs
of the /P.A./ Department," GSPA
2. "Proposal for an Association of Graduate Students," October, 1972
3. "Present and Future Condition of the P.A. Program," October,
18, 1973
4. Issues of NOTEPAD, 1972-1973
5. The Helderberg Review

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Our approach to the formulation of recommendations has been to combine the results of the faculty and student survey analysis and other background papers with the findings from interviews, meetings, and informal conversations with faculty and students between January and November.

In view of occasional critical comments, we wish to reiterate that all of us feel the school has many important strengths and that, by and large, it seems to us that a great many people in the school, in all departments and at all levels, are desirous of strengthening it. In this context, we hope the following findings, comments and recommendations will be helpful.

Summary of Recommendations

- A. Leadership, Mission, Structure and Reorganization: School Integration
 1. Further exploration of the impact of organizational structure and of reorganization upon objectives, morale and performance, by a comparative study of other schools which will bring all of GSPA up-to-date on the trade-offs suggested by continuing evolution elsewhere.
 2. Clarify current status of university plans for GSPA and communicate the information widely within GSPA.
 3. Students focus on short-term strategy of solving specific problems. Use this experience to develop positions on structure.
 4. More conscious planning is needed to reduce barriers to cross-departmental communication among faculty and students, as a precondition of meaningful thinking about structural change in GSPA.
- B. Improved Communication: Trust and Espirit
 1. Improve the orientation program.
 2. More opportunity for intellectual and social interaction between students and faculty, within and among departments.

3. Circulation of school and, departmental and faculty communications and memoranda to students.
 4. Review influences on an entering student's initial perceptions and long-term attitudes. Make indicated changes in orientation, advisement and curriculum.
 5. A chronicle or inventory of GSPA "success stories" should be prepared and regularly up-dated, covering faculty, staff, students and administration.
- C. Curriculum and Standards
1. Starting in Fall 1974, either drop or substantially reorganize Pad 500/502.
 2. Develop, by Fall 1974, a manual for distribution to all students, which will articulate degree standards by inventorying the major topics or concepts to be taught, and displaying systematically the course or courses they will be taught, in. This would also be a vehicle for reducing duplication and gaps in coverage.
 3. Provide a means by which all courses listed in the curriculum will be made available at least once each year.
 4. Students and faculty should take further action to expand the full-time P.A. faculty. Since this effort has encountered some SUNY resistance, the case should be strengthened by (a) continuing toward full utilization of Political Science faculty, and (b) demonstrating that all P.A. faculty carry a full teaching load except when conducting specific research or public service which clearly benefits the school.
 5. Improve the mesh of student demand and faculty supply for special courses, and reduce the time lag between course proposal and course presentation.
 6. The interdepartmental committee of faculty and students established to rationalize the use of GSPA resources in the quantitative methodology area should proceed rapidly and be given strong support to meet student needs rather than to protect GSPA FTES.
 7. Take a serious look at "policy science" curriculum proposals.
 8. Establish a system for identifying prerequisites and "proficiencying out" of basic courses [500/502, 520, 640].
 9. More effective measures are needed by faculty and students in all departments to expedite completion of doctoral degrees.
 10. More courses should be offered at the doctoral level, but these should be designed to meet the needs of the current group of doctoral students.

11. Restore balance in the PA curriculum by strengthening "special area" (substantive expertise) course offerings.
12. See incorporated memorandum of recommendations to the GSPA Committee on Quantitative Methodology.

D. Research, Publication, and Public Service

1. Study the need and feasibility for a governmental research institute on a much more substantial scale than current GSPA organization for research provides, in connection with, but not dependent upon, a major GSPA role in the university-wide Institute for Policy Alternatives.
2. Establish a dialogue among administration, faculty, and students on the place of research, public service, and teaching at GSPA.
3. Conduct a "research opportunities inventory" on an experimental basis over the next two years, as a complement to the inventory of on-going faculty projects undertaken last year.
4. Continue the colloquium series, with variations.
5. Budget funds to reproduce appropriate faculty and student papers; consider establishing a subscription series.
6. Budget a small amount for awards for faculty, student and other research papers.
7. Train students to critique and write published articles as an important element in class work, and consider requiring that every student submit an article for publication as a condition of receiving the degree at master's and doctoral level.
8. Library collection--in conjunction with the move from Draper to Mohawk, it is timely to review library adequacy.

E. Careers, Employers and the Job Market

1. Conduct a job-market survey of the kind designed but not implemented by this study group.
2. Develop a special placement effort for DPAs.
3. Diversify general placement channels.

F. Alumni

1. Conduct an alumni survey of the kind designed but not implemented by this study group.
2. Develop a GSPA alumni association.

3. Keep current on alumni as prospective employers.
4. Publish a regular newsletter or magazine for alumni.

G. Relations with Government

1. Continue the progress made over the past year in strengthening the school's relationships with government, for all GSPA programs.
2. Either in conjunction with or separately from the university-wide Institute for Policy Alternatives, establish a governmental research institute in affiliation with GSPA, of the kind found at many other state universities.
3. Extend the requirements and opportunity for participation in paid or unpaid intern programs, and establish a school capability to foster interplay between this experience and academic work.

H. The Student Role

1. Involve new students so they can carry on in future years.
2. Continuing student consideration to the most appropriate style and form of student organization.
3. Students should work to explore and strengthen formal as well as informal student roles in the life and governance of GSPA.
4. Students should involve themselves actively with appropriate faculty groups to strengthen each field within the graduate program and to enable offerings to be more responsive to their needs.

I. Admissions and Quality of the Student Body

1. Expand nationwide recruiting, by faculty and alumni, with the goal of shifting the regional balance of the student body in a more national direction, and achieving greater ethnic diversity.
2. Disseminate basic data on trends in student body quality.

IV. Findings and Recommendations

Our approach to the formulation of recommendations has been to combine the results of the faculty and student survey analysis and other background papers with the findings from interviews, meetings, and informal conversations with faculty and students between January and November.

In view of occasional critical comments, we wish to reiterate that all of us feel the school has many important strengths and that, by and large, it seems to us that a great many people in the school, in all departments and at all levels, are desirous of strengthening it. In this context, we hope the following findings, comments and recommendations will be helpful.

Summary of Recommendations

A. Leadership, Mission, Structure and Reorganization: School Integration

1. Further exploration of the impact of organizational structure and of reorganization upon objectives, morale and performance, by a comparative study of other schools which will bring all of GSPA up-to-date on the trade-offs suggested by continuing evolution elsewhere.
2. Clarify current status of university plans for GSPA and communicate the information widely within GSPA.
3. Students focus on short-term strategy of solving specific problems. Use this experience to develop positions on structure.
4. More conscious planning is needed to reduce barriers to cross-departmental communication among faculty and students, as a precondition of meaningful thinking about structural change in GSPA.

B. Improved Communication: Trust and Espirit

1. Improve the orientation program.
2. More opportunity for intellectual and social interaction between students and faculty, within and among departments.

3. Circulation of school and, departmental and faculty communications and memoranda to students.
4. Review influences on an entering student's initial perceptions and long-term attitudes. Make indicated changes in orientation, advisement and curriculum.
5. A chronicle or inventory of GSPA "success stories" should be prepared and regularly up-dated, covering faculty, staff, students and administration.

C. Curriculum and Standards

1. Starting in Fall 1974, either drop or substantially reorganize Pad 500/502.
2. Develop, by Fall 1974, a manual for distribution to all students, which will articulate degree standards by inventorying the major topics or concepts to be taught, and displaying systematically the course or courses they will be taught, in. This would also be a vehicle for reducing duplication and gaps in coverage.
3. Provide a means by which all courses listed in the curriculum will be made available at least once each year.
4. Students and faculty should take further action to expand the full-time P.A. faculty. Since this effort has encountered some SUNY resistance, the case should be strengthened by (a) continuing toward full utilization of Political Science faculty, and (b) demonstrating that all P.A. faculty carry a full teaching load except when conducting specific research or public service which clearly benefits the school.
5. Improve the mesh of student demand and faculty supply for special courses, and reduce the time lag between course proposal and course presentation.
6. The interdepartmental committee of faculty and students established to rationalize the use of GSPA resources in the quantitative methodology area should proceed rapidly and be given strong support to meet student needs rather than to protect GSPA FIES.
7. Take a serious look at "policy science" curriculum proposals.
8. Establish a system for identifying prerequisites and "proficiencying out" of basic courses [500/502, 520, 640].
9. More effective measures are needed by faculty and students in all departments to expedite completion of doctoral degrees.
10. More courses should be offered at the doctoral level, but these should be designed to meet the needs of the current group of doctoral students.

11. Restore balance in the PA curriculum by strengthening "special area" (substantive expertise) course offerings.
12. See incorporated memorandum of recommendations to the GSPA Committee on Quantitative Methodology.

D. Research, Publication, and Public Service

1. Study the need and feasibility for a governmental research institute on a much more substantial scale than current GSPA organization for research provides, in connection with, but not dependent upon, a major GSPA role in the university-wide Institute for Policy Alternatives.
2. Establish a dialogue among administration, faculty, and students on the place of research, public service, and teaching at GSPA.
3. Conduct a "research opportunities inventory" on an experimental basis over the next two years, as a complement to the inventory of on-going faculty projects undertaken last year.
4. Continue the colloquium series, with variations.
5. Budget funds to reproduce appropriate faculty and student papers; consider establishing a subscription series.
6. Budget a small amount for awards for faculty, student and other research papers.
7. Train students to critique and write published articles as an important element in class work, and consider requiring that every student submit an article for publication as a condition of receiving the degree at master's and doctoral level.
8. Library collection--in conjunction with the move from Draper to Mohawk, it is timely to review library adequacy.

E. Careers, Employers and the Job Market

1. Conduct a job-market survey of the kind designed but not implemented by this study group.
2. Develop a special placement effort for DPAs.
3. Diversify general placement channels.

F. Alumni

1. Conduct an alumni survey of the kind designed but not implemented by this study group.
2. Develop a GSPA alumni association.

3. Keep current on alumni as prospective employers.
4. Publish a regular newsletter or magazine for alumni.

G. Relations with Government

1. Continue the progress made over the past year in strengthening the school's relationships with government, for all GSPA programs.
2. Either in conjunction with or separately from the university-wide Institute for Policy Alternatives, establish a governmental research institute in affiliation with GSPA, of the kind found at many other state universities.
3. Extend the requirements and opportunity for participation in paid or unpaid intern programs, and establish a school capability to foster interplay between this experience and academic work.

H. The Student Role

1. Involve new students so they can carry on in future years.
2. Continuing student consideration to the most appropriate style and form of student organization.
3. Students should work to explore and strengthen formal as well as informal student roles in the life and governance of GSPA.
4. Students should involve themselves actively with appropriate faculty groups to strengthen each field within the graduate program and to enable offerings to be more responsive to their needs.

I. Admissions and Quality of the Student Body

1. Expand nationwide recruiting, by faculty and alumni, with the goal of shifting the regional balance of the student body in a more national direction, and achieving greater ethnic diversity.
2. Disseminate basic data on trends in student body quality.

*A. Leadership, Mission, Structure and Reorganization:

School Integration

The major stimulus of this study was the Dean's proposal of January, 1973, for a major reorganization of the school, with the goal of making curriculum and recruitment more responsive to trends in the job market, by removing the departmental structure and creating interdisciplinary program areas.

Based on this study, we consider the issue a continuing and unresolved one. The faculty appears to be divided along lines of self-interest, and much of student opinion appears to be uninformed, uncertain or indifferent. Still, there is continuing concern.

While the Public Administration faculty is reasonably united and clearly has a viable program, the larger Political Science faculty is divided [philosophers, empirical theorists and methodologists, institutionalists, senior and junior, and "strong vs. weak" areas] and has a program which appears to be somewhat on the defensive. Since the Dean's announcement, interaction between the two departments appears to have polarized somewhat. The different interests have been highlighted. This unfortunate result was surely not the intended one. While it is too early to say, an important exception may be an increased level of cooperation among methodologists (quantitative) and among State/Local government-oriented people, which are the two major areas of overlap.

Faculty Opinion and Attitudes

The survey suggests several areas of potential faculty movement on school organization and mission, either in terms of the Dean's proposal or some other direction:

- (1) On a scale of -3 (Disagree) to +3 (Agree), they did not

*See Appendix VI for supplementary materials.

agree (-1.3) that the GSPA program is integrated, with a strong sense of community, but they did agree (+1.5) that GSPA would be better off than currently if its efforts were more focussed;

- (2) 14/19 felt that changes required by GSPA's external environment were serious and significant;
- (3) 19/22 felt that GSPA should relate to its environment by monitoring it and planning for major change; only two desired an incremental approach, and none suggested that change be resisted;
- (4) 85% of faculty feel GSPA sense of mission is weak, and 65% (13/20) would like to see more emphasis on specialization or "product differentiation," rather than comprehensive, extensive coverage of all program areas;
- (5) 21/23 expected that their work would be more productive in a setting organized to foster multi-disciplinary perspectives and undertakings; 96% of faculty rate productivity of relations among departments as a weakness, identically with their rating of collaboration with other disciplines and departments;
- (6) with respect to structural change in GSPA, only two advocated no change in structure or mission; while 24 favored retaining current departments with a significant mission change (10); dissolving current departmental structure (5), or "spinning off" all or parts of certain departments and retaining a "core" group (Harvard Model) (9);
- (7) Q. 19 asked faculty to rate six areas which have been discussed

for special projects, grants, or institutes. They rank as follows:

- (1) legislative
- (2) public policy analysis
- (3) program evaluation
- (4) local and regional government [the greatest internal disparity, where feasibility and significance are rated high, but faculty participation and funding low]
- (5) "futures"
- (6) private sector

Only one faculty member added a project: "training county officials."

- (8) In Q. 18, faculty members responded to six sets of alternatives where GSPA might shift emphasis; only 20% favored no change, but opinion was well distributed in favor of each alternative, within a set. The edge went to the following:
 - (1) research and publication (9) over service (6) and teaching (5)
 - (2) tie between graduates (9) and undergraduates (9)
 - (3) professional development/social problem-solving (15) over liberal education (7);
 - (4) managers (7), policy (5), and politics (4) over scholars and teachers (4);
 - (5) full-time (9) over part-time (5) students
 - (6) degree (12) over non-degree (4) students.
- (9) only one member of the faculty advocated no change and no focus in GSPA programs; however, in responding to Q. 12,

the faculty tended to prefer that more resources and energies be channeled into six of the eight areas mentioned. There was general opposition to one of the eight suggestions--that there be a "focus on lower-level academic careers such as two-year college and high school teaching."

Barriers to movement identified by the survey were:

- (1) a slight tendency to be pessimistic about the way GSPA would make any decision on this matter;
- (2) 15/23 felt a need for either a shift of values/power (10) or more trust and cooperation (5) before they could live with the GSPA decision process, while 7/23 desired either more interpersonal communication (5), time (1), or information (1);
- (3) only five felt it would be most profitable to extend or re-allocate current working relationships within GSPA, as compared with other SUNYA departments (7), the profession (6), or government (8). This suggests at best, no movement toward intra-GSPA cooperation.

Student Opinion and Attitudes

Not surprisingly, student opinion on the specific reorganization proposal is somewhat less structured than faculty opinion:

- (1) only 11% are attending the school because they think it is the best, and most of these are the foreign students; others attend because it offers other advantages: convenient location (35%); state government orientation (21%); low total cost (17%); financial aid (15%); and possibility of combined work-study (11%).

- (2) their career plans are reasonably firm (92%), and have remained so or become firmer since entering the school (82%)
- (3) While 56% intend to go into either management (42%) or teaching (12%), other and possibly "emergent" areas are also strongly represented, including policy staff (22%), consulting/applied research (12%), running for elective office (3%) and public interest groups (3%).
- (4) Students intend to work primarily for some level of American government (54%), divided among state (26%), national (11%), local (9%), special (3%), and undetermined (5%); others include university (15%); foundations/institutes (12%); private or self-employed (11%); and international (8%).
- (5) Students have high salary expectations. The mean current dollars is \$11,000 at age 25, \$20,500 at age 35 and \$30,700 at age 50. The latter may be a considerable underestimate, since 29% put themselves in the highest category (\$40,000+). Prospective teachers have the lowest salary aspirations, and those in Political Economy have the highest.

General student impressions of GSPA are as follows:

- (1) on overall quality of students themselves, 24% superior and 16% below average;
- (2) on overall quality of the school, 29% think it is first-rate and 16% think it has major weaknesses.
- (3) 61% expect to fulfill or more than fulfill their initial objectives, 24% are uncertain, and 15% say they will fulfill less than expected;

- (4) if they were to make their choice of schools over again, 72% would stay (38% enthusiastically), 16% are not sure, and 12% would seek some other school.

With respect to the direction of change in which students might be interested:

- (1) 68% of all students rate GSPA sense of mission and direction weak; on a scale of -3 (Disagree) and +3 (Agree), their perception of non-integration and non-community is milder (-1/3) than faculty's, but their desire for more focus is stronger (+2);
- (2) only 16% think provision for student participation and openness in the processes of departmental governance is good, 37% adequate and 14% poor; fully 33% are unfamiliar; 52% think provision for student evaluation is poor or needs provision for a more active role.
- (3) Student opinion on the question of GSPA structure is broadly distributed. Only 20% think structure has an insignificant effect on them as students. 37% feel the structure helps them focus on their primary areas of interest, but 39% feel it discourages them from interdisciplinary study and interchange, both within and outside of GSPA;
- (4) 90-95% of full-time, and 75% of part-time students rate interdepartmental and interdepartmental and interdisciplinary collaboration weak;
- (5) with respect to structural change in GSPA, 18% favor no change in structure, 40% retain current departments but

significant mission change, 17% dissolve current departmental structure, and 23% "spin-off" all or parts of certain departments, retaining a core group;

Despite the facts that (a) 41% of students had not realized GSPA was discussing an internal reorganization; (b) only 23% expected any major result, and (c) only 17% thought it likely that the discussion could have an effect on them as students---still, 79% felt GSPA students should seek to develop their own views and make an organized input to the results (the other 20% had no opinion; one was opposed).

Additional Areas of Alignment or Non-Alignment of Student and Faculty Opinion,
Relating to GSPA Mission and Reorganization

1. Full-time DPA students would enthusiastically choose GSPA again, but their POS/PH.D. counterparts split between staying, but with less enthusiasm, or uncertainty what they would do. DPA part-timers are less positive than DPA full-timers, and MPA part-timers are more positive than MPA full-timers.
2. 75% of DPA students expect to achieve or better the goals they originally set for themselves, while 50% or less of all other student categories do.
3. Faculty opinion with respect to environmental pressure for change and appropriate GSPA posture does not appear to differ with departmental affiliation.
4. Faculty opinion with respect to the way a GSPA decision on reorganization would be made, or the particular features they would be concerned about, does not appear to differ with departmental affiliation.
5. Faculty opinion with respect to preference for a "comprehensive" or "specialized" approach by the school does not appear to differ with departmental affiliation.
6. All GSPA departments appear to favor a multi-disciplinary setting.
7. With respect to structural change in GSPA, POS faculty are slightly more inclined to dissolve the Departmental Structure (30%) and PA faculty more inclined to a "spin-off" (50%).
8. With respect to structural change, both part-time and full-time DPA students constitute a heavy proportion of those favoring a "spin-off." Otherwise, the division of student opinion seems widely distributed, with most favoring retention of structure, but a substantial change or clarification of mission.
9. In any future reallocation of working relationships, Political Science faculty are most likely to look to their own profession, but outside GSPA and SUNYA; and secondly, to other GSPA departments. P.A. faculty are overwhelmingly inclined to look to governments, institutions or foundations, and secondly to other SUNYA departments outside GSPA.
10. Not surprisingly, PA faculty prefer more emphasis on public service and consultation, while POS faculty prefer teaching of scholars. There is support in both departments for more research and publication emphasis.

11. PA faculty strongly prefer more emphasis on professional training, while most of the support for liberal education is in the Political Science Department.
 12. Support for added emphasis on policy analysis, and on politics, is most widely distributed among the departments.
 13. Political Science faculty desire more emphasis on full-time students, while PA faculty dominate those who want more part-time or no change.
 14. PA faculty dominate the minority which wishes to see more emphasis on non-degree students, or no change.
-

Findings from Comparisons with Other Schools

The study group has compiled an appendix of comparative materials and of background on GSPA which should serve as useful reference material on the importance of structure. The comparative 'information' is presented in a format which stresses advantages and disadvantages, to reflect our view that (1) there are important trade-offs involved in every arrangement, and (2) it is premature to push any one arrangement for GSPA at this time.

- I. We recommend that a survey be conducted of all schools which are members of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs. Inquiry would be made of administrators and faculty and student leaders with respect to their respective problems, successes and failures as organizational evolution proceeds in these schools. This might be accomplished by letter, telephone, or at meetings such as the annual ASPA meeting in Syracuse next Spring.

Conclusion

The apparent state of opinion within GSPA does not appear to have evolved in November from where it seemed to stand last Spring. The Academic Policy Committee had not been able to fulfill the Dean's charge to it. During the Spring, the Dean reconstituted a new group to continue working on a response over the summer. That group has apparently not progressed.

Recommendations:

- (1) As things stand now, the faculty appears to oppose any specific large-scale reorganization. Student opinion is broadly distributed, largely because students are placed somewhat on the periphery

of dialogue and decision-making on the matter. The study group does not interpret the information it has gathered as suggesting any lines of movement toward one specific structural change, although there is clearly important dissatisfaction with the current arrangement. If continuing dialogue can be kept focused on organizational structure as a means of achieving specific positive goals, it should be invigorating. If not, it would be better to focus on goals and take structure as given for the time being.

- (2) There is the possibility, however, that higher levels in the University have already determined that certain basic changes should be made in GSPA. The Dean has made it clear that the University considers the current Departmental structure of the school to be an administrative convenience to the school, that in the future faculty are to be assigned to the school rather than to the departments. We do not have useful information on university plans for GSPA, or their over-all evaluation of it, other than a favorable review of the DPA degree conducted by the Graduate Academic Council last Spring. It would be useful for such information to be sought and communicated widely within GSPA.
- (3) In lieu of suggesting a student position on any long-term commitment to the current structure or to some alternative, the study group recommends the short-term strategy of continuing to approach specific goals and problems, seeking to implement solutions within the current structure, while observing more carefully the adequacy of the current structure in terms of these specifics.
- (4) While the establishment within recent weeks of five student-faculty committees--each aimed at solving specific problems--is the kind of

thing we have in mind, only one of these committees goes beyond the PA Department, and some PA faculty opposition has been expressed even to this.

Meaningful thinking about structural change in GSPA is hard to carry on without open cross-departmental communication at both faculty and student levels. Under current conditions, there are far too many barriers to such communication, and far too few encouragements. In many respects, they are different worlds. This contributes either to the routine perpetuation of status quo, or to a hostile environment for discussions about structure.

Important interfaces do exist between PA and POS, but the exchange appears to be primarily one-way. Political Science faculty teach, and Political Science ^{students} enroll in, PA courses. No PA faculty teach POS courses, and few PA students enroll in POS courses, the exception being urban-local-federalism and methodology.

Conscious planning should be undertaken at administration, faculty and student levels to overcome these barriers, including the Political Economy and Public Affairs programs as well. The study group sees no necessity for the barriers of imagery and sentiment which have developed between "theory" and "practice", "eggheads" and "plumbers", "isolates" and "organizers".

B. Improved Communication:

Trust and Espirit

GSPA's change of location to a different site presents a challenge to (1) overcome the isolating effects of building structure and improve internal communication, and (2) take advantage of the new physical proximity of related professional schools and disciplines on the main campus. Clearly, neither will occur automatically; conscious measures need be taken.

The feeling-tone around the school is an ambivalent one, reflecting the mixed successes and failures of communication and community. Numerous elements of the faculty/student survey reflect this:

- (1) there is a general feeling that sense of direction is lacking--- but 57% of full-time MPA's think the opposite;
- (2) there is a general feeling that relations among GSPA departments, and between them and other disciplines, are weak;
- (3) 67% of faculty (both departments) think the level of faculty trust and mutual confidence is a weakness, but all MPA's and full-time DFA's think it is strong;
- (4) 67% of faculty think student esprit is weak, and 75% of the students (all groups) agree;
- (5) apriori, most of the faculty has no confidence in the way a decision would be made on GSPA's future;
- (6) there is a general feeling that leadership at the GSPA level is weak;
- (7) 40% of students surveyed were unaware of the Dean's reorganization proposal three months after it was made.

Unfortunately, the growth of barriers to communication, trust, esprit, and community seems the natural course of events. A number of measures have been taken to overcome these barriers. We assess these measures positively and recommend they be initiated both regularly and on an ad hoc basis, whenever possible:

- (1) orientation should include (1) more emphasis on the importance of the individual as an initiator of relationships and activities; (2) more complete and concrete information on what the school is all about;
- (2) social events such as the occasional school-wide picnic, the "Red Tape Ball," and the Tower beer blast this fall; also, sup-groups like doctoral and field students should be getting together regularly.
- (3) opportunities for intellectual sharing through regular colloquia and informal seminars between faculty and students, or among students only, need to be developed;
- (4) in view of the strong student desire for more awareness of materials and discussions among the faculty, the frequent stimulating memos circulated among the faculty should be made readily available to the students at that time or as soon as they lose any "sensitivity" they may have;
- (5) we believe the school would benefit immensely from a review of the influences on an entering student's initial perceptions and long-term attitudes. We believe important changes in the "orientation," "advisement," and basic curriculum approaches would result;

- (6) a chronical, inventory, newsletter, or brochure of GSPA "success stories" should be prepared and up-dated, covering faculty, staff, students and administration.

*

C. Curriculum and Standards

There is important dissatisfaction with the current curriculum among faculty and students of all departments within GSPA. Survey strength/weakness questions on courses and degree requirements show a general high level of agreement among faculty and students that (1) curriculum has too much duplication, too many gaps, and not enough coherence; (2) not enough of the listed curriculum is actually offered, (3) not enough doctoral-level courses are offered. Opinion is divided on whether standards and requirements for graduate degrees are sufficiently clear. 57% of P. A. faculty don't think so, nor do 71% of Ph.D. (Pos) students.

In general, there is a recognition that the extent of duplication and fragmentation of courses, both within and between departments, is unacceptable because it is absorbing resources and making them unavailable for important courses and material which is either not being taught, or not being taught effectively. There is a desire among students to use teaching resources outside GSPA, and to redirect resources within GSPA. Since this desire confronts the constraints of a given GSPA faculty and a strong faculty desire to preserve "FTEs" within GSPA, the problem has to be worked on over a long time frame. There are, however, several measures which could be taken immediately to establish a basis for curriculum improvement.

*

(See Appendix III-2-a and VII for Supplementary materials)

(1) It is well-established that Pad 500/502, which are currently required for entering MPA students, have a profound impact on first impressions of and attitude toward the school. Currently, lecturers and course content are evaluated negatively. We see several options:

- (a) eliminate both courses from the curriculum; replace them with a series of small informal seminars and colloquia in which many faculty participate, and use these to acquaint entering students both with the Field and the School; or
- (b) consolidate the two courses into one [] and take a close look at Pad 610] and assign the school's better lecturers; possibly use DPAs as teaching assistants to improve contact.

We feel it is imperative that this be done by Fall Semester, 1974. Too many MPA students are "turned off" on GSPA by these two courses.

(2) It is evident that students either do not understand the curriculum and how to get what they need, or that it is not all there. Also, faculty clearly do not know what is being taught in courses other than their own. The twin assumptions that "someone else is teaching it," or that "this is so important I should cover it again" have combined to produce an undesirable situation.

We recommend that, within the current academic year, faculty and students develop a manual for distribution to all students in the Fall of 1974, which will articulate degree standards by inventorying the major topics or concepts to be taught, and displaying systematically the

courses they will be taught in.

(3) Courses listed in the curriculum should either be (a) taught once a year (b) consolidated with other courses, (c) taught by visiting professors, or (d) their equivalent outside GSPA (at SUNY or a nearby school) identified and listed in the catalogue as the school's offering in that area. We understand that a cross-enrollment agreement already exists with neighboring schools.

(4) Enrollment in the P.A. program has doubled over the past two years, while faculty size has remained stable. The result is a vast increase in class size and an unavoidable reduction in the ^{perception of the} quality of the P.A. curriculum by students. 500 and 502 are only the "tip of the iceberg." There is an urgent need for more faculty members. We commend the P. A. faculty for its campaign to obtain additional faculty slots. Except in the methodology area, it appears to us that the potential for utilization of Pos faculty in PA courses has been fully realized. The need is clearly for additional faculty, as expressed in supporting material submitted by P.A. to the Dean, and to the University.

Nevertheless, it appears the university has not responded adequately to this request. Students should explore the possibility of taking action which would have a favorable impact on this situation.

We recognize and appreciate that qualified faculty like Brown, Hays, Herman, and Wallace have been brought in from outside despite the limited flexibility of the school budget for achieving this. However, the teaching load of some full-time faculty does not appear to be a heavy one, and we urge that:

(a) the teaching load be reduced below three courses only

for the most definite research or public service alternatives which will clearly advance the school, its faculty and students, and

(b) additional permanent or temporary faculty slots be used to maintain an adequate course offering;

(5) The special needs of students, and the special talents of faculty, mesh too little. During Fall Semester, 1973, alone, two doctoral seminar courses by Walsh (Education Finance) and Herman (Revenue) were cancelled due to lack of enrollment. The "mesh" could be improved if (a) the time lag between course proposal and course presentation could be reduced; and if (b) a procedure could be developed whereby student demand and faculty supply of special seminars could be coordinated.

(6) Two needed committees have been created this fall, one on P.A. Curriculum, and the other on GSPA Quantitative Methodology. Faculty and student responses to open-ended questions on curriculum indicate this need. The group has submitted preliminary recommendations of a general and procedural nature to the quantitative committee, which reflect its findings and could also have more general applicability. This committee has prepared a preliminary list of "course modules" which might be developed to improve GSPA coverage of the field, while allowing greater recognition to the widerange of student backgrounds. More than any other area in GSPA, this one confronts major questions of best use of faculty across departmental boundaries, and across GSPA boundaries. There is serious question whether P.A. Faculty resources are best used by teaching fundamentals in this area. The next step appears to be utilization of Pos faculty. If this doesn't work, courses outside

GSPA may have to be incorporated in the curriculum.

We recommend (1) that the quantitative committee proceed rapidly to rationalize the GSPA approach in this area, and that in so doing (2) it give more weight to meeting student needs effectively, even if outside GSPA, than to protecting GSPA FTEs. (For example, a trade-off might be arranged with the business school where their students enroll in certain GSPA courses, new or existing).

(7) A new and serious look should be taken by students and faculty at the "policy science" curriculum recently proposed to the Dean by the Poland Committee.

(8) Currently the P.A. department tries to accomplish too many objectives in its basic courses, such as 500/502, 520, and 640 (the basic courses in general background, quantitative techniques, and economics). There is a tendency to require these courses of all students. At the time of admission, or at initial counseling, all entering students should be assessed, and a determination made as to whether they may "proficiency out" of one or more of these courses and substitute instead more advanced courses. This will require a clearer concept of prerequisites and a better organized system of advisement and guidelines. But it will contribute immensely to the efficiency of teaching and learning, and to student and faculty morale.

(9) More effective measures are needed by faculty and students in all departments to expedite completion of doctoral degrees.

(10) More PA courses should be offered at the doctoral level, but these should be designed to meet the needs of the current group of doctoral students.

Student and Faculty Evaluation of Fields Offered by GSPA

Students and faculty were asked to evaluate fields offered by GSPA, and to indicate their own primary areas of study and interest (see p. F-5, 5-7). The rating scale was from 1 (excellent) to 5 (unacceptable):

(1) Political Economy

Faculty ratings ranged from 3-4 (average to poor), with the exception of Regional and Resource Economics (2.6). Student ratings were more favorable (2-3). Most students were interested in Economics of the Public Sector (15) and Labor Economics and Labor Relations (12), which were ranked 2.5 and 2.1 respectively.

(2) Political Science

Faculty ratings ranged from 1.7 (theory) to 2.9 (American Political Systems) (good to average). Student ratings ranged from 2.1 (Public Law) to 2.9 (comparative). Most students were interested in Public Administration (27) or American (15). Students added "Empirical Theory" and "Political Behavior" to the list.

(3) Public Administration

Faculty ratings ranged from 1.7 (Administrative processes) to 2.9 (Human Resources). Student interest is relatively evenly distributed among the P. A. fields, ranging from 11 (comparative) to 30 (administrative behavior). Student ratings range from 1.9 (administrative behavior, administrative processes) to 2.4 (management science, urban development). Faculty and student ratings of the P.A. fields appear to be best of the three departments, on average. Comparative and Human Resources are much more favorably ranked by students than by faculty.

(4) Special Areas

With one bright exception, special areas were rated quite poorly by faculty and students. The exception is "State and Local Government", which was rated 2.2 by faculty and 1.7 by students, of whom 15 had a high interest in it. "Research and Analytic Techniques and Methodology" was ranked 2.7 by 13 faculty, of whom 7 listed it as a primary area of teaching competence. It was ranked 2.9 by 29 students, of whom 17 had a primary interest in it. All other areas rated in the 3-5 range.

One of the more prominent results of cluster analysis is that P.A. students in particular show a strong unsatisfied interest in improved course offerings in "special areas." This suggests that, from the point of

view of student interests and needs, the P.A. curriculum has leaned too far toward the training of "generalists", and does not do enough to provide "specialist" training. It should be noted that some schools place much greater emphasis than does GSPA on offering a curriculum for training in selected specialties, if not all of them, and in training students with recognized expertise in an area.

To: GSPA Committee on Quantitative Methodology

From: GSPA Study Group

Date: October 23, 1973

Recommendations:

We now have a "non-program" from the student's view. I would like to see a feasible program articulated and implemented. It might include the following:

- (1) An over-all "area paper" by the faculty [and students] on the quantitative approach at GSPA, with a broad philosophy of who needs what and who provides what, including a comprehensive list of concepts and tools desired to be mastered, with a list of which ones are covered in which course; and a preferred sequencing of courses;
- (2) An orientation session, at entry, expanded to provide for a presentation followed by discussion, regarding the quantitative area, resources, how delivered, the student role in utilizing resources, the kinds of choices the student should plan for, when and how to go about making them, etc;
- (3) A diagnostic and counselling program which has available to it routinely an inventory of current quantitative skills of the student, stimulates a well-structured projection of educational goals in this area [related to career goals], and establishes a preliminary map on how to get there;
- (4) An analysis of student body characteristics re quantitative skills/potentials might show to what extent modular approach would be more efficient in targeting individual needs and reinforcing/motivating individuals "from where they are" [with all that inherent shortsightedness];
- (5) Since student body characteristics may vary from time to time, periodic analysis and curriculum redesign should be made feasible; problems to be dealt with would include (a) time lag from identification to design to offering, (b) conflict of faculty diagnosis and student perception;
- (6) While each individual faculty member must teach to his own strengths, the designed whole must represent effectively more than the sum of the parts [individual faculty members and course] so that the student is not overly distracted or diverted by these parts, but may view them as contributing to the whole.
- (7) This presumes the feasibility of curriculum integration, even while differentiating the curriculum by its major classes of users

[department, discipline, anticipated career ideas]; a clear statement should be possible, and accurate, regarding the utility of an offering at the following levels: university, GSPA, department, area of specialization;

- ...basic, "waterfront" courses might be offered in or out of GSPA,
- ...tools and applications might be presented at lower levels in flexible modules,
- ...seminars in theory should be available somewhere, but they should be distinguished from offerings on "tools and applications",

(8) All offerings should feature the following:

- an advance syllabus laying out course design, procedure, objectives, etc.
- a list of required and supplementary readings
- an opportunity for all students to purchase required readings at the beginning of the semester
- a list of concepts and tools taught in the course
- a highly structured, organized curriculum plan except in the most advanced and individualized courses [difference to be identified clearly]
- confidence - building through practice

(9) Without descending to the idiot level, course structure should behaviorally provide for and require

- the working out of problems and the application of specific cases; the faculty and students could constitute themselves as a continuing body to add to a collection of effective illustrative problems and cases, together with modes of representing them to aid perception and learning; the objective should be to generate enough variety in this collection to relate to a broad range of disciplinary and individual concerns; perhaps even more than a case approach, a "laboratory" (problem-solving) approach is needed.

(10) Provide practice in critique of published articles [confidence; habits] and in writing of research articles for publication.

(11) Involve students in "real" research projects at level of (a) class (b) group (b) group (c) individual, which may be formulated by faculty member or by student(s).

- (12) With view to conservation and best use of GSPA faculty resources, conduct a review of SUNYA and other resources, identify how and to whom useful, and make this information available to students;
- (13) Faculty availability and reinforcement is particularly important in the quantitative area; possibly faculty could also be supplemented by well-qualified T.A.'s to assist students with courses and counselling.
- (14) Relate the quantitative sequence to the need for an adequate approach to the "methodology" requirement.
- (15) Differentiate each student involved in the quantitative program by the nature of his involvement, and whether it might be greater or less, or clearer.

- To meet minimum requirements
- A quantitative methodology requirement
- Management science
- Major interest is quantitative
- Uncertain

Treat these classes of students in a rationalized, differentiated, explicit way of which they are aware and understand.

- (16) A revised statement on methodology requirements at the Master's and Doctoral levels should be prepared, reflecting the increasing emphasis on such skills in the field.

*D. Research, Publication, and Public Service

This area, as much or more than the quality of GSPA graduates, determines the reputation of the school for productivity and quality. Survey findings confirm that this is a problem area for the school. While teaching is viewed as a strength (with the exception of Pos Ph.D.'s):

- (1) 80% of faculty rate lack of incentives for research and publication a weakness; 75% of full-time students agree, along with 67% of part-time students;
- (2) more faculty (95%) rate quantity and quality of research a weakness of GSPA; 74% of full-time students agree, with 53% of part-time students;
- (3) 65% of faculty (83% in Pos) vote incentive for public service as a weakness, although student perceptions are divided -- 53% of full-time students agree, and 75% of DPAs agree, but only 43% of Ph.D. (Pos) and 25% of MPAs do; and part-time students uniformly see the incentive to public service as a strength of the school;
- (4) with regard to quality and quantity of public service actually provided, 61% of the faculty see this as a weakness; while DPA students agree, MPA and Ph.D. (Pos) students see current levels of public service as a strength.

The study group has prepared a paper on "Research and Public Service at GSPA". The paper establishes a perspective related specifically to

*(See Appendix IV - 1 for supplementary material)

Studies Center has done distinguished work and deserves its good reputation (it may be the school's best "image-maker"), it may not be a vehicle to serve as a general stimulator of research and publication. The Legislative Institute was a good idea but never became a reality for lack of funding; CDSC now serves this function. The Helderberg Review has become more of a journal of arts, letters, history and philosophy, rather than of public affairs, political science, public administration and political economy;

- (1) While the school badly needs the kind of public relations brochure distributed this fall, describing its resources and the various mechanisms available, and while demand will hopefully generate supply, we believe serious attention must be devoted immediately to the adequacy of school mechanisms for developing and meshing supply of resources with demand for research and services;
- (2) GSPA cannot afford to watch from the sidelines as the University proceeds to develop the university-wide Institute For Policy Alternatives. We believe an active effort should be made to locate the Director and seat of the Center at GSPA, in view of the excellent resources and the uniquely ideal location at the State Capitol, and within the one organization in New York State's University system most conducive to policy research.

We would place the highest priority on the establishment of a Student-Faculty task force to pursue this matter, and to conduct a campaign is appropriate.

In conjunction with this current mechanisms could be re-evaluated, and the various models of the institute of government and public affairs could be explored.

-11-

PUBLICATION AT GSPA

The Public Administration Group of GSPA has been described by many theorists and practitioners of the field as among the most distinguished P.A. programs in the country. The diversity and excellence of both faculty and students is perhaps unsurpassed elsewhere. The research conducted through the program, including our Comparative Development Studies Center, the Public Executives Project, and the new productivity work, is recognized internationally as well as locally. The quality of our DPA and MPA programs, with their union of study with internship, of theoretical with practical designs, of professional with scholarly perspectives, is as outstanding as exists anywhere. There is, however, one area in which the Public Administration Group has been weak. Our efforts at publishing articles and books have been inadequate.

As a result of this deficiency, or "ass-dragging" as the proverbial slave driver might say, is that GSPA Albany is an obscure entity to many of our colleagues in the field. The excellence of our program and distinction of our faculty and student body are largely unknown to administrators in Phoenix and London and to professors and students at Geneva and Vanderbilt. The pertinence of our research is undiscovered by governments in India and Wyoming and Dade County. More immediately, the scholarship of our Group is questioned by the hierarchy of our own State University of New York.

Particularly for a young school strong efforts at publishing are essential for establishing, maintaining, and furthering a reputation which feeds distinction. If we are as good as we so assuredly think we are we ought to tell the world about it. If we are so convinced of our excellence we ought to put our work to the test. If we hope to become more distinguished we must draw the wide attention to Albany which only publishing can attract.

NOTEPAD believes that the Public Administration Group should make a concerted effort to flood the market with the results of our work. Specifically NOTEPAD suggests the following measures could mobilize energies toward correcting the only major area we have thus far neglected: 1. Establishment of a Publication Advisory Committee with the task of providing faculty and students logistical information on publishing such as names of journals interested in particular subjects, appropriate formats and lengths of articles, etc. There literally are hundreds of journals receptive to articles in our field. Frequently the problem is knowing where to send a piece. 2. Adherence to a general policy that each faculty member and student submit at least one article per semester on some research he accomplished. Rejections of many articles is inevitable, but the more submitted the greater the chance of acceptance. 3. Adoption of a policy that as many student course papers as possible be geared for publication. In particular, this would entail selection of marketable topics, pre-research identification of possible journals, and limitation on length and format to meet journal specifications. 4. Development of guidelines for locating publishers for all doctoral dissertations.

NOTEPAD recognizes that these suggestions may reek of naivety and presumption. It also recognizes that much of what is published today from acclaimed schools is garbage. The Albany Public Administration Group has some pertinent and exciting things to say. If the past is any indication, however, little will be done unless we discipline our efforts toward publishable products.

LIBRARY COLLECTION

The study group survey shows that all groupings of students and faculty are in agreement that the library collection is inadequate to meet GSPA needs. This is an important matter for study and research. Unfortunately, the study produced little specific information about library inadequacy. In general the library suffers from the inherent limitation of a ten year collection imposed on a teacher college library. The collection tends to be out of date, and sparse on both older and newer books.

In conjunction with the move from Draper Hall to Mohawk Tower and the consolidation of the GSPA library into the SUNY library, it seems timely to conduct a review of the adequacy of:

- (1) the current collection
- (2) library plans and provisions for additions to that collection
- (3) GSPA system of requests to the library for additions
- (4) library procedures for making its holdings available conveniently and efficiently to GSPA faculty and students.

E. Careers, Employers, and the Job Market*

It appears that one of the primary reasons for the Dean's reorganization proposal was that the job market for teaching (political science) is diminishing, and that for practitioners (public administration) is increasing. The corresponding trends in enrollment suggest this is the case. At the same time, new areas such as policy analysis may be emerging which fall somewhere between the two. If students are not being recruited and trained accordingly, opportunities for student careers and effective faculty utilization are foregone.

The school maintains a dual job placement system, one for prospective teachers, operated by Associate Dean Speckhard, and one for practitioners, conducted by Dean Barone. We will not comment on teacher placement here, but to mention that it appears highly dependent on personalized contacts. Placement of practitioners at the MPA level appears to have become effective within the past year, as public agency hiring has rebounded.

- (1) While we have not been able to proceed with the market survey planned as part of this study, it has been put in final form. We urge that either students or the school administration conduct such a study at the earliest possible time. A complementary study would be the proposed alumni survey, which is also in final form. The combined results would tell us far more than we now know about such things as:

*See Appendix IV-3 for supplementary materials.

- (1) beginning salaries
- (2) rate of advancement
- (3) usefulness of the GSPA degree and of specific training as perceived by
 - (a) employers
 - (b) employee graduates
- (4) relation of training received to emerging career patterns.

(2) As the number of DPA students increases (there are now about 25), the importance of a special placement effort tailored to their needs grows. DPAs may be unique in several respects:

- (a) many already have work experience, and may be ready for middle and senior positions; this would affect the placement approach in either teaching or practice;
- (b) for those DPAs who wish to teach, the status of their degree and qualifications in the academic community needs to be strengthened;
- (c) for those DPAs who wish to practice, the status of their degree and qualifications in the "real world" needs to be strengthened.

(3) GSPA is likely to draw its students from increasingly wider backgrounds, and their career interests are likely to be broad. The placement program should strengthen its channels with major State and Local governments elsewhere, and with the Federal government and international organizations.

*F. Alumni

GSPA is a young school, less than ten years old. Although it had operated since 1947 under NYU/Maxwell auspices, only those pre-Suny alumni who are in the Albany area are likely to identify with GSPA. On the other hand, through its substantial program, GSPA has graduated several hundred persons in the past decade and for that period of time, ranks as one of the larger graduate schools of public affairs.

- (1) As mentioned in the section on "careers", the study group had planned to conduct an alumni survey, but has proceeded only so far as to complete a formal design for such a survey. We recommend that this be proceeded with immediately, for reasons discussed.
- (2) We commend GSPA and the Dean for their active solicitation of attendance at alumni day, November 15, and for the program, including a discussion of the future of GSPA. Doubtless the discussion of organizing a GSPA alumni association will have either its positive or negative effects. We strongly recommend that measures be taken to assure its success, and that the organization include among its functions the following:
 - a. means of identification (membership) and communication (newsletter);
 - b. involvement of alumni with current students, including
 - (1) career orientation
 - (2) issue/problem seminars
 - (3) job placement;
 - c. exploration of the proposed "recertification" program whereby alumni could periodically be examined and verify their continued currency in the field.

*(See Appendix IV-2 for supplementary materials)

- (3) The school should employ a system for keeping up-to-date on alumni employment and location, viewing alumni as prospective employers.
 - (4) The school should publish a regular newsletter or magazine for alumni to keep them up-to-date on new developments, somewhat like the "Maxwell News and Notes".
-

G. Relations With Government

There is general agreement within GSPA that governments are valuable resources and close relations should be maintained. However, different segments would utilize the relationships in different ways:

- (1) there is a general interest in research and consulting opportunities for faculty and students of all departments;
- (2) within the past year, P.A. has developed an extensive intern program, primarily with state government;
- (3) the expertise of public officials is widely used in classroom situations; and many government employees are enrolled as students at the school;
- (4) several faculty members have focused the course work of their students into extensive projects with a government agency
(Balk, Heikoff.)

Recommendations

- (1) In general, this kind of trend should be continued further, evidence the survey finding that faculty and students of all departments still rate this as a weakness of the school. There is mixed opinion on the desirability of close involvement with government in the Political Science Department, most often expressed as a commitment to critical roles and independence. The current chairman of the department has an interest, but found little interest in internships among political science students when he inquired at a meeting last Spring. On the other hand, the survey suggests that full-timers are very critical of the department's "failure" in this area.

- (2) As indicated in the section on research, we feel one of the major priorities of the school should be a vastly strengthened mechanism for conducting research. This organization could strengthen the school's research relationships with government, if it could operate along the lines of the Bureau /Institute of Government and Public Affairs so successfully established at other State universities, such as Oregon, Illinois, Indiana, and California.

We recommend that a special committee of students and faculty be established immediately to explore the constraints and possibilities.

- (3) Both MPA and DPA students should be required to participate in some kind of intern program unless their background already contains it. Students in other departments should also have an opportunity for an internship, and should be encouraged to take advantage of it. Since the objective of an internship is creative interplay between theory and practice, analysis and experience, it is important that the school develop a more structured means of linking the two. Currently they are carried on in compartmental fashion. This may require that a faculty member or non-faculty administrator devote a major portion of time to providing the conditions for such interplay. One means of doing so might be to require each intern, as a degree requirement, to report, analyze and evaluate his intern experiment from the perspective of his major fields of study. This could be done in addition to or in lieu of comprehensive exams, and the student would have a right to critical discussion of his project with the faculty.

The school is to be highly commended for the aggressive expansion of intern opportunities during the past year. It has contributed

substantially to the feeling of the students that "we have something going here." However, it appears that agency resource limitations have placed a limit on the number of students who can be accommodated. Keeping in mind the real monetary value of an internship to a student, and its positive effect on recruitment and retention, we nevertheless recommend exploration of additional non-paying internships if this will not undermine the successes in obtaining paid internships.

*H. The Student Role

The survey indicates that, while students overwhelmingly favor a stronger role in (1) any reorganization, (2) school governance in general, and (3) faculty and course evaluation, they nevertheless learn too little and too late to do much about the important developments or inaction which affects their future.

From all appearances, the level of constructive and effective student activity in P.A. during the past academic year (1972-73) represents a marked improvement. NotePAD, the popular and notorious weekly newspaper and sounding-board of student opinion, has made a unique contribution. The effort put forth by this study group reflects a broad student concern with GSPA.

Nevertheless, three months after the Dean made his reorganization proposal, 40% of GSPA students were unaware of it!

In the Department of Public Administration, a strong group of MPA and DPA students has contributed substantially to the formulation and articulation of student opinion, through the vehicle of an informal student organization which has met and formed ad hoc task forces as needed.

However, student generations are short-lived. If progress during the past year is to be continued, and if students are to be effective in meeting their educational and social needs through GSPA, it is necessary that:

- (1) the students currently active provide opportunities and incentives for new students to get involved and to carry on in terms of their needs and priorities, and

*See Appendix IX for supplementary material.

- (2) the newer students give serious consideration to the style and form of student organization which will best meet their needs during the next one or two academic years. Where communication is good and spirits are willing, there is much to be said for an informal, problem-solving approach.

Critical attention should be focused on the student role in school governance. We comment here on three kinds of interfaces:

- (1) informal liaison, (2) membership on standing committees of the school, and (3) membership on the Dean's reorganization task forces.

- (1) Currently, in the P.A. Department, one student has been informally selected to perform a liaison role between faculty and students, by attending each regular faculty meeting and communicating student views and faculty actions to each other. This is an important achievement and should be continued. However, it is important that the individual performing this role engage actively in two-way communication. We recommend that each (weekly) edition of NotePAD contain a summary and analysis of P.S. faculty meetings. Secondly, the minutes of each meeting should be made available immediately afterward in the student lounge.

- (2) It will surprise most GSPA students to learn that the school has standing committees on which students and faculty from each Department serve. However, insofar as we can determine, these exist as paper entities only. They have not met or performed any identifiable function during the past academic year. They meet only on call of the Dean, who fixes their agenda. In our

view, these committees have not served as meaningful vehicles of student participation. While membership does theoretically provide students entree to general GSPA faculty meetings, two factors vitiate the meaning of this:

- a. student members of GSPA standing committees are seldom notified of meetings; and
 - b. except in the rarest of circumstances, real business is done through Departmental rather than school meetings.
- (3) Two students were appointed to each of the five "reorganization task forces" last spring; these task forces were eventually discharged of their responsibilities; in this context our primary criticism of them is that little attention was given to student views; at least one task force intentionally neglected to inform its student members of the meeting when it made its final recommendations.

The general pattern of student participation appears to be:

- (1) discouragement from any real formal participation; and yet
- (2) a highly rewarding level of cooperation between individual faculty and students on ad hoc projects which may benefit the school but do not involve major planning or policy decisions.

We recommend that the next generation of students explore this situation further and work to strengthen formal as well as informal student roles in the life and governance of GSPA.

We recommend that students involve themselves actively with appropriate faculty groups to strengthen each field within the graduate program and to make offerings within those fields responsive to their needs.

I. Admissions and Quality of the Student Body

While we have not conducted a systematic review of the quality of the student body, we understand objective information such as GREs, grades, and school of undergraduate degrees indicates an over-all improvement trend. Not only have admissions increased greatly over the past several years, but the rate of rejection has also increased.

While it is natural for students who see such undesireably large classes to also wonder what this means about student quality, there is reason to believe, short of a systematic study, that student quality is actually improving. This is important for another reason. The study group believes faculty resources at GSPA are excellent. They deserve a student body of the highest possible quality.

It is interesting to note that there is some difference of perspective on both faculty rating of student quality and on student rating of GSPA and its students between the Political Science and Public Administration Departments. The attached tables show that POS tend to be somewhat critical of each other, while PA seem mutually supportive. This may simply reflect the job market conditions of the two fields, or it may reflect considerably more.

There is concern among some students and faculty that the diversity of student background is not as great as it should be.

We are concerned that the P.A. Department, in view of increasing applications and enrollments, concern itself not only with improving quality of students but with limiting enrollment to a manageable number. We

recognize this latter is largely contingent on whether the university can and will provide the needed additional faculty members. We note the possible emergence of an imbalance between the number of new students enrolled this fall in the M.P.A. program and in the DPA program (1). It is important that the school maintain continuity in the quantity and quality of the DPA program.

We recommend that:

- (1) recruiting efforts which highlight the strengths of the school be expanded; the distribution of brochures this Fall is to be commended; also, active individual faculty and alumni efforts should be pursued at selected schools throughout the country;
- (2) while the quality of the program is good and getting better in New York State and local government (why students enroll; quality rating of survey), the same is true at other features of the program. A goal of the national recruiting effort should be to shift the regional balance of students toward a more national student body;
- (3) data on trends in student body quality should be disseminated annually the Dean's office;
- (4) a more active (effective) effort should be made to increase the diversity of the student body, not only by region, but by ethnic background and by area of undergraduate major;

FACULTY RATING OF GSPA STUDENTS

	Percentages		
	Total	Pol. Sci.	Pub. Adm.
Improving	43	11	70
Stable	33	33	30
Diminishing	19	44	---
Plummeting	5	11	---

Significance: 0.15

STUDENT RATING OF GSPA STUDENTS, BY FULL-TIME

	Percentages			
	Total	MPA	Ph.D. - Pos.	DPA
Superior	25	14	29	30
Average	54	71	29	60
Below Average	21	14	43	10

Significance: 0.39

STUDENT RATING OF GSPA STUDENTS, BY PART-TIME

	Total	MPA	Ph.D. - Pos.	DPA
	Superior	20	29	--
Average	67	62	67	71
Below Average	13	9	33	---

STUDENT RATING OF GSPA, BY FULL-TIME

	Percentage			
	Total	MPA	Ph.D. - Pos.	DPA
Top Five	38	57	--	50
Adequate	50	29	71	50
Disappointed	13	14	29	--

STUDENT RATING OF GSPA, BY PART-TIME

	Total	MPA	Ph.D. - Pos.	DPA
	Top Five	24	30	--
Adequate	61	57	67	57
Disappointed	15	13	33	---