

THE FIRST 25 YEARS
A HISTORY OF THE
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

by

Alan L. Dean

with assistance by Herbert N. Jasper

April, 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
I. ORIGINS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THE BACKGROUND, 1863-1966	1
II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION; 1966-1970	5
Governance	7
Panels	8
Financing the Academy.....	8
Membership	9
Program and Projects; 1967-1970.....	10
Relationships with ASPA	11
Academy Staff.....	13
III. NAPA INCORPORATES: THE MIDDLE YEARS, 1970-1984	14
Organization and Governance.....	14
The National Institute of Public Affairs: Missed Opportunities	15
Standing Committees and Panels.....	16
Membership	19
Finance	21
Program and Projects; 1970-1984.....	24
Awards	29
Committee on Evaluation	30
Strengthening America’s Capacity to Govern	32
Academy Staff.....	33
IV. THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THE YEARS SINCE THE CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER, 1984-1992	35
Governance	38
Board Committees	38
Board Review and Oversight of Programs.....	39
National Institute of Public Affairs	41
Standing Panels	42
Membership	45
Financing the Academy.....	52
The Endowment	52
Committee on the Future	53

	Page
Program and Projects; 1984-1992.....	58
Service to Federal Agencies.....	59
Service to Congress.....	61
Service to the Judiciary.....	62
Service to Local Government	62
Government Enterprises and Alternative Structures.....	62
Academy-Initiated Studies	63
Relations with the American Society for Public Administration.....	65
Academy Staff.....	66
 EPILOGUE	 67

APPENDICES

- A. List of Chairs, Executive Directors and Presidents
- B. Members of the Editorial Advisory Group
- C. Chronology of Major Events
- D. Congressional Charter
- E. Executive Summary of the Report of the Committee on the Future
- F. Bylaws of the Academy (1992)
- G. List of Academy Reports from 1992-1996.
- H. “The Academy's First Quarter Century,” paper delivered by Elmer B. Staats at the Annual Meeting

FOREWORD

This history seeks to record succinctly the most significant events in the first 25 years of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA). It briefly describes the factors which led to the launching of NAPA in 1967, traces the Academy's evolution through February, 1992, and assesses its impact on government institutions and public administration as a profession. Major issues and challenges faced by NAPA over the years are noted, as well as current opportunities and problems.

The concept of a public administration academy similar to the National Academy of Sciences arose within the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) in 1963 and led to discussions among three former ASPA presidents: James Webb, Elmer Staats and John Macy, all of them distinguished public servants. The new Academy was established in 1967. During its first 25 years, the Academy grew into a respected source of advice on public management issues. It performed more than 250 studies for about 60 agencies of the Federal government and assisted the U.S. Congress and several State and local governments as well. It also provided informal advice to a wide variety of public and private organizations on numerous management subjects. In 1984, it was chartered by Congress with a wide range of responsibilities:

- evaluating the structure, administration, operation, and program performance of Federal and other governments and government agencies ...;
- foreseeing and examining critical emerging issues in governance, formulating practical approaches to their resolution;
- assessing the effectiveness, structure, administration, and implications for governance of present or proposed public programs, policies and processes ...;
- advising on the relationship of Federal, State, regional, and local governments; increasing ... understanding of requirements and opportunities for sound governance ...; and
- demonstrating ... a commitment to the highest standards of ethics and scholarship.

The charter also gave the Academy an especially important responsibility with respect to the Federal government by stipulating that the Academy “shall, whenever called upon by Congress, or the Federal government, investigate, examine, experiment, and report upon any subject of government” After the charter, the Academy continued to assist Federal agencies on a wide range of challenging tasks, and it experienced an increase in the number of studies for or at the direction of Congress.

In these days when government is under attack from many quarters, and proposals for “reform” abound, the Academy’s ability to perform objective analysis of management problems, and to offer practical solutions, is of greater importance than ever. Both Congress and the Executive have almost-daily need for the expertise of the Academy’s Fellows.

The purpose of this history is to record the accomplishments of the Academy, as well as its disappointments. This is intended to illuminate the Academy's value and potential, to acquaint those not familiar with its work about its capabilities, and to inform interested parties of the public interest benefits that would flow from increased support for Academy activities.

This history was intended to be published around the Academy's 25th anniversary, and to end with the appointment of a new Academy President in February 1992. A draft was completed in November 1992 and was widely circulated for comment. Circumstances prevented the revision of the document to respond to those comments until now. So that readers will not be left in the dark as to what the Academy has been doing during those last five years, there is included as an appendix a list of the studies completed since early 1992. However, no attempt has been made to comment on or evaluate the Academy's work in these recent years.

The author takes full responsibility for the content of the history and the views represented. He has been a Fellow and Senior Fellow since 1968 and served three, non-consecutive terms as a Trustee and three years as Chair of the Board. He has also been active on standing panels as chair or member and has been involved in numerous study projects, either as a panel member or chair, or as a consultant. He chaired the 1976 ad hoc Committee on Evaluation and was a member of the 1985-86 Committee on the Future. Thus, the views presented necessarily reflect his perspective as a participant in many of the events described.

In order to assure a balanced account of the Academy's first 25 years, the author enjoyed the counsel of an Editorial Advisory Group, chaired by Elmer Staats, to which he is indebted. He is likewise indebted to the former presidents, executive directors and board chairs of NAPA for their suggestions and many factual contributions to the paper. Finally, the November 1992 draft history was sent to a number of current and former Academy leaders and was available to all interested Fellows. Twenty or more made comments, some quite extensive. Academy Fellow Herbert Jasper assisted the author in incorporating changes in response to those valuable comments.

The special research assistance rendered by Don Bowen, Roy Crawley, George Esser, George Graham, Jill Martin, Eric Minkoff, Julie Oster, Harold Seidman, Phyllis Shocket, Roger Sperry, Elmer Staats and York Willbern is also gratefully acknowledged.

I. ORIGINS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THE BACKGROUND, 1863-1966

In 1863, President Abraham Lincoln signed legislation chartering a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to honor the nation's outstanding scientists and to serve as a source of scientific advice for the Federal government. The new academy eventually prospered and over the years became an influential factor in addressing the technical and scientific needs of the government and its agencies.

No comparable organization existed in the crucial area of making government more effective before 1967. Why did a century pass before a National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) was launched, and what developments led to its emergence and subsequent growth in size, status and impact? This background needs to be recorded and understood if the Academy is to be fully effective in setting and attaining its goals.

For an academy comparable to NAS or NAPA to be formed and endure, there must first exist a profession or organized field of knowledge capable of producing recognized leaders. The physical and biological sciences met these criteria long before NAS was established. In contrast, the recognition of public administration as a definitive profession with a body of knowledge and skills distinguishable from political science is a relatively recent development.

Woodrow Wilson is often credited with the first published recognition that there was an ongoing activity with associated skills which could be called public administration.¹ In the late 19th century and early 20th, concern with civil service reform, scientific management, municipal research and the professionalization of city management all contributed to interest in how government functions could be so organized and conducted as to enhance efficiency, foster accountability and improve effectiveness in the execution of programs. Scholarly writings such as Gulick and Urwick's Papers on the Science of Administration² began to present systematized concepts and principles designed to facilitate the efficient and ethical conduct of public undertakings.

In 1906, the Bureau of Municipal Research (now the Institute of Public Administration) was formed in New York City and its successes spawned similar non-profit entities in numerous urban centers, as well as the National Institute, organized by Robert S. Brookings, and later merged with the Brookings Institution. In 1924, the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs was established at Syracuse University with William E. Mosher as its first Dean. In 1926, Leonard D. White published the first textbook dealing with governmental administration and administrative processes, Introduction to the Study of Administration.

1 Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration," Political Science Quarterly, June 1887.

2 Gulick, Luther and L. Urwick, eds., "Papers on the Science of Administration," New York; Augustus M. Kelly Publishers, 1937.

The 1930s proved especially prolific in developments contributing to the recognition of public administration as a profession. A prolonged and severe depression undermined public confidence in the capacity of the private sector to bring about economic recovery and led to increased reliance on government and governmental programs to relieve distress, to provide employment and to curb the perceived excesses of private industry and finance.

This decade was marked by the establishment of the Public Administration Clearing House in 1930, the emergence of the 1313 East 60th Street complex in Chicago,³ the report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management (Brownlow Committee)⁴ and, of special significance to the annals of NAPA, the organization of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) in 1939. These events were accompanied by the rise of a group of acknowledged leaders who achieved high levels of respect as practitioners or teachers of public administration.⁵

The formation of ASPA⁶ was the definitive act in bringing to an end the declining focus on public administration accompanying the increasingly-academic orientation of the American Political Science Association. ASPA provided for the first time an open membership organization welcoming all those practitioners, researchers and teachers who wished to concentrate on the improvement of the machinery of government and the systems of management required for the effective discharge of governmental activities. It also provided persons employed by Federal agencies and state and local governments with an alternative to affiliation with the Governmental Research Association, which had been dominated by the municipal research bureaus and was resistant to changes designed to accommodate other elements of the growing public administration community.

ASPA evolved over the years into a large and complex organization. In addition to its annual national conferences, it fostered numerous chapters throughout the country and from its earliest days it also supported a journal, "The Public Administration Review" and other publications and newsletters.

In the 1960s, several events or developments occurred which had a great impact on ASPA,

³ Among the "1313" associations were the International City Managers Association (now the International City/County Management Association), American Municipal Association, Civil Service Assembly, the American Public Works Association, and the Governmental Research Association.

⁴ President's Committee on Administrative Management (1936). In addition to Chairman Louis Brownlow, Charles Merriam and Luther Gulick, served as members.

⁵ E.g., Luther Gulick, Louis Brownlow, Charles Merriam, William Mosher, Leonard D. White, Donald C. Stone, John M. Pfiffner, and Harold Smith.

⁶ The early presidents of ASPA were all drawn from among the recognized leaders in public administration. These included William Mosher, Louis Brownlow, Harold D. Smith, Luther Gulick and Donald C. Stone.

and which directly or indirectly contributed to the emergence of the Academy and helped determine its early mission, form and relationships.

First, was the decision to relocate the headquarters of ASPA from Chicago to Washington, D.C., a move which was completed in 1964 and brought ASPA closer to the largest center of interest in government administration.

Second, was the consideration in 1963 of a proposal to create within ASPA a special category of members to be called "Society Fellows." To qualify for the status of Society Fellow would require a long period of membership in ASPA and evidence of "substantial contribution" to public administration.

The supporters of the Society Fellow plan visualized the formation of a membership category composed of a relatively small number of leaders in the profession who could undertake activities which the larger, general membership organization could not carry out on a collegial basis. The plan was resisted by some National Council members who regarded it as "elitist" and others who feared that deciding which members had made a "substantial contribution" would be difficult and lead to dissension. After long debate, a watered-down plan for "senior members" was approved, and the possibility that something like NAPA might have emerged in 1963 disappeared.⁷

Third, was James E. Webb's increasing involvement in and support⁸ of ASPA, culminating in his election as President in late 1966.

Fourth, were the significant changes in the nature of ASPA leadership, and the size and composition of the National Council, together with the introduction of position-taking on issues seen as important to public administration. A "New Public Administration" movement became influential in ASPA and frictions developed between advocates of that movement and many of the established leaders of the profession.

⁷ The ASPA minutes for the 1960-1969 council meetings have disappeared. References to this proposal appear in Darrell Pugh's 1988 history of ASPA, "Looking Back - Moving Forward:" (p. 64) and in notes provided by Don Bowen.

⁸ Webb, among other things, provided ASPA with the house which became ASPA's Washington headquarters building in 1964.

Fifth, was concern that the program of the Council of Graduate Education for Public Administration (CGEPA) had not evolved to include accreditation. For awhile, it was hoped that a new public administration academy, as an independent and objective body, might take on accreditation of graduate programs in public administration.⁹

The stage had now been set for a national academy of public administration to emerge as an important contributor to the effort to improve management in a public sector which had been expanding to meet the needs of a growing and increasingly urban population and a more complex economy.

⁹ Eventually, that function was assumed by a new National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration which succeeded CGEPA.

II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION; 1966-1970

In 1965, James E. Webb, then Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and former ASPA presidents Elmer Staats and John Macy, began a series of discussions about establishing a new public administration entity along the lines of the National Academy of Sciences.

In his post as NASA Administrator, James Webb had been favorably impressed by his success in getting helpful advice from NAS committees on technical and scientific questions relating to the nation's space program. In matters involving agency management, Webb had found no comparable institution. He had drawn on a number of private consulting firms for help in organizing and administering his rapidly expanding agency, but he was not fully satisfied with the results and saw an urgent need for a "trusted source" of senior advice and assistance. That is, he wanted a group of persons experienced in public management from whom he could quickly secure assessments and recommendations on urgent management problems confronting him in the conduct of the space program.

Because of his knowledge of and involvement in ASPA, Webb preferred that it take the lead in arranging for some mechanism that could render advice to public agencies under contract or in return for standard consultant fees.¹⁰ At first Webb made little progress in winning acceptance of his proposal. Other pressures on ASPA, including financial, recollections of the defeat of the "Society Fellow" proposals, and the continuing fear in the ASPA National Council of an "elitist" affiliate, delayed the decision to proceed with the formation of an academy.

Upon assuming the presidency of ASPA in late 1966, Webb found himself in a stronger position to advance the establishment of the public administration equivalent of NAS. In November 1966, Webb persuaded the ASPA council to accept his concept in principle and to endorse the establishment of a "Public Administration Advisory Council."

The establishment of the new advisory council now became the province of the past presidents of ASPA, and they unanimously endorsed the establishment of a new organization along the lines suggested by Webb. It would initially consist of the past presidents of ASPA, who would decide at a later time on the addition of new members and the criteria and procedures for their selection.

¹⁰ *Vide.* letter from James E. Webb to former presidents of ASPA and minutes of the meeting of past ASPA presidents, March 28, 1967.

At this time, substitution of the name "National Academy of Public Administration," which was favored by Webb, for the previously used term of Public Administration Advisory Council took place.¹¹ It was still contemplated that the academy would "be clearly a part of ASPA." On March 30, 1967, the ASPA National Council endorsed the plans for an academy and agreed on the name National Academy of Public Administration. Dr. John D. Millett, a former ASPA president and Chancellor of Miami University of Ohio, was named the first chairman, and a seven member executive committee was selected to assist in getting the Academy organized and underway. At this point NAPA's only members were the past ASPA presidents.

Millett, working closely with ASPA's Executive Director Don Bowen, moved quickly to get the new Academy organized. On June 15, 1967, the first bylaws were approved by the membership. A search for a NAPA Executive Director was also launched and discussions with Webb were initiated on a proposal for a contract with NASA. The first membership meeting was held in Washington, D.C. on September 15-16, 1967. Millett was elected Chairman, and the members voted to expand the membership to 52 persons.

The next task was to make the new academy a fully operational organization. Although it was a "constituent part of the American Society for Public Administration," it was intended from the outset that NAPA would have an executive director, professional and support staff and its own sources of financial support. In October 1967, active operations got under way when George A. Graham (later a Fellow)¹² left the post of Director of Governmental Studies at the Brookings Institution to become the Academy's first Executive Director.

Graham turned to the task of staffing the new organization and getting its first studies under way with great energy. His success in quickly converting a concept into a going concern was greatly aided by the strong and imaginative leadership of Chairman Millett, by the enthusiastic support of the charter members, and by Webb's ability to assure contracts with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

James Webb stands out as the undisputed father of NAPA. With the help of others (especially Elmer Staats), he proposed the idea. While ASPA president and immediate past president, he persuaded a hesitant ASPA Council to sponsor the creation of an academy, and he provided the fledgling organization with substantial initial financial support in his capacity as NASA Administrator. It is truly remarkable that one person could have had such an impact on the concept, launching, funding and program of what has become a major force in the public administration

11 Past presidents' minutes, *Ibid.*

12 When persons are mentioned for the first time, it will be indicated if they were or later became Fellows, unless the context makes that unnecessary. The term "Fellows" will normally be used, hereafter, even though it was not substituted for "members" until a 1988 bylaw amendment.

world. His General Counsel and later a Fellow, Paul Dembling, developed the rationale to justify NASA's support of work done by the Academy.

Seven aspects of NAPA's evolution and relationships during its years as a semi-autonomous constituent of ASPA deserve recounting, namely: (1) governance, (2) panels, (3) finance, (4) membership, (5) program and projects (6) relationships with ASPA and (7) staffing. These are addressed in the following paragraphs.

Governance

It was obvious to Webb and the other founders that a national academy of public administration would be little more than a concept or an honorary society without a dedicated staff and a governing council. Once George Graham entered on duty as executive director, NAPA moved quickly from an idea to a functioning organization. Utilizing funds from an initial NASA contract and several foundation grants, Graham found the means to build an initial staff of several professionals and support personnel.¹³

The initial governance structure of past ASPA presidents, a chairman and an executive committee was soon replaced by sophisticated arrangements set forth in bylaws approved by the membership on June 15, 1967. These bylaws described the new entity as the "National Academy of Public Administration of the American Society for Public Administration."

The Academy was provided with a Chairman to be elected at the annual meeting or by mail ballot for a one year term, with eligibility for reelection. It is interesting that nominations for Chairman were to be made by a committee consisting of the three most recent presidents of ASPA who were also members of the Academy. The Chairman was given broad powers, including the appointment of committees and ad hoc panels. With the consent of the Executive Committee, he was also authorized to appoint, and if necessary remove, the Executive Director.

The governing board was the Executive Committee, which consisted of the Chairman and six other members of the Academy appointed by the Chairman, with the approval of the members, for three year terms. Executive committee members could be reappointed without limitation. They were empowered to act for the membership between meetings and were charged with approving all contracts or expenditures in excess of \$25,000.

At this stage in the evolution of NAPA, much of the governance was in the hands of the full membership. This was not all that surprising since there were initially only 20 ASPA presidents (19 former plus the current one) and the total membership did not reach 100 until December 1968.¹⁴

¹³ By October 1970, there were 12 full-time and four part-time professional staff members, including Assistant Executive Director Roy W. Crawley.

¹⁴ Of this number, 40 were still Fellows or Senior Fellows in February 1992.

ASPA's Executive Director, Don Bowen, and NAPA's first Executive Director, George Graham, were among the first to be added to the group of ASPA presidents as Fellows.

Although at this time NAPA occupied ASPA space and relied on the parent society for a variety of administrative services, in program matters it was autonomous.¹⁵ As described later, the initial staff proved capable of launching and supporting a surprising variety of undertakings for a fledgling organization.

Panels

The organizers of the Academy envisioned that it could make a unique contribution to the solution of problems of public management by calling on the expertise of the Fellows. Almost immediately, there developed a division of labor between the project panels (which, as in the NAS, were usually composed of a group of Fellows who were responsible for the conduct of studies) and the Executive Director (later, President) and staff, who provided research and drafting support. With some variations, this has characterized the work of NAPA over the years.

Since panel members were often busy persons and were expected to make only limited commitments of time to any given project, it fell upon the staff to arrange panel meetings, to assemble needed data and, in most cases, to prepare the drafts of the panel's report following the guidance of panel members provided during panel meetings or otherwise. The responsibility for the findings, conclusions, and recommendations set forth in the final report was that of the panel. Staff were to reflect faithfully panel decisions in the record of panel meetings and in the review of successive report drafts.

The Executive Director was expected to seek appropriate projects, to assure adequate financing, to assist the chairman in appointing panels, to assure that the panels were provided adequate staff support and to give any other needed assistance to panel chairs and members. The final product was, however, that of the panel, not that of the Executive Director or of the Academy as a whole.

Financing the Academy

¹⁵ The original NAPA bylaws, dated June 15, 1967, stated that "the substantive work of the Academy will be performed independently of the Society."

When George Graham was initially approached to accept appointment as NAPA's first Executive Director, he responded by saying: "It's a wonderful idea. When you have a \$5 million endowment in hand, come back and I will consider it." Although Graham eventually relented on this condition, his initial response was consistent with the widespread hope of the founders that NAPA could be launched with a substantial endowment. The Ford Foundation, which had made generous grants to the Brookings Institution and had helped ASPA, was seen as a possible source of initial funding; but this hope was dashed when Ford declined to provide a grant to establish a general purpose endowment.¹⁶

The support of Webb now became the *sine qua non* for providing the new academy with initial financing. Since he had pushed for an academy as a source of advice to NASA officials, on August 1, 1967 as NASA Administrator, he entered into a contract totaling \$675,000 for general support of the Academy and for the provision of help to NASA in matters relating to organization, international affairs, and university activities. Several other contracts for specific projects followed, as did some more limited and specifically targeted foundation awards. Together, they served to provide the funding for an active and diverse NAPA program during its early years.

The rapid growth of the Academy in fiscal terms is clearly revealed by the expenditures in the first three years:¹⁷

Year	Program Funds	ASPA for Services	Total
1967 (3 months)	\$ 27,401.45	\$ 4,799.60	\$ 32,201.05
1968	190,007.66	31,167.34	221,175.00
1969	383,507.52	92,022.57	476,130.09

Membership

The initial bylaws of NAPA provided that all former ASPA presidents who were willing and able to serve would be Academy members. For any other person to be elected, one or more of the following criteria had to be met: (1) substantial scholarly contributions to public administration, (2) significant administrative experience with evidence of sufficiently broad interests, (3) demonstrated concern for the advancement of public administration and evidence of desire to contribute to it and

¹⁶ In July 1969, the Sloan Foundation provided a \$50,000 grant for the "general development" of the Academy. Ordinarily, foundations give grants for projects that fit their objectives, rather than for general support.

¹⁷ Millett, John D., "History of the National Academy of Public Administration: 1967-1970," unpublished paper, p.11.

(4) willingness and ability to contribute to the Academy.

The bylaws also provided for a category of honorary membership for otherwise qualified persons who had retired or attained the age of 70.

As of May 1, 1970, the number of Fellows was 105. Of these, approximately one-third were from academic institutions, one-third from the Federal government, and one-third from state or local government or private sector organizations. Fifteen members were under 45, 57 were between 45 and 60, and 33 were over 60.

Except for the 20 ASPA presidents, all subsequent members were chosen through a nomination process and an election in which all the current members participated. Although the details have changed from time to time, the election process has remained essentially the same. It starts with a call to the Fellows for proposed nominees, screening of those proposed by a nominating committee composed of Fellows, and election by the Fellows of a number set by the board from among those nominated by the committee. In 1970, the Academy decided that the number of persons elected to membership should not exceed 12 annually.

It is also noteworthy that in this early period one finds little evidence of friction between academics and practitioners or between members with primarily Federal government experience and those from State and local governments. There was a shared desire to see to it that a national academy of public administration was established, and that it would become an influential factor in the public administration community. George Graham has indicated, however, that even at this early date a few members expressed concern over the Academy's becoming a "job shop," completely dependent upon contracts with government agencies.¹⁸ Since those voicing these worries were unable to produce alternative sources of financing, their admonitions had little effect at the time. Years later, the debate over contract-generated projects versus Academy-initiated studies of priority, public administration issues resurfaced in the deliberations of the Committee on the Future.¹⁹

Program and Projects; 1967-1970

From the outset, the Academy not only responded to requests from agencies such as NASA and the Congress for assistance, but also sought to identify problem areas in which it could effectively seek solutions. By 1970, the areas of urban affairs, environmental affairs, human resources programs and international development had been targeted as warranting NAPA's attention. Several management areas were also identified as being of high interest to the Fellows, including federalism and machinery of government, organization and management processes, and

¹⁸ Letter to Scott Fosler, August 16, 1992, p.1.

¹⁹ Report of the Committee on the Future, NAPA, Oct. 31, 1986, pp. 1-4.

education and training for public administration.²⁰

²⁰ Millett, *op. cit.*, pp.7-8.

Most of the substantive work of the Academy was carried out through specific projects and by April 1970 the new organization had been involved in 25 separate undertakings.²¹ These projects were quite diverse and were financed by contracts or grants with or involving such entities as the Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, NASA, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Transportation, the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

Thus, utilizing both contracts and grants, NAPA pursued problems involving agencies of the Federal government, education for public administration, cities, functioning of the Federal system, and government of a commonwealth. It also responded to the requests of committees of Congress, an example being the preparation of a report for a subcommittee of the U.S. House Committee on Science and Astronautics on the subject of technology assessment.

An interesting early effort of the Academy which has had a continuing impact on public administration was funded through a 1968 grant of \$80,000 from the Ford Foundation. The purpose was to support the writing of a book dealing with the Federal government's experience with government reorganization. It was to be written by Fellow Harold Seidman, who had recently served as the Bureau of the Budget's assistant director in charge of organization and management and who became the Academy's only instance of a foundation-funded scholar/practitioner in residence. The product of this unique effort was the book, Politics, Position and Power: The Dynamics of Federal Organization, which has since gone through four editions and is widely used in teaching and as a reference.²²

In addition to studies with written reports, in this early period NAPA also sponsored a number of conferences and colloquia and conducted an orientation program for the new political officials of the Department of Transportation after the inauguration of President Nixon in 1969.

Relationships with ASPA

Part I has reported the reasons why the Academy was originally organized by the participating past presidents of ASPA as a "constituent part of the American Society for Public Administration." Thus, for somewhat more than three years, NAPA had no separate corporate identity and was dependent upon ASPA for a variety of reimbursable administrative services, including office space.

It is rarely easy for an organization with a distinctive membership, its own governing board, and autonomy in program matters to live harmoniously with another entity from which it receives

²¹ Millet, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

²² Oxford University Press, 1970 (fifth edition forthcoming in 1997).

administrative support for which it is expected to pay. This proved to be the case for NAPA and ASPA. In spite of the important role played by ASPA executive director Don Bowen (later a Fellow) in organizing the Academy and in recruiting George Graham, tensions soon arose over the cost of services and the fact that contracts and grants intended for the Academy were made to ASPA as the corporate parent.

ASPA's difficult financial condition was exacerbated by the move of both ASPA and NAPA to 1225 Connecticut Avenue NW, in Washington, where the new office space proved to be more expensive than was expected. This aggravated the friction between the two and led to a conclusion by NAPA's executive director, George Graham, and its executive committee, as he recalled it in 1992:

The question was, should the Academy be independent or simply an adjunct of ASPA? No action was taken until it became apparent that ASPA was absorbing all the overhead on Academy contracts and grants ASPA was not a supporting host to the Academy. The Academy was supporting ASPA.²³

On the other hand, there were persons concerned with the governance of ASPA who believed that ASPA was subsidizing NAPA. They, too, soon came to believe that separation was desirable.

Passage of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 became another factor in convincing the NAPA leadership that the Academy should establish its own legal identity. There was a fear that the restrictive provisions of the legislation might endanger the tax exempt status of grants unless the Academy qualified as a separate entity.

Important in convincing a majority of Academy members to seek a separate corporation was the rise in ASPA after the Philadelphia national conference in 1970 of new leaders critical of the established public administration so strongly represented in NAPA.

Both Don Bowen and George Graham have expressed the view that an eventual separation was inevitable. Indeed, in a history of the Academy's first three years by its first board chair, John Millett, he states that "An early memorandum made it clear that this initial working relationship [between ASPA and NAPA] would continue only until the Academy was ready to obtain a separate legal existence as a non-profit corporation."²⁴

23 Letter to Scott Fosler, August 26, 1992, p. 2.

24 Millett, *op. cit.*, p. 12

Nevertheless, the achievement of separate corporate status by NAPA was opposed by many members of the ASPA National Council. NAPA leadership tried to negotiate terms of separation acceptable to ASPA and agreed to a monetary contribution²⁵ as part of a kind of “separation agreement” between the two entities, and in order to ease the transition. The Academy became an independent corporation, as did its affiliate, the National Academy of Public Administration Foundation, on December 31, 1970, but the process was to leave a residue of ill-feeling between the organizations.

Also important to ASPA-NAPA relationships was the increasing tendency of NAPA members to drop affiliation with ASPA. Some new Academy members were not active in ASPA and had no intention of joining the society. Some ASPA presidents were not members of NAPA at the time of their election and several were never admitted to the Academy. Thus, serving as an ASPA president ceased to be an assured route to NAPA membership.

Academy Staff

During this first three years of work, the Academy’s staff grew to 12 full-time and four part-time professional staff. Roy W. Crawley (later a Fellow) joined the staff in October 1967, and soon was named Assistant Executive Director. (He succeeded Graham as Executive Director in 1972.)

In this period, the Executive Director sometimes worked on projects until they were staffed and underway. He was chiefly involved in securing contracts and grants and in organizing staff support for projects. From the outset, Fellows (then called “members”) reviewed, revised and approved the research and drafting work of the staff. Thus, the practice of panels composed primarily of Fellows to conduct studies, with the support of staff, became the typical *modus operandi* of the Academy.

²⁵ NAPA's 1971 Annual Report shows \$15,000 as a "contribution to [reducing] 1970 ASPA deficit." This sum was contributed to NAPA by Fellows and staff in order to make possible a settlement with ASPA.

III. NAPA INCORPORATES: THE MIDDLE YEARS, 1970-1984

This chapter traces the further evolution of the Academy from its emergence as an independent corporation at the end of 1970 through its chartering by Congress in April 1984.²⁶ This period witnessed the further development of an increasingly influential collegial organization. Although, as will be noted in the following pages, this period was not without problems and financial difficulties, the Academy demonstrated that it had a continuing role to play in advancing the quality of public management in the United States. It was so successful in winning the respect of executive branch officials and of influential committees of the Congress that it became possible for it to achieve what James Webb so ardently desired - a statutory charter and mission equivalent to that of the National Academy of Sciences.

By the end of 1971, the Academy had acquired many of the characteristics which are evident today. The growth in membership continued, with the number of Fellows reaching 129 during the year. There were also eight honorary and three emeritus members.²⁷

The practice of holding two meetings of the entire membership each year was now firmly established. These were always held in Washington, D.C., for awhile at the Dupont Plaza Hotel and later at the Army Navy Club. As is still the case, the November meeting was the "Annual Meeting" and included both substantive discussions and the transaction of NAPA business. The 1971 Spring meeting was devoted primarily to considering President Nixon's departmental reorganization program with Fellow Dwight Ink and the writer explaining the complex proposal to replace seven existing Federal executive departments with four "super-departments."

Organization and Governance

The legal structure of the Academy was made more complex by a division, largely for tax purposes, into the National Academy of Public Administration and an incorporated National Academy of Public Administration Foundation, which became the operating arm of the organization. (Having the Foundation serve as the Academy's operating arm has led to confusion since, in other organizations, a foundation is often established as a tax-exempt affiliate which is involved primarily in fund raising and grant making.)

The Academy and the Foundation were governed by a common board of trustees with nine members.²⁸ Separate financial statements were required by this arrangement, but most funds were received by and expended through the Foundation.

²⁶ P.L. 98-257, approved April 10, 1984.

²⁷ The emeritus category was created by a 1971 bylaw change.

²⁸ The number of trustees was increased from seven to nine in 1971 through an amendment to the bylaws. In 1978, the number was again increased -- this time to fifteen.

In February 1977, the Board of Trustees held its first two-day retreat at the urging of President George Esser. This meeting at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, enabled the Board, the President and key staff to give sustained attention to matters of both program and NAPA management. All participants concluded that an annual retreat was a desirable practice, and this practice has remained an important aid to the board in carrying out its functions.

During the pre-charter years, the leadership of the Academy was provided by several chairmen and executive directors (later presidents.)²⁹ The chairmen were five in number: John D. Millett (1967-1973), James A. Norton (1973-1974), Frederic N. Cleaveland (1974-1978), Alan L. Dean (1978-1981), and Phillip S. Hughes (1981-1985).

The staff chiefs were: executive directors George A. Graham (1967-1972) and Roy W. Crawley (1972-1976); and presidents: George H. Esser (1976-1982), and J. Jackson Walter (1982-1985).

Continuity in leadership was aided by the practice of reelecting chairmen instead of rotating the post among trustees. There was also considerable stability in the key positions of executive director and president. The advancement of Roy Crawley from the assistant director position to succeed George Graham when he resigned was especially helpful in maintaining momentum during the Academy's first decade.

The National Institute of Public Affairs: Missed Opportunities

The Academy acquired an affiliate on January 1, 1971, when the theretofore independent, but financially-troubled, National Institute of Public Affairs (NIPA) was placed under a board, the majority of whose members were NAPA trustees. Board chair John D. Millett became the chairman of the new NIPA board. NIPA staff moved physically to the Academy's offices, which were then located at 1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., in Washington, D.C.

At the time of affiliation, NIPA had been carrying on three principal programs, chiefly funded by successive grants from the Ford Foundation. These were (1) industry-government seminars, (2) urban affairs conferences for Federal officials and (3) executive officers group conferences for the assistant secretaries for administration (or equivalent officials) of the executive departments and large independent agencies.

Unfortunately, at the time of affiliation, NIPA remained dependent upon foundation grants if it was to continue its activities at the 1970 level. Such assistance was not forthcoming. These financial constraints resulted in transfer of the industry-government seminars to the Advanced Study Program of the Brookings Institution, where they were successfully continued under the direction of Fellow James Mitchell.

²⁹ The title of Executive Director was changed to President by a bylaw change in 1977.

The urban affairs conferences were successfully placed on a self-supporting basis after an increase in the fees. As of the end of 1971, this was the only surviving NIPA program. Once again the inability of the Academy to secure timely and adequate help from foundations resulted in the curtailment of those activities which could not be supported by fees or contracts. Many opportunities for useful interchanges by NAPA Fellows with private sector managers were lost when neither NIPA nor NAPA was able to continue the industry-government seminars.

NIPA continued to function on a sporadic and limited basis until 1977, when the NAPA Board of Trustees undertook its reactivation, including the development of a new program and the appointment of staff. As a part of this effort, the NIPA Board of Trustees was reconstituted to coincide with the membership of the NAPA board. In May 1978, Enid Beaumont (later a Fellow), who had been the assistant director of the International Personnel Management Association, assumed the post of NIPA executive director. Her appointment ushered in a new era in which a revitalized NIPA became an important contributor to the work and revenues of the Academy.

In 1978, NIPA began administering a program of career development support for presidential management interns under a contract with the Office of Personnel Management. It was also conducting seminars for members of the newly-created Senior Executive Service. In that year, NIPA also offered nine programs for mid-level managers and responded to calls from four agencies for special education programs.

In 1979, NIPA sponsored a new seminar on the "Roles and Management of Government Enterprises." This program was designed to bring together staff and officials of government corporations and related revenue-producing entities. The seminar has been given at least once annually through 1992. Not only is the seminar profitable, but it has encouraged extensive use of the Academy for studies of existing or potential government corporations.³⁰

In May 1982, Enid Beaumont resigned her NIPA post to accept an appointment as Vice President, Academy for State and Local Government. NAPA did not succeed in recruiting a permanent successor of equivalent energy and resourcefulness. There followed several years of short-term incumbents (usually on Intergovernmental Personnel Act assignments) who were unable to restore or even maintain the momentum of the 1978-1982 years. By the end of the pre-charter period (1984), NIPA had lost several of its major programs (e.g., the support of presidential management interns) and was in evident decline. Those seminars which continued to be sponsored became increasingly dependent on the seminar directors for most aspects of their administration.

Standing Committees and Panels

From the beginning, NAPA conducted most of its studies and contract-supported projects

³⁰ E.g., Uranium Enrichment Organization, Tennessee Valley Authority, United States Postal Service, Patent and Trademark Office, Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation, National Technical Information Service, and in 1981, a general study of corporations funded by OMB.

through panels consisting chiefly of Fellows, but with non-Fellows being included when their special expertise or insights were needed on a sustained basis. The panels were usually assisted by the Academy's small number of full-time professional staff or, alternatively, by project directors employed for a specific undertaking. Project panels were dissolved when the task or project was brought to a conclusion.

In 1970 and 1971, a new type of panel or committee emerged as an on-going part of NAPA's way of carrying out its mission, namely, the "standing committee." The first of these was the Standing Committee on Education for Public Administration, established in 1970.

In 1971, the Academy launched five more standing committees. These were concerned with (1) Public Management and Machinery of Government, (2) Human Resources and Public Affairs, (3) Environmental and Resource Management, (4) International and Cross-Cultural Administration and (5) Administration of Justice and Regulatory Administration.

Each of the new committees was headed by a chair appointed by the board chair, who also appointed the members of the committees.³¹ Each committee was concerned on a continuing basis with a designated area of public administration - regardless of whether or not active funded projects were involved.

The NAPA program plan at the time described the role of the standing committees in some detail.³²

1. To serve as a policy council for the Academy in the particular program area.
2. To review and evaluate significant developments in public administration including existing and emerging problems, new ideas and currents of opinion, significant research and needs for research, institutional development, and critical matters in need of attention.
3. To provide general guidance for, and evaluation of, related problem-solving project activities of the Academy.
4. To inform the membership of the Academy of important developments.
5. To initiate or sponsor educational meetings and colloquia to communicate with a wider portion of the public administration community.
6. To prepare reports on the state of the art of public administration and statements on public administration policy for academy consideration, and public release, when judged appropriate.

In spite of the ambitious intent of the NAPA board and leadership and the hard work of some

³¹ Each committee consisted of from 15 to 25 Fellows.

³² Annual Report, NAPA, Sept. 30, 1971, p.14.

chairs and members, the early attempts to make standing committees a major factor in the development of the NAPA program and the identification of projects proved disappointing. Throughout the period under discussion, these committees underwent several reorganizations in an effort to find ways of enhancing their effectiveness.

Three problems can be cited as contributing to the shortfalls in how the early standing committees functioned and what they were able to accomplish. These were:

1. **Infrequency of meetings.** With a couple of exceptions noted below, the standing committees met only at the time of the annual and spring meetings. The semi-annual spacing of meetings made it difficult to maintain momentum or to generate written reports or statements. Many meetings were spent trying to remember what had occurred six months earlier and in general discussion leading to few, if any, tangible conclusions or proposals.

2. **Difficulty in staffing and funding.** Except from 1971 to 1974, when some funds were supplied by the Ford Foundation, the previously-noted lack of a general purpose endowment made it difficult to support the activities of the standing committees. NAPA leadership agreed to the creation of the Standing Committee on International and Cross-Cultural Administration only when the members urging its establishment gave assurances that they would ask for no staff support or otherwise make demands on Academy resources.

3. **Changes in NAPA leadership.** As the Academy underwent changes in executive directors, presidents and board chairs, there were also changes in how the standing committees were regarded. At times the Academy leadership provided support to the panels, but funding constraints often limited the support available. At other times, the President denied them staff support entirely, and downplayed their role in developing programs and projects, and in the agenda of the annual and spring meetings.

When the NAPA leadership offered support for the concept of standing committees or panels, it often sought to reorganize or redefine these groups, with disappointing results, as in 1982.

There was, however, enough evidence that standing committees had the potential to make important contributions to the functioning of the Academy that repeated efforts to improve their effectiveness characterized the period under discussion. Four examples of standing committees that functioned effectively or had significant impacts on public administration can be cited:

1. **Creation of the American Consortium for International Public Administration (ACIPA).** The Standing panel on International and Cross-Cultural Administration took the lead in creating a new United States National Section of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS) when ASPA gave up that role. The NAPA standing panel then undertook to invite a number of non-profit organizations interested in public management to form a new consortium and to restore a United States National Section. The result was the formation of ACIPA, in which NAPA

remains an active participant.

2. **Establishment of an Office of Personnel Management.** In 1975 and 1976, the Standing Committee on Public Management and Machinery of Government had discussed the desirability of replacing the three-member Civil Service Commission established in 1883 with an office headed by a single director. In 1976, a panel subcommittee specifically recommended this change as a part of advice provided to the President Carter transition team by the standing committee's chairman Dwight Ink. When Ink was later placed in charge of the staff preparing the Carter civil service reform proposals, the establishment of an Office of Personnel Management (OPM) became a major feature of the legislation.
3. **Civil Service Reform Implementation.** In December 1978, the Academy set up for a four-year period a standing panel to track the implementation of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. With the assistance of a substantial grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, this panel had ample staff support and met frequently. Its advice was given a friendly reception by OPM Director Alan K. ("Scotty") Campbell and Deputy Director Jule M. Sugarman, both of whom were Fellows.
4. **Departmental Reorganization.** On June 16, 1971, members of the Standing Committee on Public Management and Machinery of Government met with members of the U.S. House Government Operations Committee to discuss President Nixon's departmental reorganization proposals, upon which they were working at OMB. Subsequently, the whole Academy endorsed by resolution this proposed administrative reform - a rare event for NAPA.

Membership

The membership of the Academy grew from 129 in 1971 to 321 in late 1984. By 1984, there were also 25 emeritus members and 12 honorary members.³³

During this period, efforts were made to include in the Academy more Fellows from different parts of the public administration community. The calls for nomination began to include information on the demographics of the NAPA membership, and the Board of Trustees started to give guidance to the nominating committees in the interest of seeking a more diverse membership.

³³ In 1988, the designation "Emeritus" was changed to "Senior" and the designation "Member" was replaced by "Fellow."

Membership data for 1984 reveal some progress in this effort. There was, for example, only one woman (having been elected in 1968) among the 129 Fellows in 1971. In 1984, the number had risen to 32 out of 321.³⁴ The Academy's first minority Fellows were elected in 1969.

The breakdown of the total 1984 membership by predominant public administration activity was:³⁵

	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Federal	94	30%
State/Local	62	19%
Non-profit (University, foundation, etc.)	60	19%
Legislative	12	4%
Judicial	3	1%
Research, Training, and Teaching	64	20%
Other private sector	<u>23</u>	<u>7%</u>
	318	100%

The age distribution in 1984 was:

	<u>No</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Under 40	4	1%
40-49	51	16%
50-59	104	33%
60-64	52	16%
65- and over	107	34%

Of the Fellows, 185 or 58 per cent were from the Mid-Atlantic urban corridor. Of this group, 136 or 43 percent were from the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

³⁴ Other Washington institutions lagged behind the Academy in recognizing women's stature. For example, a new woman Fellow was not allowed to use the main stairway at the Cosmos Club in 1973.

³⁵ Memorandum from National Academy Nominating Committee of 1985, dated April 30, 1985. This total is three less than the 1984 year-end total due to deaths, etc.

It should be noted that many of the Fellows listed under one of the above categories also had experience in others, e.g., many were "pracademics," i.e., teachers who had had, or were now in, jobs as public managers. Others had served in more than one level of government or had moved from the government into the private sector.

As the Academy grew in size, some members, including a majority of the Board of Trustees, began to worry about a loss of the collegial character of the early NAPA. There was also a conviction that a substantial number of Fellows were not really contributing to the work of the Academy.

To help cope with these apprehensions, a bylaw ceiling of 350 Fellows was established in 1983. A change was also made in the bylaws to provide for the election of members for initial five-year terms. Members would be reelected by the Board of Trustees, provided that they had participated in the activities of the Academy during the preceding five years, including by making a contribution of any amount to the Academy's endowment fund. The intent of this bylaw was to provide a simple way of dropping from the fellowship persons having little or no interest in the Academy after election. The criteria for reelecting members proved in practice to be so undemanding that this reform failed to accomplish its purpose. The reelection provision was, therefore, repealed in 1988.

The bylaws were also amended to provide that Fellows elected should not attain that status until "...the first annual or special meeting of the membership at which they are present" (underlining supplied).³⁶ This requirement was to insure that no person elected could become a full-fledged Fellow without showing up at a general membership meeting. In spite of its status as a bylaw (and the recommendation of the Committee on the Future that it be strictly enforced), this provision has not been applied and lists of elected Fellows are released which include the names of individuals who have never been present at a membership meeting.³⁷

Finance

The financial fortunes of the Academy during the years before the enactment of the charter ranged from reasonably satisfactory to near disastrous.

Throughout this period, NAPA depended on several sources of revenue, each of which warrants brief note. These were: (1) member dues, (2) fees from contracts, (3) fees from seminars, (4) gifts and foundation grants and (5) endowment income.

³⁶ Bylaws of the National Academy of Public Administration, Article IV, 2.

³⁷ In 1996, after the period covered by this history, this bylaw provision was enforced for the first time.

1. **Dues.** The 1971 annual report shows that membership dues provided a total of \$2,425³⁸ of the \$351,000 in funds received by NAPA and the NAPA Foundation. This source of financing clearly did little to meet the financial needs of an active organization with a complex program.

As the years passed, the dues obligation became more useful as a way of weeding out uninterested Fellows than as a source of income. A provision was incorporated in the bylaws that any member who was three years in arrears and did not make payment after due notice would be considered to have resigned from the Academy.

2. **Revenues from contracts.** From the first days of NAPA, and the failure of efforts to secure substantial foundation support for its general development, the Academy has relied on fees from study contracts as its primary source of income. As indicated earlier, it would not have been possible for the early NAPA to carry out an active program had it not been for the initial contract with NASA.

Throughout this period, the income from contracts (chiefly with Federal agencies) provided 90 per cent or more of the total revenues of the Academy. When agency payments were delayed, as they often were, the Academy was forced to delay its payments to vendors and consultants. The Academy became current on paying its obligations by 1978, but by 1980 there was a sharp decline in contracts which caused a need to cut back on staff and to eliminate support for Fellows to attend meetings in Washington.

3. **Fees from seminars.** During the period that NIPA served as the educational arm of the Academy, seminars were supported by fees paid by the agencies whose employees were registrants. NIPA activities produced surpluses from 1978 to 1982. During 1980-1982, NIPA income played a significant role in assuring NAPA's financial solvency. When NIPA went into a decline after the departure of Enid Beaumont, this affiliate became more of a drain on NAPA resources than a generator of income.

4. **Gifts and foundation grants.** During the years preceding the congressional charter, the Academy received numerous grants from foundations. Some, such as the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant in 1978, were substantial and made possible major NAPA undertakings. Most were more modest in size and given for limited purposes. Their unpredictability made it difficult for the Academy to rely on the foundations as sources of financing.

5. **Endowment income.** In 1975, Melbourne Spector was serving as a "development officer" for the Academy, assisting Fellow Robert Nathan. Working with Jack Harr, a personal assistant to John D. Rockefeller, III, Spector arranged a meeting between Rockefeller and Nathan.

³⁸ The dues were initially set at \$40 annually; they were raised to \$50 in 1977 and to \$75 in 1983.

That led to the a gift of about \$25,000 in Standard Oil stock to the endowment fund which NAPA formally established in 1976. A Committee on Financial Development chaired by Nathan was also appointed and charged with raising funds from both Fellows and outside sources for inclusion in the endowment. By September 30, 1976, \$52,532 had been collected in the form of contributions by 76 Fellows and friends of the Academy. From little acorns great oaks grow, and this proved to be the case with the NAPA endowment.

In 1983, the James E. Webb Fund for Excellence in Public Administration was established in honor of James Webb who had done so much to assist the Academy. A request for a grant from the Kerr Foundation to launch this fund was made by Elmer Staats, who was a member of the foundation's Board of Trustees and a long time associate of Webb. The initial Kerr Foundation grant of \$500,000 was made on a five-to-one matching basis, but was later changed to three-to-one.

Staats took the lead in contacting other potential donors to meet the matching requirement and generally to assist in the endowment effort. He gained contributions from a number of sources, most notably from Sydney (Jim) Stein (later an Honorary Fellow), and three foundations: Gannett, Kerr-McGee, and McKnight. James Webb had previously worked with Senator Robert Kerr (D-OK) in a variety of endeavors and had been a member of the Board of Trustees of the Kerr Foundation. By 1984 the total endowment had reached \$1,162,000. Honorary Fellow Robert S. Kerr, Jr., President of the Kerr Foundation, has continued to be a strong supporter of the Academy.

In 1980, the National Academy encountered the most serious financial crisis in its history. The origins of this near disaster were several, and they taught the then-board and President a number of lessons of enduring application to the affairs of NAPA.

The **first** contributor was a defective accounting and budget monitoring system. Among other things, the Academy was carrying on its books several hundred thousand dollars as accounts receivable that proved to be invalid because (as noted below) there had been no commitment from the presumed funding source. George Esser, who was then president, lists the accounting deficiencies as an area to which he, in retrospect, should have devoted more attention.³⁹

The **second** was the buildup of overhead, chiefly in the form of a permanent professional staff that was not easily subject to adjustments to fit variations in project workload and income. Only when most of this staff was removed from the status of full-time employees with fringe benefits, and when greater reliance was placed on the recruitment of ad hoc project directors, did the Academy's overhead reach a level where it could be supported.

The **third** factor was the completion of several major Federal contracts. With the uncertainties which often mark the end of the term of an embattled President (in this instance Jimmy Carter) replacement projects proved scarce while institutional operating costs remained high.

³⁹ Letter to Scott Fosler and Alan Dean, September 10, 1992, p. 4.

A **fourth** and major contributor to the 1980 difficulties was an ambitious study of the presidency.⁴⁰ This project had no Federal contract support and depended on gifts by Jim Stein, and donations or grants by other individuals and foundations. Unfortunately, George Esser understood (it proved incorrectly) that Stein's commitment was open-ended. The costs associated with a large panel which held several meetings in expensive hotels and which involved considerable travel, together with the support of a large project staff engaged in preparing papers for panel consideration, ran far over the funds available or pledged.

The lack of good accounts, and divided responsibility for the project budget, allowed an overrun of several hundred thousand dollars which consumed all NAPA's available funds, all current endowment income, and exhausted its line of credit. Moreover, the corpus of the endowment, itself, was borrowed to meet expenses.

When, late in the course of the presidency project, the seriousness of the drain on Academy resources was realized (payroll and other current obligations could not be met), the board's executive committee directed that all outlays be curtailed except those required for the panel to complete its work and print its report. The professional staff of the Academy also incurred a 10% reduction in salary. These actions, together with an additional contribution of \$50,000 from Jim Stein, alleviated the immediate financial crisis and allowed the Academy's doors to remain open.

There was also an excellent fund raising effort led by Robert Nathan and Bernard L. Gladioux of the Committee on Financial Development. That and the fortunate timing of three major study contacts enabled the Academy to bring the budget into near balance by the end of the 1980 fiscal year.⁴¹ The endowment loans, however, were not repaid for several years.

The principal lessons learned involve: the importance of current and reliable accounting information, the need to have assured funding before committing significant resources to a project; and the necessity to monitor and restrict expenditures so that they do not unintentionally exceed available funds.

Program And Projects; 1970-1984

The separation from ASPA had little immediate substantive impact on the program of the Academy. During the years from 1971 to the passage of the 1984 Federal charter legislation, there was, however, a steady growth in the diversity and scale of the projects and activities conducted or sponsored by NAPA. As previously indicated, most of the work during this period was performed under contract with Federal agencies, but there were a number of important undertakings supported

⁴⁰ A Presidency for the 1980's, NAPA, 1980, 56 pp.

⁴¹ NAPA Annual Report: 1980, pp. 4, 12.

by foundations or gifts by individuals.

Certain of the studies and initiatives of the Academy during the period under discussion have been cited by former chairmen, executive directors and presidents as of special significance and as warranting mention in any history of the Academy. Several are described in the following pages:

1. Continuing assistance to NASA. Over the years the Academy has done more work for and with NASA than any other government agency. The initial support provided by Jim Webb to launch the Academy continued on a sustained basis through 1977, when studies of space technology transfer and the NASA Space Transportation Systems were completed. When Fellow James Beggs became the NASA Administrator in 1981, the utilization of NAPA for a variety of studies was resumed. It thus came to pass that NAPA's role as a "trusted source" of management advice for NASA, as envisaged by James Webb, has endured through most of the 25 years of the Academy's existence.

2. Institute for Court Management. As early as 1970, the Academy became involved in advising on the management of the U.S. court system. In that year an advisory panel chaired by Frederic Cleaveland was established to provide assistance to the American Bar Association in establishing the Institute for Court Management at Snowmass near Aspen, Colorado. A NAPA task force, supported by American Bar Association Foundation funds, then assisted in designing a training program to develop qualified court administrators.

3. Metropolitan government. In May 1972, under a contract funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, NAPA launched a four-year study of the feasibility of two-tier local government in the metropolitan areas of Denver, Colorado; Portland, Oregon; Rochester, New York; and Tampa, Florida. This proved to be the most intensive examination of institutions at the state and local level ever conducted by the Academy, yet it was financed entirely by Federal funds. Panels of citizens and local government officials, rather than Fellows, were set up in each metropolitan area to spearhead the studies.

The project produced proposals for area-wide urban governments, which were tailored to the needs of the individual metropolitan regions but preserved the local governments already in existence. As so often happens, these proposed reforms encountered strong resistance from defenders of the status quo, and no significant action was taken in three of the four metropolitan areas studied. There was, however, one notable and enduring success. The local governments and voters of the Portland, Oregon urban region established a new metropolitan service district, which has over the years assumed responsibility for several important functions having a metropolitan-wide application.

4. Watergate: Implications for Responsible Government. On October 5, 1973, Senator Sam Ervin, Jr., chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, requested NAPA assistance in helping the committee identify the major implications for the governmental system of the facts disclosed by the Watergate hearings. A report titled Watergate:

Implications for Responsible Government was written under severe time constraints by a 12-member panel chaired by Fritz Mosher.

The report covered such topics as the President, White House and executive office, the chief executive and the executive branch, the Attorney General and Department of Justice, the public service, executive privilege, campaign financing, congressional oversight, the presidency and the judiciary, and ethics in public office. Senator Ervin stated that the "committee benefited a great deal" from the Academy effort and urged that the report be given wide readership. The report was published as a book in 1974.⁴²

5. Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. Aided by a Ford Foundation grant in 1977, at the request of the Secretary of Florida's new Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, the Academy undertook an independent evaluation of effectiveness of a two-year old reorganization in advancing "services integration" in the human resources area. The panel report Reorganization in Florida: How Is Services Integration Working,⁴³ concluded that the "reorganization laid a sound organizational basis for services integration," but it identified several staffing and management deficiencies in need of correction.

6. Administrative History of the United States Railway Association. In 1977, the United States Railway Association (USRA) requested NAPA to undertake an administrative history of the independent Federal corporation charged with reorganizing six bankrupt northeastern railroads and creating a new Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail). The 749 page report⁴⁴ issued in March 1978 documented in detail the way in which USRA functioned in the successful effort to rationalize and rebuild the deteriorated and inefficient freight railroad system of the Northeastern United States.

7. Revitalizing Federal Management. In 1981, the executive departments (with the exception of HUD) and several large independent agencies (including EPA, VA and NASA), with the endorsement of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), called on NAPA to take a look at the obstacles to effective internal agency management, with special emphasis on the impact of central controls and regulations. The funding for this ambitious and expensive undertaking was provided through an unprecedented (for NAPA) arrangement in which each of the 17 sponsoring departments and agencies contributed to the cost.

⁴² Frederick C. Mosher, ed., Basic Books Inc., New York, 1974.

⁴³ NAPA, 1977, 129 pp.

⁴⁴ NAPA, The Great Railway Crisis: An Administrative History of the United States Railway Association, 1979.

The project was guided by a panel chaired by Dwight Ink and an advisory council of Federal officials chaired by DOT's Assistant Secretary for Administration, Robert L. Fairman (later a Fellow). Fellow Don Wortman served as staff director. The result was the most widely distributed and probably the most influential report ever issued by the Academy: Revitalizing Federal Management: Managers and Their Overburdened Systems.⁴⁵ The report described the adverse impact on Federal managers of centralized systems, controls, and regulations - especially those administered by OMB, OPM and the General Services Administration. It concluded that the cumulative result of the restraints imposed on Federal managers had been a decline in the quality of administration in the executive agencies. The panel also recommended that OMB be converted into primarily a budget agency by the removal of its management functions. These would be placed in a new Office of Federal Management in the Executive Office of the President.

The great interest shown by agencies in the report made it possible for NIPA to launch a series of successful seminars for concerned Federal officials and staff. The seminars were conducted by Fellow Charles F. Bingman, who had played a leading role as a consultant in writing the final panel report on revitalization.

8. Evaluation of the United States Postal Service. In 1981, Postmaster General William Bolger asked the Academy to evaluate how well the U.S. Postal Service had succeeded in carrying out the objectives of the Postal Reorganization Act (PRA) ten years after its passage. That legislation had replaced a politicized and inefficient executive department with a new entity with most of the features of a government corporation.⁴⁶

This study was conducted by a ten-member panel chaired by the writer under a contract totaling in excess of \$500,000. The project director was Fellow Bertrand Harding. On July 1, 1982, the panel released a 226 page report. It concluded that the Postal Reorganization Act was landmark legislation without which postal operations might well have broken down. It also concluded that the Postal Service had accomplished an outstanding implementation of the PRA. The report did, however, identify deficiencies and weakness in several aspects of the legislation and its subsequent implementation, especially in the areas of rate setting, research and development and management information.

⁴⁵ This 66-page report was first issued in 1983, and by 1985 had gone through a third printing.

⁴⁶ P.L. 91-375, enacted in August 1970.

In addition to its scope and impact on the Postal Service this study is noteworthy for the controversy generated within the Academy. Several members, some of whom had held positions in the Postal Service or the Postal Rate Commission, disagreed with certain of the panel's findings and criticized the way in which the panel had conducted its work. The Board of Trustees considered the complaints and on November 1, 1982 appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Quality Control chaired by Trustee Wayne F. Anderson. The committee submitted its report to the board on June 2, 1983, which approved it for distribution to the membership.⁴⁷ Among other things, the committee recommended greater care with respect to defining the scope of proposed studies, and on the methods for carrying them out.

9. A Presidency for the 1980s. This study and report has been mentioned above as a major contributor to the Academy's financial crisis of 1980. It deserves mention at this point because it represents a major effort funded by sources other than the Federal government to address an important area of public management. It also constitutes the first NAPA effort to prepare a document dealing comprehensively with the operation of the presidency as an institution, and the first effort to aid and influence an incoming administration or the second term of a reelected President.⁴⁸

The presidency study is also noteworthy for the impressive credentials of most of the members of the 26-member panel co-chaired by Don K. Price and Rocco C. Siciliano. It was hoped and expected that the high quality and bi-partisan composition of the panel would assure that this report would be seriously regarded by whoever took office as president on January 20, 1981. The project director was Fellow Phillip S. (Sam) Hughes.

It is hard to judge the impact of this kind of study. It was read by top officials of the new Reagan administration and members of the panel met with such influential figures as Edwin Meese (later a Fellow), who was to become a principal adviser to the new President. Yet it is difficult to identify any specific action by President Reagan and his team which could be attributed to the report. One outcome of the project was the publication of a book The Illusion of Presidential Government, edited by Fellows Hugh Hecllo and Lester Salamon, who had served on the project staff.⁴⁹

It is also likely that too much time and money was spent on papers prepared by staff and consultants for use by the panel. In retrospect, there is reason to believe that the panel members were so well informed that they could have completed their work with much less research and at much lower cost. In fact, much of the report drew primarily upon the experience of the panel members and project director.

⁴⁷ Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Quality Control, NAPA, June 2, 1983, 18 pp.

⁴⁸ The report was written before the 1980 election and was released in November 1980.

⁴⁹ Published by Westview Press, 1981.

10. Study of Government Corporations. In December 1980, OMB asked the Academy to undertake a study of Federal government corporations with a view to establishing a set of principles and standards which could enable them to operate effectively, to be more accountable financially, and to be more responsive to policies defined by Congress and the Administration.

This project grew out of rising concern in both OMB and the Academy that the principles which had once guided the creation and use of government corporations were no longer being consistently observed. The emergence of entities such as the United States Synthetic Fuels Corporation, which had functioned poorly, was an important factor in the decision to draw upon the President's Management Improvement Fund to finance a major new look at government corporations and related entities.

The ten member panel, chaired by former Amtrak Controller Robert C. Moot, completed its report in August 1981. It was widely distributed and became one of the few NAPA publications to require reprinting.⁵⁰

The report has also been used as a basic reading in the NAPA seminars on the "Roles and Management of Government Enterprises." It has, therefore, been placed each year in the hands of current or prospective corporation officials, who use it as a reference in seminar case studies and as a guide in looking at the needs and operations of their own agencies.

11. Professional Education for Public Administration. Two companion studies were combined in a 1973 report entitled Meeting the Needs of Tomorrow's Public Service: Guidelines for Professional Education in Public Administration. The first addressed the future needs of the public service and was financed by the Ford Foundation. The second focused on graduate education for public administration and was financed chiefly by NASA, with limited support from the Ford Foundation. The needs study was one of the first efforts to use the Delphi technique in the social sciences, and a distinguished group of 80 academics and practitioners participated. Frederick Cleaveland was panel chair and Executive Director Crawley served as project director. With funding from the Ford Foundation, 2000 copies of the report were printed and distributed to public administration schools, governors, mayors, Members of Congress and Fellows.

Awards

The National Academy has been cautious about involvement in giving awards, other than the recognition involved in the election of outstanding public administrators to membership. During this pre-charter period, however, it did sponsor several award programs.

The Academy first undertook to make awards in 1968, when it established the Brownlow Award to honor annually the author whose book was judged to have contributed most to the

⁵⁰ The last reprint was in 1992, 11 years after initial publication.

literature of public administration. The selection is made by a Brownlow Award Committee. The winners are recognized at the Annual Meeting and are given a certificate attesting to their receiving the award.

When Herbert E. Roback, Staff Director of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Government Operations and an active and influential Fellow, died in 1977, Arline Roback and a group of friends and admirers established the Roback Scholarship Award. This cash award, which grew from an initial \$1,000 to \$3,500, has been given annually to a graduate student pursuing a degree in public administration or public affairs, usually at a Washington, D.C. area university. It is administered by a NAPA committee, and the award is made each year at the Annual Meeting.

In 1982, the National Academy of Public Administration joined with ASPA in sponsoring five annual Public Service Awards to public administration practitioners from all levels of government. This action followed a year's work by a Practitioners Awards Committee established in 1981 under the chairmanship of Elmer Staats. It reflected a consensus in both NAPA and ASPA that a prestigious award program should be established to replace the Rockefeller Awards, which had lapsed with the death of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and the National Civil Service League Awards, which had been discontinued with the demise of the league.

Each year, five persons are chosen by a selection committee composed of from 10 to 15 members appointed jointly by the ASPA President and the NAPA Chairman. The award, which consists of a citation and Steuben crystal ware, is made at the annual meeting of ASPA. Costs are defrayed by the income from a Public Service Awards Fund managed by the NAPA Investment Committee.

Committee on Evaluation

In 1976, as NAPA entered its 10th year, it was decided to take stock of what it had accomplished and where it ought to be heading as an organization. The mechanism for this review was an ad hoc Committee on Evaluation chaired by the writer and supported by Executive Director Roy Crawley and senior staff.

A great deal of work went into this first-decade evaluation, including questionnaires mailed to the chairs of 29 project panels and to the representatives of the agencies supporting these studies. An analysis of responses and other data was provided by staff to the members of the ad hoc committee. Among the findings of the committee were.

1. Both clients and panel chairs indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the Academy's work, but the satisfaction level was higher among clients than among the panel chairs.
2. Although "remarkable progress" had been made in achieving a respected position in the public administration community, the Academy was limited in pursuing

opportunities by its heavy reliance on project funding.

3. The Academy was “hiding its light under a bushel” by not making its products better known.
4. The panel approach to the conduct of projects was successful and was viewed by clients as a major reason for drawing upon the Academy.
5. The NAPA staff was found to be “able and dedicated.”
6. The Academy’s membership size, election procedures, and the problems arising out of the inactivity of some Fellows should be carefully studied.
7. Attention should be devoted to finding ways to make the standing committees more effective.
8. Membership meeting costs should be fully covered by registration fees and the trustees should give serious attention to increasing the membership fees.
9. The executive director and trustees should activate an executive committee of the board as provided for the bylaws.⁵¹

The report of the ad hoc Committee on Evaluation provided the agenda for several subsequent meetings of the Board of Trustees in 1977 and 1978. Specific follow up actions included:

1. Establishment of a three member executive committee composed of board members.
2. Creation of an advisory committee consisting of the chairs of the six standing committees to assist the Board of Trustees in determining “research priorities.”⁵²
3. Appointment of an ad hoc committee to study membership issues and to make recommendations for consideration at the 1978 Spring Meeting.⁵³

⁵¹ Unpublished 1977 Annual Report, p.1 and Minutes of November 1976 meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Evaluation, p. 1.

⁵² The six standing committees in 1977 were (1) Public Management and Machinery of Government; (2) The Public Service; (3) International and Development Administration; (4) Environmental and Resource Management; (5) Human Resources and (6) Administration of Justice and Regulatory Administration.

⁵³ 1977 Annual Report, *op. cit.* p. 3.

4. Appointment of a bylaws revision committee chaired by Roger W. Jones.
5. Increasing the dues of Fellows and restructuring the standing committees.
6. Interviews of approximately 50 Fellows by George Esser.

On May 25 and 26, 1978, the Academy membership held a unique retreat at Marriottsville, Maryland, with an agenda concerned solely with the functioning of the organization as an institution. The retreat was well attended and the members participating demonstrated a high degree of interest in NAPA governance, bylaws, committee structure, nomination procedures for new members, general membership meetings, and other facets of how NAPA functioned. No comparable meeting has subsequently taken place.

Following the Marriottsville retreat, the bylaws committee completed its comprehensive revision of the bylaws that had been adopted in June, 1976 and amended a number of times thereafter. The new bylaws were adopted by the Fellows on May 8, 1979. Among the many provisions in the revision were changes in the composition, nomination and election of Trustees, changes in the new Fellow nomination and election procedures, and a change from the title of Executive Director to President. This new title did not, however, change the authorities or responsibilities of the President whose job was described as “the chief executive officer of the staff of the Corporation”

Strengthening America’s Capacity to Govern

In 1981, with the support of the Board of Trustees, President Esser undertook to set forth the program of the Academy and the mechanisms to carry it out in a publication titled Strengthening America’s Capacity to Govern: The Mission and Work of the National Academy of Public Administration.⁵⁴ The staff work in support of this major effort was under the immediate direction of Fellow Carl F. Stover, who met several times in 1981 with the Board of Trustees to discuss the scope and purpose of the project.

In May 1982, the report was published for distribution to the Fellows. In its 56 pages, it described the challenges to the future of government, set forth the “vision of the Academy,” described how the organization functioned, cited major representative projects and studies carried out by NAPA, presented a future agenda, and described the missions of a reconstituted set of continuing or standing panels.

The new panel structure was depicted as follows:

1. **The Panel on the Management of Governance.** This new panel was to be given an

⁵⁴ NAPA, May 1982, 56 pp.

extremely broad role. Its scope included continuing concern with the executive branch, legislative-executive relationships, the judiciary, regulatory administration, government and the private sector, and government and the citizen.

It was immediately evident that it would require a subcommittee structure and substantial staff support for such a multi-subject panel to function. After a few attempts, the panel chair concluded that, with the limited staff support available, the panel could not be made to work as set forth in the May 1982 document.

2. **The Panel on the Public Service.** This panel's charter included a broadening of the mission of the earlier standing committee charged with monitoring and evaluating the implementation of civil service reform. Its agenda was set forth in language which extended its scope to all matters affecting the quality of the public service.
3. **The Panel on Intergovernmental Systems.** This panel reflected an increased level of Academy interest in the total effectiveness of the Federal system. It was charged with identifying and assessing major issues related to the future workability of the Federal system. It was expected to address such matters as the future of state governments, the restructuring of local government and the advancing of "civic collaboration."
4. **The Panel on International Affairs.** This panel's charter involved chiefly a renaming and redescription of the predecessor Standing Committee on International and Development Administration.

When the time had arrived to implement the proposals set forth in Strengthening America's Capacity to Govern, the Academy's leadership had undergone major changes. Sam Hughes had succeeded the writer as board chair and George Esser had announced his resignation as President. Unlike during previous changes in Academy leadership, this one had a significant impact on a major undertaking of the Academy. During the next two years, the Strengthening America's Capacity to Govern report disappeared from NAPA's agenda. Further, the revised standing panel structure as set forth therein was not implemented.

Academy Staff

As noted earlier, Roy Crawley's succession to George Graham as Executive Director preserved continuity and momentum. Having been Assistant Executive Director, Crawley was thoroughly familiar with the work, staff and Fellows. He continued to be actively engaged in the conduct of studies, and provided support for such important undertakings as the Watergate report for the Senate and the graduate education for public administration report.

After Graham and Crawley, George Esser and Jack Walter served in the chief staff position. While Esser was Executive Director, his title was changed to President through a bylaw amendment.

The full-time professional staff numbered only four to five under Esser. When the board's Executive Committee determined that the overhead burden for full-time staff was too heavy for an organization that was heavily dependent on funding through contracts for time-limited projects, the permanent staff were converted to consultants, to be paid when assigned to funded projects. Thereafter, project staff were recruited for each project as it was contracted, although one of the previous full-time staff members continued to work on a substantial number of the funded projects. Significant efforts were also made in 1979-81 to solicit grants from foundations and corporations, but the returns were modest. As already noted, foundation support proved difficult to achieve except for projects in their areas of interest.

Under Walter, there was a concerted effort to raise funds from sources other than the contracting agencies. A consulting firm was engaged to assist in publicizing the Academy's work with a view toward eliciting additional support from foundations. That effort fell far short of expectations. It was also during Walter's tenure that NIPA had a series of temporary directors, as recounted earlier. Walter also recruited Paul Light (later a Fellow) to a new post as Director of Academy Studies.

IV. THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: THE YEARS SINCE THE CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER, 1984-1992

Since the founders of NAPA had in many ways used the National Academy of Sciences as a prototype, it was to be expected that securing a congressional charter along the lines of that granted the NAS in 1862 would be an early objective of the Board of Trustees and Academy staff.

Obtaining a congressional charter had over the years become increasingly difficult. The standards for granting Federal charters agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives in 1979 required that any organization seeking a charter be in operation for at least 10 years and be organized and operated in the public interest as a non-profit and non-partisan organization. The activities conducted also must have a national scope and be in response to a national need. The Senate Judiciary Committee had also adopted a stringent requirement to the effect that any proposed charter must be co-sponsored by at least 40 senators before it could receive consideration.

In the mid-1970s, consideration was given to the possibility of seeking a congressional charter in the Committee on Public Management and Machinery of Government. Exploratory discussions were held with several key members of the House and Senate Government Operations Committees. Rep. Jack Brooks (D-Tex.) chaired the House committee and was ranking member of the Judiciary Committee which was responsible for charter legislation. He was quite skeptical of the case for a charter for the Academy and was opposed, in principle, to providing a consulting organization with the substantial competitive advantage that would result from such a charter. Although he was told that Academy recommendations would be directed at fundamental problems of government, and would be formulated by Fellows whose expertise and stature would set them apart from consulting firms, he remained unconvinced.

In October 1979, the feasibility of seeking a congressional charter was discussed in a report prepared by a NAPA senior staffer, Erasmus Kloman. His memorandum to President George Esser was not encouraging. In August 1980, during the period the writer was the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, he appointed Dwight Ink as chair of a small committee, including Elmer Staats and Richard Wegman, to explore again the feasibility of securing a charter. The committee once more encountered resistance, especially from Rep. Brooks, and the Board did not press the matter at that time.

In October 1982, George Esser, then a consultant to the Academy, submitted a further memorandum to the new President, J. Jackson Walter (later a Fellow), and to the members of a congressional charter committee giving the results of further research and raising a number of questions as to the content of a Federal charter.

The moving force in the campaign for the charter was Elmer Staats, an Academy Trustee, who was then Comptroller General of the United States and was held in high regard by Members of Congress. Staats was convinced that a charter was attainable and, in early 1983, he held several discussions with Congressman Brooks and overcame Brooks' earlier objections. Brooks was

impressed by the names on the NAPA membership roster and he was also inclined to be supportive of a matter strongly advocated by Staats.

On March 14, 1983, Staats supplied Congressman Brooks with a draft bill prepared in the Academy. In June 1983, Mr. Brooks introduced H.R. 3249 to grant a Federal charter to NAPA. Fellow Richard Wegman, former staff director of the Senate Government Operations (later Governmental Affairs) Committee, was helpful in securing the needed Senate sponsors, and NAPA Chairman Sam Hughes and Dwight Ink also worked on behalf of the project. After several months during which hearings were held in the Congress, and much hard work on the part of charter supporters, the legislation was signed by President Reagan on April 10, 1984.⁵⁵

President Reagan wrote Chairman Hughes the following letter on the day he approved the charter legislation:

Dear Mr. Hughes:

It was my pleasure today to sign the bill granting a Federal charter to the National Academy of Public Administration. I was honored to learn that Abraham Lincoln was the last President to sign such a charter in 1863.

It is my hope and conviction that future administrations and Congress will profit from the research and counsel provided by the National Academy to increase the effectiveness of the government. I look forward to a continuation of your excellent work on behalf of the public interest.

With best wishes.

Ronald Reagan

The charter set forth the “objects and purposes” for which the Academy was organized as follows:⁵⁶

1. Evaluating the structure, administration, operation, and program performance of Federal and other governments and government agencies, anticipating, identifying, and analyzing significant problems and suggesting timely corrective action;
2. Foreseeing and examining critical emerging issues in governance, formulating

⁵⁵ P. L. 98-257, *op. cit.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

practical approaches to their resolution;

3. Assessing the effectiveness, structure, administration, and implications for governance of present or proposed public programs, policies, and processed, recommending specific changes;
4. Advising on the relationship of Federal, State, regional, and local governments; increasing public officials,' citizens,' and scholars' understanding of requirements and opportunities for sound governance and how these can be effectively met; and
5. Demonstrating by the conduct of its affairs a commitment to the highest professional standards of ethics and scholarship.

There is also a specific provision (Section 17) regarding service to the government of the United States, which both imposes obligations upon the Academy and makes it clear that funds from Federal appropriations can be used to pay the costs incurred. The section reads as follows:

The National Academy of Public Administration shall, whenever called upon by Congress, or the Federal Government, investigate, examine, experiment, and report upon any subject of government, the actual expense of such investigations, examinations, and reports to be paid by the Federal Government from appropriations available for such purposes.

It is not possible to quantify or to describe with any precision what the Federal charter has meant to or done for the Academy. It is certain that the impact on NAPA's prestige and activities has been significant and pervasive. After the charter was granted, there were a number of studies commissioned by or mandated by congressional committees.

The fact of the charter is almost invariably alluded to in designing the Academy's program, in discussion with potential clients, in communications to Congress, in hearings, in efforts to raise funds from foundations, corporations, and individuals, and in many ways other ways helpful to the organization.

The charter itself does not confer powers beyond those available to non-profit organizations incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. Nor does it expressly provide exemptions from Federal procurement regulations. In respect to procurement, NAPA has essentially the same status as the National Academy of Sciences. A number of Federal agencies have interpreted one or more provisions of the procurement laws, together with NAPA's Federal charter and its unique capabilities, to authorize consulting contracts with NAPA on a non-competitive basis.

We are not aware that any agency drawing upon the Academy for assistance has encountered criticism from oversight agencies or the Congress. This happy situation may be primarily the result of the high quality of NAPA's work, but one is inclined to ascribe some of the ready acceptance of

the Academy as a sole-source study contractor to the existence of the charter. On the other hand, to the extent that the Academy enters into competition for contracts, there may be some impairment of the perception of its unique status and capabilities.

As the Academy with its newly acquired charter enters into the last eight years covered by this history, it is fitting to take a look at the institution as it was in 1984 and how it has since evolved. The highlights of its program, its major accomplishments and some of the problems of the 1984-1992 period are also described below.

Governance

The dual structure of the Academy previously described continued, namely, the National Academy of Public Administration remained the parent corporation and a membership entity, and the National Academy of Public Administration Foundation continued as the corporation's operating arm, i.e, the one through which studies are financed and executed.

In 1984, the Academy was governed by a 15-member Board of Trustees.⁵⁷ As had been the case for many years, the board each year chose one of its members as the chair. The practice of reelecting chairs continued. All chairs except Elmer Staats⁵⁸ served from two to four years in the position. The Executive Director's title had been changed to President, and this official was appointed by and served at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees. During the eight post-charter years there were five chairs and three presidents.⁵⁹

During this period, the board tended progressively to become more deeply involved in the internal management and the substantive program of the organization than had been the case in earlier years. The increase in board activity was the result both of changes in its membership and the management style of some presidents. It manifested itself in several ways: (1) the establishment of board committees, (2) more active oversight of programs and projects and (3) recurrent and direct involvement in matters of quality management.

Board Committees

Executive Committee. In the early years of NAPA, a nine-member Board saw little need for an internal committee structure. Even the Executive Committee ceased to function until revived in 1977 as recommended by the ad hoc Special Committee on Evaluation. In subsequent years, the role of the Executive Committee has ranged from a strong factor in NAPA management to near hibernation. By 1989, the creation of several more specialized board committees sharply reduced the

⁵⁷ The size of the board had been increased from nine to fifteen in 1978.

⁵⁸ Staats had not been able to take on the job in 1984, and served in 1985 during his last year on the board.

⁵⁹ See Appendix A.

importance of the Executive Committee in Academy governance.

Investment Committee. This is the oldest specialized committee chaired initially by a Trustee. As the size of the endowment grew under the impetus of the Webb Fund, it became increasingly urgent that the funds involved be skillfully invested. When Mark Keane became chair of the board in 1985, he accepted a proposal to appoint a new Investment Committee. Originally chaired by Richard Wegman when he was a Trustee, the majority of the members of this highly effective group are no longer trustees and it is not now considered a board committee.

The effectiveness of the Investment Committee in managing endowment funds has been in large measure due to the interest in it taken by the late Honorary Fellow Jim Stein, who arranged for the committee to have the advice of James Bates (later an Honorary Fellow), until recently the portfolio manager for the State Farm Insurance Companies.

Management Committee. Originally established in 1990 with the title of Finance Committee, the committee was charged with overseeing current financial operations, management planning, and administrative matters such as compensation, staffing and space.

Program Committee. This group was created in 1990. It has been chaired from its inception by trustees, but it also includes a small number of former trustees. Its role has never been fully defined and it has been inactive for some time. In the few meetings it held, it advised on issues of quality management and reviewed and commented on several proposed projects. It also oversaw work on papers supporting NAPA's "strategic agenda."

Membership and Ethics Committee. This committee is chaired by a trustee but includes other Fellows. It advises the board on membership concerns, the nomination and electoral process, and issues relating to ethical conduct.

Development Committee. This Board Committee, with some non-board members, advises on increasing public awareness of NAPA and on fund raising issues.

Board Review and Oversight of Programs

During most of NAPA's history, the Board of Trustees was informed by the President of important projects but it did not often become involved with the scope, content or quality of specific reports, leaving that to the study panels. Exceptions were the United States Postal Service evaluation, the 1980 presidency study, and the Strengthening America's Capacity to Govern project previously discussed.

In 1989, the Board reviewed a proposal to conduct a study of relationships between the Congress and the Executive Branch. Several case studies were to be undertaken and a panel report was to be produced. Since substantial Academy resources were to be committed, in addition to a Ford Foundation grant, the Board discussed the initial study plan in depth and directed major

changes before giving it approval. This experience gave impetus to the establishment of the Program Committee and led to renewed attention to quality management. The board also informed the President of its concern over the staffing for the development and conduct of studies. In response to these concerns the responsibilities of senior staff were rearranged and a Director of Studies was appointed.

The development of a strategic agenda by a committee chaired by Trustee William Morrill during the 1989-1990 period arose out of a survey of the views of the Fellows with respect to priority areas for NAPA attention. It also reflected the growing view among trustees that the Academy should have its own agenda for studies and be less dependent upon Federally funded projects.

As noted above, complaints directed at the Postal Service evaluation report led the Board to establish the "Anderson Committee" (the ad hoc Committee on Quality Control chaired by Wayne Anderson) and quality issues were addressed at several board meetings in 1982 and 1983. In June 1985, the new President, Ray Kline, presented to the Board a one-page statement delineating the responsibilities of the President and project panel chairs for maintaining the quality of NAPA projects. The proposed statement was unanimously approved by the Trustees and was circulated by the President on June 9, 1985. This guidance seemed to meet the Academy's needs until December of 1987, when a much more detailed policy statement was issued. This document was provided to the Board but was not formally approved by it.

In September 1989, the Board returned to the issue of quality control and established a new Committee on Quality Assurance chaired by Trustee Lee Fritschler and with Wayne Anderson included in its membership. This committee never met and produced no report.

In January 1991, the responsibility for matters of quality assurance shifted to the Program Committee, chaired by Trustee Morrill. On January 17, 1991, a paper was presented by Chairman Morrill and an extensive discussion ensued. In its February 8, 1991 meeting, the Board received a report from Morrill which it unanimously approved. In taking this action, the Trustees decided that its approval would be required for initiating any study that required the use of funds from the endowment. The Board agreed that NAPA's Director of Studies would draft implementing documents for review by the Program Committee.

The result of the foregoing activities was a June 1991, paper titled "Quality Management Policy of the National Academy of Public Administration." This nine-page statement set forth the goals and principles to guide a quality management program and went into detail with respect to procedures and the allocation of responsibility. It charged the Program Committee with the continuing responsibility of oversight of quality management matters. It also provided for a new Quality Management Committee to advise the president on matters of panel selection and specific project proposals. A requirement was included for peer review of proposed reports completed by NAPA project panels.

At its June 6, 1991 meeting in Austin, the Board heard a further report on quality

management from Program Committee Chairman Morrill. No formal resolution on the June paper is recorded, but President Ray Kline told the Board that "steps would be taken to implement the report."⁶⁰

The June 1991 paper has had an uncertain status and, because of subsequent events, was never formally implemented before Ray Kline left office. There had been substantial disagreement in the Program Committee over the form and content of the statement. In a subsequent meeting of Chairman Fisher, other trustees, and concerned Fellows, there was sharp criticism of the document, chiefly concerning the requirement for peer review. Fellows objected on grounds that sufficient review of research and drafting by project staff was already provided by panel members, and that an additional review, like that performed in NAS, would prove to be unproductive and would seriously delay urgently-needed reports. It was also pointed out that the paper was in conflict with the bylaws in that it stated that the President would appoint panel members. That led Chairman Fisher to state that the paper needed to be revised.⁶¹

National Institute of Public Affairs (NIPA)

At the time of the approval of the congressional charter, NIPA was under the direction of Don Green, who had originally come to NAPA on an IPA assignment, and remained at the NIPA post for only a short time. Several seminars were still being conducted, including those dealing with revitalizing Federal management, government enterprises, shaping the next decade, and public management. Programs were envisioned for all four for the Spring of 1984 and were expected to contribute \$72,000 to the Academy's overhead costs.

NIPA was, however, finding it increasingly difficult to maintain a successful program as the educational arm of the Academy. In September 1984, the Board of Trustees established an advisory committee to consider NIPA's staffing needs and problems. A report to the board a few months later spoke of course cancellations, problems with Federal procurement regulations, and a difficult competitive situation.⁶² In early 1985, Acting NIPA Director and Fellow Don Wortman noted that the institute's current program ". . . may look irrelevant or be so perceived in the current climate."⁶³ Losses were being incurred by some NIPA seminars.

In early 1986, the Board of Trustees concluded that the retention of a separate NIPA affiliate was no longer warranted. The Board then approved a merger of the Academy and NIPA, with the

60 Board Summary Minutes, June 6, 1981, p.3.

61 A revised policy on quality was not adopted by the board until some years after the end of this first-25-years history.

62 Summary Minutes of Board of Trustees, November 1, 1984, p. 2.

63 Summary Minutes of Board of Trustees, January 3, 1985, p. 2.

institute's name disappearing. This action was ratified by the membership at the 1986 Annual Meeting.

The merger did not, however, end the Academy's conduct of seminars, symposia and other educational activities when they appeared to meet a real need and NAPA was the appropriate or most logical organization to undertake the activity. The 1988 Annual Report, for example, lists two seminars, a one-day symposium, and a one-day workshop for the year.

The Committee on the Future, which is discussed later, recommended that . . . "seminars, symposia and related activities be undertaken by NAPA staff only to the extent that they are integrated with or logically flow out of academy projects, study panel recommendations, the Academy report dissemination activity or the occasional convening function concerning major management or policy issues."⁶⁴ This recommendation was felt to be too limiting by some of the committee's members and it appears to have had little or no impact on the educational projects subsequently undertaken by the Academy.

In 1991, NAPA conducted a seminar on the Federal position classification system based on an Academy study⁶⁵ and gave its annual seminar on the "Roles and Management of Government Enterprises" for the twentieth time. It also offered a series of two-day seminars on "Downsizing Public Organizations."

A question which remains to be answered is how much emphasis NAPA should give to symposia, workshops, seminars, and other educational activities, and how they should be directed, staffed and financed. Certainly, the great expectations of the 1977 Board of Trustees have not been realized in this area.

Standing Panels

As previously noted, the reorganization of NAPA's standing panels proposed in the 1982 report on Strengthening America's Capacity to Govern⁶⁶ was not implemented, in large measure due to changes in NAPA leadership and priorities.

In 1982, the writer had accepted the chairmanship of the Panel on Management of Governance which was to pursue a complex agenda requiring a subcommittee structure and substantial staff support. When President Walter indicated that the financial pressures on NAPA would not permit assigning staff to help the new standing panels, all further efforts to make them operational were abandoned.

64 Report of the Academy Committee on the Future, NAPA, 1986, p. xviii.

65 Modernizing Federal Classification: An Opportunity for Excellence, 1991.

66 *Op. cit.* pp. 21-56.

In early 1985, the writer approached the new NAPA president, Ray Kline, with a plan to restore the standing panels to an active role in the affairs of the Academy. The proposal narrowed the mission of the inactive Standing Panel on the Management of Governance and renamed it the Panel on Executive Organization and Management. The plan for the new panel involved several features which departed from the prevailing practices of prior standing committees and panels. Among the innovations were:

1. The panel would be open to all members of the Academy, instead of being appointed by the NAPA Chairman.
2. All NAPA members would be informed of the objectives of the panel and be invited to take part in its work.
3. The panel would meet monthly to establish momentum and to facilitate the pursuit of an active work program.
4. The panel's meetings would normally include a working lunch to reduce the time the members would be away from their agencies and to encourage attendance.
5. The panel would include as associate members persons not Fellows of the Academy but whose backgrounds would contribute to the panel's effectiveness.
6. The panel would have a small executive committee appointed by the board chair which would plan meeting agenda and deal with other matters needing attention between meetings of the full panel.
7. Detailed minutes would be prepared for all meetings to keep absent members informed of what took place.

President Kline accepted the plan as described and promised to support the new panel in all reasonable ways. Following is a brief description of the activities of the panels.

1. Panel on Executive Organization and Management (EOM)

In February 1985, a meeting of the new EOM panel was held with 10 members present. The response of the Fellows to the idea of a standing panel which carried on an active program and received support from the President and the Board of Trustees was enthusiastic. Within one year, the panel had 23 Fellows and seven associate members on its roster and average meeting attendance, excluding NAPA staff, had risen to 20. In 1992, the total membership had reached 87 of whom 56 were Fellows and 30 were associate members. Attendance at meetings was averaging about 30 panel members.

Early fears that the meetings would become so large as to prove unmanageable did not

materialize. More than 20 members were from outside the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, and they could rarely attend, except during general meetings of the Academy. Some members participated only when the agenda included matters of direct interest to them. In addition, conflicts with other obligations reduced the number able to attend any one meeting.

In later years, this panel and the subsequently activated Panel on the Public Service found themselves discussing matters relating to internal NAPA policies and practices of interest to Fellows only. The EOM panel considered such matters in its Executive Committee, while the Public Service Panel occasionally held meetings (or parts of meetings) closed to associate members.

Working through subcommittees and working groups, the EOM Panel generated numerous documents through the *pro bono* work of its members. Included were papers relating to the Federal budget system, the need for an Office of Federal Management, management of executive departments, and strengthening leadership for internal management in Federal departments and agencies.

2. Panel on the Public Service

The success of the Panel on Executive Organization and Management stimulated new efforts to activate other standing committees in areas of major NAPA concern. The standing Panel on the Public Service soon became operational under the effective chairmanship of Alfred Zuck. It was organized and functioned in a manner similar to the EOM Panel. This standing panel grew to a membership of more than 70, with 20 to 25 persons usually present at regular meetings.

The agenda of the panel included tracking implementation of the recommendations of the “Volcker Commission” report on the public service, developing positions on Hatch Act amendments, following the Academy's project on the reform of position classification, and maintaining close contacts with the Office of Personnel Management and the Merit Systems Protection Board.

3. Panel on International Affairs

The next standing panel to become active was that concerned with international affairs. It was chaired by Edward Sanders. The International Affairs Panel addressed programs with international ramifications such as the control of narcotics and the functioning of international agencies. The Academy's participation in ACIPA and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences was, however, conducted primarily through members of the EOM Panel.

The Panel on International Affairs met less frequently than the two discussed above, and it had difficulty achieving the level of activity, membership and meeting attendance which characterized the EOM and Public Service Panels.

4. Panel on the Federal System

This panel was launched in 1988. It was the successor to an earlier committee on

Intergovernmental Systems, and a later one concerned with State and local government that had been chaired by Samuel K. Gove. After some difficulty in getting under way, the panel and its executive committee held several meetings. It became a valuable forum for focusing on issues that are key to a large number of Fellows, i.e., the role of State and local governments and their interactions with the Federal government. Especially in the absence of any significant number of study projects directly involving State and local governments, this panel provided an opportunity for Fellows in the State and local sectors to exchange information and views on critical matters affecting the operation of the Federal system.

One special problem encountered by the Federal System Panel was the large proportion of its membership living far from NAPA headquarters. It is the only standing panel which had an out-of-Washington chairman, namely, Jonathan B. Howes of North Carolina.⁶⁷ But that did not prove to be a handicap as the panel functioned very effectively under his leadership.

To cope with the dispersion of membership, the full panel usually meets only at NAPA general meetings. However, it has a large executive committee charged with convening more frequently to foster panel momentum and help formulate a program.

Concluding Observations on Standing Panels

The experience of the past few years has established that standing panels can be made to work and that they can contribute much to the Fellows who participate and to the Academy as an institution. It is clear, however, that no standing panel functions well without:

1. A chair willing to commit substantial time and energy to the affairs of the panel.
2. An executive committee consisting of active panel members to help the chair.
3. The understanding and support of the Board of Trustees and the President, including the commitment of some NAPA staff and resources to support panel activities.
4. Systematic interaction between the panel chairs, the President, the board and other NAPA organs such as the Program Committee and committees charged with planning general meetings of the Academy.

Membership

⁶⁷ The 1992 chair was Enid Beaumont, who lived in the District of Columbia.

On January 1, 1992, there were 315 Fellows. In addition, there were 93 Senior Fellows and 21 Honorary Fellows. It should be kept in mind that some of the most energetic and supportive members of NAPA are Senior Fellows who have all the rights and privileges of Fellows, but are not counted against the membership cap of 350.⁶⁸

The 1992 "Call for Nominations" was accompanied by detailed membership information as shown in the charts that follow. Chart #1 contains a breakdown by categories of current employment as of January 1, 1992. The ages, geographic distribution, and gender and minority composition of the Fellows were shown in chart #2.

Chart #3 shows the predominant experience of Fellows in 1991 as follows:

<u>Government</u>		<u>60%</u>
Federal	40%	
State/Local	20%	
Private/Nonprofit		15%
University		22%
Private Business		3%

In 1984, the partially comparable figures were as follows:

<u>Government</u>		<u>54%</u>
Federal	30%	
State/Local	19%	
Legislative/judicial	5%	
University (including foundations)		19%
Research, Training and Teaching	20%	
Other private sector		7%

⁶⁸ Under the 1992 bylaws, any Fellow who reaches the age of 75 and has been a Fellow for 10 years automatically becomes a Senior Fellow; Fellows who reach age 65 and are retired (by their own definition) may elect to convert to Senior Fellow status.

CHART 1

1992 MEMBERSHIP PROFILE OF FELLOWS BY CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

CATEGORIES OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT			Numbers and Percentages
			Fellows Only (Total: 315)*
I. Government			58 (18.4%)
	A. Federal		39 (12.3%)
		1. Executive	26 (8.2%)
		2. Legislative	11 (3.5%)
		3. Judicial	2 (.6%)
	B. State		6 (1.9%)
	C. Local		10 (3.3%)
	D. Regional		3 (.9%)
	E. International		-0-
II. Private/Nonprofit			49 (15.5%)
	A. State		7 (2.3%)
	B. Consulting		3 (.9%)
	C. National		39 (12.3%)
III. University			100 (31.6%)
	A. Administration		31 (9.8%)
	B. Deans		13 (4.1%)
	C. Professors		56 (17.7%)
IV. Private Business			77 (24.4%)
	A. Attorney		11 (3.5%)
	B. Corporate		23 (7.3%)
	C. Media		6 (1.9%)
	D. Consulting		56 (17.7%)
V. Retired/ Indep. Consulting			32 (10.1%)
	A. Federal Government		15 (4.7%)
	B. State/Local/Regional Government		7 (2.5%)
	C. Private/Nonprofit		4 (1.3%)

	D. University		5 (1.6%)
	E. Private Business		-0-

CHART 2

MEMBERSHIP ANALYSIS: PERCENTAGE COMPARISON BY YEAR, 1988-1992

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Number of Fellows at Time of Compilation	315*	312	313	334	328
AGE					
40 - 49	10.8%	12.2%	14.1%	13.2%	13.1%
50 - 59	37.0%	36.5%	37.7%	38.3%	38.1%
60 - 64	23.1%	23.1%	20.4%	15.3%	15.2%
65 - 69	13.9%	16.0%	13.7%	16.2%	16.2%
70 and older	15.2%	12.2%	14.1%	17.0%	17.4%
Total Fellows 65 and older	29.4%	28.2%	27.8%	33.2%	33.5%
Total Fellows 60 and older	52.5%	51.3%	48.2%	48.5%	48.8%
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION					
California	8.9%	8.3%	8.0%	8.4%	9.5%
Mid-Atlantic	16.1%				
New England	5.4%				
North Central	8.5%				
Northwest Mountain	3.5%				
Southeast	9.8%				
Southwest	5.1%				
National Capital Area	42.1%				
Foreign	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Number of Fellows at Time of Compilation	315*	312	313	334	328
GENDER AND MINORITY DISTRIBUTION					
Men	84.8%	84.3%	86%	87.7%	88.7%
Women	15.2%	15.7%	14.0%	12.3%	11.3%
Blacks	10.8%	9.0%	8.6%	7.8%	7.3%

Hispanics	1.3%	.6%	.6%	.6%	.6%
Asian	.6%	.6%	.3%	.3%	.3%

CHART 3

1991 MEMBERSHIP PROFILE BY PREDOMINANT EXPERIENCE

CATEGORIES OF PREDOMINANT EXPERIENCE			NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES		
			Fellows Only (Total: 309)*	Senior Fellows Only (Total: 93)*	Fellows and Senior Fellows (Total: 402)*
I. Government			185 (60.0%)	58 (62.4%)	243 (60.4%)
	A. Federal		124 (40.1%)	40 (43%)	164 (40.7%)
		1. Executive	101 (32.7%)	38 (41.1%)	139 (34.6%)
		2. Legislative	19 (6.1%)	2 (1.9%)	21 (5.1%)
		3. Judicial	4 (1.3%)	-0-	4 (1.0%)
	B. State		30 (9.8%)	8 (8.6%)	38 (9.4%)
	C. Local		29 (9.5%)	8 (8.6%)	37 (9.3%)
	D. Regional		2 (.6%)	0-0	2 (.5%)
	E. International		-0-	2 (2.2%)	2 (.5%)
II. Private/Nonprofit			48 (15.4%)	14 (15.1%)	62 (15.4%)
	A. State		12 (3.9%)	1 (1.1%)	13 (3.2%)
	B. Consulting		-0-	-0-	-0-
	C. National		36 (11.5%)	13 (14.0%)	49 (12.2%)
III. University			68 (22.0%)	21 (22.5%)	89 (22.1%)
IV. Private Business			8 (2.6%)	-0-	8 (2.1%)
	A. Attorney		-0-	-0-	-0-
	B. Corporate		3 (1.0%)	-0-	3 (.8%)
	C. Media		5 (1.6%)	-0-	5 (1.3%)
	D. Consulting		-0-	-0-	-0-

* Percentages reflect proportion of Fellows (309); Senior Fellows (93); or Fellows and Senior Fellows (402)

The current employment breakout for 1992 (see chart #1) gives a somewhat different picture of the makeup of NAPA's membership:

<u>Government</u>	18.4%
Federal	12.3%
State/Local	6.1%
Private/Nonprofit	15.5%
University	31.6%
Private Business	24.4%
Retired/Independent	
Consulting	10.1%

The above data indicate that, while the number of Fellows whose primary experience has been in government has remained high compared to 1970 and 1984, only a fraction (18.4%) are now employed by the Federal, State and local governments. On the basis of positions held in 1992, 31.6% were associated with universities and 24.4% were in private business.

These data suggest that, with the passage of years, many government practitioners have moved into academic institutions, non-profit organizations and the commercial private sector. A substantial number have retired while remaining Fellows.

The data raise this question: Is NAPA maintaining an adequate cadre of practitioners with current government experience who can assist agencies desiring help in resolving today's management problems?

The gender and minority distribution data included in chart # 2 show a steady increase over the past five years in the percentage of Fellows who are women or belong to minority groups. Compared to 1984, the demographic change is as follows:

	<u>1992</u>	<u>1984</u>
Men	85%	90%
Women	15%	10%
Black	11%	8%
Hispanic	1.3%	1%
Asian	0.6%	-

Age distribution comparisons with 1984 are as follows:

<u>Age</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1984</u>
Under 40	0%	1%
40-49	11%	15%
50-59	37%	31%
60-69	37%	35%
70 and older	15%	18%

It is obvious that the average age of Fellows is increasing. This has happened in spite of bylaws encouraging members 65 or older to seek Senior Fellow status, and the automatic shifting to such status of Fellows who attain the age of 75 after ten years of membership.

It should be noted, however, that the criteria which are applied to persons nominated for election to NAPA require a scope of experience and a level of recognizable achievement not easily attainable by persons under 40 years of age.

No subject in the history of the Academy has received more attention by the Board of Trustees, staff and Fellows than that of membership. Each evaluation panel has addressed membership issues, as have various, ad hoc, bylaw and membership committees appointed by board chairs.

From the first, there has been a near consensus that NAPA exists to pursue actively the improvement of public management. While some prestige accompanies election as a Fellow, NAPA has never been viewed as an honorary society. For many years, nominating committees have sought to assure that persons whose names are placed on the ballot understand the nature of the Academy and that they will be expected to be active if

elected.

As previously noted, a since-repealed bylaw called for dropping from membership those Fellows who did not become actively involved within five years of election. Also (according to a bylaw provision that had not been enforced until 1996), no person is supposed to be considered more than a Fellow-elect before attendance at a general meeting of the Academy. Therefore, despite bylaw provisions to avoid the problem, the roster of Fellows contains the names of a number of persons who have never been seen at an Academy meeting and have shown little interest in advancing the work of the Academy.

In all probability, the criteria for nomination and election are about as clear as the English language permits. Further opportunities for strengthening the membership lie principally in the composition of the committees to nominate members, the diligence of Fellows in proposing meritorious candidates, and the care these committees take in choosing names for inclusion on the ballot.

Financing the Academy

The combined financial statements set forth in NAPA's 1980 Annual Report showed total revenues for the fiscal year of \$2,212,000. Operating and internal expenses for the year totaled \$2,183,000, and interest charges were \$31,000, resulting in a small deficit of \$2,000.

In 1991, total revenues were \$2,856,612 with expenses amounting to \$2,742,144. The revenues and outlays for this decade vary from year to year, but the trend was one of growth in both. The extent of growth is even more clear when the 1991 total revenues are compared to the \$476,130 total receipts for NAPA's third year (1969).

In 1981, the principal sources of income were listed as:

Research	\$1,765,000
Education	426,000
Membership dues and fees	21,000

In 1991, the partially comparable figures were:

Research	\$2,659,054
Education	89,113
Membership dues and fees	45,750
Other	23,750
Income from fund investments	47,774

In 1991, \$2,003,008 of the total of \$2,742,144 in outlays, or more than 73%, went for professional services, salaries and benefits and honoraria. Most of the rest went for office rent (\$164,397), conferences and meetings (\$105,309) and travel (\$182,159).

The Endowment

We have noted above that by the year of the charter (1984), the total Academy endowment built by gifts from friends and members and the Kerr Foundation challenge grant had reached the figure of \$1,162,000. The Kerr Foundation and its President, Robert S. Kerr, have continued to be active in supporting the Academy.

In 1987, a new effort was made to enlarge the endowment by the inauguration of the Staats Fund. Fellows were encouraged to make pledges aimed at raising the total

endowment to \$5,000,000.

By June 30, 1992, the market value of the Endowment had reached \$4,014,926.⁶⁹ This represents substantial giving as shown on page 22 of the 1991 NAPA Annual Report, but it also includes \$793,320 in appreciation through investments guided by the previously-described Investment Committee.

It has always been the goal of the Academy to reduce its reliance on study contracts and unpredictable gifts or grants. The way to achieve this objective is to create an endowment of sufficient size that part of its income can be used to fund desirable undertakings which lack other sources of support. As of 1992, important progress has been made in constructing an endowment capable of serving as a significant funding source.

Committee on the Future

After the receipt of the Federal charter, the Board of Trustees began to show increased concern over the future directions of the Academy. Support for an organized effort to plan for the future led to action shortly after Ray Kline assumed the presidency in March 1985.

In its meeting of September 20, 1985, the Board of Trustees established an Academy Committee on the Future and approved a statement which directed the Committee to:

1. Examine the role and purpose of the Academy in the context of history and

⁶⁹ By publication time for this history in 1997, the value of the endowment, augmented by an almost \$1 million bequest from Jim Stein in 1996, was about \$7 million.

today's needs and propose a clear statement of mission and a set of broad objectives to attain that mission.

2. Identify the broad program areas of current public management to which the Academy should direct its energies and resources for the foreseeable future.
3. Propose a strategic plan to address these program areas, with due attention to funding mechanisms and membership involvement.

The Board explained its decision to undertake this ambitious project in the following words:

There is concern among many Academy members that the Academy has blurred its sense of purpose and that no effective program exists. Some members believe that the Academy is not addressing key public administration concerns of the day and that its presence and influence are not felt on the critical issues.

The Board also indicated that the Committee's product should serve a number of purposes, namely,

1. Structural: a basis for membership composition, standing panels, regional programs, and overall program direction.
2. Public relations: a source for development of materials and media events explaining effectively what the Academy is and what it does.
3. Outreach for fund support: a cogent rationale which makes the case for organizations and individuals supporting the work of the Academy and for new sources of financial support.

4. Project planning: a road map for staff and membership efforts in project identification and prioritization, proposal development and marketing, and education programs.
5. Membership cohesion: an anchor and rallying point to marshal the collective efforts of the membership to drive the program forward.

The Chairman of the Board, Elmer Staats, appointed a diverse group of 26 Fellows to serve on the Committee. William G. Colman, a Fellow since 1968, was named the Chairman.⁷⁰

So complex was the task assigned the committee that it was decided to create four subcommittees dealing respectively with: (1) Academy mission, (2) membership involvement, (3) program areas and (4) strategic plan.

The Academy Committee on the Future began its work on November 21, 1985, when it held its first meeting and organized the four subcommittees. It also launched a survey of member views as to the most important public administration issues and the ways in which NAPA could address them. The Committee completed its work with the release on October 31, 1986, of the “Report of the Academy Committee on the Future to the Board of Trustees.”⁷¹

This effort was the most intensive review that had been conducted of the Academy's

⁷⁰ The writer was also a member of the committee.

⁷¹ This report contains a preface and executive summary, 62 pages of supporting text and eleven appendices. The executive summary is attached as Appendix E.

work. It was substantially different from the two-day retreat at Marriottsville in 1978, which was attended by about 100 Fellows. There was an agenda for the retreat, but there was no formal report. However, a number of bylaw amendments resulted from the discussions held there.

In contrast, this year-long committee study was supported by much research and analysis, including a survey of Fellows' views. Thus, it directly involved not only its members but many other Fellows. The members had an opportunity to review issues in depth, and to formulate, review and revise recommendations in a thorough and thoughtful manner. The committee's assessment of changes in the public administration environment is still a good guide to the situation as it now stands. That assessment can be found in Appendix E, which is the Executive Summary (pp. xii-xv) of the committee's report.

The committee set forth 28 recommendations, of which seven had two to four parts. However, a substantial proportion of the recommendations could be characterized as endorsing, restating or reemphasizing current practices, so that no action by the board or Fellows was required. A principal theme of the report was the idea that the Academy should greatly reduce the proportion of its work done under contract and significantly increase its self-initiated projects with funding to be obtained from outside sources such as foundations. Such a substantial shift in the nature of the Academy's work did not take place, primarily because sufficient sources of funding to make that possible never materialized.

The report of the committee was distributed to all Fellows and was discussed at length at the 1986 Fall meeting. A number of Fellows were sharply critical of portions of the report, particularly of those they felt displayed an unrealistic bias against work for government agencies under contract.

A succinct description of the committee majority's views on new directions for the

Academy appears in the Executive Summary, and is quoted below.

Redirecting Academy Activities in Pursuing its Mission by:

- Occasionally canvassing the NAPA membership and widely recognized public administration authorities to identify significant current and emerging problems of governance needing better understanding and resolution;
- Pending further consultation outside the Academy, the Committee believes the following areas of public administration should be given priority attention over the next few years:
 - o state of the public service, broadly defined;
 - o public-private sector relationships;
 - o problems of fiscal constraint and discipline and resource scarcity;
 - o intergovernmental relations;
 - o management structure and processes in a changing environment; and
 - o overlapping international and domestic problems.
- Bringing the identified priority areas to the attention of the public administration profession as a basis for intensified attention in instructional, research and other activities;
- Establishing a new report dissemination and public information activity to

distribute, publicize and direct attention to the findings and recommendations of panel reports and other NAPA issuances;

- Placing a greater emphasis on work with state/local governments;
- Continuing responsiveness to requests from governmental agencies for advice and assistance on a contract basis, but as financial considerations permit, on a more selective basis and reducing NAPA's dependence on contract income;
- Considering both financial factors and those of breadth, relevance to priority areas, and information transfer potential in accepting projects;
- Tightening quality controls in project activity; and
- Discontinuing NIPA-type training activities, confining seminar and symposia activities to those conducted under research/study or public information auspices.

Some of the proposed actions were the subject of vigorous debate, and in several instances members filed written dissents. Most of the recommendations did, however, reflect the committee's consensus and involved little controversy.

Pervading the discussions in the committee were the differences of view between members who (1) saw the Academy as most effective when it was responding, under contract or with the assistance of a grant, to a request that some aspect of an agency's management be addressed or to a request from Congress for advice on legislation; and (2) those members who felt that NAPA was too much a "job shop" and favored more emphasis on the identification of priority areas of public administration concern and the

development of a strategic agenda to address them.

Much of the debate in the committee reflected a sincere desire to achieve a balance between these views. Few of the members who felt that the Academy had the most impact when clients had specific problems and were willing to pay for NAPA's assistance opposed the development of a strategic agenda or the launching of self-initiated projects such as the 1980 study of the presidency. On the other side, few of the members who were worried about the dominance of contract-supported projects would contend that studies such as Revitalization of Federal Management could be called "job shop" work. There was also the practical fact that, from the days of the first contract with NASA, the bulk of the funds supporting NAPA as an institution came from contracts. Appendix J-5 of the Committee on the Future report revealed that at the time of its work from 80% to 95% of annual NAPA funding came from government agencies.

In areas such as membership involvement, there was virtually unanimous acceptance of the view that Fellows were elected to play an active role in addressing public management needs and in supporting the Academy as an institution. Election was not for the purpose of honoring a member's past achievement. The committee recommended strict enforcement of the five-year reelection provision of the bylaws, as well as the provision requiring attendance at an Academy general meeting before anyone elected is officially inducted. Neither of these recommendations was implemented. In fact, the board and its chair proved unable or unwilling to enforce the reelection procedure, and later the board proposed and the Fellows approved a bylaw amendment to remove it.

The committee also proposed that inactive Fellows who were eligible be encouraged to transfer to Emeritus status. In 1988, the Bylaws were amended to provide for automatic transfer to a new Senior Fellow category (replacing Emeritus) for those reaching age 75 who have been in the Academy for ten years. After age 65, Fellows could elect to become Senior Fellows upon their own declaration that they were retired.

As previously noted, the committee was not supportive of NIPA-type activities such as seminars and symposia except when they were integrated with or flowed logically from Academy projects.⁷² Although formal and recurrent training such as NIPA used to perform has been limited to the annual seminar on government enterprises, a number of ad hoc seminars or symposia have been conducted that did not relate to projects.

Among the recommendations of the committee which were accepted and implemented was one calling for “Experimentation with ... holding the Spring or Fall meeting at locations away from Washington.”⁷³ Fellow attendance at Spring meetings held in cities such as San Francisco, Kansas City, Boston, Austin and Atlanta is always substantially smaller than that at the Fall meeting in Washington, but those attending have generally given the meetings favorable reports. The Board has continued such meetings as a means of encouraging participation by Fellows living away from the National Capital area. The Spring meeting in Philadelphia in the bicentennial year of the constitution was especially well attended and widely praised. Fellows not resident in the National Capital area have generally favored the conduct of Spring meetings elsewhere.

The committee also recommended that the growth of the endowment funds be optimized through productive investment policies. As already noted, Mark Keane established an investment committee when he was the board chair, and that committee has proved to be very effective in increasing the market value of the endowment.

⁷² *Ibid.*, Recommendation 12, p. 25.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, Recommendation 37, p. 37.

Another recommendation of the committee which engendered written dissent called for the discontinuance of the payment of honoraria “... to Academy members or others serving on project panels”⁷⁴ Such honoraria had been customary for panelists who served on panels funded by contract and the estimated amount of such payments was always included in project proposals. In recent years, the amount paid had been \$150 for each day (or part-day) spent in actual attendance at panel meetings.⁷⁵ Honoraria have not been paid for service on project panels when the study is funded by grants or out of NAPA resources. This recommendation did not receive the support of either the President or the Board and the Academy’s policy on honoraria remained unchanged.

The committee also recommended that the Academy not enter into competition for contracts. This was consistent with a long-standing board policy. When the board first authorized the staff to make competitive bids, it was to be in very limited and special circumstances. There was one unsuccessful, competitive bid after the committee’s report at a time when there was very little project work underway.⁷⁶

The committee proposed Academy strategies consistent with its preference for self-initiated studies, as noted above. While the minutes of board meetings do not record any specific action to accept or reject any or all of the committee's recommendations, in January 1987 the board adopted a new statement of the Academy's "Mission, Goals and Objectives" that was prepared by President Ray Kline, taking into account the committee's proposals, as well as the views expressed by Fellows at the 1986 Annual Meeting.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, Recommendation 26, pp. 50-51.

⁷⁵ By 1996, honoraria had been increased to \$200.

⁷⁶ Since 1992, NAPA has submitted a number of competitive proposals, at least two of which resulted in contracts, and has been a subcontractor in several proposals, of which at least two resulted in contracts.

Although the committee could not reach unanimous agreement on new directions for the Academy, and although a number of Fellows strongly disagreed with certain of the committee's recommendations, it seems clear that the work of the committee was salutary. It stimulated vigorous debate within the committee and during the Annual Meeting that followed. The conduct of an informative debate is one of the features to be treasured in a collegial organization like the Academy.

Program And Projects; 1984-1992

Since the enactment of the congressional charter, NAPA has increasingly demonstrated its capacity to respond effectively to requests for assistance from executive agencies, Congress, the judiciary, and (occasionally) State and local governments. It has, for example, become the recognized center of expertise on the organization and management of executive departments, government enterprises and alternative government structures.⁷⁷

The ultimate test of the quality and usefulness of NAPA's products is the extent to which certain agencies have come to rely on the Academy for expert and objective advice in solving difficult management problems. It is notable that a continuing relationship has been developed not only with NASA, but also with such agencies as the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Environmental Protection Agency and, most recently, the Department of Transportation. During this period, NAPA also undertook a few major studies on its own initiative with a goal of being a leader and innovator in addressing significant problems of public management. Projects can be divided among six categories.

⁷⁷ The establishment of the Academy's Alliance for Redesigning Government in 1993 has led to an increase in NAPA's focus on and contacts with State and local governments, including a few projects, one funded by the Federal government and by foundations, and two small contracts with a state and a county.

1. Service to Federal Agencies

a. National Aeronautics and Space Administration: NASA's special relationship with the Academy was maintained and strengthened in the years following the approval of the congressional charter. From time to time, NASA sought the Academy's informal advice on critical management issues, and it contracted for major studies in such areas as the management effectiveness of the Goddard Space Flight Center, employee mobility and executive management. In its work for NASA, the Academy has demonstrated its capacity to respond to requests for advice on a variety of issues ranging from the economic impact of aeronautics and space technology to the evaluation of the equal opportunity program.

b. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): In the early 1980s, EPA suffered from what its Administrator, William Ruckelshaus (later a Fellow), termed "the battered agency syndrome." He called upon the Academy to assist him in restoring the agency's reputation and effectiveness. The resulting 1984 report titled "Steps to a Stable Future," produced by a panel chaired by Frank Carlucci, contained more than 60 recommendations for improving human resource management and EPA staff morale and confidence. In 1986, Ruckelshaus' successor, Lee M. Thomas (later a Fellow), asked NAPA to return to EPA to evaluate progress in implementing the Carlucci panel's recommendations. Copies of the follow-up study were distributed by the Administrator to all EPA employees.

EPA subsequently asked NAPA for assistance in developing a strategy for implementing the Federal regulation of underground storage tanks and assessing human resources management in EPA's Office of Research and Development.

c. Federal Bureau of Prisons: Commencing with a 1987 study to analyze organizational relationships between Federal Prison Industries (UNICOR) and the rest of the Bureau of Federal Prisons (BOP), the Academy has become a trusted source of advice to BOP. In 1988, the Academy made a series of recommendations which BOP adopted to enhance its human resource capability for coping with the projected doubling of inmate population and of the

number of correctional institutions. NAPA has been called upon to identify ways and means to improve the effectiveness of UNICOR and to assist in drafting legislation to give UNICOR the financial and operating flexibility normally provided by a corporate charter. Legislation was subsequently enacted authorizing a modest increase in UNICOR's financial flexibility.

d. The Department of Transportation (DOT). In February 1990, when Secretary Samuel K. Skinner issued the most comprehensive national transportation policy in the history of the United States government, he immediately asked for an assessment of DOT's capacity to implement the policies he proposed. A departmental task force, chaired by Federal Highway Administrator Thomas D. Larson (later a Fellow), enlisted the help of the Academy in the effort to convert goals into action. This involved several different NAPA undertakings including:

NAPA Panel on Phase II. This advisory panel was chaired by Andrew Fogarty and included several other members knowledgeable in DOT and transportation matters. In its several meetings, the panel gave counsel on the DOT policy implementation effort (Phase II) and prepared several background papers, including a history of the organization and management of DOT from its inception through the Skinner administration. A symposium for DOT officials and others was also organized by NAPA.

Surface Transportation Administration. In anticipation of the 1992 passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), DOT asked the Academy in June 1991 to conduct a study of the organizational measures needed to assure effective implementation of the statute. In August 1991, a panel chaired by former DOT Secretary and Fellow Alan S. Boyd recommended the creation of a new Surface Transportation Administration, which would entail a consolidation of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (now Federal Transit Administration), the Federal Highway Administration, and parts of the Federal Railroad Administration. The report was favorably received by the department, which was required to present its recommendations to the Congress in early 1993.

Office of Commercial Space Transportation. Again at DOT request, a small NAPA panel reviewed the staffing and organizational location of the department's Office of Commercial Space Transportation and suggested alternative ways of improving the status of the office and its program.

e. Modernizing Federal Classification. Following the precedent of the 1982-83 revitalization of Federal management study, eighteen Federal agencies provided funds and in-kind support for a major effort to modernize and make more effective the Federal position classification system. The panel recommended grouping the 459 occupational series into a few broad occupational families and creating three career levels for each family. The panel believed that the proposed model would substantially reduce the costs of administering the system and greatly enhance its usefulness to Federal managers.

f. Other Federal Agencies. In addition to the studies conducted for NASA, EPA, the Bureau of Prisons and DOT, the Academy has from time to time been consulted either formally or informally by a large number of Federal agencies. These include Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Energy, National Archives and Records Administration, Office of Personnel Management, Department of the Interior, Department of Justice, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Smithsonian Institution, Small Business Administration, Central Intelligence Agency, and Department of Defense.

Academy assistance does not always take the form of a panel-directed study and report. When requested, the Academy has convened ad hoc meetings of knowledgeable Fellows to discuss specific issues, or has sponsored one-day or half-day seminars. It has provided this type of service to the General Accounting Office in commenting on its general management reviews and on pending GAO projects such as evaluation of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. It also organized and conducted a half-day meeting with the staff of the DOT Office of Commercial Space Transportation in which many aspects of the office's program management were discussed. It took part in a similar session for senior staff of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

2. Service to Congress

Since 1984, the Academy has grown significantly in stature and influence in its relations with Congress. This growth is nowhere better evidenced than by Congress' increasing reliance upon the Academy as a unique and trusted source of neutral competence in matters of governance. The Academy has demonstrated that it is nonpartisan and has no agenda other than improving public management.

Congress has accorded the Academy a status comparable to that of the National Academy of Sciences by enacting legislation specifically calling for an Academy Study of Health Care Financing Administration personnel (1989). Other studies have been conducted either pursuant to direction by a committee or under contract with a committee or a congressional agency. These have included Social Security Organization (1984), Organization for Protection of Intellectual Property (1985), Intelligence Personnel Systems (1988), and analysis of a proposal for a Department of Veterans Affairs (1989).

The evaluation of the proposal to establish a Department of Veterans Affairs broke new ground in that it represented the first time that a congressional committee (the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs) directly contracted for an Academy study. Without recommending for or against departmental status, the report set forth 14 criteria which the panel believed would be useful to the committee in evaluating whether the Veterans Administration, or any other government agency, should be given the status of an executive department.

Congressional committees, individual members, and staff have sought the advice of the Academy and its Fellows in drafting bills, evaluating legislative proposals, and analyzing special

problems such as the legality of the Federal Assets Disposition Association and the pros and cons of a board versus single administrator for the Social Security Administration.

In three years (1989-91), the Academy was invited to testify 26 times on a wide variety of subjects including post-employment restrictions, government-sponsored enterprises, the career-political interface, privatization, a proposed Department of Environmental Protection, OMB's management role, congressional oversight, and goals for the national space program. Testimony by Fellows proved to be critical in influencing Senate action on legislation to reorganize the Resolution Trust Corporation.

3. Service to the Judiciary

The Academy has had a long association with the Federal Judiciary. Fellow John Macy was an advisor to Chief Justice Burger on reforming administration of the U.S. Courts. The creation of the Institute of Court Management is a symbol of the Academy's efforts to improve the administration of the courts. In 1987, the Academy was asked to examine the relationships between the courts and the General Service Administration regarding facility management. In 1988 and 1989, NAPA assisted the courts in decentralizing their budget administration.

4. Service to Local Government

Except for the government of the District of Columbia, State and local governments have rarely looked to the Academy for help in solving their management problems. State and local governments tend to rely on locally available resources such as university-based government institutes, municipal research bureaus and comparable organizations. State and local officials, except for Academy Fellows, rarely know much about the Academy. Studies during this period were limited to those for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, the Florida State Department of Health and Rehabilitation Services, and the Pennsylvania Economy League.

Academy Fellows often have experience which cannot be duplicated elsewhere. The District of Columbia Statehood Compact Commission asked the Academy to identify and develop a comprehensive plan for dealing with the problems resulting from a proposed District of Columbia transition to statehood because Harold Seidman had been the Federal coordinator of the Alaska and Hawaii transitions to statehood. Findings and recommendations were presented to and discussed with candidates for D.C. offices and the D.C. Counsel.

5. Government Enterprises and Alternative Structures

The Academy is recognized nationally and internationally as a center of expertise on the organization, management, and financing of government enterprises and alternative structures. Its informal advice is often sought by Federal agencies, Congress, local governments, foreign governments, trade associations, and private companies, a number of whom have contracted for Academy projects. A wide range of agencies and organizations have participated in the seminar on the "Roles and Management of Government Enterprises."

Proposals to establish a government corporation to administer the uranium enrichment program, abolish the Federal Assets Disposition Association, and reorganize the Resolution Trust Corporation have been enacted into law. Recommendations to convert the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) and the two, federally-administered Washington area airports to government corporations were the subject of extensive hearings but failed of enactment.⁷⁸ In the case of NTIS, introduction of legislation caused OMB to withdraw its directive that the service be privatized.

Studies have been made of the Patent and Trademark Office under contract with the Intellectual Property Owners Association, the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation, and Federal Prison Industries Corporation. Alternative structures were examined for the National Institute of Health's intramural research program in conjunction with a study by the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences. Advisory services were also provided to the Tennessee Valley Authority with respect to its organization.

6. Academy-Initiated Studies

Among the Academy's "objects and purposes" set forth in its charter are "foreseeing and examining critical emerging issues in governance, and formulating practical approaches to their solution." The Academy has taken this directive seriously and undertaken a number of in-depth studies of current and emerging critical problems in governance. These have been funded by foundation grants, gifts from individuals, and the Academy's own resources. Examples of such studies include:

Leadership in Jeopardy: The Fraying of the Presidential Appointments Process:⁷⁹ This 1985 report concluded that fundamental changes must be made in the present system of recruiting and training presidential appointees in order to provide the nation with talented and creative leaders. The report has had a significant impact and the Presidential Appointee Handbook developed in connection with the project was made available to appointees by the White House in two presidential administrations. The panel was chaired by John Macy.

⁷⁸ The Washington area airports were transferred to a public authority after the period covered here.

⁷⁹ NAPA, November 1985, 30 pp.

The Executive Presidency: Federal Management in the 1990's:⁸⁰ In 1988, a panel chaired by Elmer Staats produced this report. The panel's recommendations were divided into six broad topics: (1) presidential staff; (2) political appointments; (3) career service; (4) organizations and processes for management; (5) President and Congress; (6) budget deficit. As with its previous presidency study, the report was acknowledged by the incoming President. Although the Administration did not announce its adoption of any of the report's recommendations, there were a number of actions that followed it that were consistent with those recommendations. For example, President Bush's widely-praised address to members of the Senior Executive Service, in which he lauded the career civil service, stemmed in part from the report. Further, when Brent Scowcroft became Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, he performed in the manner that he and the panel had proposed.

Privatization: The Challenge to Public Management: The report prepared by this panel emphasized that privatization is not a substitute for public management. On the contrary, privatization was found by the study panel to involve management problems that are every bit as difficult as those of direct government programs, and perhaps even more so. The report sets forth guidelines to assist government agencies in responding to the management problems resulting from privatization. The report attracted significant congressional interest, and the findings were presented at a hearing of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the U.S. House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The panel chair was Lester Salamon.

Congress and the Executive: Relationships between Congress and the executive branch were addressed in three Academy reports. In 1988, a NAPA panel chaired by Richard Wegman released a study of Congressional Oversight of Regulatory Agencies: The Need to Strike a Balance and Focus on Performance⁸¹ and in January 1992 the Academy published Beyond Distrust: Building Bridges Between Congress and the Executive.⁸² The latter report represented the culmination of a two-year study by a panel chaired by former Congressman and Fellow James R. Jones. Both reports stressed that Congress and the Executive should avoid antagonisms and seek balance in performing their functions. In Beyond Distrust the panel warned that "The outright confrontation and increasingly competitive relationship between the two branches has a high cost: a political system more and more unresponsive to national problems and unaccountable to the American people for addressing those problems."⁸³

80 NAPA, September 1988, 45 pp.

81 NAPA, September 1988, 57 pp.

82 NAPA, January 1992, 136 pp.

83 *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

The panel made four broad recommendations for improving relations between the executive and legislative branches, providing leadership for planning and policy development, and strengthening executive branch structure. Beyond Distrust was published as a book and widely circulated. It was the subject of a column by Fellow David Broder in The Washington Post. Case studies prepared in connection with the project were commercially published.⁸⁴

The report on The Executive Presidency, discussed above, also addressed at length issues concerning legislative-executive relations.

These reports, as is usual practice in NAPA, represent the views of the panels, not those of the Academy as an institution. In dealing with highly controversial issues, disagreement is to be expected. While panels usually seek to achieve as much agreement as possible, unanimity is not sought as a goal in itself. Additional and dissenting views of panel members are included in such reports as Beyond Distrust and Presidential Management of Rulemaking in Executive Agencies.

Through projects and reports such as those mentioned above, the Academy is making an increasingly important contribution to the public debate of current and emerging issues of public management. One evidence of the Academy's contribution is the frequency with which Academy studies are cited in the professional literature. It is noteworthy that, five months after publication of Beyond Distrust, Congress created a joint committee to develop congressional reforms. Academy Fellows from the project testified before the House Rules Committee in support of the measure establishing the joint committee. The committee's agenda, however, concentrated on matters internal to Congress.

Relations with the American Society for Public Administration

This history has described the key role played by ASPA, its council, its former Presidents and Executive Director (as of 1967) in launching this National Academy and in providing it with its initial support. It has also noted that frictions soon developed between the leadership of the two organizations and that these became especially acute in 1970, when NAPA decided to seek an independent corporate status and to cut all formal organizational ties with ASPA.

There is much good news to report with respect to the state of ASPA-NAPA relations. The most important is that the period since the receipt of the charter has witnessed the virtual disappearance of the ill will which marked the period immediately after NAPA's achievement of independent status on December 31, 1970.

Any person interested in public administration or the public service must hope that ASPA and NAPA will both succeed in their important roles and that each will support the other in all

⁸⁴ Who Makes Public Policy: The Struggle for Control Between Congress and the Executive, Chatham House, Gilmour, Robert S. and Alexis Halley, eds., 1994.

possible ways. In recent years, there has been a substantial realization of this desirable end.

Part of the reason for the prevailing level of good will and cooperation is the rising to leadership in both organization of persons who were not involved in the quarrels of the 1960s and 1970s. The need for cooperation in pursuing shared goals has become so compelling that, once an independent national Academy came to be accepted as a permanent feature of the public administration community, there remained little basis for continuing friction.

There remain strong membership linkages between ASPA and NAPA. Many NAPA Fellows have served as presidents or council members of ASPA or have been active in ASPA chapters. ASPA presidents and executive directors are often NAPA Fellows at the time of taking office or have been subsequently elected to the Academy. Most recent chairs and presidents of the Academy have urged Fellows to join or to remain active in ASPA.

The collaboration between the two organizations in launching the National Public Service Award Program and in jointly funding and administering it is a fine example of what has become possible. ASPA annual meetings are replete with such examples of inter-organizational cooperation as the presentation of the National Public Service awards, holding special meetings for NAPA Fellows at ASPA meetings and the active role played by some Fellows in ASPA panels and other program events.

This account does not mean to imply that there are no ASPA members who worry about the "elitist" character of NAPA, or that there are no NAPA Fellows who criticize ASPA's structure and governance or the program content of ASPA meetings. The situation in 1992 was, however, one in which the forces favoring cooperation were clearly dominant in both organizations. This bodes well for the profession as well as for ASPA and NAPA.

Academy Staff

As President, Jack Walter had been active in the successful effort to gain a charter. His service continued into the first year covered by this section. Mention has already been made of his efforts to raise funds from external sources and of his appointment of a Director of Academy Studies. The staff and program level remained stable during his tenure.

With the support of the board, President Ray Kline charted a number of new directions for the Academy. He strongly backed proposals to involve Fellows outside of Washington through such measures as having the Spring meetings elsewhere. He strove to make the Annual and Spring meetings more meaningful by engaging Fellows in planning agenda with subject-matter themes. As noted earlier, he drafted a mission statement and a policy statement on quality assurance, for board approval; and he agreed to provide staff resources to enable the standing panels to function effectively.

Under Kline, the program level doubled, including a renewal of active service to

NASA, and the size of the staff grew accordingly. He supplemented the staff with persons on IPA assignments. Yet, his tenure was marked by concerns faced by all his predecessors, i.e., the lack of significant foundation support and the dependence on “keeping the pipeline full” with contracts. And when he left office, there was very little in the pipeline - a condition which had arisen numerous times in the past.

EPILOGUE

This history of the National Academy of Public Administration ends with the taking office on February 3, 1992, of Fellow R. Scott Fosler as the organization's sixth executive director or president. Describing and evaluating what NAPA does and how it changes after this date will be left to a future chronicler. The years since Fosler became President constitute current events and cannot yet be treated with a historical perspective. In order, however, to provide readers some appreciation of the Academy's recent work, there is included as Appendix G a list of Academy reports issued from 1992 to 1996.

The first 25 years of the National Academy are remarkable for the success it has enjoyed in moving from an adjunct of the American Society for Public Administration to a fully independent non-profit corporation chartered by the Congress of the United States. The remarks of Elmer Staats, prepared for delivery at the 1992 Annual Meeting, offer a valuable perspective on these 25 years. They can be found in Appendix H.

As one takes note of what has happened to NAPA as an institution, there has been steady progress in building a diverse membership of about 400 Fellows and Senior Fellows, designing workable arrangements for governance, and creating a system of boards, panels and committees which maximize Fellow participation and permit the application of the skills of the membership to the solution or amelioration of public management problems.

There has also been progressive building of respect for the Academy's impartiality, integrity and competence which has led the Congress to call upon it for advice and to encourage or require executive agencies to do likewise. It is also an established fact that the vast majority of government agencies and institutions which have sought the assistance of NAPA have been pleased by the results.

It is now virtually certain that the days when NAPA's viability and usefulness were being put to the test are past. The Academy should be around as long as this nation functions as a democracy.

Like most viable institutions, the Academy is always changing and evolving, but it also has taken care to retain those features which have served the institution well. A number of characteristics and modes of operation which have proved useful and which few Fellows would change can be noted:

1. Keeping the academy a collegial body, with a strict limitation on total membership.
2. Electing as Fellows only those persons who have attained genuine distinction in the field of public administration.
3. Functioning as an active agent in the identification of needs and problems in the area of public management and in the development of solutions, with each Fellow expected to take part in this effort.
4. Holding two general meetings each year to permit Fellows to exchange views and experiences, to address topics of broad interest to the Fellows, to discuss matters of NAPA governance and management and to strengthen the ties between the individual

Fellows.

5. Use of project panels to conduct studies. These mechanisms are chaired by a Fellow, but panels may include non-members in the interest of developing improved advice. In most cases, the findings and recommendations of panels do not reflect a formal position of NAPA as an institution.
6. Emergence of standing panels open to all Fellows, which seek to develop programs and identify problems in areas such as executive organization and management, public service, international affairs and the Federal system. These mechanisms enable Fellows to stay involved, even when there are no funded projects in their areas of interest.
7. Use of ad hoc committees and working groups to address special NAPA needs. These have existed in areas such as general evaluation of the institution, shaping the Academy's future and agenda, revision of bylaws, membership problems, quality assurance, ethics and conflict of interest, and fund raising. Most Fellows have consistently shown a willingness to serve actively on such groups.
8. Use of an institutionalized approach to identifying and electing new Fellows which permits every Fellow to suggest names and to vote directly on the persons appearing on the annual ballot.
9. Willingness to set up special arrangements to give advice on public management problems when the formal panel approach seems to be inappropriate. Included are seminars for agency

staff or officials in which general discussion takes place but no formal NAPA report is involved. There is also occasional reliance on small groups of Fellows to do most of the research and writing for a particular study, sometimes with an advisory committee of Fellows and others to review and comment on the proposed report.

10. Avoidance of political bias or ideological predispositions. This has been crucial to the Academy's cherished position as a "trusted source of advice." The charter, of course, requires NAPA to be a non-partisan organization and, for all 25 years, NAPA has responded to requests for help without regard to the political affiliation of those seeking assistance.
11. Insistence on telling clients the truth as we see it, even if it is unpleasant or unwelcome. The Academy does, of course, address the matters agreed to in a contract or project proposal, but it has consistently refused to shape its findings in ways not supported by the facts.

There remain in 1992 a number of areas of concern for the National Academy, its leaders and the individual Fellows. Some of these have persisted through much of the life of the Academy. A few can be listed:

1. Assuring that the persons elected as Fellows are both willing and able to make significant contributions to NAPA's work and that they are individuals who have earned election by their accomplishments in the field of public administration.
2. Assuring stable financing by increasing the endowment and building

ongoing relationships with agencies.

3. Maintaining current and reliable accounting information.
4. Improving the Academy's records and retention of accessible documents for: purposes of subsequent research; historical purposes; and consistency in management and financial policies and practices.
5. Development and maintenance of an optimum relationship between the Board of Trustees and the President in matters of internal NAPA management.
6. Continued attention to policies and procedures for assuring that NAPA studies and project reports are of high quality.
7. Devising ways to assure that the revived standing panels can play an increasingly constructive role in the functioning of the Academy and that they will not again recede into inactivity.
8. Provision for greater involvement of Fellows in advising on how the organization as an institution functions. This can best be achieved by providing more time for such matters in general meetings and occasionally scheduling the equivalent of the Marriottsville Retreat described in this history.
9. Recognition that, unless and until substantially greater resources are available through grants or from increased endowment income, the Academy's work program will be

determined largely by the studies that it performs under contract.

#

Appendix A

BOARD CHAIRMEN

John D. Millett (1970-1973)

James A. Norton (1973-1974)

Frederic N. Cleaveland (1974-1978)

Alan L. Dean (1978-1981)

Phillip S. Hughes (1981-1985)

Elmer B. Staats (1985)

Mark E. Keane (1985-1987)

Joseph L. Fisher (1987-1991)

Astrid E. Merget (1991-93) *

Alfred M. Zuck (1993-1995) *

Peter L. Szanton (1995-) *

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS AND PRESIDENTS

George A. Graham (1967-1972)

Roy W. Crawley (1972-1976)

George H. Esser (1976-1982)

J. Jackson Walter (1982-1985)

Ray Kline (1985-1992)

R. Scott Fosler (1992-) *

* This history of the Academy's first 25 years does not cover the period after February 1992.