

The First 50 Years

National Academy of Public Administration
(1967-2017)

By R. Scott Fosler
President's Note by Teresa W. Gerton





The National Academy of Public Administration (the Academy) is an independent, nonprofit, and nonpartisan organization established in 1967 to assist government leaders in building more effective, accountable, and transparent organizations. Chartered by Congress to provide nonpartisan expert advice, the Academy's unique feature is its over 850 Fellows—including former cabinet officers, Members of Congress, governors, mayors, and state legislators, as well as prominent scholars, business executives, and public administrators. The Academy helps the federal government address its critical management challenges through in-depth studies and analyses, advisory services and technical assistance, congressional testimony, forums and conferences, and online stakeholder engagement. Under contracts with government agencies, some of which are directed by Congress, as well as grants from private foundations, the Academy provides insights on key public management issues, as well as advisory services to government agencies.

To access this document online, please visit our website at www.napawash.org/history.

Copyright © 2017 by National Academy of Public Administration.
All rights reserved. Published and hosted by the Academy

Table of Contents

PRESIDENT'S NOTE	I
PREFACE	III
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER 2. ORIGINS OF NAPA	12
CHAPTER 3. FOUNDATIONS	28
CHAPTER 4. THE CLINTON YEARS	64
CHAPTER 5. THE BUSH YEARS	118
CHAPTER 6. THE OBAMA YEARS	150
CHAPTER 7. EPILOGUE	186
APPENDICES	204

President's Note

When I became the 16th President of the National Academy of Public Administration in January, 2017, our 50th Anniversary year, one of the first documents I read was Alan Dean's history of the Academy's first 25 years. His brief summary of the Academy's incredible impact over its initial two and half decades left me even more impressed by this organization and its members, but it also left me wanting more. And yet, there wasn't more...no one had kept the history of the second 25 years! Sure, we had reams of paper documents and virtual stacks of electronic files, but no one had told the story in such a way that it could be shared and passed on.

As I began to ask around about who might take up the pen for such a task, one name kept coming back to me: Scott Fosler. Over lunch one day, I asked, and Scott later agreed. He drafted a general outline in late spring. Over the summer, the Academy's staff and interns searched the archives; reviewed and indexed thousands of articles, meeting minutes, and reports; scanned hours of video from interviews and events; and provided Scott with volumes of raw content. He miraculously sorted, sifted, culled, and prioritized all of that, and crafted the history you now hold.

From the beginning, we knew this document could not be comprehensive. In the time and pages available, we simply could not capture every event, every report, or the name of every Fellow

involved in every facet of the Academy's myriad activities. What we did want to capture was the essence of the Academy, the arc of its history, its persistence through times of national and organizational stress, and its extraordinary value to the country.

To the Academy's team, including Elijah Evans, Lisa Trahan, Randy Lyon, Joe Mitchell, and interns David Bilger and Anne Lieber, I offer my thanks. The Fellows who reviewed and edited this document one last time before it went to print have my sincere appreciation. I am most deeply grateful to Scott for his willing spirit, his good humor, and his persistence throughout this project. Whether your tenure as a Fellow is one year or fifty, I hope you enjoy this story. But more than that, I hope you find it inspiring. It is a compelling story, one filled with hope and commitment and accomplishment, and one that should remind us that "a government that works, and works for all" is worth striving toward for another 50 years.

Teresa W. Gerton
President/CEO
National Academy of Public Administration

Preface

When Academy President Terry Gerton asked me to take on this assignment last spring, I was pleased to hear that she wanted an updated history of the Academy for the 50th anniversary, and honored to be asked to do it. But I had two concerns. One was time. And the other was the fact that I've been deeply involved with the Academy for a substantial part of that history. I worked through the time issue and concluded the project was doable on a tight schedule.

As to the second concern, it brought to mind the thinking of Yale political scientist and Academy Fellow James Fesler about a similar dilemma when he considered writing an article on a 50-year look back at the Brownlow Committee,¹ for which he was a staff member:

A retrospective approach to an event of half a century ago carries the risk of unwarranted benignity. That risk is compounded if one was, as I, a participant in the event. I can only declare my interest and proceed with my present task, disciplined by awareness that this year is also the bicentennial of the Constitution, the centennial of Woodrow Wilson's seminal essay, 'The Study of Administration,' and year one of a reaffirmation of the checks and balances system.²

Invoking his droll sense of humor, Jim Fesler once told me that he thought the two of us must have a lot in common since one of us was a Fesler and the other a Fosler. So I feel at some liberty to follow his example, declare my interest and proceed with my present task, disciplined by awareness that several hundred Fellows who have also been deeply involved with the Academy will be sharing this opportunity for a 50th anniversary retrospection from their own perspectives.

Fifty years is something of an arbitrary time period. But it also has some genuine meaning in human context. The Bible (Leviticus) talks of a 50-year Jubilee when all debts are to be forgiven, all property returned to its original owners, and all land allowed to lie fallow. It's not clear to what extent this admonition was ever followed in practice, but its expression reflected more than theology alone. The Jubilee was also viewed as a way to alleviate swelling inequalities and avert associated economic, social and political calamities, as well as to restore nutrients to the soil.³

Jay Forrester, an MIT pioneer of the digital revolution who applied his computer prowess to problems of management and public policy, discovered what he believed to be a half-century pattern in the systems dynamics of societies.⁴ Forrester found support for this notion in (Kondratieff) economic long-wave theory that predicts a major economic and financial upheaval every 40 to 60 years, a notion largely dismissed by mainstream economists who nonetheless generally accept the existence of shorter-term economic cycles.

Forrester was a rigorously objective scientist curious about what constituted the dividing line between theories that claimed to be scientific and habits of practice and conventional wisdom he found regularly at play in the management of organizations. His answer settled on fallible human cognition in both perspectives, with the

fifty year spread constituting a period over which living memory and experience fade, as Carmen M. Reinhart and Kenneth S. Rogoff found in their 2009 book, *This Time is Different: Eight Centuries of Financial Folly*.⁵

As the National Academy of Public Administration looks back on its first fifty years, we can see this dynamic of fading institutional memory at play, highlighted against the trajectory of the American system of governance. Many of the first generation of Academy Fellows that we have lost were consequential players in earlier phases of that broader history of our national democracy and its complex organizational forms. Consider the intermingled careers of four Academy Fellows whose lives spanned the 20th century.

Luther Gulick (1892-1993) was born before Frederick Jackson Turner informed the world that the American frontier had closed,⁶ and lived to see the first Baby Boomer elected president of the United States in 1992. That was the same year the Academy ended its first quarter-century and started its second. Gulick began his career in the new field of public administration in 1915, was in personal contact with its earliest founders,⁷ and became a leader in its intellectual and institutional development for the next half-century (and beyond).⁸

In the immediate post-World War II period, future Nobel Prize winner Herbert Simon (1916- 2001) challenged Gulick and the intellectual direction of public administration,⁹ a debate in which Dwight Waldo (1913- 2000) was soon fully engaged.¹⁰ At about the same time, Peter Drucker (1909 - 2005) was consciously deciding that a focus on the role and management of the business corporation posed the better hope for Western civilization than undue preoccupation with government per se.¹¹

In the second half of the 20th century, as Gulick and Waldo remained firmly oriented toward the world of government, Simon

moved in the direction of generic themes of management, social organization and the emerging world of artificial intelligence,¹² while Drucker made an intellectual round-trip back to his first love of social ecology more broadly defined, including public service and the rising importance of nonprofit organizations.¹³

I had the honor of meeting Simon and Drucker on occasion, and the privilege (and delight) of working with Gulick and Waldo, which also provided a bridge of personal connection to early founders of the field. Now the first generations both of the field of public administration and of the National Academy of Public Administration are gone.

None of the Academy's founding members of 1967, none of the Academy Board chairs during that first quarter-century, and none of my predecessors as Academy president or executive director, are still with us. I am fortunate to have known or worked with all of my predecessors going back to the first Executive Director, George Graham, who provided me with invaluable background on the history and operations of the Academy and guidance on how to do the job he pioneered. I was honored to have worked with founding Academy members Elmer B. Staats and Donald C. Stone, as well as Luther Gulick. And of the Board chairs of that era, I was fortunate to count as colleagues and friends Alan Dean, Phillip (Sam) Hughes, Mark Keane, Joseph (Joe) Fisher, and Astrid Merget (whose term as the first female Chair of the Academy's Board of Directors straddled the two quarter-centuries of NAPA's history). All of these personal relationships have played a role in shaping my understanding of the Academy's early history, as the systems dynamics of half-a-century close out the living memory embodied in those founding generations.

Fortunately, we do have a current memory bank of Fellows who joined the Academy within five years of its founding, and of those, I've had the privilege of working with Dwight A. Ink, Harold B.

Finger, Edward K. Hamilton, Richard P. Nathan, Mark W. Cannon, and Rocco C. Siciliano. The others in that same early wave we can continue to call on include Richard E. Stewart, Norman A. Carlson, James M. Beggs, Elmer K. Nelson, Laurin L. Henry, and Edwin A. Bock. To all of these people I say thank you for your long years of service to the Academy and for your formidable contributions to American governance.

The Academy is a network of institutions and their associated people, and I, like other Fellows, have had a variety of institutional connections over the years with their multiplying connections to still other Fellows.¹⁴ These institutional and personal relationships have also played a role in shaping the Academy's history as well as my understanding of it.

In addition, my roles as Academy President, Board member, participant on project and standing panels, and Fellow since 1983 have provided opportunities to meet and work with several hundred Fellows, a rewarding experience beyond compare, which also ingrained my understanding of how many talented and dedicated people have contributed to the Academy's work over the years, and therefore to its history. Sincere thanks to all of these people, especially the esteemed colleagues and dear friends with whom I served over 14 years of Academy Boards.

It is these hundreds of Fellows who are the real authors of this history. We were not able to acknowledge in the text everyone who contributed to specific projects and activities. However, the names of our entire current Fellowship of over 850 are included in the appendix and can be accessed at the Academy website, along with further information on their extraordinary careers of public service.¹⁵ On behalf of the entire Academy as well as the countless numbers of people and organizations that have benefitted from its work over the past half-century, our deepest and sincerest thanks.

I also want to acknowledge and extend personal thanks to the hundreds of staff members who have done most of the research and drafting of Academy project panel reports over the years, as well as played major roles in managing its operations and shaping its history. Countless others have contributed through professional consultancies and volunteer efforts, and have helped organize and participated in innumerable events and activities through which that work was done.

And to this already extensive list of contributors to the Academy's history must be added the sponsors and subjects of Academy studies, the people who actually have done the frontline work of American governance, including government officials and all those who have worked as part of the *de facto* public service alongside and outside government, not to mention citizens associated with all of these organizations.

To all of these people I express my gratitude and admiration. I have known many personally, and to those with whom I have worked on Academy projects I add a special thanks for their contributions to this history. The research on this project has underscored just how many people have made enormous efforts through Academy projects to help improve American governance, and my hat is off to all of them.

Special thanks are also due the Academy Fellows who served as the review team for this project: Diane Disney, Mort Downey, David Garrison, Mary Hamilton, Mark Pisano, and Nancy Tate, as well as Terry Gerton. I could not have had better partners, who were willing to review drafts of this document in great detail, and offer their edits, critiques, suggestions and their own deep knowledge of the Academy's history from first-hand observation and participation. Their contributions have immeasurably improved this history from what it otherwise would have been,

although remaining flaws or questions of interpretation are, of course, wholly my responsibility.

I was fortunate to have the excellent assistance of Academy staff on this project, without which it would have been impossible, especially given the abundant materials and tight schedule we followed. Terry Gerton produced all the support promised, and was actively engaged herself in the entire process with the kind of wise counsel and good judgment needed to keep a project of this scope on the right track and within the bounds of resources available. Thanks to Elijah Evans for applying his research skills, keeping things on schedule, and pulling it all together with unfailing good humor; to David Bilger and Anne Lieber who pitched in as summer interns; and to Lisa Trahan, Director of Academy Affairs, Joe Mitchell, Director of Academy Programs, and Randy Lyon, Chief Financial Officer and Director of Development (and a recently elected Fellow) for reviewing text and sharing their extensive knowledge of the Academy, its work, and its people.

I trust everyone can share the sense of pride in the National Academy of Public Administration's past half-century as an example of Americans, along with the Academy's numerous friends and colleagues around the world, joined in the mutual enterprise of making democracy work.

¹ President's Committee on Administrative Management, *Administrative Management in the Government of the United States: Report with Special Studies*, 1937. President's Committee on Administrative Management: Louis Brownlow, Chairman, Luther H. Gulick and Charles E. Merriam. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed The Brownlow Committee to assess the general organizational structure and management capacity of the U.S. Federal government and recommend improvements the president and Congress should undertake, including ways of strengthening the ongoing managerial function of the presidency.

-
- ² James W. Fesler, "The Brownlow Committee Fifty Years Later," *Public Administration Review* 47, no. 4 (Jul.-Aug., 1987): 291-296.
- ³ The fifty years of the Jubilee was divided into seven periods of seven years each, with the last year of each period a time to leave the land uncultivated. Such sabbatical practices might serve several purposes, including religious observation, restoration of the land, a vacation from labor in the fields, and the discipline of living off stored food along with whatever else was yielded through timeless hunting and gathering practices. The observance of the fifty-year Jubilee would thus mean two continuous years of fallow fields, freedom from customary labor, and the spiritual and psychological discipline imposed by adjustments in material realities and social relationships. Leviticus 25.
- ⁴ Jay W. Forrester, "Systems Dynamics and the Lessons of 35 Years," in *A Systems-Based Approach to Policymaking*, ed. Kenyon B. De Greene (1993), 199-240.
- ⁵ Carmen M. Reinhart and Kenneth S. Rogoff, *This Time is Different: Eight Centuries of Financial Folly*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).
- ⁶ Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," in *Proceedings of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin at its Forty-First Annual Meeting Held December 14, 1893*, (Madison: Democrat Printing Company, 1894).
- ⁷ Lyle C. Fitch, *Making Democracy Work: The Life and Letters of Luther Halsey Gulick, 1892-1993*, (Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, University of California, Berkeley, 1996).
- ⁸ In connection with his work on the Brownlow Committee, Gulick and his colleagues compiled and updated a compendium of sources on their subject matter, including some of Gulick's own contributions. One of his best known pieces was Luther H. Gulick, 1937. "Notes on the Theory of Organization." pp. 3-45 in Gulick, Luther H. and Lyndall Urwick (eds.) 1937/1947/1954. *Papers on the Science of Administration*. Authors of the anthology included Luther H. Gulick, Lyndall Urwick, James D. Mooney, Henri Fayol, Henry S. Dennison, I. J. Henderson, T. N. Whitehead, Elton Mayo, Mary P. Follett, John Lee, and V. A. Graicunas. New York: Institute of Public Administration and Columbia University.
- ⁹ Herbert A. Simon, "The Proverbs of Administration," *Public Administration Review*, 6, no. 1, (1946, Winter), 53-67.
- ¹⁰ Dwight Waldo, *The Administrative State. A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*, (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1948).
- ¹¹ Peter Drucker, *Concept of the Corporation*, (New York: The John Day Company, 1946). The World War II era was a fertile period for thinking about institutions and social dynamics. While Gulick, Simon, and Waldo were

nurturing their respective positions on the nature and future of American public administration, Peter Drucker and his colleague and friend Karl Polanyi had been puzzling out the sorry state of Western civilization and how that might inform their own intellectual journeys and career paths. The two men were born in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, knew each other in Vienna where they both lived in the early 1930s, and Polanyi stayed with Drucker at his Vermont home in the early 1940s. Drucker's 1942 book, *The Future of Industrial Man: A Conservative Approach* (New York: The John Day Company), followed the same general line of thinking and had some of the same concepts and definitions as Polanyi's 1944 book, *The Great Transformation*, which addressed a broad sweep of the roles and relationships among the state, society and economic institutions.

- ¹² Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, (New York: Macmillan, 1947).
- ¹³ Peter F. Drucker "What Business Can Learn from Nonprofits," in *Harvard Business Review*, July 1989; and Drucker, *Managing the Nonprofit Organization: Practices and Principles*, (New York: HarperCollins, 1990).
- ¹⁴ By way of example and disclosure, following in rough chronological order are the institutions with which I have enjoyed a connection and that engaged other Fellows of the Academy: Dickinson College, the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, the Institute of Public Administration, the National Commission on Productivity, the Committee for Economic Development (CED), the National Civic League, government in Montgomery County and the State of Maryland, the Johns Hopkins Institute of Policy Studies, the National Association of Counties (NACO) and associated "Public Interest Groups (PIGS)," the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA), the Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM), and the University of Maryland School of Public Policy. I should probably add to this list the U.S. federal government more generally, including my earlier incarnation as a GS14, and also, of course, the National Academy of Public Administration itself.
- ¹⁵ When a Fellow's name first appears in future chapters it will be identified by an asterisk,* unless otherwise indicated as such in the text. The term "Fellow," and its history and variations, are explained in detail in Chapter 3. For instance, Peter Drucker, noted in this preface, was an "Honorary Fellow" of the Academy.

Chapter 1

Introduction

The National Academy of Public Administration has been in existence for 50 years. This retrospective looks back over that half-century and asks why the organization was created, what it has done since it began, how it has operated, and what impact it has had. The narrative also probes the reasons for the Academy's longevity and accomplishments, and its remarkable ability to adjust to changing circumstances, surmount its own shortcomings, and build on its strengths to address new challenges. An epilogue offers some reflections on the Academy's first fifty years and its prospects for the future.

NAPA was created in mid-twentieth century America to solve increasingly complex problems of institutional design and operation confronting the American system of governance. In the previous three decades, the U.S. federal government had successfully led the nation in overcoming the worst economic depression in its history, in defeating the immediate totalitarian threat to democracy, and in establishing post-World War II international institutions that rallied the free world.

America, to be sure, still had its problems. But when President Dwight D. Eisenhower delivered his first inaugural address in 1953 he did not hold back from praising government for all it had accomplished. He proudly recounted how the United States had stood strong during “a time of recurring trial,” and had “grown in power and in responsibility,” having “passed through the anxieties of depression and of war to a summit unmatched in man's history.”¹ Eisenhower had been a public servant all his life, and had employed government organizations, processes, people and technology to mobilize a mighty armed force, transport it across an ocean, invade a formidable continental fortress, defeat a powerful and determined enemy, restore order and the rule of law, and lay the foundations for 70 years of peace and prosperity in a continent that had experienced long stretches of bloody warfare for centuries.

By the end of Eisenhower’s eight years as president, with the federal government continuing its leadership on such ambitious initiatives as building a continent-wide Interstate Highway System and massively upgrading the country’s public education systems, about three-quarters of Americans said they trusted the federal government to do the right thing almost always or most of the time.² Government had demonstrated its will and capacity to act on behalf of the country as a whole, and Americans’ satisfaction, confidence and pride in their government had rarely been higher.

The 1960s began in the same spirit of strong federal leadership as a new, youthful President John F. Kennedy pledged the United States to bear any burden in the defense of freedom around the world, and promised a “New Frontier” of generational challenges. Following the assassination of President Kennedy, President Lyndon B. Johnson reinforced the promise of federal leadership at home with the passage of historic civil rights legislation and initiation of an array of “Great Society” social programs, and abroad with an escalation of the American combat presence in Vietnam. In 1964, Americans’ trust in the federal government

peaked and began a long-term decline.³ The United States had entered a turbulent era of great aspirations and new anxieties, both at home and abroad, which would once again challenge the purposes and test the capacities of public institutions.

The immediate motivation for the creation of NAPA in 1967 was the need felt by James E. Webb*, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), for “a source of trusted advice” to help create an institutional apparatus capable of carrying out the nation’s ambitious plans for exploring outer space. Webb’s broader vision was for a National Academy of Public Administration, similar to the National Academy of Sciences, to help government design and operate the complex institutions required to harness the potential of science, solve complex problems at home, and meet the challenge of global leadership.

NAPA became a congressionally chartered organization in a four-step process beginning half-a-century ago. It was conceived by Webb at NASA, born as a program of the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) in 1967, incorporated as an independent non-profit organization in the District of Columbia in 1970, and granted a federal charter by act of Congress, signed by President Ronald Reagan in 1984. This story is recounted in Chapter 2.

The knowledge and experience that the new National Academy of Public Administration brought to the country went back a long way. In 1904, Frank J. Goodnow, the first president of the recently created American Political Science Association (APSA), outlined what he viewed APSA’s objects and purposes to be.⁴ Goodnow, a Columbia University Professor of Administrative Law and Municipal Science, said that political science was about “the State,” and recommended that APSA address three topics: (1) the expression of the State will; (2) the content of the State will as expressed; and (3) the execution of the State will. Goodnow’s third

topic essentially carved out a large space within the discipline of political science for the emerging “sub-field” of public administration, which was concerned with developing the capacity to achieve public goals effectively and efficiently while respecting democratic values.

The task that Frank Goodnow laid out at the beginning of the 20th century was no less than to collect and consider the accumulated evidence about states up to that point in history in order to help the American democratic state determine how best to conduct its business. Allies in this effort included Theodore Roosevelt, indefatigable government reformer and incumbent President of the United States, and Woodrow Wilson, author of a seminal essay on “The Study of Administration”⁵ and soon to become president himself. Over the course of the first half of the twentieth century the American public administration discipline and profession would emerge, grow, and mature to play a major role in shaping the federal, state and local governance structures and processes required to build history’s wealthiest, strongest and most dynamic democracy.

Chapter 3 outlines the Academy’s institutional foundations, established in the first twenty-five years of its history. This chapter does not attempt to retell the story of those years, which has already been told in detail by Alan Dean* in his history of the Academy’s first quarter-century.⁶ What does need to be recognized, and is summarized in Chapter 3, is the extraordinary efforts and accomplishments of the Academy’s first quarter-century, and its success in establishing the durable institutional structures and processes on which NAPA would continue to build in its second quarter-century.

By the end of its first twenty-five years, the Academy’s essence could be discerned as a unique combination of factors: its congressional charter and mission of providing trusted advice on

governance; the scope, diversity and quality of its membership; its core values of impartiality, competence and integrity; a vision of governance that draws on a wide range of knowledge and experience in public administration, public management, and other relevant disciplines; the integration of its key functions of membership, thought leadership, and trusted advice; its governance structure and operational capacities for converting mission and vision into practical action; its flexibility and adaptability in adjusting to change, and resilience in addressing institutional challenges and adversities; and a strategic outlook based on learning from the past, continually looking to the future, and acting pragmatically and effectively in the present to address concrete problems.

As the Academy began its second quarter-century in 1992, the country confronted yet another generation of increasingly complex problems of institutional design and operation. An expanding economy continued on its path of globalization, American society continued to be dynamic and turbulent, and the American political system was increasingly polarized. Along with this growth and dynamism came new environmental, social and cultural challenges. Meanwhile, accelerating technological revolutions in information, communications, digitization, artificial intelligence, and the emergence of the Internet, both facilitated governance and also made it that much more complex.

The scope and complexity of public problems had grown beyond the capacity of government itself, and required governance approaches that drew more effectively on the combined strengths of multiple sectors, including government, business, nonprofit and civic organizations, as well as citizens in their own right. The Academy needed to tap a still broader range of experience and knowledge that had developed in public administration, public affairs, public policy, public and generic management, and other relevant disciplines in the social sciences and beyond, in order to

address this new generation of challenges confronting the nation's systems of governance.

As it happened, a new surge of reform had already begun in American state and local government in the 1960s, and similar kinds of public management reforms had begun to emerge in the 1970s and 80s in other economically advanced democracies such as the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand. This new wave of reforms included boundary-spanning efforts to draw on and connect the government, business, nonprofit and civic sectors in networks of mutual problem-solving to address a more complex array of public needs. In that light, the National Civic League characterized the new reform wave as encompassing issues of *governance* as much as *government*⁷, while the government side of the reform equation was variously characterized as *new public management*⁸ and *reinventing government*⁹.

In 1996, a conference of top officials responsible for government reform in 26 countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris confirmed the international scope and similarity of this wave of reform efforts. The presiding officer of the conference, Alice Rivlin,* Director of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, reported that all 26 country representatives agreed – much to their common surprise – that they were facing similar challenges (e.g. fiscal stress, taxpayer resistance, and demands for higher service), using similar approaches (e.g. privatization, devolution, performance measurement, competition), and wrestling with similar dilemmas (e.g. how to give greater latitude to government employees while ensuring high standards of performance).¹⁰

The conference participants also stressed that “[t]he quality and effectiveness of "governance" is crucial to national prosperity.” Good public management, to be sure, was an essential component of good governance, and there was no question that public

management reform was necessary. However, concluded the OECD ministers, “[g]overnance goes beyond the issue of public management to the more fundamental question of how in our modern society democracy can be adapted to help countries resolve the problems they are facing. In that regard, we urge the OECD and its Public Management Committee in particular to expand its attention to governance issues.”¹¹

By the beginning of the Academy’s second quarter-century in the early 1990s, the 30-year decline of trust in the federal government was hovering at its all-time lows. Only one-fifth of Americans said they would trust the federal government to do the right thing almost always or most of the time.¹² There were many reasons for this long-term decline. For one thing, the public’s trust in most major institutions was declining. The public also perceived government performance --- including both its effectiveness and efficiency -- as lagging behind that of the business sector, as well as inadequately addressing, or even confounding, urgent public needs.¹³

It had become clear to a growing number of leaders in a wide variety of professions and arenas of public life that something systemic was at play that called for government to rethink its purposes, values, structures, processes and its overall capacity for addressing the needs of its citizens and of the country as a whole.¹⁴ This was the nature of the challenge confronting the National Academy of Public Administration as it began its second quarter-century.

NAPA’s second twenty-five years, as it turns out, breaks down rather neatly along the unusual occurrence in American history of three successive two-term presidencies. Chapter 4 recounts the activities of the Academy during the years of the Clinton Administration (1992-2001), Chapter 5 during the years of the

Bush Administration (2001-2009), and Chapter 6 during the years of the Obama Administration (2009-2017).

Chapter 7, an epilogue rather than a conclusion, offers some reflections on the Academy's first fifty years, including comparisons with Alan Dean's reflections on its first quarter-century. The epilogue ends by summarizing the apparent essence of the Academy that accounts for its longevity and accomplishments in the past, and will no doubt test its prospects in a future that will be at least as challenging. For the country now confronts yet another generation of daunting institutional challenges, and the public's low trust in the federal government is further complicated by what appears to be a declining loss of confidence in democracy itself. The United States will need a strong National Academy of Public Administration in the next fifty years at least as much as it did in the last fifty years.

An Appendix includes access to the reports produced by the Academy over the past quarter-century, as well as links to information on the Fellows of the Academy and various documents that might ease future reference in fleshing out the story told here and answering questions about the Academy and its operations.

¹ President Dwight David Eisenhower, "First Inaugural Address" (speech, Washington D.C., January 20, 1953).

² The National Election Study began asking about trust in government in 1958, posing the question: "Do you trust the federal government to do the right thing almost always or most of the time?" In 1958, about three-quarters of Americans trusted the federal government to do the right thing almost always or most of the time. Pew Research Center, "Public Trust in Government: 1958-2017," National Election Study, (2017), <http://www.people-press.org/2017/05/03/public-trust-in-government-1958-2017>

³ Trust in the federal government began to decline in about 1964, and the decline continued in the 1970s, falling to about 25 percent in 1979. It then recovered,

reaching about 45 percent by 1986, when it turned and began to decline again, falling to 20 percent in 1992. Pew *Research Center, Op cit.*

⁴ Frank J. Goodnow, “The Work of the American Political Science Association,” Presidential Address, (1904), in *Proceedings of the American Political Science Association*, 35-46.

⁵ Woodrow Wilson, “The Study of Administration,” *Political Science Quarterly*, 2, no. 2, (June, 1887): 197-222.

⁶ A detailed account of the Academy from its creation in 1967 to 1992 is presented in Alan L. Dean with the assistance of Herbert N. Jasper, *The First 25 Years: A History of the National Academy of Public Administration*, (Washington, DC: National Academy of Public Administration, 1997). That history is the principal source used in Chapters 2 and 3 to describe NAPA’s origins and institutional foundations, which were established in that first quarter-century.

⁷ The National Civic League, originally formed in 1894 as the National Municipal League, broadened its perspective from government to governance as a pragmatic adjustment to the changing realities in American cities. A new generation of public challenges required enlisting the comparative advantages and special talents of multiple sectors, including networks of business, nonprofit, and civic organizations, as well as government. The League promoted “citizen democracy,” dependent on a strong civic culture, to drive the demand for constructive politics, sound public administration and management, and collaborative problem-solving that shared in the production of high-performance public services. Academy Fellows engaged with the National Civic League included Terry Sanford, Terrell Blodgett, Alan K. “Scotty” Campbell, Neal Peirce, Scott Fosler, John Parr, Chris Gates, Mark Pisano, Henry Cisneros, Curtis Johnson, John Gardner, Walter Broadnax, David Matthews, Camille Cates Barnett, William Dodge, and Gloria Rubio-Cortez.

⁸ Christopher Hood, “A Public Management for All Seasons?,” *Public Administration*, 69 Spring, 1991, 3-19.

⁹ David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Longman, 1992).

¹⁰ Alice Rivlin, “Statement by the Chair of the Ministerial Symposium on the Future of Public Services.” (speech, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1996).

¹¹ Rivlin, 1996, *Op cit.*

¹² Trust in the federal was around 20 percent in 1992. By the year 2000, it had climbed erratically back up to about 35 percent. After 9/11, it spiked to 55 percent and then almost as quickly began a sharp decline to below 20 percent. It recovered slightly, but since 2007, the share of Americans saying they can

trust the federal government always or most of the time has not surpassed 30 percent, and by 2017 had fallen back to 20 per cent (with 4 percent who say they can trust the federal government to do what is right “just about always” and 16 percent “most of the time”). Pew *Research Center, Op cit.*

¹³ The Academy has addressed the question of trust government in a number of projects, including a Panel chaired by former Congressman James R. Jones*, which produced a report entitled *Beyond Distrust: Building Bridges Between Congress and the Executive* (1992) with support from the Ford Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, the Prudential Foundation, and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company; and a report by a Panel chaired by former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul A. Volcker* entitled *A Government to Trust and Respect: Rebuilding Citizen Government Relations for the 21st Century* (1999), with support from the Pew Charitable Trust.

¹⁴ Prominent leaders in the field of public administration had begun to address these issues in 1968 when public administration scholar Dwight Waldo organized a conference at Syracuse University’s Minnowbrook Conference Center in the Adirondack Mountains to seriously assess the state of the field and of American government. Syracuse University is the home of The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, which established one of the country’s earliest graduate programs of public administration in the United States. In 1988 public administration scholar H. George Frederickson organized a Minnowbrook II” conference, establishing a 20-year tradition for such an assessment that was honored in 2008 with ”Minnowbrook III.” See H. George Frederickson* and Richard T. Mayer, eds. 1989 PAR49(2), “Minnowbrook II: Changing Epochs of Public Administration,” *Public Administration Review* 49(2) and Rosemary O’Leary*, David M. Van Slyke*, and Soonhee Kim, eds. 2010, *The Future of Public Administration around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press).

Chapter 2

Origins of NAPA

NAPA was born in the space age. The National Academy of Public Administration was established in 1967 largely due to the efforts of James E. Webb*, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).¹ Webb needed help in fashioning an organization with the performance capacities to fulfill President Kennedy's goal of putting a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth by the end of the decade.

A successful human round-trip to the moon obviously required cutting-edge science and technology. But Webb understood that it also meant drawing on a rich and diverse base of knowledge and experience in organization, administration, and management that had developed over the previous century in an age of increasingly complex organizations and institutional challenges. Webb needed not just theoretical knowledge, but also people with first-hand experience in actually shaping and managing such organizations, knowledgeable people driven by a pragmatic tradition of doing what works in the American grand tradition of performance-based, results-driven thought and action.

NAPA was also born in a space-age culture of governance. A revolution in science was literally remaking society, and science-

based, technology-infused organizations and thinking were becoming more pervasive in the federal government. NASA was established in 1958 as just one of many new organizations that looked to strengthen the federal government's capacity to harness science and technology in the nation's interest. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Office of Naval Research had been created in 1946 in a science-oriented federal restructuring that included the entire Department of Defense in 1947–1949, the creation of the National Science Foundation in 1950, and the creation of the National Bureau of Standards two years after NASA was formed.²

The federal government had been engaged with science from its earliest days. President Thomas Jefferson viewed the Lewis and Clark expedition he initiated as a scientific venture. The Morrill Act of 1862 provided federal land grants to the states to establish colleges and universities that supported scientific research and education. The National Academy of Sciences was chartered by Congress in 1863 to support the federal war effort against the Confederacy. And the nation's scientific establishment was enlisted again in both world wars in the 20th century.³

However, the scientific agenda adopted by the federal government after World War II was of a different magnitude and nature. In the last year of the war, President Roosevelt had approached his senior science advisor, Vannevar Bush, Director of the federal Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD), about his thoughts on a role for science after the war.⁴ Bush responded with a report that laid out an ambitious vision for the federal support of science, with an emphasis on financing basic scientific research.⁵ The reason for the profound influence of the report lay less in Bush's detailed policy blueprint than his framework for thinking about science and technology. He and his colleagues sought to extend the government's support of basic science into peacetime while reducing the government's control of

the performance of basic research in a manner that might unduly stifle scientific creativity.”⁶ Achieving a balance between basic scientific research and the development of results-oriented technologies within a budget Congress and the American public would support was to become a continuing theme of national policy.

So Webb’s leadership of NASA was not just part of a transforming federal government. It was also part of the expansion of relationships among government, business, universities, and other nonprofit organizations as the United States geared up to address mounting global challenges, including the Cold War, as well increasingly complex challenges in domestic policy. In his farewell address in 1961, President Eisenhower had warned of a “military-industrial complex” that had developed in support of the Cold War against the Soviet Union, a development which Senator William J. Fulbright later suggested (somewhat sarcastically) would be more accurately characterized as a “military-industrial-academic complex.”⁷ The challenge of enlisting science in the national interest had an increasingly complex institutional dimension.

Webb had drawn on the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) for assistance with the scientific and technical aspects of the space program. He had also tapped some of the leading management consulting firms for assistance on the organizational and management aspects of the manned-space challenge. But he was still lacking people with first-hand knowledge and experience of how to design and manage complex public institutions. For that, he envisioned the creation of a National Academy of Public Administration, similar to the NAS in institutional structure, for providing trusted advice to government. Webb was aware that no organization had received a congressional charter similar to that of NAS since 1863, when President Abraham Lincoln signed the congressionally-adopted charter for the science academy. But

Webb was a man of great imagination and ambition, and so he set out to create an organization that would both address his immediate need at NASA and provide “a source of trusted advice” that could also serve the expanding challenges of an increasingly complex American system of governance.

It would take nearly two decades and three major organizational steps to achieve Webb’s conception of a congressionally chartered National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), including:

- the creation of NAPA as a program within the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) in 1967;
- incorporation as an independent, nonprofit organization in the District of Columbia in 1970; and,
- establishment as a federally chartered organization by act of Congress signed by President Reagan in 1984.

Emergence in the American Society of Public Administration (1967)

The National Academy of Public Administration was created as a semi-autonomous organizational component of the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) in 1967. ASPA was part of a complex of organizations that had emerged in Chicago in the 1930s to address the challenges to American governance that had grown out of the Great Depression and a faltering economy.

In 1965, Webb, then NASA Administrator, began a series of conversations with Elmer Staats* and John Macy*, both former ASPA presidents, about establishing a new public administration academy similar to the National Academy of Sciences.

Webb was familiar with ASPA, had become increasingly involved in its leadership, and believed that organization was a suitable

vehicle for fashioning the kind of regular, high-level, hands-on source of “trusted advice” he sought to help him design and manage NASA and the American space program. He envisioned a mechanism by which senior people could provide advice to government agencies under contract in return for standard consultant fees. When Webb first tested this idea with ASPA he found little support for it. ASPA at the time was under financial pressure, and members of the ASPA National Council continued to be wary of an "elitist" affiliate, with recollections still fresh in their minds of an earlier rejected proposal to create the position of “Society Fellow.” So the notion of a national academy for public administration had been put off.⁸

However, after Webb became President of ASPA in late 1966, he was in a stronger position to promote the idea. In November of that year, he persuaded the ASPA National Council to accept his concept in principle, and to endorse what he saw as a first step toward a full-fledged academy, by establishing a "Public Administration Advisory Council," which, in the meantime, might also serve to provide him with the kind of advice he was looking for as Administrator of NASA.

The new advisory council enlisted the past presidents of ASPA, who began to see the potential for Webb’s vision, and who soon unanimously endorsed the establishment of a new organization along the lines he had originally suggested. Its members would initially consist of all the past presidents of ASPA, who would collectively act as its governing body, deciding among other things the process and criteria for selection of additional members.

A formal plan to create such an organization was put to the ASPA National Council, which endorsed it on March 30, 1967, substituting the name “National Academy of Public Administration,” preferred by Webb, for the previously used term of Public Administration Advisory Council.⁹ 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 from among the newly constituted membership of former ASPA presidents to assist in getting the Academy organized and underway.

Bylaws were approved by the membership of the new organization on June 15, 1967, just a few months after it had been formally established. The bylaws named the new entity the "National Academy of Public Administration of the American Society for Public Administration." The Chairman, to be elected annually by the membership to a one-year renewable term, was given broad powers to appoint committees and *ad hoc* project panels, and, with the consent of the Executive Committee, to appoint and remove the Executive Director.

Chairman Millett immediately began working with ASPA's Executive Director, Don Bowen,* to organize the new Academy and make it operational. The Executive Committee launched a search for a NAPA Executive Director, and began discussions with Webb for a contract with NASA to provide financing for the new organization.

The first formal membership meeting of the new National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) was held in Washington, D.C. on September 15-16, 1967. The founding membership, composed of all former presidents of ASPA, formally elected Millett as Chairman, and voted to increase the organization's membership to 52 persons.¹⁰

While NAPA was created as a "constituent part of the American Society for Public Administration," both the ASPA and new NAPA leadership intended it would have its own organizational identity and operational capacity, with a full-time executive director, professional and support staff, and its own sources of

financial support sufficient to cover the full costs of its operations, including the overhead to ASPA.

Active operations began in October 1967, when George A. Graham* was recruited to be NAPA's first executive director. At the time he was hired, Graham had been Director of Governmental Studies at the Brookings Institution, and previously a professor of politics at Princeton University and one of the founding faculty members of Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

Webb and NAPA's other founders understood that a National Academy of Public Administration would be little more than a concept or an honorary society without a full-time and dedicated professional staff, and that required a steady source of adequate financing. Webb's willingness to assure contracts with NASA was crucial to providing the financial support that allowed for the hiring of Graham and other professional staff. Webb's General Counsel at NASA, Paul G. Dembling,* developed the rationale to justify NASA's support of work done by the Academy.¹¹ The initial NASA contract also appeared to be helpful in convincing several foundations of the seriousness of this new enterprise, and so added foundation grants to the start-up financial support. Graham was thus able to begin staffing the new organization with several professionals and support personnel and getting its first studies under way, with the full and enthusiastic support of Chairman Millett and NAPA's other charter members. By October 1970, there were 12 full-time and four part-time professional staff members, including Assistant Executive Director Roy W. Crawley,* who would later succeed Graham as Executive Director.¹²

In writing the history of NAPA's first 25 years, Alan Dean concluded that:

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 world.¹³

Incorporation as an Independent Organization (1970)

The Academy's next major organizational step was to become an independent nonprofit organization. By this early stage, NAPA had developed many of the key institutional features that continued to characterize it for the next half-century, including its name, mission, values, governance structure, membership concept, staffing patterns, financing, panel structure, program and project formats, and style of relationships with other organizations.¹⁴

The National Academy of Public Administration was incorporated as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization in the District of Columbia in 1970. The Articles of Incorporation (since amended principally for clarification) essentially formalized and gave legal authority to the governance structure of the original bylaws that had been adopted when NAPA was created as a program of ASPA. The articles established a Board of Trustees¹⁵ to manage the organization, designated seven initial trustees, established NAPA as a "membership corporation," with each member entitled to one vote, and authorized the membership itself to designate in the bylaws the

criteria for membership and how the elections would be conducted.¹⁶ The purposes of the Academy originally included in the Articles of Incorporation were later incorporated into the Academy's 1984 congressional charter, which now states the Academy's "objects and purposes."¹⁷

The Articles of Incorporation established two legal entities, one the "National Academy of Public Administration" and the other the "National Academy of Public Administration Foundation," which for all practical purposes have functioned as a single organization.¹⁸

Congressional Charter (1984)

The idea of securing a Federal charter had been alive in NAPA from its conception. The model NAPA's founders had in mind was the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), which had received a Federal charter in 1863 signed by President Abraham Lincoln.

The National Academy of Sciences was chartered to honor the nation's outstanding scientists and to serve as a source of scientific advice for the Federal government, especially urgent at the time since the nation was engaged in a civil war. The new science academy had its ups and downs at the beginning, but grew in stature in the years up to World War I. In its preparation for that war, the Federal government approached NAS for assistance, and the leaders of the Academy were confronted with the reality that its membership in general had fallen behind in certain areas of science and technology, and were not fully prepared to offer the kind of assistance the Federal government needed to enter into a modern, industrial-strength war.¹⁹ NAS leaders took action to alter the structure and procedures of their Academy in order to tap the "best in the field" for all of the expert panels, whether or not those

people had been elected to Academy membership. Throughout the 20th century NAS grew in stature and in size, and became influential in addressing the technical and scientific needs of the federal government and its agencies.²⁰

Obtaining a congressional charter had become increasingly difficult in the early years of NAPA's formation. According to new standards adopted by the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives in 1979, any organization seeking a charter had to have been in operation for at least 10 years and be organized and operated in the public interest as a nonprofit and non-partisan organization. Its activities needed to have a national scope and be in the service of a national need. The Senate Judiciary Committee adopted a stringent procedural requirement that any proposed charter must be co-sponsored by at least 40 senators before it would even be considered.²¹

The key mover in getting the Academy's charter was Elmer Staats, then Controller General of the United States and an Academy Fellow and Trustee. Staats was highly regarded in Congress, and made the case to key Members. In early 1983, Staats presented a draft bill for an Academy Federal charter to Rep. Jack Brooks (D-Tex.), who chaired the House Government Operations Committee and was also ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, which was responsible for charter legislation.²² After some initial reluctance, Brooks introduced H.R. bill 3249 to award the Academy a charter. Richard Wegman*, a former staff director of the Senate Government Operations (later Governmental Affairs) Committee, was instrumental in securing the needed Senate sponsors, and NAPA Board Chairman Philip (Sam) Hughes* and Dwight Ink* also worked on behalf of the project. Supporters of the Academy charter persevered through several months, including hearings in the House and Senate. The bill finally passed both houses of Congress, and President Ronald Reagan signed it on April 10, 1984.²³

President Reagan sent the following letter to Academy Chairman Sam Hughes:

The White House
April 10, 1984

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 Academy's Federal Charter is now its core governance document. It establishes the Academy's official authority as the nation's premier source of "trusted advice" on issues of governance, public management, and public administration. It provides the Academy with certain rights and responsibilities. And it articulates the Academy's core mission and values.²⁴

The Charter set forth the following "objects and purposes" for the Academy:

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 practical approaches to their resolution;
3. Assessing the effectiveness, structure, administration, and implications for governance of present or proposed public programs, policies, and processes, 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.²⁵

In pursuit of those objectives, the Charter sets out the following charge: “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 purpose.”²⁶

Beginning in 1984, the National Academy of Public Administration was increasingly called upon by Congress and Federal agencies to enlist recognized experts to provide independent, objective, evidence-based advice on important issues of governance, management, and public administration affecting

the federal government and the nation. For the most part, the Academy's principal method of engaging experts was on project panels in which a consensus view of findings and recommendations would be recorded in written reports to Congress or the sponsoring agencies. However, the instruments and methods used by the Academy to provide such advice have evolved over time to accommodate different kinds of government needs. For instance, from its beginning, NAPA had established standing panels. In the Academy's second 25 years, the changing needs of sponsors as well as significant federal court decisions, legislation, and executive orders, all contributed to changes in how the Academy operated in fulfilling its mission. It has employed a wider array of instruments and methods to provide "trusted advice" to government (and other sponsors) in a manner that suits their needs, especially for timely advice delivered to assist in coping with an increasingly complex and fast-paced environment.²⁷

¹ As noted earlier, this chapter on the origins of NAPA relies heavily on Alan L. Dean with the assistance of Herbert N. Jasper, *The First 25 Years: A History of the National Academy of Public Administration*, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration, 1997). A link to that history is included in the Appendix.

² Peter D. Blair, "The Evolving Role of the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in Providing Science and Technology Policy Advice to the US Government," *Palgrave Communications*, (2016), doi: 10.1057/palcomms.2016.30.

³ R. Cochrane, *The National Academy of Sciences: The First 100 Years, 1863–1963*, (Washington D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978).

⁴ G. Pascal Zachary, *Endless Frontier: Vannevar Bush, Engineer of the American Century*, (New York: Free Press, 1997).

⁵ Vannevar Bush, *Science: The Endless Frontier: A Report to the President by Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, July 1945*, (Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1945), Reprinted as *Science: The Endless Frontier: A Report to the President on a Program for Postwar Scientific Research*, (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1990).

⁶ Donald E. Stokes, *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation*, (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1997): 2.

-
- ⁷ J. William Fulbright, “The War and Its Effects: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex,” in *Super-State: Readings in the Military-Industrial Complex*, ed. Herbert I. Schiller and Joseph D. Phillips, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970): 171-77.
- ⁸ Letter from James E. Webb to former presidents of ASPA and minutes of the meeting of past ASPA presidents, March 28, 1967 cited in Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.
- ⁹ Minutes of the meeting of past ASPA presidents, March 28, 1967 cited in Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.
- ¹⁰ In 1988 the Academy bylaws were amended to use the term “Fellow” for members. For simplicity, the text uses the term “Fellow” throughout to identify members of the Academy.
- ¹¹ Conversation between Paul Dembling, legal council to the National Academy of Public Administration, and Scott Fosler, Academy President, February 1992. Dembling’s basic rationale was essentially that NASA required the kind of trusted, expert advice an organization like NAPA could provide in order to accomplish its mission. It is less likely such financial arrangements and rapid startup could be achieved in Washington today (or at virtually any time in NAPA’s second 25 years). In fact, since at least the 1990s, when the Academy has elected executives in federal agencies to the Academy membership they more often than not would recuse themselves from any form of contractual or financial exchange between their agencies and NAPA.
- ¹² Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.
- ¹³ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.
- ¹⁴ These key organizational features of NAPA are discussed in Chapter 3 “Foundations: The Legacy of the First 25 Years.”
- ¹⁵ The original designation of an Academy Board of Trustees included in the Articles of Incorporation was altered to “Board of Directors” in the congressional charter. The latter name became the designation used by NAPA, although many Fellows and others have continued to refer to the “Board of Trustees,” and its members as “Trustees.”
- ¹⁶ The registered agent for the Articles of Incorporation was George A. Graham, NAPA’s first executive director, and the registered address was 1225 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. The seven initial trustees of the corporation were John D. Millett, Chairman, Ferrel Heady, Matthias E. Lukens, Rufus E. Miles, Jr., William Parsons, John A. Perkins and York Willbern. The three incorporators were James M. Mitchell, James E. Webb and Roy W. Crawley. The congressional charter adopted in 1984 recognized NAPA’s incorporation as a nonprofit 501(c) (3) organization in the District of Columbia in 1970, but superseded it as the organization’s principal governing authority.

-
- ¹⁷ PL 98-257. United States Congress, Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Public Law 98-257, 98th Congress, signed by President Ronald Reagan April 10, 1984, Charter of the National Academy of Public Administration, hereafter referred to interchangeably as PL 98-257, or the Academy’s congressional charter or federal charter.
- ¹⁸ The “National Academy of Public Administration” was referred to in official parlance as “the Academy,” and the “National Academy of Public Administration Foundation” was referred to as “the Foundation.” The “National Academy of Public Administration Foundation” served as the Academy’s operating arm, carrying out its study projects and consulting services for which it charged a fee or otherwise had a grant or contract. These names led to some confusion since a foundation in common parlance is viewed as a grant-making organization, and since some organizations establish foundations as a tax-exempt affiliate that is involved primarily in fund-raising and grant-making. In 2006 an amendment to the Articles of Incorporation, while keeping the “dual organization” structure, essentially exchanged the names so that they aligned with the respective legal entity fitting their titles. This name change, of course, created a period of further confusion for all those who had carefully mastered the counter-intuitive terminology in the original names of the two legal entities.
- ¹⁹ Conversation between Frank Press, President, National Academy of Sciences, and Scott Fosler, President, National Academy of Public Administration, February 1992.
- ²⁰ Blair, *Op cit.*, 2016; and, Cochrane R, *Op. cit.*, 1978.
- ²¹ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.
- ²² Elmer Staats, “The History of the Congressional Charter for the National Academy of Public Administration,” National Academy of Public Administration, 1997.
- ²³ P.L. 98-257, *Op. cit.* United States Congress, Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Public Law 98-257, 98th Congress, signed by President Ronald Reagan on April 10, 1984, Charter of the National Academy of Public Administration
- ²⁴ PL 98-257, *Op. cit.*
- ²⁵ PL 98-257, *Op. cit.*
- ²⁶ PL 98-257, *Op. cit.*
- ²⁷ Both NAPA and the National Academy of Sciences have evolved over the years in their methods, in response to experience as well as changing circumstances. See Blair, “The Evolving Role of the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in Providing Science and Technology Policy Advice to the US Government.” Over the years,

NAPA and NAS have worked together on substantive projects, and have also collaborated regarding their similar charters and parallel roles. See Chapter 5: The Clinton Years 1992-2001 for a discussion of congressional modifications of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) to accommodate the special roles of NAPA and NAS. In 2017, the two academies collaborated on examining methods NAS has long-used to produce its expert panel reports.

Chapter 3

Foundations: Legacy of NAPA's

First 25 Years

In its first quarter-century, NAPA's founders and early contributors put in place an organizational structure and basic practices that provided high-quality research and trusted advice to government institutions in all three branches of the federal government, as well as at the state, local, regional, and international levels.¹ The institutional foundation laid in those years constitutes the key structural features of the organization as it exists today, presented here in three principal arenas of Academy activity: governance and operations, programs and projects, and Academy affairs.

Governance and Operations (1967-1992)

As presented in Chapter 2, NAPA's legal structure as an organization was formed in three key steps, each of which was based on a formal governance document: creation in ASPA in 1967 with its own Academy bylaws; establishment as an

independent nonprofit organization in 1970 through Articles of Incorporation in the District of Columbia; and a Federal charter passed by Congress and signed by the President in 1984. In each of those steps NAPA was governed by a progressively “higher authority,” so that after it was awarded a federal charter, the hierarchy of its formal governing authorities became the reverse of the sequence in which it obtained them. Beginning in 1984, its overall governing authority was set by the congressional charter, which recognized the Academy’s laws of incorporation, which in turn gave the Academy the authority to establish its own bylaws. This is the layering of governing authority which has continued to the present: congressional charter, Articles of Incorporation, Academy Bylaws.

Mission, Vision, and Values

The Academy’s mission is spelled out in the “objects and purposes” of its charter, enumerated in Chapter 2. James Webb’s vision of the Academy as a source of “trusted advice” has from the beginning served to summarize NAPA’s core mission and values, elaborated as providing meaningful advice that is of the highest quality, factual, evidence-based, supported by professional research, strictly nonpartisan and impartial, and guided by the highest standards of ethics and integrity.

Governing Board and Committees

NAPA’s basic governance structure consists of a Board of Directors elected by the full Academy membership, which also adopts the organization’s bylaws. The Board, in turn, elects its own officers, headed by a Chair. The Chair has broad powers to appoint committees and *ad hoc* panels, and, with the consent of the Board,

to appoint the President and Chief Executive Officer, who is responsible for the appointment and management of the staff and running the basic operations of the organization.²

Each year, the Board Chair appoints a Directors Nominating Committee which recommends a slate to the full membership. Any Fellow is permitted to nominate additional candidates by petition, provided at least ten additional Fellows are in support.

The Board of Directors has had a variety of committee structures over the years. By 1989 it was regularly using an Executive Committee, Investment Committee, Management Committee, Program Committee, Membership and Ethics Committee, and Development Committee.³

The Executive Committee originally functioned as an executive organ of the entire Academy membership of 20 (19 former ASPA presidents plus the current one) because at the outset there was no formal governing board. In fact, because it included most of the membership, the Executive Committee functioned more or less as a *de facto* governing board.⁴ Once a Board of Trustees was created (later renamed the Board of Directors), the Executive Committee operated in the more familiar manner of expediting the business of the Board. By 1992 the Executive Committee generally was composed of the Board officers with the possible addition of one to three other Board members (and perhaps corporate officers who were not Board members) and functioned as a more traditional board executive committee, a practice which has continued into the present.

The Investment Committee is the oldest specialized committee. Initially composed only of Directors, the Investment Committee expanded its membership pool as the size of the investment fund grew, adding Fellows who were not Directors, and occasionally non-Fellows with financial and investment expertise. James Stein,

who made substantial contributions to the Academy's investment fund, arranged for the committee to have the advice of James Bates (later an Honorary Fellow), a professional portfolio manager for the State Farm Insurance Companies, who advised the Investment Committee on a *pro bono* basis for many years and played a major role in the growth of the Academy's financial base.⁵

The Management Committee was reconstituted in 1990 as the Finance Committee, charged with overseeing the Academy's financial operations, management planning, and administrative matters, including staffing, staff compensation, and office space.

The Program Committee was created in 1990 and chaired by a Director, but also included a small number of former Directors. Its role was never clearly defined, and it was periodically inactive. It occasionally advised on issues of quality management, reviewed and commented on several proposed projects, and oversaw work on papers supporting NAPA's strategic agenda.

The Membership and Ethics Committee was chaired by a Director but included other Fellows. It advised the Board on membership concerns, including procedures for nominating and electing Fellows, and issues relating to ethical conduct.

The Development Committee, chaired by a Director with some non-Board members, advised on increasing public awareness of NAPA and on fundraising issues.

In 1977 the Board held its first "off campus" overnight retreat at Harper's Ferry, West Virginia, enabling the Board, the President, and key staff to give sustained attention both to the substantive program and to operational matters. Subsequent Boards generally sustained that practice, although over time the retreat was reduced to one day and held in the Academy offices, becoming essentially an extended Board meeting.

There was substantial continuity in Academy leadership during the first 25 years, aided by the practice of reelecting Board chairs instead of rotating the post among Directors, and by the fact that Presidents generally served four to five years.

President and Staff

In 1972, the Assistant Executive Director, Roy W. Crawley, succeeded the first Executive Director, George Graham, helping to maintain stability of leadership and to sustain the momentum of organizational development in the Academy's first decade.

The top professional staff officer of the Academy was originally called the Executive Director. That title was changed to President in 1976. The President was formally characterized as “chief executive of the staff,” but not of the entire organization. This formal designation was changed in 2003 so that the title became President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO).

The President (and formerly the Executive Director) has always been appointed by and served at the pleasure of the Board, and has always been a professional in public administration, government, or some related field.

Professional project staff who work on specific NAPA projects included permanent professional staff as well as people hired temporarily for specific projects.

Priorities, Strategy, and Capacity

A threshold challenge for the Academy over the years has been to define precisely what its subject matter is, and what the best ways are to set priorities and to build and finance the institutional capacities required to achieve its mission.

As noted in Chapter 2, the name “National Academy of Public Administration” was chosen by its founders only after several years of discussion before the organization was created.⁶ The *national* part was clear enough, meaning the United States of America, and has always been taken to mean all levels of governance from federal to state, regional, and local.⁷ Over the years the Academy has also ranged widely into the international arena, and occasionally has elected non-American citizens to membership.

The *academy* part of the name was also fairly clear. The founders had in mind creating a “sister organization” to the National Academy of Sciences, composed of members elected to the academy on the basis of outstanding professional accomplishments and contributions to the field. From its beginnings, views about precisely how such an Academy should function have varied, the more so as NAPA significantly expanded its membership and became a far more diverse organization. .

Fellows play a major role in the governance of NAPA, electing the Board of Directors and serving on that board and various other governing committees. Fellows are also central to the substantive work of the Academy, serving as members of project panels and other vehicles for meeting contractual obligations to sponsors, as well as on standing panels, which provide an important source of ongoing connection to various arenas of governance.

Most Fellow participation in Academy activities is volunteer and generally *pro bono*, including service on governing bodies of the Academy, and on project and standing panels. Project panel members are offered an honorary stipend, and Fellows may be hired as consultants to staff project work. Some of NAPA's professional staff may also be Fellows, as has always been the case with the office of Academy President. Fellows also make a financial contribution to the Academy, regularly through annual dues (which account for a small percentage of Academy revenues), and occasionally through donations.

Defining *public administration* has been perhaps the most problematic aspect of NAPA's name. Both *public* and *administration* can have widely different meanings, and are sources of spirited debate and varied interpretation. The term *public administration* is also endlessly debated, including by those who profess to be within the profession, practice, or discipline of public administration, whether as practitioners, theorists, or educators.

At the time of NAPA's founding in the 1960s, the term "public administration" was generally understood by those who characterized themselves by the label to refer principally to the actual operations of government, especially in its modern context of complex organizations operating within the public sphere. The principal task of public administration was to "make government work," and, more broadly, to "make democracy work."

As noted in Chapter 1, the field and academic discipline of public administration was born within the academic field and discipline of political science, which was concerned with the institutions of the state and the political process, as well as with the design and operations of government organizations. The subfield of public administration emerged as political scientists came to understand that in the modern world, the complexities of the formal organs of

government had reached a point that required a specialized focus, and its own base of knowledge and specialists.

In the United States, the American Political Science Association (APSA) recognized “public administration” as a subdiscipline early in the twentieth century.⁸ As that sub-discipline developed, its adherents increasingly sought their own institutions, recognition, and independence from political science per se. Many political scientists were content to let them do so while they themselves continued to focus on the problems of overtly political institutions and political dynamics. A variation of the “politics-administration dichotomy” was present at the creation of public administration as a subdiscipline of political science, and its contours and nature have been debated ever since.

The consensus view of the theoretical “politics-administration dichotomy,” which emerged in the early days of public administration (most prominently in the writings of Woodrow Wilson), has generally been that while it is empirically and normatively useful to differentiate the political (or policy) from the administrative (or operational) dimensions of a governance system, the two realms are not distinct but are overlapping and endlessly intertwined. Indeed, part of the art of governance, and especially democratic governance, is to understand and to keep clear both the contours of the differentiation and the ubiquitous interactions among politics, policy-making, and policy execution. One of the challenges of public administration is to understand the areas of overlap and to consciously keep them as differentiated as is practically possible so that policy-making remains the realm of elected officials and political appointees, while execution remains the realm of nonpartisan, politically neutral, impartial and competent professionals.

The U.S. Constitution establishes a complex structure for framing these issues, with its provision for a strong federal government

capable of acting with sufficient strength to pursue the compelling public interests of a great nation, while also being constrained within a system of federalism, separate branches of government, and various checks and balances to keep overly ambitious and self-interested politicians and political groups from amassing disproportionate power. American states, meanwhile, are not just building blocks of the federal system, but also essential organs of a decentralized structure.

Within this institutional thicket it is expected that the organs of government will function effectively and efficiently in carrying out the legitimate political aims determined by an informed and freely voting public. It is one of the principal tasks of public administration to endeavor to ensure that this is what actually happens.

These questions became even more complicated as ancillary or rival subdisciplines emerged to address various aspects of the increasingly complex governance challenge. In reflecting on this period from the perspectives of the late 1990s and his experience as Dean of Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Donald Stokes identified several waves of public service education that also represented varying approaches to the challenge of making democratic government work in mid-twentieth-century America. These included:

- the *public administration* movement that grew out of the Progressive Era's intense desire to sever administration from corrupt politics and make it a field of specialized professional competence;
- the *public affairs* movement that spread across a number of college campuses after World War II motivated by the belief that it was "impossible to make headway on the country's problems without becoming involved in the content of policy as well as in its administrative implementation";

- the *public policy* movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s, when “it was thought that government had an urgent need for policy analysts rigorously trained in the new optimizing techniques”; and
- the *public management* movement, “The disappointment with the results of many of the policy initiatives of the Johnson years gave rise to the view that the government might not need a set of classy policy analysts as much as it needed a set of managers who could build and administer programs and get things done.”⁹

Stokes noted that the growing interest in public management during this period was also associated with the emergence of public management programs in business schools, as well as the appearance of schools of generic management. And he noted the irony that the new interest in management within the public policy schools themselves suggested that the policy schools “have thereby rediscovered a number of the classical problems of public administration although they conceal this from themselves by clinging to the belief that public management is something quite different from the older public administration they so strongly rejected when the public policy tide was at flood.”¹⁰

A further challenge was the explosive expansion and increasing complexity of government, hence the need for ever more specialized fields of expertise, including in specific substantive arenas of public policy development (education, national security), in various kinds of management (planning, budgeting, information), in different levels of government (international, federal, state and local), in different kinds of organizations (government agencies, government corporations, “public corporations,” nonprofits), and in the ubiquitous relations among all of these (intergovernmental, inter-sectoral).

During NAPA’s first quarter-century all these definitional questions were in play on two principal levels. The first was in the

ongoing conversations and debates among Fellows of the Academy, among themselves and within the broader field of practitioners, theorists, and educators, about the theoretical, conceptual, and historical meaning of these terms, and their application to the challenges confronting the nation's governance system. The second level was the more practical reality of determining what the Academy should actually do, and how to pay for it. The debates on these two levels continually interacted and informed one another, and, paradoxically, that spirited conversation itself turned out to reflect one of the Academy's underlying strengths.

On the practical level, the question came down to what projects the Academy should undertake, how the knowledge and experience of Academy Fellows should be tapped to undertake them, and how they were to be funded. The basic contour of that debate within the Academy was whether it should define its own program agenda or simply respond to requests from sponsors.

As was the case with the National Academy of Sciences, NAPA's congressional charter was clear that its principal responsibility was to respond to requests from the government (principally Congress or federal agencies) for assistance, and that the government should pay for that assistance. This suggested a demand-driven model to shape the Academy's program agenda. The obvious merit of being demand-driven was that this was the best way to ensure that the Academy was addressing problems that government officials felt were important, and for which they needed practical help. So long as the Academy's assistance was sought and paid for with sufficient volume and regularity, it also met the Academy's need for financial resources to cover the costs of specific projects and also to support the organizational infrastructure required to sustain ongoing operations so that the Academy could continue responding to government requests for assistance.

There were three principal problems with this arrangement. One was what would happen if demand for NAPA's services was not sufficient to defray the costs of operations. A second was whether the government, at any given time and under any given political leadership, would necessarily have the knowledge, wisdom, and motivation to understand what the governance system really needed to function adequately, if not also to develop the capacity required to address the needs of the nation. In other words, what responsibility did the Academy have to help the nation set an agenda of the most important questions that needed to be addressed to ensure the proper functioning of government, even if the government did not ask it to do so?

The third, and most often heard concern from some Fellows, was that the Academy over time would simply "chase the money" and in the end be simply one more "job shop" or "beltway bandit," that is, a commercial consulting firm.¹¹ After the awarding of the Academy's Federal charter, one response to this complaint was that doing "jobs" for the government was precisely what the Charter intended. And on a more practical level, Fellows who voiced such complaints were challenged to identify and procure different sources of revenue that would permit the Academy the kind of financial independence required to choose freely what kind of projects to undertake.

There were, of course, other sources of potential funding for the Academy, including foundations, businesses, individual donors, and Fellows themselves, ultimately building an "endowment" large enough to generate sufficient annual operating revenue to permit the Academy some independence of action. All of these avenues, were, in fact, pursued, with varying degrees of success, but in the first twenty-five years they rarely generated sufficient financial resources to permit more than the occasional "self-initiated" project.

So, as both a practical matter, as well as in response to the Academy's congressional charter, the actual resolution of what the Academy's subject matter was, and what activities it should pursue, was defined by the nature of the projects it decided to undertake according to its largely demand-driven model of operation. In its first quarter-century this model produced some 285 Academy project reports.

Logistical Capacity and Operations

Most of the Academy's financial support in the early years came from grants and contracts in payment for projects undertaken, principally for the federal government, beginning with a general support contract with NASA, along with specific NASA project contracts.

NAPA got off to a fast start as a new organization. By 1969, its third year of operation, it was generating an annual revenue stream of about \$500,000 (in current dollars), ample to support a high-quality professional staff and program. The 1970s were a period of rapid growth, with annual revenues reaching \$2.0 million by 1980.¹² The pace of growth slowed considerably in the 1980s. Revenues and expenditures varied from year to year, but the trend remained one of overall growth in both, and by 1991 annual revenues were \$2.9 million.¹³

The Academy also made considerable progress in building an investment reserve.¹⁴ In 1987, the Board created the Elmer B. Staats Fund¹⁵ in an effort to enlarge the investment reserve, and Fellows were encouraged to make pledges aimed at increasing it to \$5 million. By 1992, the market value of the investment reserve was estimated to be \$3.2 million.¹⁶

When it was originally established as a component of the American Society of Public Administration, NAPA occupied office space in ASPA's Washington D.C. office on Connecticut Avenue. As NAPA's program and staff expanded in those early years, disagreements with ASPA arose over NAPA's appropriate share of overhead costs. These and other predictable disagreements hastened the time when NAPA would both move out of ASPA's office and sever organizational ties (an eventuality the leaders of both ASPA and NAPA had envisioned from the outset).

By the end of its first 25 years, NAPA had moved into leased office space in Suite 850 at 1120 G Street NW, where ASPA and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) were also then located.

Programs & Projects (1967-1992)

The heart of the Academy's work from the outset was to study key issues of governance and public administration and issue reports on its findings and recommendations. To carry out this work the Academy typically has organized projects consisting of expert project panels and professional study teams, falling into various thematic program areas.

Program Components: Project, Panel, Study, and Report

An Academy *program* is, in general, a substantive arena of ongoing work, and, on occasion, a specific organizational center established within the Academy to carry on such work. The Academy's overall program of work has consisted principally of the projects undertaken for sponsors. In the first 25 years the Academy developed a few program specializations into centers of

operation. For instance, the National Institute of Public Affairs operated as a specialized center within the Academy for several years, specializing in training. But for the most part the Academy maintained a general program of management studies with projects covering a wide array of programmatic themes.

An Academy *project* is a specific undertaking, generally within a broad program area, focused on a specific task with a defined scope of work and timeline and leading to a specific work product, usually for a specific sponsor. An Academy project is typically carried out under the supervision of a *project panel*, appointed by the Board Chair with the advice of the President from among NAPA Fellows (and often including non-Fellows) with relevant expertise. The President appoints a professional staff, including a project director, to support the project with research and drafting, and provides overall supervision of the project through to completion, including certification that the final report meets the Academy's high-quality standards. However, the project panel itself is the ultimate author of the report, not the Academy as a whole.

An Academy *study* is a type of project that results in a written report.

An Academy *report* is the written work product resulting from an Academy study, which may vary in length, but generally runs somewhere between 50 and 100 pages, sometimes substantially longer with appendices of supporting material. During its first 25 years the Academy produced 285 reports.¹⁷

Quality Assurance

Ensuring that all Academy work is of the highest professional standards has been a top priority – really a foregone assumption – of the Academy from its inception. The basic premise of an

“academy” of recognized leaders in their field, both theoreticians and practitioners, was that they set the standard for both theory and practice in that field. Achieving and sustaining the highest levels of quality, however, required ensuring that appropriate practices and standards were in place at several points in the Academy’s operation, including the selection of Fellows, the election of the Board, the appointment of staff, and especially in the Academy’s ongoing project work.

In its earliest days the Academy consisted of 20 recognized leaders in the field, who also composed the governing Executive Committee, which hired and supervised the Executive Director. The intent was that Academy members themselves would be intimately involved in the actual project work. Quality, therefore, was assumed to be built into the organizational structure. However, as the Academy grew quickly in numbers of members, staff, and project activity, a division of labor was required to organize and undertake the project work. Therefore attention to ensuring quality in an increasingly complex operation took on greater importance.

As noted earlier, the primary vehicle for project work from the outset was the formation of a project panel of experts, mostly if not exclusively Academy Fellows, appointed by the Board Chair, working with a professional project staff, whose director would be appointed and generally supervised by the President. This basic model was well in place and had been regularly tested and improved by the end of the first 25 years, and has remained the Academy’s main vehicle for doing project work up to the present. The Board of Directors was kept informed by the President of projects being developed and underway, but it rarely became involved with the scope, content, or quality of specific reports, leaving that to the President, professional staff, and the study panels themselves.

Exceptions to this basic work model occurred on the rare occasion that substantial criticism was leveled at a particular project, or when the Academy was considering a self-initiated project funded with its own resources. For instance, complaints about an Academy evaluation of the United States Postal Service led the Board to establish an *ad hoc* Committee on Quality Control. And in 1989, the Board itself reviewed a proposal to conduct a study of relationships between Congress and the Executive Branch, in which several case studies were to be included. The Ford Foundation had pledged some financial support for the project, to be supplemented by the Academy's own financing. And so the Board took a special interest in examining the initial study plan in depth and directing major changes in it before approving the project and funding.

Quality issues were addressed at several Board meetings in the 1980s. In 1985 the Board adopted a one-page statement delineating the responsibilities of the President and project panel chairs for maintaining the quality of NAPA projects. In 1987 a more detailed policy statement on quality was discussed by the Board but not formally approved. In 1989 the Board's experience with the study of Congress and the Executive Branch led it to create a Committee on Quality Assurance, but that effort was soon abandoned. The Board also informed the President of its concern over the staffing for the development and conduct of studies, which prompted a rearrangement of senior staff responsibilities and the creation of a new position of Director of Studies.¹⁸

In 1991 the Board also established a Program Committee, largely to address issues of quality assurance, and appointed one of its members, William Morrill*, as Committee chair with the task of addressing issues of quality control. The Committee presented a paper on "quality assurance" to the Board, which unanimously approved it. The Board at that time decided that its approval would be required for any study that entailed the use of funds from the

investment reserve. NAPA's Director of Studies was directed to draft implementing documents for review by the Program Committee.¹⁹

In 1991 the Board reviewed a paper on "Quality Management Policy of the National Academy of Public Administration," which proposed goals, principles, and procedures for a quality management program. It charged the Program Committee with the continuing responsibility of oversight of quality management matters, provided for a new Quality Management Committee to advise the President on matters of panel selection and specific project proposals, and recommended that all Academy panel reports be peer reviewed. There is no record of the Board having approved these proposals, but the President informed the Board that "steps would be taken to implement the report."²⁰ The paper provoked considerable controversy within the Academy, especially the proposal for peer review of all panel reports, which critics of the idea held was redundant given the careful selection and quality of project panels, and would substantially delay the completion of project reports in keeping with the needs of Academy sponsors.

Discussion of the quality assurance issue was continued through 1992 and resolved in 1993 when the Board gave the President principal responsibility for overall quality control, including the options to 1) refuse to sign off on a project report unless he or she was satisfied that it had met quality standards, and 2) call for a peer review of the report. Meanwhile, immediate responsibility for quality assurance would rest with project panels themselves, which would continue to include at least a majority of Academy Fellows, including the panel chair.

Program Agenda

From its beginnings in 1967, the principal sources of projects were requests from Congress and federal government agencies for

studies of particular subjects, or for the Academy to organize conferences or training, and consequently this stream projects principally defined the Academy's program agenda. While most of the Academy's work was done through project panels, other appropriate vehicles were fashioned to fit the particular needs of sponsors.²¹

NASA was the first federal agency to request an Academy study, and became a regular sponsor of Academy studies thereafter. Virtually every executive departments requested Academy studies, conferences, and/or training in its first quarter-century (as also in its second).

The Academy undertook studies for scores of federal executive department agencies, as well as for numerous federal independent agencies (such as the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Archives and Records Administration, Small Business Administration, Smithsonian Institution, and United States Postal Service, as well as NASA).

NAPA developed a strong presence in assisting government enterprises, quasi-governmental, and nonprofit organizations, such as, the Federal Assets Disposition Association, Federal Prison Industries Corporation, Resolution Trust Corporation, National Institutes of Health, National Technical Information Service, Patent and Trademark Office, Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences). A team of Academy Fellows led by Alan Dean and Harold Seidman* incorporated this experience into a popular seminar series offered by the Academy on the "Roles and Management of Government Enterprises."

Congressional committees and subcommittees also requested that NAPA undertake studies directly for them, and directed federal agencies to engage the Academy to undertake specific project studies. For instance, a subcommittee of the U.S. House Committee on Science and Astronautics requested NAPA to prepare a report on the subject of technology assessment. Other work directly for Congress included studies on the Health Care Financing Administration personnel (1989), Social Security Organization (1984), Organization for Protection of Intellectual Property (1985), Intelligence Personnel Systems (1988), and Department of Veterans Affairs (1989), including an analysis of a proposal for a Department of Veterans Affairs (1989).

In its first quarter-century, NAPA began a line of work for the Judiciary, including studies of court administration and management, and planning for an Institute of Court Management.

State (and commonwealth) and local governments on occasion requested the Academy to undertake studies, although such requests were infrequent. While its work with state and local government was not extensive (and increased only marginally in the second twenty-five years), the Academy in its first quarter-century did undertake important studies for the District of Columbia, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, the Florida State Department of Health and Rehabilitation Services, and the Pennsylvania Economy League.

As noted in Chapter 2, foundations provided some financial start up support for the Academy, and foundation grants continued to support specific initiatives. In 1968 the Academy was awarded one of its first foundation project grants, \$80,000 from the Ford Foundation to support the writing of a book dealing with the Federal government's experience with government reorganization. The principal author was Harold Seidman, who had served as the Bureau of the Budget's assistant director in charge of organization

and management. The product was the book entitled *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 responding to requests from sponsors, the Academy identified problem areas in which it might 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, the machinery of government, organization and management processes, and education and training for public administration.²³

Academy Affairs (1967-1992)

All of the Academy's activities are in one fashion or another "Academy affairs," but from the outset there also have been topics of particular importance to the Academy as an academy.

Membership (Fellows)

NAPA was conceived as a membership organization – an academy – composed of and governed by people who had established successful careers in public administration or a related field of public service, with the intention that this collection of experienced people could and would contribute to the continual repair and improvement of the American system of governance. That vision has remained a mainstay of the Academy's character as well as its governance structure up to the present.

The initial 20 Academy members, all former presidents of ASPA (and the then current president), were a highly distinguished group of leading figures in the field who had been playing a consequential role in American government during the middle decades of the twentieth century.²⁴ And it was a sufficiently small group that it could play a direct role in the governance and operation of the Academy, approving the bylaws, selecting the executive committee and chair, functioning as a *de facto* board of directors, and playing a close and often direct role in decisions of operation. It was a group that placed a very high stock on the value and importance of collegiality for an academy dedicated to the serious business of making American democracy work in all its complex operations.

Except for the original membership (stipulated to include former ASPA presidents), subsequent members of NAPA were selected through a nomination process and an election in which all the current members participated. This process has remained more or less the same, with some adjustments to account for the expanding number of members. The basic process begins with a call to the Fellows for proposed nominees, a screening of those proposed by a nominating committee appointed by the Board chair and composed of Fellows, and election by the Fellows of a number determined by the Board from among those nominated by the committee.

There is little evidence of friction in NAPA's early years among the principal groups that composed the membership – Federal government, state and local government, and academic institutions – as to the relative numbers and criteria of membership. There was general agreement that the proportions among these three groups should be roughly equal. The principal focus was on the shared desire to create a national academy of people experienced in public service and dedicated to the values of effective and efficient democratic governance.

In 1970, the number of Fellows reached 105, about a third each from the Federal government, state and local government, and academic institutions. Fifteen members were under 45 years of age, 57 were between 45 and 60, and 33 were over 60. In the same year (1970), the Academy established a limit of 12 new members to be elected annually. The membership of the Academy grew from 129 in 1971 to 321 in late 1984. By 1984, there were also 25 emeritus members (later called “Senior Fellows”) and 12 honorary members (later called “Honorary Fellows”).²⁵

As the membership grew in number, some Fellows and eventually a majority of the Board of Directors became concerned that the Academy was losing its collegial character, which was considered critical to its ability to work effectively as an academy. A related concern was that substantial numbers of Fellows were not contributing to the work of the Academy. In response to these concerns, the membership amended the bylaws in 1983 to limit the membership to 350.²⁶

By the end of the Academy’s first quarter-century (on January 1, 1992), there were 315 Fellows, plus 93 Senior Fellows and 21 Honorary Fellows. Senior Fellows, who were not counted against the cap of 350 Fellows, continued to have all the rights and privileges of Fellows, and constituted some of the most active members, serving on project and standing panels, and various Academy committees. And while Senior Fellows were not required to pay dues, many continued to make financial contributions to the Academy.²⁷

Of the 315 active Fellows in 1992, 32 percent were in academia, 24 percent in private business, 18 percent in government (12 percent federal; 6 percent state and local), 16 percent in nonprofit organizations, and 10 percent independently employed or retired. Of those in government, most were in the Federal executive branch, with representation scattered among the legislative and

judicial branches and state and local government. These data indicated a decline in the proportion of Fellows in government from the Academy's early years, although many government practitioners were known to have moved into academic institutions, nonprofit organizations, and the commercial private sector, and a substantial number had retired. Still, the drop in active government Fellows, and the fact that they reflected just 18 percent of the total fellowship, was sufficient to provoke a mild alarm, causing Alan Dean to ask: "Is NAPA maintaining an adequate cadre of practitioners with current government experience who can assist agencies desiring help in resolving today's management problems?"²⁸

By age, 52 percent of Fellows in 1992 were 60 years or over, and 48 percent under 60. Geographically, there were Fellows in all regions of the country, but with a heavy concentration of 42 percent in the National Capital Region (i.e. Greater Washington, D.C.). By gender and minority group, 85 percent were men, 15 percent women, 10 percent Black, 1 percent Hispanic and 1 percent Asian. The first woman was elected to NAPA in 1968, the year after its creation. There were 3 women among the 129 Fellows in 1971, and 32 women of the 321 total Fellows in 1984. Astrid Merget was elected the first female Board Chair in 1991. The Academy's first minority Fellows were elected in 1969. The first African American Board Chair, Valerie Lemmie, was elected to that position in 2004. Given that the first 20 members of NAPA in 1967 were white men, these figures indicated an increase in diversity, but how significant an increase and with what implications for future action remained a matter of debate among Fellows in 1992.²⁹

Standing Panels

In 1970 NAPA began creating standing panels (initially called “standing committees”) to address ongoing substantive priority interests regardless of whether or not funded projects were involved. The first of these was the Standing Committee on Education for Public Administration, established in 1970.

In 1971, the Academy created five more standing panels (“standing committees”): on Public Management and Machinery of Government, Human Resources and Public Affairs, Environmental and Resource Management, International and Cross-Cultural Administration, and Administration of Justice and Regulatory Administration.

Each standing panel, composed of between 15 and 25 Fellows, was headed by a chair appointed by the Board Chair, who also appointed the members of the committees.

The role of the standing panels was the following:

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.³⁰

The regularity of meetings, level of activity, and accomplishments of the standing panels varied widely over the first 25 years. Some rarely met, others eventually faded and a few were terminated. The high expectations for the standing panels met with little significant result in the early years of their existence, and they were generally felt to be disappointing. The Academy leadership persevered in experimenting with different modes of operation for the standing panels, but continued to encounter three principal problems: the infrequency of meetings, difficulty in staffing and funding, and changes in NAPA leadership.³¹

However, with persistence, some of the standing panels found what seemed to be a formula for successful operation, and were felt to have made substantial contributions. For instance, the Standing Panel on International and Cross-Cultural Administration took the lead in creating the American Consortium for International Public Administration (ACIPA) as a new United States National Section of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS). And in 1975 and 1976, the Standing Committee on Public Management and Machinery of Government played a role in helping to establish an Office of Personnel Management to replace the former Civil Service Commission.³²

Alan Dean concluded that experience with standing panels over the Academy's first 25 years showed that there were several key factors in making standing panels work so that they could

contribute to the Fellows who participated and to the Academy as an institution. These factors include a chair willing to commit substantial time and energy to the affairs of the panel; an executive committee consisting of active panel members to help the chair; the understanding and support of the Board of Directors and the President, including the commitment of some NAPA staff and resources to support panel activities; and 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.³³

By 1992, NAPA had four standing panels, all of which continued to be active (with some lapses in a few instances) for the next 25 years. These include (with their starting dates) the Standing Panels on Executive Organization and Management (EOM) 1985; the Public Service (1986); the Federal System (more recently called Intergovernmental Relations) 1988; and International Affairs (1990).

Since 1992 the Academy has added two standing panels and a working group. The Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance was created in 2000, the Standing Panel on Technology Leadership in 2011, and the Africa Working Group in 2001. These three are discussed further in the period of their creation.

Awards

The Academy established three awards programs in its first quarter-century to honor accomplishments in various fields and aspects of public service, all of which have been sustained into the present.³⁴

The Academy's first award, established in 1968, was the Brownlow Book Award, named after Louis Brownlow, to honor annually the author whose book in that year was judged to have contributed most to the literature of public administration. The selection is made by a Brownlow Award Committee. Winners are recognized at the Annual Meeting and are given a certificate attesting to their receiving the award. The Brownlow Award has been made in every year since.

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

In 1982, the National Academy of Public Administration joined with the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) in the Public Service Awards, given annually to five public administration practitioners from any level of government. These Public Service Awards were created following 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, the five award winners are chosen by a selection committee composed of 10 to 15 members appointed jointly by the ASPA President and the NAPA Board

Chair. The award, which consists of a citation and Steuben crystal ware, is made at the annual meeting of ASPA. Costs are defrayed by income from a Public Service Awards Fund managed by the NAPA Investment Committee.

Academy Meetings

From its creation and through its first 25 years the Academy held two full membership meetings a year. At first, both meetings were held in Washington, D.C. The November meeting came to be known as the Annual Fall Meeting, and included both substantive discussions and the transaction of NAPA business. Many Fellows felt two meetings a year were important to building and nurturing the collegiality of the Academy, and the familiarity of Fellows with its substantive work and activities.

Beginning in the 1990s, the spring meeting was regularly held outside Washington in order to facilitate attendance by Fellows around the country, and also to encourage Fellows living in the capital to get out and around the country. It also provided an opportunity for Fellows in regions around the country to showcase their activities in public administration and governance, and for other Fellows and other interested parties to learn about them first-hand. In 2007, the spring meeting was discontinued, principally because of its cost and declining attendance.

Academy-Initiated Studies

While most of the Academy's substantive work was carried out by project panels funded by grants and contracts, the Academy endeavored to undertake self-initiated projects supported by a combination of the Academy's own financial resources as well as

the volunteer efforts of its Fellows and associates.³⁵ Academy projects also led to research published by individual authors, such as Harold Seidman's aforementioned book on government organization, and Robert S. Gilmour and Alexis Halley's *Who Makes Public Policy: The Struggle for Control Between Congress and the Executive*, Chatham House.³⁶

Strategic Assessment

In its first twenty-five years, the Academy established the practice of periodically undertaking strategic assessments of its own performance, including examination of its own work and processes, as well as the changing environment in which it was operating.

For instance, in 1976, the Academy appointed a Committee on Evaluation, and in 1978 held a retreat at Marriottsville, MD. In 1982 Carl F. Stover* led a group of Fellows in producing a report on "Strengthening America's Capacity to Govern: The Mission and Work of the National Academy of Public Administration," and in 1985 the Board established a Committee on the Future. In 1989 the Board did a survey of all Fellows to get their views on the status of the Academy and suggestions for improvement. The survey reinforced the growing view among the Board of Directors that the Academy should have its own agenda for studies and be less dependent upon federally funded projects. It followed up by appointing a strategic planning committee headed by Board Director William Morrill.

Reflections on the First Twenty-Five Years

When he summed up NAPA's first twenty-five years, Alan Dean began with the very fact that the Academy was created, that it quickly established itself to the extent of being awarded a congressional charter, and that it continued to build respect for its impartiality, integrity and competence in solving concrete problems of public administration and management. The core test for all this was that Congress and virtually every federal executive department continued calling on the Academy for assistance.³⁷ With another quarter-century of hindsight, we cannot only reaffirm Dean's judgment on all these counts, but also now better appreciate and even more resolutely respect what an extraordinary set of accomplishments it was.

As a management expert and student of institutions himself, Dean was also acutely aware of what a triumphant labor of institution building the Academy represented. As one of the principal builders, he was quite aware of what it took to expand a membership from its 20 homogenous original members to a diverse membership of 400 Fellows; to design workable arrangements for governance that facilitated and drew on the active participation of this membership; to create practical arrangements for converting this wide ranging experience and knowledge into useful "trusted advice" to solve concrete problems; and to figure out how to finance such an operation.

The first cluster of substantive accomplishments, documented in greater detail in Dean's history, alone warrant our gratitude and admiration. However, it is the second cluster of accomplishments that has been the focus of this chapter. For in its first quarter-century, the Academy also laid the institutional foundations – the basic structures and processes described above in some detail –

that permitted NAPA to serve the country and continue developing itself over the next quarter-century.

In the Epilogue to his history, Alan Dean listed “[a] number of characteristics and modes of operation which have proved useful and which few Fellows would change,”³⁸ as well as some of the “areas of concern” that had “persisted through much of the life of the Academy” up through 1992.³⁹ The lessons learned from the Academy’s first quarter-century are compared to those of the second quarter-century in Chapter 7, an epilogue.

¹ As noted earlier, this chapter on NAPA’s foundations relies heavily on Alan L. Dean with the assistance of Herbert N. Jasper, *The First 25 Years: A History of the National Academy of Public Administration*, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration, 1997). A link to that history is included in the Appendix.

² Various amendments to the Academy’s governing documents over time, as well as common practice in keeping pace with changing cultural and professional norms, have resulted in such name changes as the original “Board of Trustees” becoming the “Board of Directors,” the original “Chairman” becoming the “Chair,” and the original “Executive Director” becoming first the “President” and then the “President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO).”

³ By the 1990s the Board dropped the Program and Development Committees, and was using a Fellows Nominating Committee, which included mostly non-Board Fellows, an Audit Committee, which included non-Board members as well as non-Fellow, and also a Board Officers Nominating Committee, comprised of Directors to present slate of offers to the Board for the coming year.

⁴ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

⁵ Jim Bates followed an investment strategy similar to that of Warren Buffett of purchasing and holding stock companies with good growth prospects producing products and services Bates could fully understand and had management teams he knew personally and in which he had confidence.

⁶ Various terms have been used interchangeably over the years as shorthand for “National Academy of Public Administration,” including the National Academy, the Academy, and NAPA. None of these appears to reflect any official preference or particular connotation among Fellows.

⁷ Some Fellows feel that “national” tends to be conflated with “federal,” thereby creating the perception that the Academy’s purview is more restrictive than

was the intention of its founders or of its congressional charter, to the detriment of attention to and from of state, local and regional government.

⁸ Frank J. Goodnow, “The Work of the American Political Science Association,” Presidential Address, (1904) in *Proceedings of the American Political Science Association*, 35-46. Goodnow’s address to APSA identified the “execution of state will” as an agenda item for study, opening a space for what would become the political science subfield of public administration.

⁹ Donald E. Stokes, “The Changing Environment of Education for Public Service,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 15, no. 2, (1996), 159-60.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, 161.

¹¹ Letter from George Graham, first NAPA Executive Director, to Scott Fosler, NAPA President, August 16, 1992, p.1.

¹² National Academy of Public Administration Annual Report, 1980.

¹³ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

¹⁴ The Academy originally used the term “endowment” to characterize its unrestricted investments. In 2008, on the basis of legal advice, the Board concluded that the term “endowment” could be taken to have a particular legal definition that implied restrictions on the use of those funds, and began using the formulation of “investment reserve.”

¹⁵ The Staats Fund was named after Academy founding member Elmer B. Staats, who was also Controller General of the United States and head of the General Accounting Office (GAO), renamed the Government Accountability Office in 2004.

¹⁶ Total Board-designated funds in 1992 audited financial statements. NAPA Chief Financial Officer, November, 2017.

¹⁷ An Academy “report” is not a standard unit, except that most all NAPA reports are the result of a project and a project panel, most funded by grants and contracts (some are supported by NAPA’s own internal financing and Fellow and staff support). The size of the formal, sponsor-funded projects that produce a report can vary widely, from a few months duration with a small professional staff and costing tens of thousands of dollars to large projects lasting a year or more with a 10 to 20 person professional staff and costing in excess of a million dollars. Consequently, the size and depth of reports can vary widely from fairly short 30 to 50 page reports to reports in excess of 200 pages or more with substantial back-up research in additional supplementary volumes. Obviously, whether a project and the resulting report it produces is large or small says nothing about the quality of the report itself. Still, as a rough gauge of output, a “report” from a “project,” which generally is produced by a “project panel” and professional staff, is a useful way of getting a general idea of the volume of the Academy’s activity and production, and of gauging changes in that volume of activity over time

(especially since the varying size of projects and length of reports tends to average out over time). This measure of volume output, of course, needs to be placed in context of the subject matter and the quality, usefulness and overall impact of a report.

¹⁸ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

¹⁹ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

²⁰ “Board Summary Minutes”, June 6, 1981: 3, cited in Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

²¹ For instance, following the inauguration of President Nixon in 1969 NAPA sponsored a series conferences, colloquia and orientation programs for the new political officials of the Department of Transportation.

²² Harold Seidman, *Politics, Position, and Power: The Dynamics of Federal Organization*. Fifth Edition (1997). (New York: Oxford University Press.)

²³ John D. Millett, "History of the National Academy of Public Administration: 1967-1970," unpublished paper, (1971), 7-8. John D. Millett was the first Chairman of NAPA. Cited by Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

²⁴ Among the recognized leaders in public administration included in this group were William Mosher, Louis Brownlow, Harold D. Smith, Luther Gulick, and Donald C. Stone

²⁵ As noted earlier, the term “Fellow” was substituted for “member” of NAPA in a 1988 by-law amendment. The term “Senior Fellow” was adopted as designation for Fellows who had reached a certain age and would no longer be required to pay dues. (The term “Senior Fellow” had been suggested in the 1960s as a name to differentiate a select segment of long-standing and distinguished ASPA members, part of the deliberation that eventually led to the creation of NAPA. That proposal was never adopted, in part because of what some felt was “elite” tone.) Darrell Pugh, “Looking Back - Moving Forward,” in *A History of the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA)*, (1988), cited by Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

²⁶ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

²⁷ Under the 1992 by-law amendments, any Fellow who reaches the age of 75 and has been a Fellow for 10 years automatically becomes a Senior Fellow, and Fellows who reach age of 65 and are retired (by their own definition) may elect to convert to Senior Fellow status. Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997

²⁸ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

²⁹ Source: National Academy of Public Administration.

³⁰ National Academy of Public Administration Annual Report, 1971, 14.

³¹ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

³² Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

³³ Dean, *Op cit.*, 1997.

³⁴ The Academy has since added two other awards to its program, the Elliot L. Richardson Prize (2002) and the George Graham Award for Exceptional

Service to the Academy (2006). These are presented in the Chapter 6: The Bush Years 2001-2009

- ³⁵ Examples of self-initiated projects in the first quarter century include *Leadership in Jeopardy: The Fraying of the Presidential Appointments Process* (1985); *The Executive Presidency: Federal Management in the 1990's* (1988); *Congressional Oversight of Regulatory Agencies: The Need to Strike a Balance and Focus on Performance* (1988); and *Beyond Distrust: Building Bridges Between Congress and the Executive* (1992).
- ³⁶ Robert S. Gilmour and Alexis Halley, eds., *Who Makes Public Policy: The Struggle for Control Between Congress and the Executive*, (Chatham House, 1994).
- ³⁷ Alan L. Dean, with the assistance of Herbert N. Jasper, *The First 25 Years: A History of the National Academy of Public Administration*, (Washington, DC: National Academy of Public Administration, 1997).
- ³⁸ Alan Dean's Epilogue listed the following "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; 6. Emergence of standing panels open to all Fellows; 7. Use of ad hoc committees and working groups to address special NAPA needs; 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; 10. Avoidance of political bias or ideological predispositions; and 11. Insistence on telling clients the truth as we see it, even if it is unpleasant or unwelcome.
- ³⁹ The "areas of concern" that had "persisted through much of the life of the Academy" up through 1992 listed in Alan Dean's Epilogue included: 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; and 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.

Chapter 4

The Clinton Years (1992-2001)

Bill Clinton was elected President in November 1992, coinciding with the beginning of the Academy's second twenty-five years. He took office in January 1993, and served until mid-January 2001.

A key theme of the Clinton campaign was reforming the federal government, summarized in the shorthand of “reinventing government,” based on the book by David Osborne* and Ted Gaebler*.¹ One of President Clinton's earliest initiatives was to assign Vice President Al Gore leadership in the creation of a National Performance Review (NPR) aimed at “reinventing” the federal government.²

Vice President Gore defined the mission of the NPR as making government “work better and cost less,” essentially the same concerns with effectiveness and efficiency that had driven most of the ten or so other federal government management reform efforts in the 20th century. The NPR drew on many sources of experience and advice, including the Fellows, staff, and a large inventory of reports on improving government management of the National Academy of Public Administration.³ Mindful of the failed efforts of the Carter Administration to reorganize the federal government, and eager to avoid strategies involving long-term structural changes requiring

major political investment with little short-term impact, the NPR avoided large organizational changes that it feared would amount to little more “shuffling the boxes.” A major theme of the NPR was its intent to change the culture of government from a preoccupation with procedure and compliance to a focus on results and performance.⁴

In keeping with its emphasis on improving government performance, the Clinton Administration and its NPR strongly supported the bipartisan and congressionally-initiated Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), which required every federal agency to produce a five year strategic plan (beginning in 1997), an annual performance plan with measures (beginning in 1998), and an annual performance report which assessed the extent to which its intended results were achieved (beginning in 1999). The Academy played a role in shaping the GPRA and supported its adoption.

The first NPR report, *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less*, was presented to the President on the south lawn of the White House with great fanfare on September 7, 1993.⁵ The NPR staff had assembled several forklifts burdened with high stacks of government documents, and the Vice President handed the President a huge pair of scissors with which to snip a long, broad red ribbon. The report focused on “*how* government should work, not on *what* it should do” in order to “improve performance in areas where policymakers had already decided government should play a role.”⁶

Another early Clinton reform initiative addressed health care, a task the President assigned his wife, Hillary Clinton. A small group of advisors worked largely in private to prepare a policy proposal that involved far-reaching and complex institutional and administrative changes to the health care system. Both the process and the proposal became subjects of criticism, and the initiative failed to gain congressional support.

In November 1994, Republicans won control of Congress, both the Senate and House of Representatives. House Republicans had run on a platform called a "Contract with America" that pledged, among other things, to cut the size and scope of the federal government and to devolve significant powers to state and local government.⁷ Partly in response to the Republican victory, the President and Vice President in December, 1994, announced Phase II of the National Performance Review which expanded the NPR's concerns beyond "how" government works, to include "what" government should do. Specifically, it asked whether government should cease doing certain things by privatizing them, by devolving them to state and local government, or by simply terminating them.

For much of 1995 the President and Congress debated these and other issues, culminating in the almost unprecedented "shut down" of significant portions of the federal government in late 1995. In November 1996, President Clinton won re-election to a second term, and the Republicans retained control of both houses of Congress. And in 1997, the NPR began to focus more intensively on the "reinvention" and improvement of individual agencies.⁸

Reactions to the NPR among public administration experts varied widely.⁹ In 1998 public administration scholar Donald F. Kettl did a comprehensive assessment of the NPR, giving it an overall grade of B, and finding components to vary widely in their effectiveness.¹⁰

Governance and Operations (1992-2001)

NAPA Chairs of Board of Directors, 1992-2000

Joseph Fisher	(1991-1992)
Astrid Merget	(1992-1993)
Alfred Zuck	(1994-1995)

Peter Szanton	(1996-1997)
Jonathan Howes	(1998-1999)
David S.C. Chu	(2000-2002)

NAPA Presidents, 1992-2000

Ray Kline	(1985-1992)
R. Scott Fosler	(1992-2000)
Robert J. O’Neill, Jr.	(2000-2002)

The Academy’s basic governance structure, which had evolved and was firmly in place by the end of the Academy’s first quarter-century (as presented in Chapter 3), proved to offer a strong foundation on which to build as NAPA began its second quarter-century.

Mission, Values, and Vision

The Academy’s growth had slowed in the 1980s from its robust growth in the 1970s, and in 1992 “there was very little in the (project) pipeline - a condition which had arisen numerous times in the past.”¹¹ Moreover, it was clear that the institutional challenge to governance had changed in fundamental ways since the era of NAPA’s founding. The NAPA Board of Directors was fully aware of these challenges – both to NAPA and to the American governance system – and determined to address them head on. The first step was to focus on the Academy’s core mission as articulated in its congressional charter, and to conceptualize how that mission could best be achieved in the current environment. Discussions about how to do this were front-and-center in the Board’s recruitment of a new President, and addressing the challenge to *governance* confronting the country became a priority for the Academy.

In 1992, the Academy Board adopted a “Framework of Governance” reflecting the Academy’s charter mission.¹² The framework was both an intellectual construct of the field of governance, public management, and public administration, and a template for guiding the Academy’s work. Its purpose was not to immediately target opportunities for NAPA projects, but rather to conceptually outline a wide range of project possibilities, so that the Academy could scan and identify opportunities with the greatest promise of being doable and fundable.

The framework began by sketching the *context* in which public institutions function, and was organized around four basic questions:

1. First, what is the public purpose?¹³
2. Second, what are the appropriate institutional designs, roles, and strategies for addressing a given public purpose?¹⁴

A key challenge was the need for *institutional integration* of several kinds, including:

- *inter-organizational*, among organizations within government departments and agencies;
- *intergovernmental*, among the federal, state, regional, county, municipal and community levels of government;
- *inter-sectoral*, among the government, business, nonprofit, and civic sectors; and
- *international*, among the some 200 national governmental systems (including their sub-national components), as well as international institutions, intergovernmental networks and other arrangements that, taken together, constituted the foundations of a *de facto* institutional fabric of global governance.

3. Third, what performance capacities are required to carry out institutional responsibilities?¹⁵
4. Fourth, what change strategies should be pursued to implement appropriate institutional structures and provide the capacities needed to support institutions and their accomplishment of public purposes?

At first the concept of *governance* caused concern among some Fellows who felt that it strayed from NAPA's core function of addressing problems of *government*. A period of robust debate helped demonstrate that there was no conflict between the two concepts, and that government was inherently at the core of the nation's governance systems. Moreover, the Academy's congressional charter specifically included the charges of "[f]oreseeing and examining critical emerging issues in governance, and formulating practical approaches to their resolution; [a]ssessing the effectiveness, structure, administration, and implications for governance of present or proposed public programs, policies, and processes; and [i]ncreasing public officials,' citizens,' and scholars' understanding of requirements and opportunities for sound governance and how these can be effectively met."¹⁶

Strategy and Capacity

Based on Framework of Governance, the Academy fashioned a strategy and defined the capacities required to put it into effect which linked several interconnected elements:

- *Mission.* The Academy's mission was taken from its congressional charter directive to address the country's most pressing problems of governance and public administration.

- *Value Proposition.* The key value proposition included recognizing and fostering the interrelated -- and mutually-reinforcing -- values among the Academy's congressional charter, membership (Fellows), expertise, credibility, integrity, neutrality, services, and leadership. Potential services the Academy could provide included advice, consulting, research, and convening capacity. Leadership included thought leadership, value leadership, and professional leadership in the field of public administration broadly defined.
- *Communication.* Communications were directed at four principal groups: Fellows, the professional field, potential sponsors, and the public.
- *Entrepreneurship.* The Board gave the President and staff wide latitude to identify the best ways to carry out that strategy, including responsibility for financing activities to support it that fell within the governance framework.
- *Instruments.* The Board left to the President the choice of instruments for developing project activities, generating revenue, and carrying out the mission.
- *Capacities.* NAPA drew on all the above instruments and resources to develop the more specific kinds of capacities required to pursue its strategy. Of special note in this regard was the decision to develop a series of Academy centers of expertise.
- *Investment Reserve.* The Academy's investment reserve (then called the Endowment) was viewed as a long-term investment in the Academy's future financial stability and opportunity to undertake self-financed activities. The staff had no access to the investment reserve other than through specific Board appropriations, including one \$50,000 appropriation for program development and another, smaller appropriation to upgrade internal infrastructure.

Organizational Capacity and Operations

During the Clinton years the Academy's headquarters were located at 1120 G Street NW, Suite 850. The Academy also added a number of satellite offices around Washington as its program and staff expanded, and as it established new program centers. In 2001 these offices were consolidated in a larger single space at 1100 New York Avenue NW.

The Academy's financial resources increased considerably in the 1990s. Between 1992 and 2000 NAPA's annual revenues (including investment income) grew from about \$2.8 million to \$9.9. Expenses also rose during the period. Board-designated funds (investment reserves that were sometimes referred to as an endowment) grew from \$3.2 million to \$10.0 million.¹⁷ The number of full-time Academy staff increased from 12 to 48, with a large group of consultants engaged in various types and stages of project work. Academy staff regularly met with executive department personnel to discuss project ideas and develop projects that Congress, executive agencies, or other sponsors might fund. During the Clinton years the Academy produced 196 reports, an average of about 20 reports per year.

The Academy also undertook a major upgrading of its infrastructure and internal management systems. Significant enhancements in systems of financial management, human resources management, information technology, communications, and office and facilities management were required to support the Academy's expanding and more diverse program activities:

- *General management.* NAPA created the position of Chief Operating Officer (COO) with responsibility for a wide range of operational and support activities which directly served program activity as well as enhanced engagement

with Fellows. Nancy Tate* became the Academy's first COO.

- *Human resources management.* The new COO had principal responsibility for human resources management systems. The Academy's programmatic Center for Human Resource Management was tapped to help develop and implement a new HRM system for the Academy itself. A new handbook of Academy HRM policies proved helpful to employees, and especially senior Academy managers, as did the adoption of a new, written personal performance appraisal system.
- *Communications.* The position of Director of Communications was created, and the new directors, Larry Haas and later Gregory McCarthy, developed comprehensive communication plans that permitted the Academy to substantially upgrade its capacity to communicate both internally and externally.
- *Information Technology Management.* With an appropriation from the Board, the Academy undertook a comprehensive hardware upgrade that permitted use of the most up-to-date software and effective use of emerging Internet opportunities. Up to that point, the Academy's access to "cyberspace" had been limited principally to the Academy's newly established Public Innovator Learning Network, which, working in conjunction with IBM, had been a leader in creating an up-to-date public management network. A new position of Systems Administrator was established to manage the upgrade and new IT capacities, which also enhanced the Academy's communications capacity. The ability to communicate via email with the Executive Committee, Board, and Fellows alone proved to be a significant improvement in Academy communications. Training was provided to all staff, and offered to regular Academy consultants and associates, with the added benefit of constituting a team-building effort.

Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and Congressional Charter

In 1997 the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) suggested that NAPA and NAS work together to address developments that posed significant challenges to both academies in their mission to provide independent, objective, evidence-based advice.¹⁸ The issue had to do with whether and in what ways the two congressionally chartered academies were covered by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).¹⁹ A series of lawsuits had been brought against NAS,²⁰ and in 1997 the U.S. federal District of Columbia (D.C.) Court of Appeals ruled that NAS study committees were governed by FACA.²¹

NAS leaders believed that the Court of Appeals ruling would compromise the independence of the academy study process, conducted largely by expert project panels, much as NAPA did. Their reasoning was that if NAS study committees were placed under the direct influence and control of sponsoring agencies (i.e. those federal agencies that had contracted with NAS to perform a study), as strict compliance with FACA would require, the independence (actual and/or perceived) of the study committees would be undermined. NAS was also concerned that strict FACA compliance would make it difficult to recruit expert and volunteer committee members, due to the potentially compromised nature of their independence, the requirement that all committee deliberations be open to the public, and the added administrative burden of FACA compliance.

NAS leaders concluded that the best way to resolve these issues was to seek legislative relief from the Appeals Court ruling. Since the NAS and NAPA congressional charters were so similar, NAS leaders suggested that the two academies work together in approaching Congress about amending FACA. NAPA

leaders agreed on both the nature of the problem and the proposed approach to seeking legislative relief directly from Congress. So the two academies worked together toward this end.

The basic argument NAS and NAPA made to Congress was that FACA was intended to apply to organizations quite different from what Congress had envisaged in granting the NAS and NAPA charters, and that the strict application of FACA to the two academies would undermine their independence and value to Congress and the federal government. NAPA also pointed out that its research, investigation, and study processes also needed to maintain confidentiality on occasion in order to protect individuals who were critical to certain studies of government agencies who might otherwise feel vulnerable if their testimony were made public (this included “whistle blowers,” but it also might have applied to many employees asked to make candid assessments about the leadership and management of their agencies in the course of management reviews).²²

In the end, Congress agreed with NAS and NAPA, and required that only a few provisions of FACA be applied to two academies. NAPA was granted somewhat greater latitude than NAS in guarding the privacy of some aspects of its deliberations in order to assure certain individuals confidentiality when testifying, reporting, or otherwise discussing matters of sensitivity that might affect their careers.

In 1997, Congress enacted Public Law 105–153²³ which amended FACA to exempt the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Public Administration study committees from most FACA requirements, but did stipulate measures to increase the transparency of the two academies’ study processes while preserving their capacities to do independent, evidence-based research.²⁴

Programs and Projects (1992-2001)

Beginning in 1992, in accordance with its new Framework of Governance and related organizational strategy and capacity, the Academy began organizing its program and project work according to four principal themes: *public purposes; institutional roles, organizations, systems, and strategies; performance capacities; and change management*. As part of that approach, NAPA started to develop a series of specialized centers to carry out the programs reflected in the selected strategic elements of the governance framework. The centers and their respective directors and staff became an integral part of the Academy's expanding program supported by new operational capacity and a strengthening fiscal position. The Academy also expanded its staffing by employing former Senior Executive Service (SES) members with track records of accomplishment in relevant specializations.

Public purposes

The Academy continued its activities in the wide range of *public purposes* arenas it had covered in its first twenty-five years, but focused its systematic exploration on the institutional dimensions of specific public purpose arenas including the nation's space program through its longstanding *NASA Program*, and the intertwined public purposes of environmental protection and economic development through a newly created Center for the Economy and the Environment.

One example of an approach to governance systems driven by a focus on public purpose was the Academy's work for Congress in restructuring the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in the 1990s. Following a series of hurricanes in the early

1990s and the failure of FEMA to cope with those disasters, Congress approached the Academy to do a study that would “fix FEMA.” The Academy responded that the problem was not just with FEMA, but with the absence of a national emergency management system. Congress agreed that the Academy should undertake a study which addressed that broader governance challenge, as well as the more detailed agency organizational and management improvements that FEMA required to create an effective national emergency network. The result was an Academy study entitled *Coping with Catastrophe: Building an Emergency Management System to Meet People’s Needs in Natural and Manmade Disasters* (1993).

The essence of the Academy report was that, in addition to significantly upgrading its own operational capacities for managing disasters, FEMA should take the lead in advocating, organizing, and serving as the hub and overall manager of a national emergency management system. This system would address all hazards, natural and manmade, across a continuum of emergency management functions – mitigation, preparation, response, and recovery – in the context of a network that involved all levels of government, including all relevant federal departments and agencies, as well as non-governmental organizations and residents prepared to cope with disaster on their own and in teams of cooperative neighbors. Congress endorsed this approach, and the President immediately directed the FEMA administrator to implement it. The new system proved itself in responding effectively to a series of natural disasters over the subsequent few years.²⁵ Unfortunately, that national emergency system was dismantled by the succeeding administration, and FEMA suffered further disruption as it was folded into the new Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in 2003.²⁶

The Academy followed up with additional studies for FEMA, including a *Review of Actions Taken to Strengthen the Nation's*

Emergency Management System: Implementing Management Change (1994), which assessed progress on implementing earlier recommendations by the Academy. It provided further attention to aspects of the national emergency management network in *The Role of the National Guard in Emergency Preparedness and Response* (1996) and *Reducing Seismic Risks in Existing Buildings: Options for Applying Federal Standards for Seismic Safety through Federal-Aid and Regulatory Programs* (1997).

The Academy also worked to extend the networked governance concept by placing the national emergency management system in the broader context of a developing global disaster information network with a 1999 report, *Legal Limits on Access to and Disclosure of Disaster Information*.

NASA Program

The Academy continued its long relationship with NASA, dating back to the Academy's origins with founder James Webb, Administrator of NASA, during the early years of the Apollo manned space flight program. Under the direction of former NASA assistant administrator Bill Lily, and with the assistance of Dr. Carol Neves, the Academy's NASA Program benefitted from the stability offered by an ongoing series of five-year basic contracts with NASA. During the Clinton years, Academy projects for NASA ranged from logistics management to the design and management of Centers for Commercial Development of Space and review of Space Shuttle costs and procedures.

In related projects, the Academy assisted the National Science Foundation's Science and Technology Centers in developing an interdisciplinary research paradigm, reviewed the aviation safety reporting system and general performance expectations for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and assessed the

organization and management of National Air and Space Museum for the Smithsonian Institution.

The Academy also worked jointly with NAS's National Research Council (NRC) to do a combined scientific and institutional assessment regarding the future of the global positioning system, producing a 1995 report on *The Global Positioning System: Charting the Future*.

Center for the Economy and Environment

In 1994 the Academy established the Center for the Economy and Environment under the direction of Dr. DeWitt John, to explore the intersection between policy and management, and the need to link economic and environmental policies, governance systems, and management innovation. The Center produced a series of reports examining and helping to shape the changing landscape of environmental management, as well as the federal government's economic development programs.

In 1998 the Academy's Visiting Committee gave a strong endorsement to this approach, urging the Academy to

*build on this foundation and expand its attention to critical governance issues, with special attention to the institutional dimension of the most important policy questions confronting our nation.*²⁷

The Center undertook a series of studies for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), recommending to Congress and the EPA ways to protect the environment by moving toward a more information-rich, flexible, performance-based system, while maintaining the integrity of the national system of environmental standards. Among the topics addressed in these reports were the

use of economic incentives for pollution control; the use of both in-house and outside expertise to inform and manage agency programs; and principles for federal managers of community-based programs.

The Center was asked by both Congress and the EPA to address broad questions about the nation's environmental goals and ways of better structuring institutional approaches to supporting those goals. This included two Academy reports: *Setting Priorities, Getting Results: A New Direction for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency* (1995), and *Resolving the Paradox of Environmental Protections: An Agenda for Congress, EPA, and the States* (1997).

The Center provided advice and assistance to state governments, both through its work directly with the U.S. EPA and through such projects as a report for the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality, *New Tools for State Environmental Agencies: Improving Environmental Management Through Certification Programs and Enhanced Monitoring Technologies* (1996).

The Center also used the Academy's convening role to design and facilitate various conferences, workshops, and other forms of collaboration. For instance, at the request of U.S. EPA it organized a large conference in January 1999 that brought together for the first time 120 state and federal employees responsible for the management of dredged materials. The proceedings were published in a report, along with its associated research, entitled *Dredged-Material Management and State Coastal Management Programs: Lessons from a Workshop* (1999).²⁸

In addition to EPA, the Center for the Economy and the Environment worked with other federal agencies that had programs related to the environment. For instance, in 1999 the Occupational

Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) asked the Center to help it plan for the possibility of assuming regulatory authority at some or all of the Department of Energy's weapons complexes. The Center helped OSHA design pilot "regulatory simulations" at several DOE sites, work through complex legal and administrative challenges relating to DOE's privatization of some facilities, and develop materials OSHA could use to help its regional offices prepare for greater responsibilities at the DOE complex.

The Center also did an Evaluation of the National Marine Sanctuary Program (1999), the first-ever effort to canvass a cross-section of citizens, boaters, fishermen, environmental activists, community leaders, and agency staff at all 12 of the sanctuaries.

The Center's work on the economy included an assessment of the overall structure of the federal government's principal economic development activities for the Economic Development Administration (EDA), presented in a 1996 report, *A Path to Smarter Economic Development: Reassessing the Federal Role*. The Center also undertook a *Survey of Regional Organizations* in cooperation with the National Association of Regional Councils, documenting the many different kinds of organizations that had been emerging to address regional issues, including private, nonprofit, and public sector groups.

Institutional roles, organizations, systems, and strategies

The Academy's focus on public purposes included attention to the basic design, structure, and operation of various kinds of institutions involved in almost any complex public purpose cluster of organizations. The Academy's work with FEMA, EPA and EDA, for example, required placing those three comparatively small federal agencies in a broader institutional context of national

emergency management, environmental protection, and economic development systems, respectively.

The Academy also addressed the problem that had been brewing since the 1970s of growing stress between the legislative and executive branches of the federal government. With support from the Ford Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, the Prudential Foundation, and State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, an Academy Panel chaired by former Congressman and Academy Fellow James R. Jones, produced a report entitled *Beyond Distrust: Building Bridges Between Congress and the Executive* (1992).

In 1994 the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, chaired by Senator John Glenn (D-OH) with Ranking Minority Member Senator William V. Roth, Jr. (R-DE), asked the Academy to undertake an overall assessment of the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO, later renamed the Government Accountability Office), leading to a report on *The Roles, Mission, and Operation of the U.S. General Accounting Office* (1994).

The Academy also initiated a series of projects with the judicial branch of government, at both the federal and state levels, focused on improving court organization and management. NAPA's work with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts included *An Assessment of the Qualifications Standards Program of the Judiciary Salary Plan* (1992), a *Review of Judiciary Space and Facilities Responsibilities* (1993), and an overall assessment of personnel needs (1994). Working with courts on the state level, the Academy did reports on *Long Range Planning in the State Courts: Selected Features for the Federal Judiciary* (1992) and *Salary Levels of Secretaries to Judicial Officers: Information and Analyses* (1996).

The Academy continued its long-standing work examining the roles, organizational structures, and operations of the many kinds of organizations that do not fit neatly into conventional typologies, such as government corporations and government-sponsored enterprises (GSE). In addition to continuing a popular seminar on this topic, the Academy did studies of specific organizations, such as its proposed restructuring of the Bonneville Power Administration (1993). NAPA did a feasibility study for the creation of an enterprise organization to conduct environmental management functions in the Department of Energy (DOE), and another on converting the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) into a government corporation (1995), as well as a review of the institutional structure, organization, and management of the Corporation for National Service (CNS) (1997).

In addition to examining specific institutions, the Academy gave more attention to the generic design and dynamics of institutional roles, organizations, systems, and strategies, and established two centers for that purpose: the Alliance for Redesigning Government and the International Center.

Alliance for Redesigning Government

In 1993, the Academy established the Alliance for Redesigning Government as a vehicle to examine new approaches to governance and public management; to expand NAPA's activities in state, local, and regional government; to accelerate the Academy's entry into digital technology and the Internet; to involve innovators at all levels of government and in the private sector; and to engage young and innovative public leaders with Academy Fellows.²⁹

The Alliance for Redesigning Government was structured as a program within the Academy, with its own advisory board.³⁰ The

Alliance's executive committee, composed principally of Academy Fellows, was co-chaired by Neal Peirce*, who wrote a nationally syndicated column on state, local, and governmental affairs, and Gail Christopher*, Vice President of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies' Office of Health, Women and Families in Washington, D.C., and included William Hudnut*, former Congressman (R-IN) and mayor of Indianapolis; David Osborne*, who had recently co-authored the book *Reinventing Government*; Barbara Roberts*, Governor of Oregon, and the Academy President.

Under the initial direction of Barbara Dyer, and later Gail Christopher, and with support from several national foundations, the Alliance for Redesigning Government worked with innovators at all levels of government, with special attention to engaging state and local leaders. The Alliance undertook a variety of activities using a range of vehicles, including traditional Academy project panels and reports such as *Government Business Process Reengineering—Agency Survey Results* (1994) and *Redesigning Government State-Style* (1995).

In 1999, an Academy Panel, chaired by former Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker and funded by the PEW Charitable Trusts, produced a report entitled *A Government to Trust and Respect: Rebuilding Citizen-Government Relations for the 21st Century*. The purpose of the study was “to define a government worthy of the respect and trust of the American people, focusing principally on the way government operates.” The report made recommendations for government actions in two key areas: (1) improving trust in public officials, and (2) enhancing government performance. Recommendations addressed all levels of government, federal, state, and local.

The Alliance also experimented with a number of other vehicles for its work. For instance, the Alliance created a periodical called

The Public Innovator: A Bulletin for Change Agents, financed by proceeds from a Ford Foundation Program Related Investment (PRI) and distributed to approximately 15,000 government practitioners throughout the fifty states at all levels of government, as well as to members of Congress. The magazine served as a vehicle for promoting Academy publications to a broad audience "beyond the beltway," and as a forum for exchange about government practitioner solutions and approaches to the ongoing challenges of performance-based governance. *The Public Innovator* included news of government reform efforts from around the United States and throughout the world, and also provided detailed coverage of particular topics with articles, for example, on "Real War Stories of Failed Performance Measurement Strategies," "Strategies In Creating Intergovernmental and Cross Sector Partnerships," "Ways to Work Effectively with the Media," and "Engaging Citizens in Performance Management Systems."

In addition to its extensive database of people and organizations who received the publication, *The Public Innovator* created a network of experts, writers, and researchers who were familiar with performance-based government activities and progress within state and local governments. Increased visibility generated by the magazine and related marketing efforts enhanced the presence of the Academy in state and local governments. Alliance staff attended and exhibited at conferences of several organizations for local governments, including the National Association of Counties, International City/County Management Association, National Association of Towns and Townships, and U.S. Conference of Mayors.

The Alliance created The Learning Network Web Site, an on-line data source for government practitioners seeking information on performance-based governance. In addition to thousands of case studies, reports, and documents about performance-based

governance, the site was linked to several related websites and served as a gateway to resources for practitioners. It also housed a database of key contacts within each state and continued to expand in numbers of documents, links, and accesses by practitioners.

The Alliance established a Reinvention Laboratory and Waiver Clearinghouse in conjunction with the federal government's National Partnership for Reinventing Government, including hosting the clearinghouse databases on the Alliance website and server. (Reinvention Laboratories were federal state, local, and tribal government organizations and activities across the United States that had volunteered and been recognized to lead efforts to transform government toward performance-based management.) At one point there were over 350 such "labs" working on reinvention projects in about 30 government agencies. The clearinghouse offered examples of how 24 federal agencies provided waivers to facilitate innovation and improve customer service. These waivers gave delegations of authority to deviate from existing internal agency policies and procedures in order to promote innovations.

In partnership with the George Washington University Center for Excellence in Municipal Management, and the D.C. Agenda, the Alliance designed a performance-based D.C. Scorecard, a citizen engagement initiative for the District of Columbia. After gathering data on scorecard efforts from several jurisdictions across the country, the Alliance designed and facilitated a series of senior management forums for District government agency senior staff to engage them in the scorecard process. The Scorecard staff also worked with the office of the city administrator to incorporate the Scorecard into the Citizens Performance Accountability Plan submitted to Congress.

In 1999 an Alliance/Innovator Task Force was created to review the role of the Academy within state and local governments. It

recommended ways in which the Academy could focus on its comparative advantage in integrating three key elements: the needs of state and local government; the Academy's inherent capabilities; and the Academy assets already engaged with state and local government.

The Alliance pioneered the concept of a “design lab,” in which experts and practitioners engaged in developing and operating various components of emerging public systems that would then be brought together to determine how their respective components might merge into a more effective integrated system. For instance, a Design Lab on new budgeting concepts and practices developed such an approach which was published in a 1994 report, *Deciding for Investment: Getting Returns on Tax Dollars*. With funding from an anonymous donor and matching support from the Lilly Endowment, the Alliance completed phase one of a public/nonprofit sector high-performance partnership design lab. This involved designing and implementing a national survey to determine the extent and characteristics of public/nonprofit partnerships. In addition, the Alliance devoted its winter 1999 issue of the *New Public Innovator* to the theme of intergovernmental and cross sector partnerships.

In partnership with the Academy's Center for the Economy and the Environment, the Alliance received a grant from the MacArthur Foundation to develop a design lab on regional collaboration. This project built on the Center's previously mentioned work on regional governance.

With support from the Ford Foundation and Annie E. Casey Foundations, the Alliance acted as sponsor and convener for The Oregon Option, which brought to the federal level an innovative approach to intergovernmental and cross-organization integrative management in Oregon. This led to a 1994 report on *Results-Driven Federalism: A Pilot, The Oregon Option*, and a 1996

report, *The Oregon Option: Early Lessons from a Performance Partnership on Building Results-Driven Accountability*.

International Programs

In 1993, the Academy established an International Center to help improve the design and management of federal government organizations and activities in the international sphere; to compare U.S. public institutional frameworks with those of other leading democracies (principally Germany and Japan); to provide assistance to governments in Asia, Africa, and Eastern Europe; and to examine changes occurring in global governance and public management throughout the world.

In 1994, Republic of Georgia President Eduard Shevardnadze requested that the U.S. government enter into a partnership with the Georgian government to train a new generation of public administrators for his country. The U.S. government asked the Academy to serve as a partner through a contract with the State Department. Under the supervision of Center Director Carol Neves, the Academy helped establish the Georgian Institute of Public Affairs (GIPA) in Tbilisi, Georgia, as an independent nonprofit organization housed in Tbilisi Technical University. GIPA offered graduate degrees in public management to civil servants. Over the course of this partnership (1995 – 2002), the Academy helped GIPA organize itself; trained its staff; developed education and training materials; provided visiting full-time faculty; held numerous workshops; hosted guest lecturers; managed consulting services; published papers, articles, and a glossary of public administration terms; supported the establishment of an alumni association; and helped train some 150 students who graduated with master's degrees in public administration. In 1998, the Academy arranged for three GIPA senior staff to visit American universities to review, among other

things, their processes for assisting student placement and for developing internship programs.

The program of assistance to the Georgian Institute of Public Administration also involved related projects in the Republic of Georgia, including assistance to the local public officials throughout Georgia,³¹ to senior executives in ministries,³² and to Georgian parliamentary staff to create an information system for the Georgian Parliament.³³

The Academy also provided assistance to other newly independent states of the former Soviet Union, supported by grants from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). One Academy project assessed the management of USAID's democracy and governance programs in Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States at the request of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations. A team of Academy Fellows examined USAID's Bureau of Europe and Newly Independent States (ENI) relationships with its non-governmental partners, the appropriateness of performance criteria and reporting systems, the roles of ENI headquarters managers and field managers, the rationale for using acquisition or assistance instruments, and the quality of training initiatives relating to project management. In a 1999 report, *Enhancing the Capabilities of USAID and its Nongovernmental Partners*, the Academy team recommended ways for the Bureau to work more efficiently with its NGO partners to create an environment that would facilitate achieving results, and to better manage several aspects of procurement.

In 1996, the Academy signed an agreement with the Russian government's equivalent to the former U.S. Civil Service Commission to provide assistance as that agency attempted to develop a modern, merit-based, politically neutral and independent professional civil service in the new Russian democracy, providing

funds could be secured. Unfortunately, the Academy was not successful in persuading the State Department, AID, or private sources to support this effort, and the tentative project of support was never undertaken.

However, the International Center did provide assistance to the Czech Republic on how to foster civic activity and improve government service delivery in local communities, and helped implement a budgeting training course and provided technical assistance in budget reform in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The Academy co-sponsored a series of research projects with the National Institute of Research Advancement of Japan, comparing public management practices in the United States and Japan, including three international conferences and a number of joint Japanese-American publications.³⁴ A conference held in Tokyo in 1998 expanded the international comparison to include China, Australia, and Korea.

The Academy also worked with the Research Institute for Public Administration of the Post-Graduate School of Administrative Sciences at the University of Speyer, Germany, comparing German and American approaches to regional governance. A conference supported with funding from the German Marshall Fund was held in Speyer, Germany, in 1998. Dr. Klaus Koenig, a long-time associate member of the Academy's Standing Panel on Executive Organization and Management, was the principal organizer and co-moderator of the conference, along with Academy President. The project led to a joint German-American publication on regionalism in Germany and the United States.³⁵

As part of its international activities, the Academy sponsored an active program of foreign visitors to the United States from Asia, Latin America, Europe, Africa, and Australia. It involved many Fellows in briefings of visitors and participated in a variety of

cooperative activities with other organizations such as USAID, USIA, the World Bank, IREX, and the Eurasia Foundation.

Performance capacities

Much of the Academy's work over its first quarter-century had been focused on the development and application of performance capacities to help public institutions perform more effectively and efficiently. The Academy's long-standing expertise in these areas had been addressing precisely the kinds of performance capacities needed to match the strong interest the federal executive and legislative leadership was taking in improving the performance of government. When Congress passed the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), it signaled that it wanted the federal government to change the way it was doing business. Instead of measuring the success of departments and agencies solely by looking at how strictly they complied with regulations, or even how well they implemented their programs, Congress wanted to know the results – both the agency outputs and social outcomes – that accrued from departments' and agencies' efforts. In short, Congress wanted to be able to tell the American people what their tax dollars were buying in terms of tangible program results and social impacts.

To address these aspirations from Congress and the executive branch, the Academy developed new capacity to multiply its efforts in this critical aspect of government, including the creation of new centers that specialized in three key areas: *human resources management*, *government performance*, and *information management*.

Center for Human Resources Management

In 1993, NAPA established the Center for Human Resources Management (HRM) under the direction of former federal SES official and HRM specialist Frank Cipolla. His years with the Department of Defense enabled him to maintain close relationships with the department's pioneering work in downsizing and HRM modernization. The Center provided a professional base for the formation of the Academy's Human Resources Management Consortium, which by 1998 had over 60 members, including 55 federal agencies, 5 states, 2 city governments, and the World Bank. Working in conjunction with the HRM Consortium, the HRM Center produced nearly three dozen reports during the Clinton years, and undertook a wide variety of activities to develop and promote cutting-edge knowledge and practices in human resources management.

The HRM Center pioneered the consortium model at the Academy at a time when federal agencies were under enormous pressure to cut their budgets, reduce levels of personnel, sustain if not increase levels of service, adjust to new public challenges and demands from citizens and legislators, and manage major demographic changes in the workforce. There was little experience in the federal government, and comparatively little in the experience and literature of public management and administration, on how to handle these new and unfamiliar challenges after a century of growth in government. (Practitioners were surprised to discover that there was practically no serious academic literature on how to downsize a government agency.)

The consortium model brought together the HRM professionals who were on the front lines of agencies working to meet these new challenges. It provided a forum for exchanging experiences in real time, developing new ideas by patching together nearly similar

experimental approaches emerging in the different agencies, and pinpointing the subjects of research needed to fill knowledge gaps with timely, high-quality work supervised or undertaken directly by the Center's professional staff. The consortium model proved to be an efficient way of pooling limited financial and human resources at a time when federal HRM offices were being forced to cut back their own budgets and staffing even as their challenges and workloads increased. It also provided a revenue stream for the Academy to finance the HRM Center and the Center's efforts to assist agencies.

The HRM Center and Consortium undertook pioneering work in such areas as downsizing,³⁶ productivity improvement and results-based management,³⁷ strategic planning and management,³⁸ succession planning,³⁹ employee flexibility and satisfaction,⁴⁰ alternatives to conventional service delivery,⁴¹ and change management.⁴²

Other reports on the HRM Center's work for the Consortium included

- *Best Practices in Building the Workforce for Organizational Success*, examined key HRM areas critical to achieving high-quality performance and results such as workforce planning, recruiting for scarce skills, investing in human capital, and performance management.
- *Using Information Technology to Strengthen HRM* included elements on managing HRM technology projects; conducting the ongoing HRM Web Forum; providing information, demonstrations, and guidance related to the HRM electronic collaboration; using the Web as an HRM resource; establishing and conducting demonstrations for a Computer-Assisted Decision Facility; and pursuing collaborative relationships with non-government organizations to report IT initiatives.

- *Entry Hiring and Development for the 21ST Century: Professional and Administrative Positions* was a broad review of eight processes used to acquire entry-level professional and administrative workers.

The HRM Center also offered optional services to Consortium members and other interested agencies, including

- *Benchmarking*. In 1998, 20 federal agencies participated in an HRM benchmarking project, and a set of federal HRM benchmarks was established;
- *The Line Manager's Role in HRM*. The Center offered assistance to agencies on delivering HRM programs that emphasized achieving organizational objectives, customer service, and meeting line manager needs;
- *Electronic HRM Support*. The Center's "Computer-Assisted Decision Facility" at the satellite NAPA office at 800 N. Capitol Street, NW was made available to outside agencies to help them generate ideas, develop options, and make better decisions;
- *Agency-Specific Projects*. The Center provided technical assistance and consultative services to individual agencies.⁴³

The HRM Center hosted a number of international delegations, including groups from Taiwan, the Republic of Georgia, China, Singapore, and the city of Caen, Normandy. Seminar topics included how to establish executive development programs for technical and scientific employees, develop a merit-based civil service system, and address a range of contemporary HRM issues for both advanced and developing countries.

The Center supported Academy work directed by Congress, including an independent review of major changes in Department of Defense (DoD) policies, practices, and organizations to improve the conduct of sex crime investigations as they applied to military

criminal investigative organizations (MCIOs) and to felony sex crimes. An Academy Panel's report, *Adapting Military Sex Crime Investigations to Changing Times* (1999) addressed the specific areas relevant to sex crime investigations which it had been directed by Congress to study, including the issues sex crimes pose, the competencies and deficiencies of MCIO policies and practices, and actions the MCIOs, DoD, and Congress could take to improve their ability to address the investigation and management of sex crimes cases.

The pioneering work of the Academy's HRM Center and Consortium led the way in rethinking the entire approach to human resources management in government with such reports as *Strategies and Alternatives for Transforming Human Resources Management, Implementing Real Change in Human Resources Management* (1993), *Innovative Approaches to Human Resources Management*, 1995). *Modernizing Federal Classification: Operational Broad-Banding Systems Alternatives* (1995), and *A Competency Model for Human Resources Professionals* (1996).

Center for Improving Government Performance

As noted earlier, NAPA helped usher in the contemporary performance movement in the federal government by supporting implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) by assisting the President's National Performance Review (NPR) through the Office of the Vice President, and by working with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and departments and agencies of the executive branch in their efforts to improve performance.

In 1994 the Academy enhanced its capacity to support these efforts by establishing the Center on Improving Government Performance under the direction of Dr. Christopher Wye, who had extensive

federal experience in the SES. The Center formed and provided support to a new interagency Performance Consortium (replicating the model of NAPA's successful Human Resource Management Consortium) composed of 30 federal agencies and focused on performance-based government. An Academy Panel on the Performance Consortium, chaired by David Chu*, provided oversight and guidance for the activities of the Performance Consortium. During the Clinton years the Center for Improving Government Performance, in conjunction with the government-wide Performance Consortium, produced over two dozen reports and organized numerous activities to promote the knowledge and practice of performance-based government.

The Performance Consortium's agenda was determined largely by the Consortium members themselves, with the professional assistance of the Center staff, which would oversee the implementation of projects, under the guidance of the Consortium and Academy Panel. For some projects, a formal Academy project panel was created.

Other Center activities included the following:

- *Workshops.* A typical two-day workshop hosted by a federal agency and attended by up to 100 participants from Consortium member organizations would use a peer-to-peer approach and case-study illustrations to help develop outcome indicators, operationalize performance management, use performance data to improve program effectiveness, and build an evaluation capacity. Panelists consisted of peers from other federal agencies and representatives from OMB, congressional staff, GAO, NPR, the Congressional Institute, universities, and private-sector enterprises.
- *Workshop Papers.* Information generated in the workshops was published in *Focus*, one of the

Center's periodicals, along with companion summary *Dialogue* papers of workshop presentation highlights.

- *Monthly Discussion Forums* were sessions with expert speakers from a wide range of organizations on topics of priority interest to Consortium members.⁴⁴
- *Annual Performance Conference*. Beginning in the mid-1990s the Performance Consortium held annual two-day conferences on Improving Government Performance, which attracted about 300 participants at the outset, rising to 500 by the year 2000. Participants included people from federal, state, and local government and the private sector, with exhibits on tools and systems developed by enterprises and conference sponsors such as the Logistics Management Institute, Federal Data Corporation, Atlantic Rim Corporation, PricewaterhouseCoopers, MRJ Technology Solutions, and Corvu. Reports of each conference's proceedings were published.
- *Leaders' Forums*. These were held in conjunction with the annual Performance Conference. For instance, in 1999 a half-day Executive/Legislative Branch Forum was co-sponsored by the Logistics Management Institute and led by Performance Consortium Panel Chair David Chu. Forty senior executive branch officials and professional staff members from Congress met for roundtable discussions to address what had gone well, what needed to be improved, and how the two branches could better integrate their efforts to implement performance-based initiatives. This event continued previous dialogues initiated by the Academy's Performance Consortium on the implementation of

GPRA at the executive level and in a Congress-led summit meeting on the same subject.

The Performance Consortium also undertook projects for individual federal agencies. For instance, the Center worked for the Department of Commerce's Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) to help establish a PTO performance measurement system; for the Department of Justice's Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to assist INS in understanding the dynamics of change in an environment of multiple change factors; and for the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to assist with a national evaluation of a program to implement performance-based standards for juvenile detention and correctional facilities. The Center also assisted the National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration (NOAA) in developing a performance-based financial management and budget process.

The Academy's Performance Center established a website clearinghouse of performance management resources, and worked with other organizations to establish a 15-workstation Computer-Assisted Decision Facility, a state-of-the-art "group meetingware" facility designed to use electronic intelligence capacity to help improve the quality and quantity of ideas generated in meetings.

In 1998 the Center organized a forum, "Year Two Perspectives: Implementing the (GPRA) Results Act," consisting of articles from thirteen performance-management experts from the government, private sector, and academia on the current status of GPRA and its prospects for success.⁴⁵

Center for Information Management

NAPA established the Center for Information Management in 1994 to focus on the changing role of information, communications

technology, and information management in the transformation of governance. Its first task was to establish an agenda of issues that needed to be addressed, which it did with a 1993 report on *The Information Government: National Agenda for Improving Government through Information Technology*.

The Administration's National Performance Review recognized the powerful role that new information technologies were playing, and could play, in the "reinvention" of government, and asked the Academy for assistance in this arena. In April 1993, the Center for Information Management organized an Airlie House (Virginia) conference of senior information managers from federal, state, and local governments and the private sector, leading to a report on *The Role of Information Technology in Reinventing Government* (1993).

The Information Management Center helped government managers engaged in the effort to improve government performance with reports such as *Information Management Performance Measures: Developing Performance Measures* (1995). It also assisted specific agencies in this arena, including a report for the Department of Defense (DOD) on *Information Management Performance Measures: Developing Performance Measures and Management Controls for Migration Systems, Data Standards and Process Improvement* (1996).

During this period the federal government was increasing its own ability to address the rapidly changing information technology landscape through such initiatives as the new Federal Information Resources Management Policy Council. In 1994 The Center did a report for the Council on *Reengineering for Results: Keys to Success from Government Experience*.

The Academy's Center for Information Management carried its work to other levels of government as well. For instance in 1995, it

prepared a report on *Developing Performance Measures for Information in Montgomery County, Maryland*. And the Center more generally addressed its core mission challenge in such reports as *Information Technology Management Assessment* (1997).

Change Management

The rising importance of *change management*, the fourth element of the NAPA Framework of Governance, was addressed through virtually all of the Academy's studies in the other three principal arenas of the governance framework, as noted above. In addition, change management became a major theme of the Academy's Management Studies Program, which also continued a wide range of studies in response to government requests to the Academy for assistance.

Management Studies Program

NAPA's Management Studies Program remained a mainstay of Academy programs, through both its focus on the Federal government and its attention to key issues of public administration and management. Under the leadership of Roger Sperry, Carol Neves, and William Gadsby, the Management Studies Program expanded its activities in addressing such issues as organizational structure, operations, and management issues confronted by federal agencies in a period of rapid, and in the 1990s, turbulent change. The Management Studies Program broke new ground for the Academy in several areas, such as its review of business process reengineering.

Academy management studies in the Clinton years included the following:

- *Administrative Operations in the Customs Service.* An Academy report entitled *Improving Administrative Operations* (1999) reviewed several administrative operations issues for the Office of Information Technology in the Customs Service, including financial reporting and the roles and responsibilities of all administrative staff.
- *U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum.* At the request of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, the Academy in 1999 conducted a study of the museum's governance and management. The Holocaust Museum, which had earned widespread acclaim, took the opportunity to step back, assess its progress to date, and focus on its role in the next millennium.
- *Managerial Accountability at the U.S. Forest Service.* Over the previous decade, the U.S. Forest Service had lost credibility because of persistent management weaknesses, financial accounting deficiencies, questions relating to the relevance and veracity of the data it generated, and the poor quality of its planning. The Forest Service, at the direction of Congress, in 1999 contracted with the Academy for an assessment of its business and fiscal systems and for recommendations to revise its budget structure.
- *A Management Review of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).* The Department of the Interior asked the Academy to conduct a comprehensive study of BIA's management, organizational structure, and administration. The Academy reviewed a range of administrative services including human resources management, budgeting, accounting, information resources management, records management, procurement, safety management, and construction and facilities management.
- *Rural Transportation Planning.* An Academy Panel addressed the effectiveness of state consultations with local officials during the preparation of state transportation plans

and state programs using federal-aid funds commonly referred to as state transportation improvement programs.

- *A Review of the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) of the U.S. Department of Energy.* An Academy Panel examined EERE's year-end unobligated and uncosted fund balances to determine whether the R&D cost sharing agreements were reasonable and appropriate.
- *Nuclear Regulatory Commission.* An Academy Panel undertook a project for the Inspector General of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to advise the IG staff on the scope, direction, and role and operations of the Office of the Commissioner. In this instance, the Academy Panel served as a sounding board for the IG staff with a goal of increasing the "value added" of the IG review.
- *The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.* In 1997, an Academy Panel did a study of the Center's governance and management, and in its report, *The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars: A Review of the Organization and Management*, recommended significant changes in both.

During the 1990s, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was one of many federal departments and agencies to undergo substantial downsizing and personnel reductions. HUD's staff levels fell from over 13,000 to just over 9,000 during the decade. Along with GPRA, these reductions provided a spur for the department to reassess and better express its mission, goals, and objectives. At the request of Congress and HUD secretaries Henry Cisneros* and Andrew Cuomo, the Academy undertook a series of studies to assist in the fundamental rethinking of the department's structures and management processes. A primary challenge throughout these efforts was the lack of analytically based data from which to determine resource needs in relation to program requirements. Congress asked that the Academy evaluate selected departmental management systems,

including the ability to develop personnel requirements based on meaningful measures. The Academy Panel determined that the most effective approach would be to work in partnership with the department. The result was a long-term relationship in which NAPA and HUD worked to restructure key management systems and processes throughout the department.⁴⁶

Academy Affairs (1992-2001)

Academy Fellows were extremely active during the Clinton years, as principal contributors to the Academy's expanding programs and project panels and members of the reenergized Standing Panels. They also engaged in robust debate about the changing nature of the country's governance systems and the new directions underway within the Academy itself. Academy Fellows were also actively involved as practitioners and theoreticians in the work underway in government at all levels both within the United States and around the world.

Membership (Fellows)

In 1998 the Academy membership voted to amend the bylaws to increase the Fellow membership cap from 350 to 400 (in addition to some 145 senior Fellows). By December 1998 there were 509 Fellows and Senior Fellows of the Academy.

Standing Panels

All four standing panels in existence in 1992 remained active throughout the Clinton years (and up to the present), including the

Standing Panels on Executive Organization and Management, Public Service, Federal System (Intergovernmental), and International Affairs.

In 1997 the Standing Panels pooled their resources to produce a series of papers, “Making Reform Work.” The Academy President sent a letter explaining the project and containing the titles and authors of the papers to the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs and the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, as well as to OMB and the NPR. Favorable response prompted a further mailing to every congressional committee.⁴⁷

In 1999, planning also started for the creation of a new Academy Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance. This new panel was prompted by interests of African American Fellows, reinforced by interest demonstrated in the 1999 Fellow Survey. In February 2000, the Academy Board of Trustees established the *Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance*, whose charter was drafted by one of its principal initiators, Board member Philip Rutledge*.⁴⁸ The new standing panel began holding annual leadership conferences on Social Equity in Governance at various locations around the country, and became one of the most active and productive standing panels in the Academy’s history.

Awards

All three awards programs in existence in 1992 (the Brownlow Award, Roback Scholarship Award, and Public Service Awards) remained active throughout the Clinton years (and up to the present). For a number of years in the 1990s, the Alliance for Redesigning Government also gave awards to outstanding leaders working to improve the operations and performance of government, including U.S. Senator William Roth (R-DE) for his sponsorship of the Government Performance and Results Act

(GPRA) and Vice President Al Gore for his leadership of the National Performance Review (NPR).

Academy Meetings

The Academy continued the practice of having two Fellows meetings per year, the Annual Fall Meeting held in Washington, and the Annual Spring Meeting now held outside Washington. Having two full Fellows meetings per year was thought to be important in helping Fellows maintain contact with the Academy and with other Fellows, since personal and informational connections are far less likely to fade over the course of six months than over a year. Holding the Spring Meeting outside of Washington also provided an opportunity to showcase activities in different locales across the country, made it easier for Fellows in that region to attend, and encouraged Washington-based Fellows to get beyond the Beltway and see first-hand what is happening around the country.

Relationships with Other Organizations

During the Clinton years the Academy continued to work closely with such national public service organization as the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA),⁴⁹ and the International Association of Administrative Sciences (IAAS). It also welcomed new organizations focused on strengthening public service and improving the performance of government, such as the Council for Excellence in Government, the IBM Center for the Business of Government, the Public Administration Forum, and the Congressional Institute.

The Academy substantially expanded its relationships with other organization in a number of ways. For instance, the new consortium model developed by the Academy involved collaboration with numerous organizations. The Academy undertook its first joint project with the National Academy of Sciences in its study of the science, technology and institutional dimensions of the future of the Global Positioning System (or GPS). And it joined with numerous organizations in conferences, such as an event in 1998 cosponsored with the Council for Excellence in Government which brought together the Administration and Congress in an important demonstration of bipartisan support for the Government Performance and Results Act.

In 1995 the Academy initiated an “Informal Information Exchange,” which brought together senior majority and minority staff from congressional committees, GAO, OMB, and the NPR, to discuss key issues of government structure and process, such as the GPRA and performance-based organizations. These exchanges proved to be popular with the participants, providing a unique forum to help bridge the gaps among the branches of government and across partisan lines on these critical issues.

The Academy also worked with local universities on a variety of projects. For instance, in 1997 NAPA co-sponsored a forum with American University on how to measure and improve the performance of regulatory agencies, and worked on joint projects with public policy organizations such as the Brookings Institution, the Urban Institute, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).

Strategic Assessment

Visiting Committee

In 1998 the Academy Board concluded that the governance approach the Academy had taken had been successful in substantially expanding the programs and projects that contributed to the Academy's mission. In the process it had generated a rapid increase in both the Academy's annual operating revenue and in its investment reserves. To build on those gains, the Board convened a Visiting Committee of Fellows, chaired by Alcoa Chairman and CEO and former OMB Deputy Director Paul O'Neill,^{*50} charged with assessing the Academy's progress and determining how best to mobilize its expanding capacities to address the nation's mounting governance challenges.

The Visiting Committee reviewed the mission and specific charges to the Academy in specific areas of its Congressional Charter, and concluded:

The Academy has made significant progress in each of these areas. It is fulfilling the first purpose with growing skill, especially with respect to federal programs and operations. It has experimented with ways to address emerging issues of governance, specifically in the areas of environmental protection and economic development. It has established a strong base for assessing the effectiveness of key governmental processes in such areas as performance management and human resources management. It has actively reached out to engage state, regional, and local governments. And it has steadfastly abided by the highest professional standards of ethics and scholarship.

The Visiting Committee stressed that of all the congressional charges to the Academy, “our nation’s greatest need – and therefore the Academy’s highest priority – lay in “foreseeing and examining the critical emerging issues of governance.”

The United States has been well served by its democratic system of government. Our nation is strong and prosperous, and has every reason to look to the future with hope and promise. And yet our society must confront serious challenges if it is to achieve still higher aspirations. These challenges include protecting the environment while maintaining a productive economy; providing effective and accessible health care for all; and creating not merely better public schools but widespread opportunities for lifelong learning. Each of these areas involves far more than the structure of a government agency or the administration of a government program. They involve rethinking broad governance systems that engage a wide range of nongovernmental stakeholders, including corporations, not-for-profit organizations, foundations, universities, unions, professional associations, and civic organizations.

We believe these are precisely the kinds of problems the congressional charter directs the Academy to examine – not just issues confined to the structure and management of *government*, and its various agencies, but also issues of *governance*. The broader concerns of governance include the complex interplay of politics, policy, and implementation among the interdependent constituencies and institutions that are jointly engaged in addressing our nation’s most important public purposes.

We should be clear here that we are not suggesting the Academy engage in policy analysis and development. That is not the Academy’s prescribed role, and besides there are

numerous other organizations available to analyze the full range of public policy issues. But the Academy *can* play an important role in addressing the *institutional dimension of policy issues*: the design and management of broad governance systems and their various components to improve management, operations and overall performance in the accomplishment of important public purposes. Redesigning the architecture of such systems requires knowledge *both* of the policy substance of those areas and of organizational design and management of operations.

The Academy's "framework of governance" recognizes the important roles played by the private and not-for-profit sectors in achieving important public purposes. And its Center for the Economy and the Environment was established precisely to examine the interplay between policy and management in the critical areas of environmental protection and economic development. Other policy areas which have received sustained Academy attention in recent years are housing and community development, and science and technology.

*We urge the Academy to build on this foundation and expand its attention to critical governance issues, with special attention to the institutional dimension of the most important policy questions confronting our nation.*⁵¹

Fellow Survey

The Board circulated the Visiting Committee report to Fellows to get their reaction and input, and also undertook a survey of Fellows.⁵² The survey asked Fellows to comment on two points: First, what are the three most important issues of governance, public management and/or public administration confronting the nation (including local, regional, state, federal, and/or international

issues)? And, second what are the three priority issues of governance, public management and/or public administration that you believe the National Academy of Public Administration should address? The questions were purposefully open ended in order to avoid prejudging or limiting the topics Fellows might choose. The purpose was to develop an agenda of key issues that would guide the Academy's work in the following three to five years. The views expressed were diverse and wide-ranging, and provided a rich collection of insights and suggestions for setting priorities.⁵³

Priority Issues Task Force

In following up on the Fellow survey, and responding to one of the recommendations of the Visiting Committee, the Academy Board appointed a Priorities Task Force chaired by Donald Kettl to recommend Academy priorities for moving to that next level. The Task Force reported to the Board:

The Task Force strongly recommends that the transformation of governance ought to be the defining focus. Throughout much of the 1990s, NAPA pursued a four-step "framework of governance" to guide its work. The Task Force has carefully considered the important issues facing the country and how well this framework can help the Academy tackle them. The Task Force concludes that the formwork remains extremely valuable. The Task Force has also found that the nation – indeed, the world – faces important new challenge to which this framework ought to be applied...The Task Force concludes that this transformation of governance ought to be the central theme that serves as the Academy's strategic emphasis over the next several years.⁵⁴

-
- ¹ David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Longman, 1992).
- ² The National Performance Review was modeled on the Texas Performance Review, led by Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts John Sharp to improve the management and performance of Texas state government. See Texas Performance Review publications: *Breaking the Mold: New Ways to Govern Texas* (1991) and *Against the Grain: High-Quality Low-Cost Government for Texas* (1993), Austin, Texas.
- ³ The NPR tapped federal government employees, numerous in-house agency studies, and the advice of private sector reformers, including the executives of successfully restructured corporations as well as management specialists such as Peter Drucker and Joseph Juran.
- ⁴ R. Scott Fosler, "The National Performance Review (NPR): The U.S. Federal Government's Initiative to 'Reinvent Government,'" (Washington D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration, 1999).
- ⁵ Al Gore (Vice President), *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less*, (Washington, D.C.: National Performance Review of the U.S. Federal Government, 1993).
- ⁶ Gore, *Op cit.*, 1993, ii. The report identified four major goals for a "reinvented government: *Cutting red tape* (streamlining the budget process, decentralizing personnel policy, streamlining procurement, reorienting the inspectors general, eliminating regulatory overkill, empowering state and local government); *Putting customers first* (giving customers a voice -- and a choice, making service organizations compete, creating market dynamics, using market mechanisms to solve problems); *Empowering employees to get results* (decentralizing decision-making power, hold all federal employees accountable for results, giving federal workers the tools they need to do their jobs, enhancing the quality of work-life, forming a labor-management partnership, exert leadership); and *cutting back to basics* (eliminate what we don't need, collecting more, investing in greater productivity, reengineering programs to cut costs). The NPR claimed its recommendations over 5 years would produce savings of \$ 108 billion and reduce the size of the civilian, non-postal workforce by 12 percent, or 252,000 positions. The personnel reductions were to be concentrated in "the structures of over-control and micromanagement that now bind the federal government: supervisors, headquarters staffs, personnel specialists, budget analysts, procurement specialists, accountants, an auditors" Gore *Op cit.* 1993 p. iii.
- ⁷ Congress made significant cuts in a number of programs and agencies, and public administration experts had to scramble to provide guidance on how to "downsize" government. In the end, only a few agencies were actually terminated, including the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

(ACIR), the Administrative Conference of the United States (ACUS), and the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA).

- ⁸ In Phase III the NPR was renamed the “National Partnership to Reinvent Government” with more focus on the problems of “high impact” agencies (principally those providing services directly to citizens), on coordinating related programs across agency and governmental boundaries, and on achieving greater balance in objectives (including the use of the balanced score card and focus on customer service and employee satisfaction).
- ¹¹ Alan L. Dean, with the assistance of Herbert N. Jasper, *The First 25 Years: A History of the National Academy of Public Administration*, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration, 1997).
- ¹² R. Scott Fosler. 1999-11. “A Framework of Governance: Guiding the National Academy of Public Administration.” *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, Vol. 21, No. 4. pp. 516-519.
- ¹³ One of the striking lessons from the early experience with the 1993 Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) was how many federal agencies could not clearly define what their missions were. When agencies did finally comply with the GPRA requirement to state the agency mission, many articulated missions that were at odds with the laws that established the agencies and programs, and across government many agencies overlapped or were in conflict with one another.
- ¹⁴ Public institutions tended to fall into siloed *policy systems* tethered to various presumed public purposes and their subsets, such as homeland security and emergency management, intelligence and counterterrorism, education, finance and financial oversight, health care, and so on. Close examination frequently showed that the structures of such policy systems and the institutions that comprise them were often based on faulty assumptions, outdated organizational principles, and an absence of critical organizational thinking, or else were simply the sub-optimal, least-common-denominator result of a dysfunctional process of political bargaining. A further complication was the *interdependence among policy systems*. The complex mix of institutions *within* each policy system, and the interdependence *among* the various policy systems, has in recent years underscored the importance of still another kind of institutional challenge: the need to *integrate the numerous and complex forms of institutions* in order to achieve single, or closely related, public purposes. A further complication was the *interdependence among policy systems*. The complex mix of institutions *within* each policy system, and the interdependence *among* the various policy systems, has in recent years underscored the importance of still another kind of institutional challenge: the need to *integrate the numerous and complex forms of institutions* in order to achieve single, or closely related, public purposes.

-
- ¹⁵ Performance capacities generally encompass much of the traditional purview of public administration, including planning, budgeting, performance management and measurement, financial management and accounting, human resource management, program design and management, communications and information management, technology management, asset management, procurement, auditing, evaluation, and accountability, among others.
- ¹⁶ Public Law 98-257. *Op cit.* 1984. United States Congress. Public Law 98-257, 98th Congress, signed by President Ronald Reagan April 10, 1984, Charter of the National Academy of Public Administration.
- ¹⁷ Total Board-designated funds in 2000 audited financial statements. NAPA Chief Financial Officer, November, 2017.
- ¹⁸ At the time, the National Academy of Sciences was comprised of three science academies, the National Academy of Science(s), the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institutes of Medicine. In 2015 NAS changed its name to the “National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine.”
- ¹⁹ The Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) was enacted in 1972 to provide oversight of advisory committees internal to federal agencies, and increase the transparency of their activities. FACA established policies and procedures for controlling the number, operations, and costs of federal advisory committees and rules for their review, oversight, and accountability.
- ²⁰ The case before the D.C. Court of Appeals involved a complaint by the Animal Legal Defense Fund regarding a National Research Council (NRC) committee providing advice to the National Institutes of Health on revising the federal guidelines regarding the treatment of laboratory animals. The D.C. Appeals Court ruling reversed an earlier federal district court ruling that the NRC committee was not subject to FACA (*Animal Legal Defense Fund, Inc. v. Shalala*, 104 F.3d 424 [D.C. Cir. 1997]). NAS appealed the Appeals Court decision to the U.S. Supreme Court, which declined to hear the case (*Animal Legal Defense Fund, Inc. v. Shalala*, 104 F.3d 424 [D.C. Cir. 1997], cert. denied, 552 U.S. 949 [1997]). Cited in Peter D. Blair. 2016. “The Evolving Role of the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in Providing Science and Technology Policy Advice to the US Government.” Palgrave Communications. 2:16030 <https://www.nature.com/articles/palcomms201630>
- ²¹ In 2014, across the federal government there were 68,179 members serving on 989 federal advisory committees, 576 of which are required in statutes, although 61 of the committees required by statute were “administratively inactive” (see W. Ginsberg.2015. “The Federal Advisory Committee Act:

Analysis of Operations and Costs.” Report No. R44248. Congressional Research Service: Washington D.C. cited by Blair *Op cit.* 2016.

- ²² Scott Fosler, testimony before the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, November 5, 1997.
- ²³ P.L. 105–153 (approved, December 17, 1997), “Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments of 1997,” introduced as H.R. 2977, “An act to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to clarify public disclosure requirements that are applicable to the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Public Administration.”
- ²⁴ The new requirements included posting for public comment the names and biographies of prospective committee members; opening data-gathering committee meetings to the public (committee deliberation meetings could remain closed, with discretion granted to NAPA to close data-gathering meetings that involved sensitive issues regarding government employees); making public the names of reviewers who critique the academies’ reports (which were previously not publicly disclosed); and posting brief summaries of meetings that were closed to the public to protect information exempted from public disclosure (national security, business proprietary and other information exempted from public disclosure by the Freedom of Information Act [FOIA]). Blair *Op cit.* 2016.
- ²⁵ Shane Harris, “What FEMA May Have Gotten Right,” *National Journal*, (September 9/17/05): 2842-2843.
- ²⁶ Pffiffner, James P., “The First MBA President: George W. Bush as Public Administrator,” *Public Administration Review*, 67, no. 1, (January/February 2007).
- ²⁸ Participants in the January 1999 workshop on “Dredged-Material Management and State Coastal Management Programs” included the U.S. EPA and state environmental agency employees; district and headquarters employees of the Army Corps of Engineers; representatives of port authorities, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The Center staff prepared briefing materials for the meeting, including analyses of the statutory and regulatory controls over dredging, state and federal roles, and recent budget histories. Participants said they found the conference to be an effective way of opening the dialogue among the many federal and state agencies, and their various offices. The co-chairs of the National Dredging Team, representing the EPA and the Corps of Engineers, wrote in their foreword to the report that the workshop had “exceeded our expectations,” and committed the National Dredging Team to “formulate an

action plan that extracts key recommendations from the workshop and specifies how the various agencies in the federal government can make improvements in this important area."

- ²⁹ In its own evolution as an academy, the National Academy of Sciences discovered that it needed to reach out to a broader range of the scientific world, as scientific knowledge and activity was proliferating and becoming increasingly specialized, and as science and technology were reshaping the economy and society. This recognition evolved during the late 19th century, and came to a head when the federal government approached the National Academy of Science for assistance in World War I, and the NAS realized that it did not have the expertise within its ranks to meet the scientific and technological challenges the nation confronted. The result was the development of a new structure and procedures, including the creation of the National Research Council, and the policy of choosing "best in field" for Academy study committees, as well as a substantial expansion of the NAS membership itself. (Conversation between NAS President Frank Press and NAPA President Scott Fosler, February 1992).
- ³⁰ In his 1997 book, *The Tides of Reform: Making Government Work, 1945-1995*, public administration scholar Paul C. Light* outlined "four separate tides, or philosophies, of reform [that] worked their will on the coastline of administration: (1) scientific management, with its focus on tight hierarchy, specialization and clear chains of command, (2) war on waste, with its emphasis on inspectors, auditors, cross-checkers, and reviewers, (3) watchful eye, with its embrace of sunshine and openness, and (4) liberation management, with its cry to let the managers manage, albeit with a bit of market pressure. Even the effort to liberate government from rules and hierarchy has been known to generate rules and hierarchy." (p. 1). Light identified the Alliance for Redesigning Government as the "Patron Organization of Liberation Management." (Table 1.4, p. 37). Light also identified the "National Academy of Public Administration (Standing Panel on Executive Organization)" as the "Patron Organization of Scientific Management." (Table 1.1, p. 21) The insight of Light's categorization and citation of examples was that various patterns of reform efforts were at play at any given time in American government, and, it turns out, could even be reflected within the same organization, including NAPA. Paul C. Light. 1997. *The Tides of Reform: Making Government Work, 1945-1995*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- ³¹ In 1999, the Academy hosted Timur Andriadze, a Georgian member of Parliament and Chairman of the Committee on Local Self Government, for a six month visit under the auspices of the Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Program. During this period of study, Mr. Andriadze had the opportunity to

discuss intergovernmental, local economic development, regional and local issues with Academy Fellows, attend conferences and prepare an action plan to provide the Georgian Parliament with an important role in implementation of laws affecting regional and local government.

³² In 1999, the Academy's Center of Human Resource Management did an assessment of Georgia's Executive Branch Civil Service reform and human resources management reform efforts (including policies that affect employment, employee development, personnel and payroll information systems, resources to support recruitment, training and development, and classification systems) and arranged for nine Georgian senior officials to visit the United States to review organizations with best practices at the state, local, and federal levels.

³³ This project, which began in September 1996, assessed technology requirements relating to the automation of Parliament. Although data access and communications are essential to informed decision making in all countries, they can be especially important to newly independent countries like Georgia to rapidly establish and stabilize a democratic government while responding to urgent public needs. The Academy project assessed needs for hardware and software, network requirements, and legislative databases on a department-by-department basis. It resulted in a plan and an implementation strategy for the installation of some 200 computers, the establishment of a network, the acquisition of Internet capability, and the design and testing of diverse databases. Both Georgian officials and members of the donor community ranked it as the most successful foreign project in recent years.

³⁴ R. Scott Fosler and Shinyasu Hoshino, *The Challenge to New Governance in the Twenty-First Century: Achieving Effective Central-Local Relations*, (Tokyo: National Institute of Research Advancement of Japan and National Academy of Public Administration of the United States, 1999).

³⁵ Klaus Konig and R. Scott Fosler, *Regionalization Below State-Level In Germany and the United States (Regionalisierung Unterhalb Der Landesebene In Deutschland Und Den Vereinigten Staaten)* Forschungsinstitut für öffentliche Verwaltung bei der Deutschen Hochschule für Verwaltungswissenschaften Speyer, (Speyer: Forschungsinstitut für öffentliche Verwaltung, 1999). Papers from Academy participants included those by Fellows Scott Fosler, Jonathan Howes, Curtis Johnson, Thomas Larson, Mark Pisano, and James Svava, and DeWitt John, director of the Academy's Center for the Economy and the Environment (and later a Fellow).

³⁶ *Effective Downsizing: A Compendium of Lessons Learned for Government* (1995) and *Downsizing the Federal Workforce: Effects and Alternatives* (1995), for the NAPA Human Resources Consortium.

-
- ³⁷ *Investment in Productivity: Successful Human Resources Development Practices*, (1996), and *Improving the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Human Resources Services* (1996), for the NAPA Human Resources Consortium.
- ³⁸ *A Guide for Effective Strategic Management of Human Resources* (1996) for the NAPA Human Resources Consortium.
- ³⁹ *Succession Planning Special Report: The Critical Characteristics of Succession Planning* (1993) for the NAPA Human Resources Consortium.
- ⁴⁰ *Work/Life Programs: Helping Managers, Helping Employees*, for the NAPA Human Resources Consortium.
- ⁴¹ *Alternative Service Delivery: A Viable Strategy for Federal Government* (1997), for the NAPA Human Resources Consortium.
- ⁴² *Leading People in Change: Empowerment, Commitment, Accountability*, for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, (1993).
- ⁴³ Examples of individual agency assistance from NAPA's Center for Human Resources Management included an in-depth assessment of the human resources management environment in the Office of Information Technology (OIT) at the U.S. Customs Service; assistance in developing a new human resources model for IT positions for the Centers for Disease Control; the continuation of a multi-year evaluation of HRM at the National Institute of Health; the development of an employee handbook for the Peace Corps and an examination of the contribution-based compensation system for the Naval Research Lab; an evaluation for the Congress of personnel reform at the Federal Aviation Administration; continued assistance to the Department of Energy for processing whistleblower complaints; a technical assessment of the World Bank's executive development program; and the development of a workforce planning model for the U.S. Forest Service (1999).
- ⁴⁴ Topics at the Monthly Discussion Forums of the NAPA Performance Consortium included developing outcome measures, international experiences with performance measurement and management, the role of evaluation in the GPRA, congressional consultations on outcome measures, managing joint responsibility for common outcomes, the drug community experience, and executive and legislative expectations for the annual performance reports.
- ⁴⁵ The papers were published in *The Public Manager*, Fall 1998, Vol. 27, No. 3
- ⁴⁶ The Academy's work for HUD in the 1990s began with reports on *Renewing HUD: A Long-Term Agenda for Effective Performance* (1994), and continued through the decade with reports in 1999 on *Aligning Resources and Priorities at HUD: Designing a Resource Management System* (1999), *HUD Procurement Reform* (1999) and *GPRA in HUD* (1999), *Implementation Plan Resource Estimation and Allocation Process*, *Evaluating Methods for Monitoring and Improving HUD-Assisted Housing Programs* (1999).

-
- ⁴⁷ For instance, one paper in particular that drew widespread attention was the Standing Panel on Executive Organization and Management's *Principles of Federal Organization* (1997).
- ⁴⁸ "Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance: Panel Charter." National Academy of Public Administration. February 2000.
- ⁴⁹ The headquarters of NAPA, ASPA, and NASPAA were all housed at 1120 G St, NW, Washington, D.C. during the 1990s.
- ⁵⁰ Paul O'Neill was later U.S. Secretary of the Treasury in President George W. Bush's Administration.
- ⁵¹ O'Neill et al. Visiting Committee *Op cit.* Paul O'Neill, Paul, et al. 1998. "Final Report of the Visiting Committee." National Academy of Public Administration. October 28, 1998. Paul O'Neill, Chair, Graham Allison, John Brandl, Walter Broadnax, David S. C. Chu, Jonathan Howes, Dwight Ink, Mark Keane, Astrid Merget, Jane Pisano, Norman Rice, Alice Rivlin, Suzanne Woolsey, Alfred Zuck. Visiting Committee of the National Academy of Public Administration. Peter Szanton, Chair, Board of Directors. Scott Fosler, President.
- ⁵² All 509 Fellows and Senior Fellows of the Academy were queried in December 1998, with a second appeal in January 1999. A total of 187, or 37 percent of those queried, responded. While this was not a random sample and could not be said to precisely reflect the views of the entire Academy membership, it did reflect the views of the 187 who did respond.
- ⁵³ R. Scott Fosler, "Key Issues of Governance, Public Management, and Public Administration: Results of a Survey of Fellows of the National Academy of Public Administration," (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration, 1999). [Overview and Summary of Issues of American Government and Intergovernmental Relations](#)
- ⁵⁴ Donald Kettl, et al., "Report of the Priority Issues Task Force," (National Academy of Public Administration, November, 1999). Donald Kettl (Chair), Mark Abramson, Donald Borut, Jonathan Breul, Peter Harkness, Steven Kelman, Naomi B. Lynn, David Matthews, David Mathiasen, Brian O'Connell and Susan Schwab.

Chapter 5

The Bush Years (2001-2009)

George W. Bush was elected President in November 2000, took office in January 2001, and served until January 2009.

President George W. Bush, the first president to have a Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree, declared his interest in assuring an effective and well-managed federal government. He supported the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and the continuation of efforts undertaken by his predecessor through the National Performance Review (NPR), although the NPR program itself was not sustained.

Soon after his inauguration in 2001, President Bush announced his own President's Management Agenda. The Office of Management (OMB) initiated a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) to assist in preparing annual budget requests to Congress, and to assure that OMB used a consistent approach when reviewing federal programs. PART aggregated what was known about key features of federal programs, including their goals, measures, and results, and made that information publicly accessible for review and critique.¹

In connection with PART, the Bush Administration developed a management scorecard to grade agencies in five areas: financial management, personnel management, electronic government, competitive sourcing, and better use of performance data in budget decisions. The scorecard was like a traffic light: green meant an agency was meeting objectives; yellow meant an agency was on the right path; and red meant management practices were unacceptable.²

NAPA President Robert O’Neill served as counselor to the director and deputy director of OMB for six months in 2001, and OMB also tapped the expertise and counsel of other Academy Fellows in shaping the President’s Management Agenda. President Bush later wrote a note of thanks to the Academy for helping his administration “get off on the right foot on our plan to develop a federal management system that is focused on delivering results to the citizens it serves.”³

Over the course of his presidency, President Bush’s management agenda was driven increasingly by events. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, set in motion a whole new agenda for national security, including a world-wide “war on terror” and invasions and occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq, all of which presented formidable organizational and management challenges. Hurricane Katrina called into question the decision by the Bush Administration to dismantle the national emergency management system that had been established by his predecessor. And the Financial Crisis of 2008 resulted in aggressive federal intervention intended to limit damage from the financial crisis and restore economic health in its aftermath.

In 2003 the President and Congress joined together (with strong reservations at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue⁴) to create a Department of Homeland Security (DHS), combining 22 different agencies employing 170,000 employees with a combined annual

budget (FY2004) of some \$40 billion. In a related reorganization, the nation's 16 principal intelligence agencies were loosely consolidated under a new umbrella organization headed by a Director of National Intelligence.⁵

Taken together, these actions constituted the largest reorganization of the federal executive branch since the National Security Act of 1947, which created the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the National Security Council. The ostensible purpose of DHS was to ensure that disparate agencies related to "homeland security" could be guided by a single official – the department's secretary – with a coherent view of the big picture. Defining homeland security proved to be controversial, since most of the federal agencies dealing directly with terrorism remained outside of DHS (including virtually the entire newly fashioned intelligence community, as well as all the armed services and criminal justice agencies). Meanwhile, combining 22 different government agencies, most of which were huge operations in their own right, each with their own strong organizational structures, cultures, and histories (which in some cases went back to the beginning of the country), proved to be a major challenge.⁶

One of the casualties of the DHS reorganization was the manner in which FEMA was incorporated into the new structure. The new director of FEMA, who was not an emergency management professional, had decided to abandon the concept of a national emergency management system adopted by the previous administration. Once it was relocated within DHS, FEMA's recently integrated continuum mission of mitigation-preparation-response-renewal was broken up, with the preparation function removed from the agency and assigned to a new departmental agency. The consequences of these organizational changes, without adequate compensating actions, were played out in dramatic fashion when Hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans in August 2005.⁷

Governance and Operations (2001-2009)

NAPA Chairs of Board of Directors 2001-09:

David S.C. Chu	(2000-2001)
Jane G. Pisano	(2001)
Mortimer Downey	(2002)
Carl Stenberg	(2003-2004)
Valerie A. Lemmie	(2004-2006)
J. Christopher Mihm	(2007-2008)
Kenneth Apfel	(2009-2010)

NAPA Presidents & Chief Executive Officers, 2001-09:

Robert J. O’Neill, Jr.—President	(2000-2002)
Philip Burgess	(2002-2003)
Howard Messner—Interim	(2003)
C. Morgan Kinghorn—Pres./CEO ⁸	(2003-2006)
Howard Messner—Interim	(2006 -2007)
Jennifer L. Dorn	(2007-2010)

There were no major changes to the overall governance structure of the Academy during the Bush years. One mainly cosmetic change that helped clarify a long-standing point of confusion on the Academy’s formal dual organizational structure was flipping the legal names of the “Academy” and “Foundation” so that each corresponded to the plain English meaning of its title (as discussed in Chapter 2).

The turnover of the Academy’s top staff leadership during these years was more frequent than had been the norm over its previous history, and on one occasion Fellows used the prerogative of petition to successfully challenge the slate of candidates

recommended for the Board of Directors by the Directors Nominating Committee.

The Academy continued to use the program centers of expertise that had been established in the previous decade for several more years. As indicated earlier, the centers had encountered some resistance and criticism from some Fellows, who claimed that they lacked “transparency” or otherwise did not neatly fit the mission of the Academy. A couple of new program centers were established during the Bush years, but by the end of the period most had accomplished their missions, encountered funding difficulties, fallen into disuse, or otherwise been disbanded. The Academy also reduced its use of retired SES members.

Vision, Strategy and Capacity

The Academy undertook two major strategic initiatives during the Bush years, one to identify Big Ideas focusing on key substantive priorities and the other, a new Strategic Plan.

Big Ideas

At its February 2004 retreat the Academy’s Board of Directors identified ten key issues -- “Big Ideas” of governance and public administration -- around which to build the Academy’s program and project base over the ensuing three to five years. These ten ideas were reduced from a list of more than eighty initially developed by the Board.

The Directors saw the Big Ideas initiative as a way of extending the Academy’s impact and visibility, as well as a way to increase Fellows' participation in the Academy's work, to re-think some of its operating methods, to team with new organizations, and to further strengthen the Academy’s financial base. The Board also

believed that the Big Ideas initiative could help the Academy determine who should be considered for election as new Fellows, guide the Academy in its activities and research, and provide a substantive focus for potential donors and new sponsors in all sectors. It was also hoped the Big Ideas could build links to Standing Panels, spark Fellow-led initiatives, develop new sources for projects and funding, and increase the public visibility of the Academy.

The ten “Big Ideas” were the following:

1. *Fiscal Future*: Develop approaches for federal, state, and local governments to deal with their financial issues and the potentially increasing structural deficit, by improving public understanding of the scope and consequences of the problem, as well as its impacts, if any, on our ability to meet national goals and on the influence of the United States in the world.

2. *Inter-governmental Systems*: Provide leadership in improving trust, collaboration, and interdependency among the various levels of government (federal, state, and local) for delivering effective public services by clarifying roles and responsibilities; and consider establishing an Academy Center for Inter-governmental Relations, focused initially on changes required to reconcile the strengths of our decentralized system with the need for a more consistent and uniform response to issues of national urgency, such as homeland security, K through 12 education, Medicaid, and the threat of bioterrorism.

3. *Bioterrorism*: Develop practical approaches and procedures to address a bioterrorism attack, with particular emphasis on the need for effective inter-governmental and multi-disciplinary cooperation and coordination, including simulated responses using case studies, scenarios, and "serious games" that can facilitate analyzing and learning about a variety of potential outcomes.

4. *Health Care*: Analyze the current health care system in order to recommend how to create a fiscally responsible one.

5. *International*: Recommend approaches for a new Academy role in international relations to assist foreign governments in improving their management capacity and governance.

6. *Human Capital*: Strengthen the ability of governments to compete in attracting and holding the "best and brightest" employees by examining performance-based personnel systems, analyzing the "hollowing out" of agencies, and assessing how to use and manage an aging workforce.

7. *Social Equity/Justice*: Evaluate the effect of government programs on social equity, economic inclusion, and racial reconciliation and recommend ways to improve governmental decision-making.

8. *Department of Homeland Security*: Assist in ongoing implementation of the new department, assess and advise on its effectiveness, and assess opportunities to improve existing organizational structures.

9. *Emerging Issues*: Establish an "emerging issues forum" to provide early identification of critical issues for future Academy focus, thus providing a highly valued, on-demand capability to offer the Academy's trusted advice to Congress, the White House, Governors, city or county officials, and senior executives at all three levels of government.

10. *Prisons*: Analyze the current status of prison management and the federal-state corrections system with the intent of recommending specific methods for improving management and accountability, as well as identifying the cost drivers and structure.

Some of the Big Ideas were quite broad, so the Academy needed to focus them in greater detail and develop implementation strategies over the next several months. To do so, the Academy formed 10 “positioning committees” and recruited Fellows to serve on them.

The role of the positioning committees was to develop each of the Big Ideas, and to advise the Board on a particular niche or focus that the Academy should develop on each Big Idea, as well as to offer some initial thoughts on levels of effort and next steps. Each position committee began by addressing some of the questions raised by the initial ranking criteria.⁹

In addition to those questions, the Board asked the positioning committees to consider how existing or new technologies could be used to address their respective topics, and to focus especially on how the Academy could improve the actual implementation and program management for each of the Ideas. The Board Chair, consulting with the President, appointed the chairs and members of each of the positioning committees. Two Board members participated on each committee and were responsible for assisting in the preparation of the Board Reports and joining in their presentations to the Board. Once the Board and positioning committees had completed their reviews and made recommendations for each of the Big Ideas, the Academy's Finance Committee was asked to consider each of the reports and the proposals for future funding. With these substantive and financial reviews in hand, the full Academy Board considered all of the Big Ideas and decided how to proceed with the recommendations of each of them.

The Board called on the Academy's professional staff to assist with the organization, research, and analysis of the Big Ideas, including the work of the positioning committees. However, the Board also looked to Fellows and others assigned to each of the

positioning committees, as well as the two Board members for each committee, to produce the analysis of each Big Idea. The Board asked each committee to produce a short (5 pages or so) paper addressing in appropriate ways the questions presented above. For those Big Ideas that developed into funded studies, the Board asked members of the relevant committees to serve in a variety of roles as the idea was developed, including serving on project panels or other implementation activities. The Board also hoped that the Fellows who volunteered would continue as active participants in a variety of ways to achieve the specific objectives of the agreed-upon activities.

NAPA 2005 Strategic Plan

The second major Academy initiative of the Bush years was the adoption by the Board of a new strategic plan.¹⁰ The 2005 Strategic Plan began by clarifying the Academy's mission, vision, and values. The vision was summed up in a new slogan for the Academy: "Making government work, and work for all." As the plan explained:

From the beginning, the Academy's unique feature has been its Fellows who guide its work. Elected by their peers, Fellows include the nation's top policy makers, outstanding public administrators, distinguished scholars, business executives, labor leaders, current and former cabinet officers, members of Congress, governor, mayors, state legislators and diplomats. Individually, Fellows represent the very best in leadership. Collectively, they make the Academy an invaluable national asset. Led by the Fellows, the Academy has taken its charge seriously and put it into action for more than a third of a century. The Academy provides hands-on assistance to thousands of government leaders and hundreds of agencies through research and analysis, problem-solving and information sharing,

strategic planning and connecting people and ideas. The Academy works with every branch and level of government, civic organization, international organizations and others.¹¹

The Strategic Plan reaffirmed the Academy's "purposes and objectives" of the congressional charter, and it enumerated a list of Academy values, including leadership, independence, integrity, public service, equity, innovation, connecting people and ideas, and global perspective.¹²

The core of the 2005 Strategic Plan was the articulation of four overarching goals to follow for next several years:

- (1) Establish the Academy as the preeminent organization for public governance;
- (2) Incorporate and model social equity in Academy activities and operations;
- (3) Enhance the quality of the Fellow experience and the capacity of the Fellowship to make government work and work for all; and
- (4) Increase financial independence so it can undertake initiatives on its own to help it achieve its mission.¹³

The Board agreed to revisit the strategic plan periodically to ensure that it remained current and relevant to the Academy's vision, mission, and values.

In 2007, the Academy staff developed an operating plan to continue implementation of the 2005 Strategic Plan adopted by the Board of Directors in 2005, including follow up on the Big Ideas that had been presented in 2003.

Organizational Capacity and Operations

As mentioned earlier, in 2001 the Academy moved its headquarters from 1120 G Street NW to larger office space at 1100 New York Avenue NW to accommodate the Academy's rapidly expanding program. As it continued to grow in the early Bush years, the Academy moved again in 2006 to 900 7th Street NW, Suite 600, which provided both more office space and a suite of meeting and conference spaces.¹⁴

From 2005 on, beginning with Alaska's famed Bridge to Nowhere, Congress restricted earmarks, which affected the flow of congressionally directed studies. In response to the Financial Crisis of 2008, the Academy reassessed its operations throughout the organization. It worked to strengthen its focus on external offerings (opportunities for leverage and collaboration), contingency planning (coping with uncertainty), and organizational changes (reasons, types, and criteria for partnerships, Academy quality control, and engagement of Fellows).

In 2000 the Academy investment reserve had grown to \$10.0 million. It reached a peak of \$10.7 million in 2005. After taking a hit in the stock market decline that followed the 2008 financial crisis, the investment reserve recovered some of the loss and the Academy's financial reserves (excluding donor-restricted funds) ended the Bush years (fiscal year 2009) at \$8.4 million.¹⁵

The Board had allocated \$1 million from the Investment Fund in 2004 to support the Big Ideas initiative, and staff analysis in subsequent years demonstrated a positive financial return on that investment in terms of grants and contracts that came to the Academy as a consequence of development of several of the Big Ideas. (The Big Ideas initiative actually used \$660,691, a little less than two-thirds of the total allocated by the Board.) The Board's

goals had included education of the public on such key issues as prisons, healthcare, and intergovernmental relations, for which there was no expected financial return. In addition, a new Academy Intergovernmental Center was established, and was intended to become self-financing.

Quite aside from these non-financial gains, data suggested that by 2008, four years after the initiation of the project, there was reason to conclude that the Big Ideas did generate financial gains in specific arenas, including

- \$55,000 from major public interest groups to support the Academy's intergovernmental research;
- \$700,000 grant from the MacArthur Foundation on the nation's fiscal future;
- \$359,000 grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to study management aspects of health care insurance policy; and
- \$56,000 from the Bureau of Prisons to study facilities management issues.¹⁶

The Academy also made further efforts to strengthen its internal management systems and infrastructure, with special emphasis on communications strategy.

In 2006, the Academy received significant national attention for its activities in the international arena, with initial offerings in the International Affairs Working Papers series, and the start of its Global Leadership Consortium. The Academy's visibility in the intergovernmental arena was boosted by inauguration of its Ray Kline Endowed Intergovernmental Research Fund to support research and examine emerging issues related to intergovernmental effectiveness. The Academy's work on the "Fiscal Future" was covered in several national newspapers. In addition, an Academy workgroup, with participation from the Standing Panel on the Public Service, issued *Achieving Federal Missions with a Multi-*

sector Workforce: Leadership for the 21st Century, which was covered in the *Washington Post*, *Government Executive* and *Federal Human Resources Week*, while *Meeting the Challenge of 9/11: Blueprints for More Effective Government* was featured in the *Washington Post*.

Program and Projects (2001-2009)

The Academy maintained the high level of program and project activities it had reached during the 1990s well into the Bush years, in some areas increasing the levels of activity, in some reducing it, including both termination of some program centers and the introduction of new ones. By the middle of the Bush years, the tendency was to eliminate program centers, and by the end of the Bush years nearly all the individual program centers were gone. The Academy had returned to a more traditional organizational structure for its programs and projects. Overall during the Bush years (2001-2009), NAPA produced 78 reports, an average of about 10 per year.

The Big Ideas initiative not only produced a series of self-financed NAPA reports, but also led to the development of several projects and new lines of program development, including the Intergovernmental Center. The Big Idea to address the fiscal future of the United States and its governance system led to a project and report, *Ensuring the Prosperity of America: Addressing the Fiscal Future* (2005), which, as noted above, attracted a great deal of media attention around the country.

With the surge of interest in homeland security, the Academy's expertise in restructuring was used to tap yet another Big Idea, leading to a long-term Academy project assisting the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) as it worked to encompass a whole

new mission of preventing terrorism as well as bringing criminals to justice. In 2002, under the leadership of former U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh, the Academy began a multi-year assessment of the FBI's reorganization plan, using a mix of panels with Fellows or particular expertise.

NASA Program

The Academy continued its long and unbroken relationship with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), dating back to the Academy's. Projects in the first decade of the 21st century for NASA included reports on enhancing technology transfer from NASA activities and human capital flexibilities for balancing a multisector workforce in NASA projects.

Center for the Economy and Environment

In 2001, Suellen Terrill Keiner became director of the Center for the Economy and Environment. The Academy continued its long-standing relationship with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), with a two-year project resulting in a blueprint for transforming environmental protection.¹⁷

Speaking at a 2001 conference, EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman said,

I know over the past 10 years we've seen a creation of a major body of work that provides a road map to the relationship of laws and institutions to our future... Reports from the Academy and other groups have all taken a hard look at how our current laws and institutions suit our future needs.¹⁸

The Academy developed a set of plans that communities could use to manage environmental justice concerns more effectively in concert with federal, state, and local governments. A 2001 study concluded that EPA needed to integrate environmental justice more proactively into its core mission and permitting processes. Building on this work, a further NAPA report analyzed innovative practices that four states had used to incorporate environmental justice into their procedures and decision making.¹⁹

Additional reports produced for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) included

- *Environmental Justice in EPA Permitting: Reducing Pollution in High-Risk Communities Is Integral to the Agency’s Mission.*
- *Understanding What States Need to Protect Water Quality.* The scope of water-quality programs had grown tremendously since the Clean Water Act (CWA) was first enacted in 1972. But federal funding to the states—which are responsible for most of the day-to-day implementation of these programs—had not kept pace. EPA asked the Academy to review the methodologies and techniques used in the Resource Analysis project and determine whether they produced a reasonable estimate of the national funding gap for state water programs.
- *Breath of Fresh Air: Reviving the New Source Review Program.* Congress asked the Academy to do an independent management evaluation of the Clean Air Act’s New Source Review (NSR) program. The NSR was a critical tool enacted by Congress 25 years earlier to protect public health and improve the nation’s air quality. But as applied to existing facilities, NSR did not work as Congress had intended. An Academy Panel reviewed how the NSR program was managed, why it had generated so much

debate in more recent years, and how EPA and the states had shared their implementation roles.

- *Taking Environmental Protection to the Next Level: An Assessment of the U.S. Environmental Services Delivery System* (2007).

An Academy Panel examined EPA's water-quality program through a detailed review of the Chesapeake Bay Program, considered unique because of its combination of scientific studies, interstate policies, stakeholder partnering, and best practice innovation, all of which were required to restore the Bay to healthy conditions.

The Academy extended its work in the environmental area to include other federal agencies. Responding to the catastrophic wildfires that were increasingly gripping the western United States, the Academy developed a solid body of research and counsel to make fighting them more manageable and controllable. The 2001 report, *Managing Wildland Fire*, recommended an organizational structure and management tools for enhancing federal agencies' capacity to achieve greater success in firefighting. The Academy continued its work in wildfire management, including a 2004 report on *Containing Wildland Fire Costs: Improving Equipment and Services Acquisition* for the Departments of Agriculture (USDA) and Interior (DOI).

The Academy prepared a report on *Planning and Management at the National Marine Sanctuary Program* (2006) for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). In the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, there were growing concerns about how the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers financed and ranked its water resource related projects. Congress asked the Academy to prepare a report, *Prioritizing America's Water Resources Investments: Budget Reform for Civil Works Construction Projects* (2007).

As energy development and use became an increasingly important economic and environmental concern, the Academy undertook studies for Congress and the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) on its reorganization (2004).²⁰ The Academy also prepared a report for DOE's Office of Environmental Management on *Managing America's Defense Nuclear Waste* (2007).

Center for Human Resources Management

In 2001, Myra Howze Shiplett* became director of the Center for Human Resources Management. By 2002, the Academy's Human Resources Management Consortium's membership had grown to 60 agencies, providing leadership for a broad-based movement to transform public sector human resources management through research studies and peer-to-peer sessions.

In 2002 the Academy provided the Department of the Navy with recommendations for ensuring that its human resources management operations met civilian workforce challenges in the future. *Workforce 2020: Strategies for Modernizing Human Resources Management in the Department of the Navy* outlined actions that the Navy should take to attract and retain a high-quality civilian workforce.

In 2002, expressing an interest in the Academy's extensive work in federal human resources management, the National Commission on the Public Service, chaired by former Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul A. Volcker, asked the Academy to assist in its examination of the state of the federal service. Past Academy reports had highlighted many of the Commission's current concerns, such as entry into the federal service, defining and valuing work, human resources development, performance management, and personnel retention. In 2002, a report was given

to the Commission, and the Academy President testified before it in July. In 2003 the Commission took up residence at the Academy. The relationship represented a unique opportunity to further encourage informed dialogue and appropriate reform of the public service

In 2004 the Academy released the fifth and last report of its “21st Century Federal Manager” series on the changing roles of managers in federal agencies, the capability and readiness of federal managers to achieve their performance objectives, the obstacles facing managers, and the adequacy of their support and development. Strategies and actions needed for leader development and succession management.

The University of California engaged the Academy in an effort to ensure that its human resources operations exhibited the same level of excellence that it had achieved in its primary mission areas of education, medical care, and research. In a partnership arrangement begun in 2007, the Academy and the University of California developed the Certified Assessment of Human Resources Systems (CAHRS) model.²¹

The HRM Center continued providing assistance to numerous federal agencies, including, in 2008, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

Center for Improving Government Performance

The Center for Improving Government Performance Consortium continued to provide a forum for 30 government agencies engaged in constructive dialogue and research on performance measurement and management and results-based government.

Attendance at the Center's annual Performance Conference for federal, state, and local executives, managers, and professionals continued to grow, reaching 500 in 2002.²²

The Center produced reports on *Performance Management: A "Start Where You Are, Use What You Have" Guide* (2002) sponsored by the IBM Center for the Business of Government, and on *An Integrated Facility Identification System: Key to Effective Management of Environmental Information at the Environmental Protection Agency* (2005) jointly with the Environmental Information Consortium for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Environmental Information.

Center for Information Management

In 2001 the Academy released *The Transforming Power of Information Technology*, which called for significant changes in the federal government's antiquated recruitment, retention, and compensation practices for its IT workforce. The Academy Panel, chaired by Costis Toregas*, urged a market-based pay-for-performance compensation system and innovative recruiting and retention tools. *Washington Post* columnist Steve Barr* called the study a "bold prescription for reform" that could apply to numerous other hard-to-fill occupations.

Collaboration Project

In 2008 the Academy launched The Collaboration Project to encourage and facilitate collaboration across the federal government and to enhance the way the Academy conducted its traditional project work. By the end of 2008 the Collaboration Project had six paid memberships, which fully funded the work

undertaken and provided an operating base for future work. Members then included the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, Office of Management and Budget, General Services Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Collaborative technology was incorporated into a number of Academy studies, and proved to be particularly useful for managing and analyzing interview data. In addition, several agencies—including the Department of Defense, Transportation Security Administration, and OMB—sought the Academy’s assistance in using collaborative technology to find innovative ways to solve complex problems.²³

The Collaboration Project attracted government leaders looking to transform government and share ideas, strategies, and best practices. Over 500 visitors per week accessed the 50-plus cases in its database, blog, and updates on news and events. In addition, the Academy’s work in the application of collaborative technology to the problems of government was featured in major publications and in numerous blogs.

The Collaboration Project worked to build a collaboration community and developed products to help leaders break through the barriers that inhibited collaboration. For example, it partnered with an action learning team from USDA’s cross-government SES development program to do research on critical issues of culture, governance, policy, and law as they related to increasing government collaboration. It also worked closely with EPA leadership in the design and execution of a series of forums to address a range of policy issues that were arising as new forms of collaboration were embraced, such as potential implications under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).²⁴

International Programs

The Academy continued to maintain an active international program. Between 2001 and 2005 the Academy provided support to the Bulgarian Institute for Public Administration and European Integration. In 2003, with support from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the Academy held a conference for high-level policymakers and leading experts in the field to help governments design policies and management strategies for mitigating the effects of HIV/AIDS on the civil service in African countries. In 2005 Fellows Philip Rutledge*, Charles Washington*, and Norman Johnson* participated in the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between NAPA and South Africa's Free State Province for assistance in government management.

Beginning in 2007, the Academy used USAID funding and subcontract work with Management Systems International (MSI) to support the USAID Tatweer National Capacity Development Program in Iraq to increase the Iraqi government's capacity to train its civil servants. The Academy developed a validation model and standards for assessing course curricula on the basis of their support for Iraq's development of a professional, merit-based civil service and instructional strategies and course processes and procedures.

In 2006 the Academy partnered with the Federal Executive Institute and USDA Graduate School to form the Global Leadership Consortium, and also began a series of International Affairs Working Papers.

Intergovernmental Center

One of the roles of the Academy's Alliance for Redesigning Government was to establish stronger ties with state and local government. In the Bush years the Academy sustained that outreach. In 2000, the Academy began a project to help New Jersey supervise the finances and operations of Camden, one of the poorest cities in the nation. Announcing this collaboration, New Jersey Community Affairs Commissioner Jane Kenny said, "...The Academy (has) an excellent track record in helping governments find unique solutions to their problems. The state is fortunate to have this support as we work to put Camden back on its financial feet. The Academy will be an integral part of our strategy to be bold and creative in our approach to reform."

An Academy report for the Federal Highway Administration (FHA), *Rural Transportation Consultation Processes* (2001), included state-by-state summaries of the various approaches to such processes and how local governments viewed them.

The Greater Louisville Project asked the Academy for technical assistance in 2002 as Jefferson County, Kentucky, and the City of Louisville restructured their governance systems. The overarching goal was to produce a set of options for establishing a re-structured government combining the functions of city and county governments based on public management and accountability best practices.

In conjunction with the Intergovernmental Forum on Transportation, the Academy examined the status of surface transportation financing, the appropriate roles of each level of government, and the governing policies and financing agreements that might be needed. A Panel report on *Financing Transportation in the 21st Century* (2007) evaluated the roles and responsibilities

of the many governments and agencies that support the nation's highway transit systems, and made recommendations for re-crafting more reliable transportation financing arrangements to support future highway transit needs.

Management Studies

NAPA's Management Studies Program continued to provide services to a wide range of federal agencies during the Bush years, including the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Health & Human Services, Housing & Urban Development, Interior, Justice, and Veterans Affairs.

“NAPA's Panel on FBI Reorganization has been a valuable partner in the FBI's transformation efforts. We are gratified that the Panel has endorsed our overall approach to reform the Bureau and enhance its capabilities... we look forward to working with NAPA during the upcoming year.”

--FBI Director Robert Mueller (2005)

As noted earlier, the Academy assisted the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) with its post-9/11 transformation efforts from 2002 to 2011, when the agency was expanding its traditional mission of criminal justice and law enforcement to encompass the prevention of terrorist attacks. This entailed both a major addition to the FBI's responsibilities, and a major shock to its culture. Investigating crimes after they have occurred involves a very different set of values and operating assumptions than preventing a harmful event from happening in the first place. To be sure, the FBI over the years had developed significant capacity for anticipating and mitigating, as well as preventing crime. But the agency's mission and culture were steeped in the commitment to bringing criminals to justice, that is, apprehending people who had

already committed crimes. The institutional, managerial, and cultural change required by the FBI was all the greater because it was now expected to take on roles, values, and cultural traits more in keeping with the nation's intelligence agencies, such as the CIA and the dozen or more other national intelligence agencies, as well as the new Department of Homeland Security, and to work in close coordination and cooperation with all of those agencies in the interest of protecting the nation from terrorists.

The magnitude of this challenge entailed major institutional, organizational, and managerial challenges, for which the FBI sought the assistance of the Academy. The Academy responded by organizing a multi-year effort with a series of panels under the chairmanship of former Pennsylvania Governor, U.S. Attorney General and Academy Fellow Dick Thornburgh*, and a professional staff with the combined knowledge and skills required for the task.

The Academy's multi-year effort with the FBI resulted in the publication of several reports, including *Transforming the FBI: Progress and Challenges* (2005); *Transforming the FBI: Roadmap to an Effective Human Capital Program* (2005); and *Transforming the FBI: Integrating Management Functions under a Chief Management Officer* (2006). In addition, several internal guidance papers were prepared for the FBI regarding a broad range of specific issues.

Academy Affairs (2001-2009)

In response to the Financial Crisis of 2008, the Academy reassessed its operations throughout the organization, including key elements of Academy Affairs.

Membership (Fellows)

During the Bush years, the Academy undertook a variety of new services to inform and engage Fellows, including the following:

- *Fellows Newsletter*. In 2008, the Academy developed and began publishing *Nota Bene*, a newsletter e-mailed to all Fellows and featured on the front page of the website.
- *Board Update*. The Board Chair initiated *Board Update* in 2008 to communicate better with Fellows, summarizing key Board discussions and decisions.
- *Online Surveys*. In 2008 the Academy conducted four online surveys of all Fellows covering Fellow satisfaction, Fall Meeting input, Fellow experiences, and input to the fiscal future curriculum pilot project. Responses ranged from 70 to 160 Fellows, depending on the subject matter. These responses informed the development of Academy initiatives, marketing materials, and the Fall Meeting. Fellows were able to see the results of the survey in real-time as responses were compiled.
- *13L Initiative*. Fellow Mark Abramson took the lead on this initiative to engage Academy Fellows in mentoring GS 9-13s in the federal government.
- *On-Site and Real-Time Consulting to Federal Agencies*. In NAPA's work with the National Institutes of Health (NIH), several Fellows were located on-site for up to two weeks, and in its work with the State Department, several Fellows provided real-time consulting services.
- *Panel Solicitations*. The Panel solicitation process continued to expand and NAPA used an increasing number of Fellows to serve on project panels. In 2007, 196 Fellows volunteered for one or more panels and 57 volunteers were selected.

- *Academy's Living Histories.* The Academy began a *Living Histories* initiative to capture Fellow experiences through on-camera interviews and Fellows' testimonials.

Standing Panels

All of the Academy's Standing Panels active since the end of the Clinton years (including the Executive Organization and Management, Public Service, the Federal System, International Affairs, and Social Equity in Governance) remained active throughout the Bush years. In 2008 the Standing Panel on Executive Organization and Management developed a set of papers to help inform the upcoming presidential transition.

In 2001 the Academy established the Africa Working Group with the mission to pursue initiatives and implement programs that directly enhanced good governance and effective public administration in Africa. The working group brought together public officials from across Sub-Saharan Africa to develop a strategy to deal with the devastating effects of AIDS on African teachers, administrators, and civil servants. It also hosted a colloquium on information technology and governance in Accra, Ghana

Awards

The Academy continued issuing the Brownlow, Roback Scholarship, and Public Service Awards throughout the Bush years. In 2007 the Board established a new award, the George Graham Award for Exceptional Service to the Academy. Named after the Academy's first executive director, this award recognizes Fellows who have made a sustained and extraordinary contribution

toward the Academy's long-term organizational strength, capacities and contributions.²⁵

Academy Meetings

The Academy ceased having two meetings a year for Fellows, terminating the Spring Meeting, usually held outside Washington at a location with a cluster of Academy Fellows, while the annual Fall Meeting in Washington continued. The principal reason for termination was financial. There had never been a regular revenue source for the meetings, and the Board determined that the Academy could no longer justify holding two per year.

Relationships with Other Organizations

In 2001 the Academy joined with the Conference Board, Council on Foundations, Independent Sector, National Alliance of Business, National Civic League, and National Governors' Association on a collaborative "Three Sector Initiative" to examine ways that organization in the government, business, and nonprofit sectors could work more effectively together to address mutual concerns and public purposes. A working group of representatives from all these organizations, representing the three sectors, undertook original research that included conferences in different kinds of communities around the country to examine on-the-ground examples of how such cross-sector collaboration could best occur. The collaborative effort produced a report, published by the Conference Board, entitled *Working Better Together: How Government, Business, and Nonprofit Organizations Can Achieve Public Purposes Through Cross-Sector Collaboration, Alliances, and Partnerships* (2001).²⁶

In 2005 the Academy joined the Partnership for Public Service in releasing *Where the Jobs Are: The Continuing Growth of Federal Job Opportunities*, the first-ever study to project hiring needs across the federal government. At the top of the list were security and law enforcement positions spawned by the post-9/11 environment, followed by health care and engineering jobs. Job seekers looked to the guide as a comprehensive resource for pursuing vacancies expected as the Baby Boomer generation retired over the next decade.

Academy-Initiated Studies

In addition to the Big Ideas and Strategic Plan noted earlier, the Academy held a major celebration of its 40th anniversary in 2007. The 40th anniversary was also used to “build a dynamic brand through influential work that tackles tough management issues in the public sector,” to develop partnerships with like-minded stakeholders, and “utilize marketing and strategic communications as fundamental development and brand-positioning tools.” The Academy viewed the 40th anniversary as an opportunity to reassert its core values (impact, integrity, partnership) and to build on its key strengths (Fellows and a reputation for high-quality work), to address its principal challenges (not enough attention to having an impact, potential growth constraining policies, a belief by some that the “membership vs. mission-driven organization” debate had become part of the Academy culture and a barrier to progress, and a development strategy too focused on charitable gifts). The Academy set out four goals:

1. Build an internal culture around shared values, leadership, and accountability for results;
2. Deliver high-impact strategic initiatives that produce measurable results;
3. Expand the Academy’s business model to engage partners and generate strong, stable funding; and

4. Develop a robust infrastructure—systems and processes—to support high performance.”²⁷

As it turned out, of course, the following year (2008) delivered a serious financial shock.

¹PART was implemented incrementally. With the release of the FY2005 budget, about 40 percent of federal programs had been “PARTed”.

²Barr, Stephen, “OMB Pleased at Numbers Showing Agencies Improving,” *Washington Post*, (Sunday, February 5, 2006): page C2.

³Robert J. O’Neill, Jr. 2002. “A Retrospective by Robert J. O’Neill, Jr., President, National Academy of Public Administration, December 2002.

⁴Brooks et al., *Legislating Civil Service Reform: The Homeland Security Act of 2002*, (Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School, Center for Defense Management Reform, 2006): 89-90.
www.nps.navy.mil/gspbb/CDMR/publications.htm

⁵Pfiffner, James P., “The First MBA President: George W. Bush as Public Administrator,” *Public Administration Review*, 67. no. 1, (January/February 2007).

⁶Pfiffner, *Op cit.*, 16.

⁷Pfiffner *PAR* Jan/Feb 2007 *Op cit.* p. 15.

⁸In 2003 the title of the Academy President was changed to President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO).

⁹The questions raised by the initial ranking criteria for the Big Ideas included the following: 1. Is this idea one that really meets the criteria considered by the Board, and, if so, why? If not, do you still think it should be considered? Are any other groups working on the topic? 2. Define the Big Idea’s objective, scope, and potential impact on the Academy and on public governance; specify what the Academy can do that is unique and what we can realistically expect to do; and propose the potential output or deliverable for the Academy’s work on this topic. 3. Provide the reasons why the idea would positively impact the ability of the Academy to improve public governance and increase its presence and influence, as well as determine who else has expertise we may need to use and leverage. 4. What would be the estimated costs for the Academy to proceed on this idea? 5. What are the likely sources of financial support for the initiative and is there a potential sponsor in Congress, possibly a government agency, or foundation source of funding? 6. Will the idea need support from the Academy’s endowment? If so, why, and what is the estimated payback, if any? 7. What approach would be taken to move forward on the initiative? What would be the Academy’s role: facilitator, catalyst, convener, analyst, researcher, focal point, etc.? 8.

Who will be involved with the initiative? 9. What are appropriate performance metrics so that the Academy will know it has been successful? 10. Is this initiative related to any of other 10 ideas? If so, which one(s) and how should they be coordinated? 11. What next steps do we need to take to begin implementation?

¹⁰ “National Academy of Public Administration Strategic Plan 2005.”

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ The size of the offices at 900 7th Street NW proved to be a financial burden when NAPA’s program and revenue began to decline in 2011. In 2014 the Academy moved to smaller space at 1600 K Street NW, Suite 400, where it remained up to the present (2017).

¹⁵ Total Board-designated funds in 2009 audited financial statements. NAPA Chief Financial Officer, November, 2017.

¹⁶ Academy Newsletter, (February 2008).

¹⁷ *Environment.gov: Transforming Environmental Protection for the 21st Century* (2002), for the Environmental Protection Agency.

¹⁸ Robert J. O’Neill, Jr., “A Retrospective.” Robert J. O’Neill, Jr., President, National Academy of Public Administration, December 2002.

¹⁹ O’Neill, Retrospective 2002, *Op cit.*

²⁰ This was an instance where before submitting its final report, *Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy: Reorganizing for Results* (2004), the Academy worked with EERE’s senior management to provide observations and recommendations as the reorganization progressed. As a result, EERE accepted most of the Academy Panel’s recommendations and made many changes to its structure and processes.

²¹ *A Model and Process for the Certified Assessment of Human Resources Systems: A Pathway to Assurance* (2007) for the University of California.

²² O’Neill, Retrospective 2002 *Op cit.*

²³ Academy Fellows active in the Collaboration Project included Greg Lashutka, John Kamensky, P.K. Agarwal, Jonathan Bruel, Robert Shea, Bill Eggers and Steve Goldsmith, Anne Laurent, Frank Reeder, Mark Forman.

²⁴ NAPA, *Update*, May 2008.

²⁵ The idea for the George Graham Award for Exceptional Service to the Academy was developed by Fellows Don Wortman and Scott Fosler, in recognition of the Academy’s first Executive Director, also a Fellow of the Academy, who was a former professor of government at Princeton University, one of the founding faculty of Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and director of the Brookings Government Studies Program. Winners of the George Graham Award for Exceptional Service to

the Academy, have included George Graham, James Webb, Philip Rutledge and Elmer B. Staats (2006); Alan L. Dean and Dwight A. Ink (2007); Howard Messner (2008); Richard A. Wegman and James A. “Dolph” Norton (2009); H. George Frederickson (2010); Chester A. Newland (2011); Enid Beaumont (2012); William Hansell, Roz Kleeman and Sylvester “Sy” Murray (2013); Diane M. Disney, Paul L. Posner and Dick Thornburgh (2014); Daniel L. Skoler (2015); and Jonathan D. Breul (2016).

²⁶ R. Scott Fosler, *Working Better Together: How Government, Business, and Nonprofit Organizations Can Achieve Public Purposes Through Cross-Sector Collaboration, Alliances, and Partnerships*, (New York: The Conference Board, 2001). A Collaborative “Three Sector Initiative” of The Conference Board, Council on Foundations, Independent Sector, National Academy of Public Administration, National Alliance of Business, National Civic League, and National Governors’ Association.

http://www.independentsector.org/PDFs/working_together.pdf

http://www.cof.org/files/Documents/Emerging_Issues/EI%20for%20Philanthropy/Strategic%20Relationships/WorkingBetterTogether_12-01.pdf

²⁷ Summary of 2007, National Academy of Public Administration.

Chapter 6

The Obama Years (2009-2017)

Barack Obama was elected President in November 2008, took office in January 2009, and served until January 2017. He was succeeded by Donald Trump, who was elected in November 2016 and took office in January 2017.

For the country as a whole, for the federal government, and for the intergovernmental system, the transition from the Bush to the Obama administrations was a tumultuous period. The United States had been at war in Afghanistan and Iraq since the early years of the decade; government at all levels, as well as business, nonprofit organizations, and citizens, had been engaged in responses to the 9/11 terrorist attacks, including a major federal reorganization of intelligence and homeland security agencies; and the Financial Crisis of 2008 and subsequent recession were a priority concern of the country and the federal government. The Academy was affected by all of these forces, as was virtually every other institution in the country. The Academy had a double responsibility for helping to address the governance and management aspects of these events for the country as a whole while also attending to its own financial health.

The sharp downturn in the stock markets took its toll on the Academy's investment reserves, and the general uncertainty both of events and of the change in presidential administrations also affected the Academy's pipeline of projects. The Academy's financial posture recovered to some extent, but internal turbulence within the Academy took an additional financial toll beginning in 2010.

The Obama administration's focus in its early years was on the country's economic and financial systems, as well as on a major reform of the health care system. These major system reforms tended to absorb more of the Administration's attention to governance and management issues than did the question of government-wide organization and management of the kind that the previous two administrations had addressed.

The president's management agenda in the Obama years included continued attention to strengthening overall performance. Support for the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) was reinforced by congressional adoption of the GPRA Modernization Act in 2011, which enhanced ways agencies should use GPRA as a management tool. Emphasis was also placed on evidence-based decision-making and place-based management.

Governance and Operations (2009-2017)

NAPA Chairs of Board of Directors 2009-2017:

Kenneth Apfel	(2009-2010)
Diane M. Disney	(2011-2012)
Robert Shea	(2013-2014)
Paul L. Posner	(2015)
Reginald L. Robinson	(2016-current)

NAPA Presidents & Chief Executive Officer 2009-2017:

Jennifer L. Dorn	(2007-2010)
Kristine Marcy (Interim)	(2011)
Dan G. Blair	(2011-2016)
Teresa W. Gerton	(2017-current)

Vision, Strategy, and Capacity

In 2009 Board members completed an assessment of the organization's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT analysis) to help formulate ideas for planning. Then in 2010 Board members developed an online survey for all Fellows concerning organizational leadership, activities, and other issues. Results were presented at the 2010 annual meeting and helped guide subsequent actions and plans.

In 2012 the Academy Board Chair created three task forces to address the serious financial challenges the Academy was facing, including a deep annual operating deficit, few active projects, and limited prospects in the pipeline.

A Scenario Task Force proposed three options to help raise revenue: creation of an Executive Management Consortium, a Corporate Sponsorship Program, and a NAPA Training Program.

A Business Model Task Force was charged with identifying long-term business models to ensure the Academy stayed true to its mission, recognize that the world has changed, generate revenues to enhance the Academy's relevance, and provide a default option to reduce current program activities to operate within current revenues. Among seven options it identified, the Task Force recommended that the Academy explore developing relationships with the private sector.

An Education Task Force suggested the potential of the Academy's being involved in education (certificates, and master's and doctoral degrees) in collaboration with area universities wanting to establish D.C. anchors. This idea was ultimately rejected.

Two other activities expanded NAPA's capacity. First was the active partnering with consulting firms to co-sponsor forums on critical issues; and second was the creative use of technology to expand stakeholder engagement.

Operations

The Obama years were financially challenging for the Academy. The Financial Crisis of 2008 at the end of the Bush years and the subsequent recession were a financial shock to the Academy as they were to many organizations, nonprofit and otherwise, some of which did not survive. However, as noted in the previous chapter, the Academy was able to limit the financial damage, and regain some of its losses in both operating revenue and in investment funds. Part of its success in easing the financial burden came in the form of private sector and foundation grants and support, including from Grant Thornton, ICF Incorporated, the Peter G. Peterson Foundation, and the MacArthur Foundation. Examining all of its options, in late 2008, NAPA sought legal counsel on the status of its fund reserves. When this determined that the bulk of the money was in fact reserves rather than endowment, some became usable for operations, but only with specific Board approval.

NAPA also experienced leadership instability and turnover, with its finances suffering another jolt in 2010-2011 as projects dropped sharply, leaving little to nothing in the project pipeline.

The large office space the Academy had leased for 15 years in 2004 as its programs had continued to expand and revenues continued to grow, now constituted an increasingly heavy cost as projects and revenues declined. Fortunately by the end of 2013 the organization was able to find a more suitably-sized space (1600 K St, NW) at half the rent, thereby relieving considerable financial pressure. In 2014, former chair Diane Disney led an initiative that raised over \$100,000 to help furnish the new space, while recognizing Fellows for their contributions.

The turbulence also took its toll on staff, both in staff morale and in staff reductions. The Academy's staff fell from 25 fulltime employees in 2012 to 17 at the beginning of 2017 (4 of whom worked 30 hours/week). While the Academy worked strenuously to rebuild its project base, annual operating deficits further drained the Investment reserve. The Academy's financial reserves (excluding donor-restricted funds) started the Obama years (fiscal year 2009) at \$8.4 million and by the beginning of fiscal year 2016 had fallen to \$2.0 million.¹

The staff adopted a "back to basics strategy," working with Congress and agencies to develop an agenda tailored to the challenging times. Continuing challenges included capacity issues with staffing, a less than ideal and uncertain business environment, the restrictions on earmarks, and the need to continually update the Academy's approaches to maintain its relevance. A successful transition to the new office space (9500 sq. ft.) had cut costs by \$450,000 per year. A Cost-Cutting Committee composed of Fellows made several recommendations to further improve the Academy's finances. There were also suggestions to use the Academy's upcoming 50th anniversary as a way to raise additional funds, and to reach out to individual donors and foundations. The Academy did in fact gradually rebuild its project base, and by FY 2016 annual revenues had moved back up to \$5 million, while

cost-cutting held expenses to \$ 4.5 million, so that the Academy had a budget surplus for the first time in the Obama years.

Internal Management Systems

The Academy undertook a series of management audits of its own operations in order to find ways of cutting costs and upgrading its technology in a manner to save money while achieving higher quality and capacity. In 2016, it generated savings on its IMIS data base, rented storage space, achieved further savings in facilitation services, bank fees, the Deltek financial system, credit card interest, termination of the postal machine lease, printing and copying costs, and editorial services. Economies were sought in all areas of Academy activities, including projects as well as administrative matters.

Program and Projects (2009-2017)

By the early years of the Obama Administration, virtually all of the Academy's program centers had ceased to function, with the exception of general management studies and the Academy's long-standing work with federal agencies. During the Obama years (2009-2017) NAPA produced approximately 70 reports while also providing consulting support to the U.S. Coast Guard and the FBI on their organizational transformation activities. Overall, NAPA continued working for a wide array of federal agencies during the Obama years, including virtually all of the federal executive departments.²

Over the course of the Obama years, the Academy's work came to focus on several key areas: organizational assessment and design;

strategy development and implementation; human capital development; program evaluation and performance measurement; business process transformation; change management; and stakeholder outreach and collaboration.

Organizational Assessment and Design

The Academy conducted a number of assessments of federal agencies, examining organizational design and operation.

In the FY 2012 appropriations, Congress mandated that the Academy conduct a broad operational review of the Government Printing Office (GPO) to examine the feasibility of GPO's continuing to perform executive branch printing and to identify additional cost-saving operational alternatives beyond those that GPO had already implemented. An Academy Panel, in its 2013 report *Rebooting the Government Printing Office: Keeping America Informed in the Digital Age*, determined that the federal government in the digital age should continue to ensure that the public had permanent access to authentic government information and that GPO had a critical role to play in meeting this need. GPO leaders had made significant progress in "rebooting" the agency from a print-centric to a content-centric focus, but the Academy Panel concluded that the agency needed to make further business and operational changes. After the report was released, Congress enacted legislation to change the agency's name to the Government *Publishing* Office—legislative action consistent with the Panel's findings and recommendations on the organization's purpose and new role in the digital age.

Congress also mandated an Academy study of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC), which was governed by a three-member Board consisting of the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce, and Treasury. The Academy report, *The Governance Structure of*

the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation: An Independent Review (2013), included a comprehensive review of PBGC's governance structure and recommendations to enhance its effectiveness.

When Congress requested an expert study and analysis of organizational options for establishing a Climate Service within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA asked the Academy to provide an independent assessment of how it should organize its climate capabilities. In its report, *Building Strong for Tomorrow: Recommendations for the Organizational Design of the NOAA Climate Service* (2010), the Panel recommended a Climate Service structure that would integrate NOAA's climate science and research with service delivery.

A couple of years later, the Academy conducted another major study for NOAA—this time to evaluate efficiencies that could be made to National Weather Service (NWS) operations. The Panel issued fifteen recommendations intended to help the NWS manage additional and ongoing change. To realize the vision of building a Weather-Ready Nation, the Panel recommended the agency collaborate with partners through a defined framework to manage significant change. The Panel noted that NWS would need to engage internal and external stakeholders to establish a common understanding of goals and clarify the capabilities and capacities of participants.

Additional Panel recommendations for NWS included the need to realign resources; conduct infrastructure, dissemination systems, telecommunications, and facilities analyses; strengthen the corporate Research to Operations (R2O) and Operations to Research (O2R) processes; and reframe the labor/management relationship at the agency to provide the pre-decisional involvement sought by the union and the increased organizational results sought by management within a climate of mutual trust.

NWS leadership began implementing the Panel’s recommendations and spoke to the Standing Panel on Executive Organization and Management, as well as Academy executives, about their progress in making the recommended reforms.

Citing the growing importance and complexity of agricultural trade, Congress in the Agricultural Act of 2014 mandated that the Secretary of Agriculture develop a plan to create a new Under Secretary position focused on trade-related issues. The Act directed the department to contract with NAPA to assist in developing a plan for reorganizing the department with the goal of enhancing the department’s leadership and coordination on trade-related issues. The Academy responded with a report on *Advancing U.S. Agricultural Trade: Reorganizing the U.S. Department of Agriculture* (2014).

By 2015 the Census Bureau had initiated organizational changes intended to improve its ability to provide high-quality data while enabling it to anticipate and readily adapt to future needs. The Bureau requested that the Academy conduct an independent assessment and recommend practical actions to increase the likelihood that its transformation would be successful and sustained. The Academy responded with a report on *Achieving and Sustaining Transformation at the U.S. Census Bureau* (2015).

Strategy Development and Implementation

Studies addressing strategy development and implementation were undertaken for a number of agencies.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) engaged the Academy as an independent third party to provide strategic planning and business transformation management assistance in the areas of acquisition, human resources, and

information technology. In its 2010 report, *Transformation Support Services*, an Academy Panel made assessments against leading practices in these key functional areas and mapped links among the areas that support operational success.

At the request of Congress, the Social Security Administration (SSA) contracted with NAPA to assist with the development of a strategic plan. The 2014 Academy report, *Anticipating the Future: Developing a Vision and Strategic Plan for the Social Security Administration for 2025-2030*, helped the SSA develop a long-range vision and high-level strategic plan to address its service delivery challenges over the next ten to fifteen years. The report stressed that a long-term strategic view was increasingly important in light of more rapid and profound technological and demographic changes, and recommended that SSA expand and enhance its virtual service delivery channels and accelerate introduction of new technologies to meet customer needs effectively in 2025-2030. The Panel also urged that SSA provide personal service delivery for those customers, or for those transactions, for which direct assistance and face-to-face interaction were necessary and appropriate.

In 2015 the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) asked the Academy to conduct an independent assessment of the agency's new planning and operational system (Project Aim 2020), intended to enhance the NRC's ability to plan and execute its mission in a more effective, efficient, and agile manner. The Academy responded with two reports evaluating Project Aim processes and overall assessment.

Human Capital Development

NAPA continued its long-standing work in human resources management (now called human capital development in some

arenas), with studies addressing the public service broadly, the Senior Executive Service (SES), and various HR systems (including recruitment, selection, compensation, motivation, supervision, evaluation).

In 1991 the U.S. Forest Service (Department of Agriculture) had developed several Multicultural Workforce Strategic Initiatives (MWSIs), which focused on providing recruitment sources to attract underrepresented groups in the Forest Service workforce. Concerned in 2008 that the diversity gaps within the Forest Service had widened since it established its Strategic Initiatives, the Forest Service requested that the Academy do a study to determine whether the Strategic Initiatives Program objectives were being met; to identify opportunities for increasing efficiencies in Strategic Initiatives Program delivery, oversight, and administration; and to evaluate the cost effectiveness return-on-investment for Strategic Initiatives. The Academy's 2009 report, *A Program Review of Diversity Strategic Initiatives*, addressed these topics.

The Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) was created to unite the Defense Intelligence organizations under a single set of common personnel policies. At Congress' direction, the Academy reviewed DCIPS and issued a report, *The Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System: An Assessment of Design, Implementation, and Impact* in 2010. Through a multi-method data collection effort, including interviews, two colloquia of experts, several focus groups, an online dialogue, and open forums, as well as extensive secondary research, an Academy Panel addressed a congressional requirement to review DCIPS on several points. These included DCIPS's impact on career progression; its appropriateness or inappropriateness in light of the complexities of the workforce affected; its sufficiency in terms of providing protections for diversity; and the adequacy of the training, policy guidelines, and other preparations. In Phase 2 of the DCIPS

review, a second Academy Panel assessed the progress, challenges, and opportunities for improvement facing the Defense Intelligence Enterprise as it worked to refocus DCIPS's design in light of the Secretary of Defense's decision to limit the full scope of the pay-for-performance aspects of DCIPS to one agency, the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (2011).

An Academy project team undertook an effort to solicit ideas from front-line union workers at Department of Energy (DOE) sites on how to improve worker safety across the DOE complex. Based on the results of the survey, the Panel in 2010 issued a report for the DOE Office of Health, Safety and Security, entitled *A Worker Dialogue: Improving Health Safety and Security at DOE*, which identified key points of employee concern and safety that merited further investigation, and also addressed the current state of reporting processes in DOE.

The Academy did additional work in the human resources management area in the Department of Defense (DOD) under a mandate from Congress; in the Department of Justice (DOJ) for the Civil Rights Division, with a 2015 report *Independent Review of the Management Policies of the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division*; and for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention with a 2017 report, *Improving CDC's Executive Recruitment, Performance Management, Compensation and Onboarding Processes*.

Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement and Management

The Academy continued its work in the area of program evaluation and performance measurement and management during the Obama years.

In 2009 NAPA responded to the House and Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees' request for a study to assist the Department of Energy's three major mission-support organizations (human resources, procurement, and financial management) to improve their operations. The NAPA report, *Managing at the Speed of Light: Improving Mission Support Performance* (2009), offered solutions on how these organizations could better meet the current and future needs of the department. The passage of the Recovery Act only increased the importance of having DOE's mission-support offices working in the most effective, efficient, and timely manner possible.

Federal performance reporting had often focused on measuring how well agencies were meeting short-term goals, but enhancements to GPRA began to focus on implementing improvements via strategic review. In 2014, the Academy issued *Getting the Most from Strategic Reviews: A Report from a Joint Forum of The United States Office of Management and Budget and The National Academy of Public Administration*, which summarized early lessons learned about the ongoing process of GPRA Strategic Reviews.

In 2015, the Academy wrote a white paper for the Project Management Institute titled *Improving Program Management in the Federal Government*. While the paper was concerned with strengthening both project and program management, it focused on *program management*, with an emphasis on programs in the areas of acquisition and information technology. The paper took a broad view of program management as encompassing people, processes, and technology in the management of any large-scale, complex change initiative.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Evaluation

Another focus of Academy project work during the Obama years was monitoring, assessment, and evaluation.

In 2010 the Amtrak Office of the Inspector General (Amtrak OIG) engaged the Academy to conduct an organizational assessment that examined the current operations of the IG's office. *Amtrak OIG Organizational Assessment* identified core organizational strengths and weaknesses, and recommended specific, ranked actions to improve OIG processes, policies, and management practices that would help the office achieve the goals outlined in its five-year strategic plan. Amtrak OIG later engaged the Academy to help develop "implementation roadmaps" addressing six high-priority areas in *Amtrak OIG Organizational Assessment, Phase II: Implementation Roadmap Development*.

The Department of Energy (DOE) Fiscal Year 2012 appropriations directed the Academy to conduct an independent review of the management and oversight of DOE's national laboratories. In directing the study, the Appropriations Committees stated that the Academy should consider such issues as how DOE headquarters and site offices oversaw lab operations, whether existing laboratory performance metrics for the Department's management and operating contractors measured critical aspects of their performance, and how the Department used performance metrics and data.

Business Process Transformation

When the private sector began experimenting with business process reengineering, the Academy examined the experiences and issued a report in the 1990s on its application to government.

During the Obama years, the Academy continued to assist government agencies with appropriate applications of business process transformation, with applications across a broad array of processes including finance, information and communications, and program management.

The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 and subsequent legislation called for improved financial information and improved financial standards, including a managerial cost accounting standard that required government agencies to develop the capability to look at the “full cost” of operations. Over the subsequent two decades, significant reforms relating to financial and performance reporting were made. The Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB), whose mission is to improve federal financial reporting, established managerial cost accounting standards in 1995 and continued to advise on the need for federal agencies to improve the internal availability of cost information and its link to performance information. In 2010 FASAB requested the Academy to determine how federal executives and senior managers were using financial and related information, what gaps they saw that affected their ability to manage effectively, and what opportunities existed to close those gaps. The Academy responded with a report on *Financial and Related Information for Decision-Making: Enhancing Management Information to Support Operational Effectiveness and Priority Goals* (2010).

In 2010 the General Services Administration (GSA) Office of Citizen Services and Communications (OCS) partnered with the Academy to host a one-month online discussion of possible enhancements, new features, and added functionality that could be built into the site.

Congress passed an amendment to the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge (STOCK) Act in 2012 that required online posting of executive and legislative branch officials’

financial forms on April 15, 2013, as well as the creation of a searchable, sortable, public database for these financial forms in October 2013. Concerns about the potential impact of the Act's online posting prompted Congress to delay certain of these requirements and to direct the Academy to "examine the nature, scope, and degree of risk, including risk of harm to national security, law enforcement, or other Federal missions and risk of endangerment, including to personal safety and security, financial security (such as through identity theft), and privacy, of officers and employees and their family members, that may be posed by website and other publication of financial disclosure forms and associated personal information."

In response to this congressional mandate, the Academy conducted an independent review, presented in a 2013 report, sponsored by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), entitled *An Independent Review of the Stop Trading on Congressional Knowledge (STOCK) Act*, which considered how best to manage the balance between promoting transparency and accountability while protecting privacy and security, among other issues. Within a few weeks of the report's release, Congress passed a law to modify the requirements under the STOCK Act regarding electronic filing and online access to certain financial disclosure statements and related forms that was signed by President Obama on April 15, 2013.³

SafeGov.org, a forum to discuss and promote cloud computing solutions for the public and private sectors, developed a framework to spur the creation of a more effective approach to cybersecurity evaluation. As part of its strategy for developing this framework, SafeGov engaged NAPA to conduct an independent review, leading to a 2013 report, *Measuring What Matters: Reducing Risk by Rethinking How We Evaluate Cybersecurity*. The Academy Panel performing the review found that the cybersecurity evaluation framework developed by SafeGov was an important

step toward building a more dynamic, risk-based approach that would yield more robust protection from cyber threats across the government. The framework included the suggestion of tools that might be used by Inspectors General (IGs) and agency managers to ground their assessments and decision-making on common standards and methodologies. That Panel felt that such a tools-based approach could help enable consistently higher levels of protection across the government, while enabling flexibility in its application to the diverse circumstances of federal departments, agencies and programs. The Academy Panel also believed that the success of this new approach would require additional outreach to stakeholders to refine and build support for the framework, as well as a strategy to address significant administrative challenges.

In 2014, the Center for Internet Security and Deloitte and Touche LLP engaged the Academy to identify ways to improve the federal role in the nation's cybersecurity education efforts. This project was led by an Academy Panel with expertise in cybersecurity, performance metrics, and defense education. The study examined two of the nation's leading cybersecurity education programs – the National Centers for Academic Excellence in Information Assurance/Cyber Defense (CAE) program and the CyberCorps: Scholarship for Service (SFS) program. The 2015 report, *Increasing the Effectiveness of the Federal Role in Cybersecurity Education*, covered various aspects of these programs, including funding, performance indicators, curriculum, and designation standards.

In 2015, the Academy worked with ICF to produce an inaugural report, the *Federal Leaders' Digital Insight Study*, designed to survey federal leaders' perspectives about the pace with which the government was adopting, applying, and leveraging technological advancements in service to its constituencies. The study included a survey of federal executives and experts that supported the Panel's analysis and recommendations. The report addressed such topics as

the use of digital technology, job interaction with digital technology, views of agency adoption of digital technology, and the acquisition of digital technology.

That same year, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) asked the Academy to review its telework program to ensure that management controls and programmatic goals were effective and aligned with the PTO's mission. The Academy performed a two-part review of the telework program, reported in *The United States Patent and Trademark Office: A Telework Internal Control and Program Review* (2015). This included an internal control review of the PTO telework program to determine if it complied with the Internal Control standards outlined in OMB Circular A- 123, "Management's Responsibility for Internal Control," and a programmatic review to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the PTO Telework Program.

The Academy teamed with Ernst & Young LLP in a forum entitled "From Enterprise Risk Management to Risk-Enabled Performance: A Conversation with Leaders." The discussion focused on using risk management to enable improved outcomes based on a holistic approach to managing an agency's performance by leveraging risk-enabled methods and tools.

In 2015 the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Science Board asked the Academy to review NSF's use of cooperative agreements (CAs) to support the development, construction, commissioning, and future operations of state-of-the-art, large-scale research facilities. Specifically, the Academy was asked to address how CAs are currently used at NSF, examine the effectiveness of NSF's current CA policy, compare the CA mechanism with other federal funding mechanisms, determine how comparable scientific agencies managed similarly large, complex research facilities projects, and identify potential improvements to the NSF's processes that support large-scale research facilities.

The Academy study focused on NSF's largest cooperative agreements of \$100 million or more involving major facility construction projects under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account, and addressed issues highlighted in OIG audits and concerns raised during congressional oversight hearings.

Change Management

The Academy continued its project work in the area of change management during the Obama Years.

In 2009 the Academy undertook an innovative project called Budgetball, which included diverse partners and sponsors in government, business, and the philanthropic world (including the Kellogg Foundation, the Peter G. Peterson Foundation, the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, PETLab, Coca-Cola, and other sponsors). Budgetball was a team-based sport that combined fiscal strategy and physical play, designed to help participants (principally young people) experience managing debt and savings. Its intent was to provide an entry point for youth to gain experience with activities related to personal financial literacy and the nation's fiscal future. While highly innovative, this project was not financially sustainable past 2010.

Stakeholder Outreach and Collaboration

One of the Academy's major initiatives during the Obama years was the development of capacities and approaches to effective collaboration, especially across organizational lines and engaging large numbers of diverse stakeholders.

Collaborative Forum

In 2010, Congress and the President enacted the Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation (Partnership Fund) to develop and assess pilot projects that aimed to maximize public resources and impact by encouraging federal, state, and local governments to work together on collaborative approaches to getting the right benefits to the right people at the right time. The program, with a \$32.5 million appropriation authorized through FY 2012, was administered by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB). OMB developed an innovative collaborative process to identify, vet, and propose pilot projects that revolved around the “Collaborative Forum,” an organization of over 200 members that included the private sector, state and local governments and their associations, and community organizations.

The Collaborative Forum worked to generate innovative ideas from key stakeholders on how to improve services, increase efficiency, and reduce cost, especially in program areas that crossed agency or intergovernmental boundaries. To support this effort, the National Academy of Public Administration, the Partnership for Public Service, and the IBM Center for The Business of Government worked with OMB to convene a Roundtable of leading federal, state, local, academic, and private sector experts to discuss ways to improve human service delivery and identify even more strategies for successful innovation. The Roundtable identified key areas where the Partnership Fund could look to develop new ideas for pilots.⁴

Reviews for Other Federal Agencies

During the Obama years the Academy provided ongoing advice and assistance to a number of federal departments and agencies.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)

The Academy continued its half-century collaboration with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). In 2013 NASA contracted with the Academy to conduct an independent security review assessing the effectiveness of its foreign national access management program, including a review of NASA's foreign national access (physical and logical), information technology security, counterintelligence, export controls, and organizational and functional relationships. The Academy conducted a follow-up review for NASA in 2016 to assess the agency's progress.

Homeland Security

The Academy continued its work with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in 2009, responding to a congressional mandate to review the effectiveness and efficiency of DHS's Science and Technology Directorate (S&T) in addressing homeland security needs. The review, *Developing Technology to Protect America*, conducted by the Academy in consultation with S&T, focused on identifying unnecessary duplication of effort and opportunity costs arising from an emphasis on homeland security-related research.

In a 2010 project, *National Dialogue on the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review*, the Academy helped the Department of Homeland Security meet mandates outlined by the report on *Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007*. The Academy helped DHS engage thousands of stakeholders through a series of web-based discussions to address the long-term strategy and priorities of the nation for homeland security and guidance on the programs, assets, capabilities, budget, policies, and authorities of the department.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

The Academy also continued its long-standing work relationship with the FBI. The General Services Administration (GSA) had been seeking to relocate the FBI Headquarters on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C., to a new campus facility in the National Capital region. The Request for Information issued by GSA elicited 35 response proposals from landowners, developers, and local governments in 2013. The Academy formed a three-member Panel and was engaged by the District of Columbia's Office of the Chief Financial Officer to work with Bolan Smart Associates (BSA), a D.C.-based real estate consulting firm. In a 2013 report, *Revenue and Job Impact Analysis: The Relocation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation Headquarters*, the team examined the net impact of the departure of the FBI from Washington, D.C., the potential benefit of the redevelopment of the FBI's current Pennsylvania Avenue site for a new use, and the impact of developing Poplar Point in Washington, D.C., as an alternative location for a new FBI Headquarters.

Veterans Affairs

In 2011 the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) contracted with the Academy for a review of the Veterans Health Administration (VHA)'s Fee Care Program after the department's Inspector General identified problems with inaccurate payments and inefficient claims processing by the program. The Academy reviewed relevant reports, studies, and audits of the Fee Care program. Additionally, the Academy conducted targeted interviews with more than 70 knowledgeable individuals, including VA senior leaders, program staff, and officials from other federal and commercial health care payer programs. The Academy study team visited the VHA Chief Field Office and National Fee Care Program Office in Denver, Veterans Integrated Services Networks

(VISNs) with consolidated claims processing centers, and VISNs that still processed claims in individual medical centers.

At the request of Congress, the Academy conducted an independent review of the progress of the Veterans Benefits Administration (VBA) in reducing the disability claims backlog since 2010 and examined the increased appeals inventory over the previous two years. The Academy assembled a Panel of seven Fellows, many of whom were veterans, with broad experience in a variety of fields, including process reform, information technology, healthcare, and the military. The Panel worked with a study team of seven who carried out the review based on a structured study approach.

The Panel found that VBA had reached an important milestone in August, 2015 when the number of backlogged claims fell below 100,000 from a backlog peak of 611,000 claims in March 2013. Since August 2015, the backlog had remained at around 70,000-80,000 claims. The VBA experienced a large increase in the appeals inventory, which effectively doubled from 2014 to 2016. As of January 2016, over 443,000 Veterans were waiting for final appeal adjudication. The Panel concluded that the claims and appeals adjudication processes needed to be fundamentally transformed, that VBA could not accomplish the needed transformation of the claims and appeals processes by itself (that is, without the participation of other stakeholders), and that more effective engagement among all stakeholders, including Veterans Service Organizations (VSOs), the Department of Defense, Congress, veterans, and other interested parties. *Veterans Benefits Administration: Review of the Disability Claims and Appeals Processes* (2016).

Postal Service

Rapidly declining volumes of conventional mail and a range of other financial and operating factors had been placing the US Postal Service (USPS) under significant financial pressure for several years, and threatened its continued viability. In addition to other recent studies of proposed alternatives for Congress and the Postal Service to consider, a group of thought-leaders had proposed a new model: a hybrid public-private partnership. Under this proposed model, the Postal Service would be responsible for the “last mile” of delivery and collection, and the private sector would be responsible for handling all other aspects of the mail system. In 2013 the Academy formed a panel to assess this hybrid model. In performing this independent review, the Panel and study team interviewed or received written comments from over 90 postal stakeholders representing the Postal Service, collective bargaining units, the Postal Regulatory Commission (PRC), Congress, competitors, mailers, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and others. The team included other research and analysis and presented its findings in *Reforming the U.S. Postal Service (USPS): An Independent Review of a Thought-Leader Proposal to Reform the U.S. Postal Service* (2013).

In 2013 the U.S. Postal Service Office of Inspector General (OIG) authored a white paper entitled “Public-Private Partnerships: Best Practices and Opportunities for the Postal Service.” Such partnerships (PPP) had become an increasingly common way for governments to achieve policy goals and develop infrastructure while shifting short-term financial burdens out of government. The OIG's white paper discussed how U.S. government agencies, states, and international postal operators use PPPs, and how the Postal Service might adopt these practices to reduce the cost of universal service and leverage private sector competencies. The Academy formed a Panel to conduct a review of this white paper,

presented in *Independent Assessment of a White Paper by the United States Postal Service Office of Inspector General*” (2013).

Emergency Management

In 2011 Congress asked the Academy to assist the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in studying, developing, and implementing quantifiable performance measures to assess the effectiveness of homeland security preparedness grants. In its report the same year, *Improving the National Preparedness System: Developing More Meaningful Grant Performance Measures*, an Academy Panel focused its study on the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) and Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI), the two largest of FEMA’s homeland security grant programs

In the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, Congress extended the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) for five years, while requiring significant program reform. In 2013, Congress directed FEMA to contract with the Academy to prepare a report on how FEMA should improve interagency and intergovernmental coordination on flood mapping, including a funding strategy, and how FEMA could establish joint funding mechanisms with other federal, state, and local governments to share the collection and use of data among all governmental users. An Academy Panel addressed these issues in its report, *FEMA Flood Mapping: Enhancing Coordination to Maximize Performance* (2012).

In 2014 an Academy Panel issued a white paper entitled “An Analysis of Prehospital Emergency Medical Services as an Essential Service and as a Public Good in Economic Theory” to support the deliberations of the National Emergency Medical Services Advisory Council regarding options for funding Emergency Medical Service (EMS) systems at the state and local

levels. The paper explored the concept of an essential service as it related to EMS and considered the pros and cons for states and localities of implementing EMS as an essential service. It also examined the characteristics of a public good in economic theory as they related to EMS systems and discussed the general policy guidance economic theory offers regarding their efficient provision.

Health Care

NAPA partnered with the National Academy of Social Insurance and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in 2007 to assess the management and administrative issues that arise in expanding health coverage. The two-year project identified and described core administrative functions that needed to be performed regardless of the health system in place, and assessed how these functions might be performed under different health care alternatives. In its 2009 report, *Administrative Solutions in Health Reform: Administrative Issues in Expanding Access to Health Care*, the Panel drew lessons from experiences both in the United States and abroad, and recommended administrative and management approaches designed to facilitate the improvement and expansion of health care coverage.

In 2009 the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), General Services Administration (GSA), and Federal Chief Information Officers (CIO) Council undertook an initiative to engage the public on the following question: “How should we expand the use of information technology and protect personal privacy to improve healthcare?” An Academy report, *The National Dialogue on Health Information Technology and Privacy*, captured the results of this first-of-its-kind online event on health information technology and privacy, and suggested lessons learned from it.

NAPA conducted an online dialogue on “Green and Healthy Homes” in partnership with the National Coalition to End Childhood Lead Poisoning in 2011. Participants were asked to identify the most critical challenges to improving the health, safety, and energy-efficiency of low- to moderate-income homes and to propose innovative practices to use to overcome these challenges. Over the course of its two and a half weeks, the Dialogue received more than 2,500 visits from over 1,100 people in 48 states and territories. The Academy described this project in a report entitled *The National Dialogue on Green and Healthy Homes* (2001),

Fiscal and Financial Security

In 2009 the Academy convened a roundtable of government and business leaders, researchers, and other experts to discuss the governance issues related to the government’s response to the financial crisis. The roundtable addressed the potential of government investments to transform the role the federal government plays in the private economy. This experience was written up in an Academy report, *Governance Challenges and the Financial Crisis: Seven Key Questions* (2009).

In 2008 the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation supported a two-year joint study conducted by a Committee on the Fiscal Future under the joint auspices of the National Academy of Public Administration and the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), using the procedures of the National Research Council. In its 2010 report, *Choosing the Nation’s Fiscal Future*, the Committee examined the magnitude of the long-term budget challenge facing the federal government and provided a framework that leaders can use systematically to consider a range of choices to put the federal budget on a sustainable course.

Environmental Protection

The Academy continued its long-standing relationship with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with a 2009 report, *Putting Community First: A Promising Approach to Federal Collaboration for Environmental Improvement: An Evaluation of the Community Action for a Renewed Environment Demonstration Program*. The report evaluated EPA's Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE) Demonstration Program, a community-driven process that used the best available data to help communities set priorities and take action on their greatest environmental risks. CARE fostered local partnerships that engaged participation from business, government, organizations, residents, and EPA staff. It also supported a public, transparent planning and implementation process based on collaborative decision-making and shared action.

The Academy also addressed environmental issues within the purview of other federal agencies including NOAA, the Department of Defense, the National Park Service, and the National Weather Service. For instance, an Academy Panel issued *An Early Evaluation of NOAA's Habitat Matrix Program (2009)*, which assessed NOAA's efforts to protect and restore coastal and marine habitats – the essential living environments upon which the nation's commercial and recreational fish populations depend. This report built upon the Academy's previous work with NOAA, which focused on maintaining and protecting the nation's marine fisheries and marine sanctuaries.

The Joint Land Use Study program (JLUS), administered by the Department of Defense (DoD) Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), is the only federal government program that provides assistance to communities to help them work with the military to prevent and mitigate encroachment. However, DoD and the Military Departments also have undertaken several other efforts to

help address encroachment challenges. The Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative, or REPI, provides federal funds in support of the purchase of conservation land or easements on lands around military installations and ranges to restrict land uses that would be incompatible with military missions. Beyond encroachment, DoD provides funds to assist communities to adjust to the impacts of significant increases or decreases in the defense presence, including changes resulting from Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) decisions. OEA asked the Academy to study the JLUS program in the context of related DoD efforts and identify ways to improve the program so it can meet current and future encroachment responsibilities. The Panel reported its finding and recommendations in *Strengthening National Defense: Countering Encroachment through Military-Community Collaboration* (2009).

The National Park Service's Natural Resource Stewardship and Science Directorate (NRSS) is responsible for providing usable natural and social science information throughout the National Park Service. The NRSS requested that the Academy do an independent review of its effectiveness in five core functions, its relationships with key internal stakeholders, and its performance measurement system. The Academy responded with a report, *Strengthening America's Best Idea: An Independent Review of the National Park Service's Natural Resource Stewardship and Science Directorate* (2009).

In 2012 Congress directed the National Weather Service (NWS) to contract with an independent organization to evaluate efficiencies that can be made to NWS operations. The NWS selected the Academy to conduct this independent assessment. (A parallel assessment of NWS technology was undertaken by the NAS.) The Academy report, *Forecast for the Future: Assuring the Capacity of the National Weather Service* (2013), assessed NWS's operations and structure against the challenges the agency was facing going forward, and recommended ways in might close the gap.

Academy Affairs (2009-2017)

The Obama years saw several new developments for important elements of the Academy.

Membership (Fellows)

In 2011 the Board explored ways of enhancing the prestige of becoming an Academy Fellow, including ways of incorporating recognition in a university's tenure decisions. By 2015, following discussions with the Academy's Membership Committee, the Association of American Universities started including Academy Fellowship as part of its award criteria, in the "Faculty Awards, Fellowships, and Memberships" category.

The Academy considered a number of questions regarding membership, including the possibility of creating an "Associate Fellow" category, the way in which standing panels recruit associate panel members, the potential vehicles for increasing opportunities for virtual participation, and granting Fellowship status to people who were not U.S. citizens.

Standing Panels

All of the Academy's Standing Panels that had been active since the end of the Clinton years -- including the Standing Panels on Executive Organization and Management, Public Service, the Federal System (later Intergovernmental Systems), International Affairs, and Social Equity in Governance, plus the Africa Working Group -- remained active throughout the Obama years.

And in 2011 the Academy Board of Directors established a Standing Panel on Technology Leadership initially chaired by

Fellow Alan Shark. In establishing this Panel, the Board viewed technology as a set of tools requiring a high level of understanding and leadership that could no longer be delegated to a single person, support agency, or department. Government leaders struggled to navigate the ever-changing landscape of technology, trying to keep current with the latest trends and best practices. The new Standing Panel was intended to scan all levels of government for the latest trends in technology and governance as well as to focus on best practices aimed at improving executive level capacity, and to seek ways to assess the value of technology systems from a public management executive perspective.

The mission of the Standing Panel on Technology Leadership was to pursue technology initiatives designed to make government function better. As with all the Academy's Standing Panels, the new one would be expected to live up to the mission and values embodied in the Academy's congressional charter by helping Academy members stay better informed about current trends and governance developments as well as exploring new policies, models, and courses of action to improve performance in all levels of public management.

Awards

The Academy continued issuing the Brownlow, Roback Scholarship, and Public Service Awards, and the George Graham Award for Exceptional Service during the Obama years, and added an additional award.

The Elliot L. Richardson Prize was established by the Council for Excellence in Government (CEG) and managed in conjunction with NAPA to recognize outstanding lifetime achievement in public service.⁵ When CEG terminated its operations in 2012, responsibility for administering the Elliot L. Richardson Prize and

its financial reserves were transferred to NAPA by mutual agreement.⁶

Several other Fellows were honored as a result of the fundraising for the new offices described earlier. These included the Donald Wortman Board Room, the Luther Gulick President's Suite, and the Dwight Ink Fellows' Hall.

Academy Meetings

The Academy's annual Fall Meeting of Fellows, open to the public, continued to provide an opportunity to address pressing and topical issues of governance and public administration. For instance, for the November 2016 annual Fall Meeting the Academy collaborated with KPMG on the theme of "Strengthening Public Administration in a Time of Transition," anticipating the start of a new presidential administration.

Academy Initiated Studies and Activities

Over the past several U.S. presidential cycles, the Academy has worked in partnership with other organizations to support presidential transitions. In 2012 the Academy teamed with the American Society of Public Administration (ASPA) to produce *Transition Project: Memoranda to National Leaders*, informing incoming national leaders about the policy and management challenges facing the nation. The report's recommendations represented a consensus of the best thinking by public management practitioners and researchers across the country. The series of memos in ten key areas were developed with both a presidential and congressional focus, reflecting the joint ownership of problems and solutions for the major challenges.⁷

For the 2016 transition, NAPA and ASPA were joined by the American University School of Public Affairs and George Washington University Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration, as well as scholars and practitioners from other institutions, in *Transition 2016 (T-16)*, to prepare background papers and advice for both presidential campaigns in anticipation of a transition to the White House and responsibility for the executive branch.⁸ This effort was co-chaired by Fellows Edward DeSeve and David Chu, who had both been presidential appointees.

The Academy also continued an active agenda of conferences. In 2016 it teamed with the American University School of Public Affairs to hold a forum on accountability, and also a “Governors Forum” in conjunction with the National Governors Association featuring Governor Jack Markell (D-DE) and former Governors George Allen (R-VA), and Parris Glendening* (D-MD).

Relationships with Other Organizations

In addition to the many projects on which it worked with other organizations, the Academy partnered with other nonprofit organizations focused the public service, including Partnership for Public Service and IBM Center for The Business of Government (for instance, on the previously mentioned Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation). NAPA continued to look to for-profit organizations to support certain Academy activities, including Grant Thornton, ICF Inc., KPMG, and Management Concepts support of the Academy annual Fall Meeting and Ernest & Young’s support of the Political Appointee Project and website.

Strategic Assessment

In late 2013 and early 2014 the Academy conducted a survey of Fellows and agencies with which the Academy did work to get their views on NAPA’s mission, work, impact, and how it could be more effective in pursuing its mission. Fellows responded to several open-ended questions, generating a rich array of substantial and thoughtful comments in their own words. The survey provided guidance to the Academy Board in its planning.⁹

¹ NAPA Chief Financial Officer, November, 2017.

² Between 2009 and 2017 the Academy had projects with agencies within the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, Health & Human Services, Homeland Security, Housing & Urban Development, Interior, Justice, State, Transportation, and Veterans Affairs, and also with various independent agencies, including EPA, NASA, NSF, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Postal Regulatory Commission (PRC).

³ Key provisions under the STOCK Act included the following: The April 15, 2013 deadline for publishing the legislative and executive branch officials’ financial disclosure information on official government websites would not go into effect; Financial disclosure reports for the President, the Vice President, members and candidates for Congress, and cabinet-level and deputy-cabinet-level Senate-confirmed officials in the executive branch must still be posted online, but as a PDF, not a searchable, sortable, and downloadable form; The deadline for the development of systems to enable electronic filing of financial disclosure reports will be extended to January 1, 2014; The STOCK Act provision granting public access on government websites to the electronically filed financial disclosure information for the top legislative-branch and executive-branch positions who are already subject to Internet-publication requirements of the STOCK Act was retained; The requirement that electronically filed financial-disclosure data be made available to the public in searchable, sortable, and downloadable form was repealed; Several conforming amendments to the STOCK Act were made, including removal of the STOCK Act provision that disallows a login requirement to search or sort the electronically filed data.

⁴ Jonathan C. Tucker, “The Partnership Fund for Program Integrity Innovation: Expanding Ways to Provide Cost-Effective Services,” National Academy of

Public Administration and the IMB Center for the Business of Government, (2012).

- ⁵ Elliot L. Richardson (1920 - 1999), a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration, had an illustrious public service career, including serving as Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and Attorney General. He also served in various state government and judicial positions. During World War II he served in the U.S. Army and participated in the June 6, 1944 “D-Day” landing in Normandy. As U. S Attorney General in 1973 Richardson resigned rather than obey President Nixon's order to fire special prosecutor Archibald Cox who was investigating the Watergate affair.
- ⁶ Winners of the Richardson prize have included George P. Schutz, Alice M. Rivlin and Colin L. Powell (2002); Sandra Day O’Connor and Norman Y. Mineta (2004); Tom Kean and Lee Hamilton (2006); George J. Mitchell and James A. Baker III (2010); Robert M. Gates (2012); Paul A. Volcker and Sheila C. Blair (2013); and William D. Ruckelshaus and John Koskinen (2016).
- ⁷ Paul Posner, “Summary of NAPA/ASPA Transition Project: Memoranda to National Leaders,” Memo to the Board of Directors, National Academy of Public Administration, (May 18, 2012).
- ⁸ National Academy of Public Administration, *Transition 2016: Equipping the Government for Success in 2016 and Beyond*, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration, 2016).
- ⁹ “National Academy of Public Administration Survey: Results from Fellows and Agencies,” as of January, 27 2014.

Chapter 7

Epilogue

The National Academy of Public Administration has been “a source of trusted advice” on improving the nation’s governance systems for half a century. Innumerable people have contributed to building and sustaining this national institutional asset.

When Alan Dean summed up NAPA’s first twenty-five years, he showed justifiable pride in what the Academy’s founders and original stewards had accomplished in those early years. He pointed especially to the “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.”¹ He would be pleased to know that another generation has built on that strong tradition and has now brought the Academy to the successful completion of its first half-century.

Accomplishments

Dean considered the Academy’s establishment and congressional charter important measures of the success of its first 25 years. However, he also valued its “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.” The fact that the Academy in its second twenty-five years continued to build successfully on the foundation laid in the first twenty-five is testament to the validity of Dean’s judgment.

Most of the advice dispensed by the Academy over the years has been delivered in written reports. Dean counted 265 Academy reports in the first twenty-five years. Another 296 were produced in the second twenty-five, for a total of 561 reports over the full fifty years. That’s an average of a little over 11 reports a year, although the annual number has fluctuated widely from as many as thirty to as few as three or four.

A “report,” of course, can take many different forms, both generically and in the context of the Academy’s operations.² Most all of the Academy reports over the past half-century have been “project panel reports,” each the product of a carefully selected panel of experts, mostly but not all Academy Fellows, supported by a high-quality professional staff, undertaking research and sifting through evidence to address various questions of governance, administrative organization or management for sponsors, including Congress, the Judiciary, and every type of Executive branch agency, as well as state and local governments and nongovernmental organizations.

This familiar formula for an Academy project panel has stood the test of fifty years, and over that entire time has conformed to Dean’s assessment that in the first quarter-century “the vast majority of government agencies and institutions which have sought the assistance of NAPA have been pleased by the results.” A qualification here is that even if not necessarily pleased, a

sponsor or subject of an Academy report has rarely expressed reservations as to whether the highest professional standards of research, judgment, and impartiality had been observed.

The mere existence of this extensive library of Academy reports on the intricate workings of the American governance system, and how to make it work better, is arguably worth all the effort and (comparatively small) expense that has gone into the creation and sustenance of the Academy for the past half-century.

This history has attempted to show in some detail the abundant evidence of concrete steps taken to implement Academy recommendations and the positive consequences of those actions in specific instances. The tangible results are also reflected in the testimonials from American presidents and members of Congress, to departmental secretaries and agency directors, to employees and other stakeholders who have praised the Academy's work and expressed gratitude for help in solving knotty problems and sorting out new opportunities for higher performance.

Some Academy advice has helped improve management and administrative systems so that agencies are more successful in pursuing their missions. In other instances, the Academy has focused directly on improving performance, not just of individual agencies but also of entire governance systems. For example, following the devastating Florida hurricanes of the 1980s and '90s (described in Chapter 4), the Academy helped conceptualize and construct an entirely new governance system that demonstrated tangible results in coping with catastrophes in a rapidly changing and increasingly complex world (and so it was all the more disappointing when that system was later dismantled with devastating consequences in subsequent hurricanes).

The Academy has helped improve institutional capacity and performance in specific policy arenas, including national security,

criminal justice, environmental protection, housing and urban development, transportation, education, and international relations, not to mention a half-century of assistance to the nation's extraordinarily successful space program.

The broader impact of some Academy work may have been even more consequential, if also more difficult to assess. For instance, the Academy's performance consortium engaged scores of agencies throughout the federal government to help them improve their performance measurement and management systems. A similar consortium for human resources management helped scores of organizations improve their respective systems, and also contributed to a new generation of ideas and practices to better recruit, select, develop, and employ human talent in the public service.

The Academy was also at the forefront of thought leadership in surfacing the key themes and practices of the reform wave that began in American state and local government in the 1960s and by the 1990s was manifest throughout the OECD countries: governance, new public management, reinventing government, performance measurement and management, cross-boundary collaboration, and network management, among others. Academy Fellows had been attentive to all aspects of this new generation of reform, as participants and analysts, advocates and skeptics. So the Academy was in a strong position to assess them, determine how to fold them into its overall program, and help decision-makers and practitioners sort through and use the best of them.

Academy assistance to the central management agencies and programs of virtually every Presidential administration over the past half-century has bolstered efforts to improve the organization, management, and performance of the federal government. The Academy has regularly joined with other public service organizations to help prepare Presidential campaigns for transition

to the White House, and in one instance an Academy President took a short leave to work directly in the Executive Office of the President to help get a new administration's management agenda up and running.

While the Academy has depended on its Fellows to achieve all of these things, it has in turn provided Fellows with opportunities to serve the country, to remain connected to the best in front-line practice and thinking in the field, to continually refresh and sharpen their own thinking and professional skills, and to enjoy the Fellowship of others who share their concern to improve American governance.

Comparing Lessons Learned Over Time

In summing up the experience of the Academy's first twenty-five years Alan Dean highlighted what he viewed as a number of "characteristics and modes of operation which have proved useful and which few Fellows would change," as well as "areas of concern" for the Academy. It is instructive to assess the second twenty-five years of the Academy's operations against Dean's list.

"Useful Characteristics and Modes of Operation"

Most of the positive traits Dean identified have continued to hold true, including the avoidance of political bias or ideological predispositions; insistence on telling clients the truth as we see it, even if it is unpleasant or unwelcome; and the use of project panels to conduct studies, of ad hoc committees and working groups to address special NAPA needs, and of an institutionalized approach to identifying and electing new Fellows.

Dean might be disappointed to learn that the Academy stopped holding two general meetings each year; the Academy Spring Meeting was dropped in 2007, although the Fall Meeting has continued uninterrupted. He believed two meetings a year were required “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.” He may have been right. However, the Academy in 2017 held four conferences around the nation focused on themes related to “Governing Across the Divide” in addition to the Fall Meeting. Groups of fellows also continue to gather for other conferences as time and geography permit, and modern tools facilitate virtual gatherings that partially substitute for a second Academy national meeting at much lower cost.

Some of the items Dean identified as Academy strengths require further reflection. He felt quite strongly about “keeping the academy a collegial body, with a strict limitation on total membership.” Collegiality is certainly a worthy value, to the extent that it refers to a culture among professional colleagues conducive to mutual respect, one that encourages and permits deeper reflection and consideration of matters at hand in a context of civility and trust. Collegiality gets a bit trickier if the criteria and boundaries defining “colleagues” wander beyond those required to assure high-quality in professional expertise, judgment, and achievement to favor more self-serving traditions and privileges of exclusiveness.

The original Academy membership was composed of 30 former presidents of the American Society of Public Administration, all white males with distinguished public service careers. It was, by all accounts, a very collegial group, and that collegiality appears to have served them well in acting with dispatch once the word was given to get the new Academy off the ground and running.

By 1992, the Academy Fellowship had grown to 400, and in 2017 was composed of more than 800 Fellows, including former cabinet officers, Members of Congress, governors, mayors, and state legislators, as well as prominent scholars, business executives, and public administrators.

The Academy today is also far more diverse in race, gender, and ethnicity, as well as in professional and policy areas, and therefore a closer approximation to the composition of the American public service. In 1999, the Executive Committee of the Academy Board of Directors did not include a male of European extraction. In that year the Academy staff was sixty percent female (including 33 percent of program directors and both the chief operating officer and the chief financial officer), and 32 percent of staff members were African-American (including 17 percent of program directors and 14 percent of corporate staff). This increasing diversity did not happen by accident. Rather, it resulted from deliberate Board activities to seek out and welcome the full complement of talent, experience and perspective required for the Academy to do its work. For example, the annual call for nominating Fellows has attached priority to different categories, including important occupations and talents not fully represented in the Fellowship.

The Academy has become a microcosm of the American governance system. The Fellowship represents virtually all its dimensions: federal, state, and local; neighborhood, regional, and international; practitioners, journalists, and academics; various management and administrative specializations (such as finance, human resources, information, and performance management); and the full range of policy areas (such as education, environmental protection, health, transportation, national security, and community development).

As a microcosm, the Academy can tap into the diverse disciplines and specialized knowledge areas required to address the wide range of individual challenges confronting American governance. It can also bring together the expertise and experience in interrelated problem areas that need to be treated in a more integrated and comprehensive fashion. As is true with the American governance system it reflects, the challenge for the Academy is to channel highly valued and occasionally competing individual interests and institutional loyalties to focus on common projects identified by the Academy and guided by its shared principles. As the Fellowship has grown in both numbers and diversity, Academy leaders have used every tool at their disposal, from in-person meetings to online video, to keep Fellows connected to each other and to the Academy, and to foster the bonds that support collegiality.

“Areas of Concern”

Alan Dean also cited in his Epilogue “a number of areas of concern for the National Academy.” Some of those have been largely addressed in the years since, although they always warrant vigilance, including the basics of good internal management and financial practices.

As the Academy was completing its first quarter-century, there was rising concern about sustaining the high-quality of reports. That issue was squarely addressed in the opening years of the second quarter-century, but must always remain a prime concern that bears watching.

Over the years, the Academy Board of Directors and President have followed various formulas regarding the Board’s recruitment, selection, and oversight of the president, and the president’s role in directing and managing the organization. There have been periods

of instability and turbulence, occasionally with troubling implication for the well-being of the Academy. No single formula will necessarily suit all circumstances, nor will even the best formula substitute for wise leadership and skillful management.

Dean's history revealed a chronic concern about the role and functioning of Academy standing panels, although by the end of the first quarter-century a certain stability appeared to have been achieved. Moreover, all four of the Standing Panels in place in 1992 – on Executive Organization and Management, Public Service, Intergovernmental Relations, and International Affairs – have remained active through 2017, with two additional Standing Panels—Social Equity in Governance and Technology Leadership—as well as the Africa Working Group, added to the mix in the meantime.

Dean was concerned that there was inadequate provision for greater involvement of Fellows in advising on how the Academy as an organization should function. He believed that could best be achieved by providing more time for such matters in general meetings and occasionally scheduling all-Fellow retreats. And he worried that achieving that end would become more problematic the larger the Academy membership became. He was right to some extent, but expectations have changed in this regard over time. This continued to be a topic of discussion in the second twenty-five years.

There was considerable concern in the first quarter-century to assure that people elected Fellows of the Academy were both qualified and willing to participate actively in the life the Academy and also to volunteer their time to projects. One reason for strong resistance to expanding membership was concern that it would dilute the professional quality and active engagement of Fellows. A counter-argument to these concerns was that the National Academy of Sciences (including each of its three Academies) had

a far larger membership than NAPA drawn from a smaller pool of potential candidates. Moreover, failure to enlist genuinely qualified people as Academy Fellows risked undermining the Academy's claim to include the most distinguished career professionals in the field. In the end, the Academy continued expanding its membership, and the kinds of concerns raised by Dean also persisted.

Financial stability was a frequent concern in the first quarter-century. Over the past fifty years, the Academy's revenues (along with its program and staff size) have fluctuated. They rose rapidly in the Academy's first decade as the organization sprouted from a baseline of zero, held steady in the second decade, and began to falter in the third. Something of a repeat of that pattern occurred in the second quarter-century when the Academy again experienced a period of rapid growth, then a period of little net change (with fluctuations in between), followed by a period of decline in revenue and in volume of activity, which has since leveled off and turned positive.

In its early years Fellows debated how best to address the financial conundrum, not just as a matter of practically funding the Academy, but also as a matter of principle and organizational purpose and strategy. The Academy's initial financial base was a combination of NASA contracts with a dash of foundation startup support. Some Fellows argued against reliance on government contracts lest the Academy become one more "job shop" and lose control of its own program independence. Others argued that responsiveness to government sponsors was precisely the point of the Academy, and warned that a financially independent Academy would be tempted in the direction of well-funded institutions that are able to follow their own ideals or vanities without necessarily addressing the concerns of practitioners or otherwise grappling with the hard and gritty challenge of making government work.

The Academy's congressional charter lends support to the latter model, essentially requiring the Academy to "report upon any subject of government" whenever the federal government calls for it, with appropriate financial compensation.³ This does not restrict the Academy from developing independent sources of funding, including its own investment reserves. Nor does it necessarily solve the practical necessity of financing a base of operations capable of assuring an ongoing and consistently high-quality program.

Dean's preferred formula for Academy financial stability suggested a balance between the financial independence and demand-driven models, by "increasing the endowment [investment reserve] and building ongoing relationships with agencies." This is essentially the path the Academy pursued, by doggedly building the investment reserve, although expanding the proportion of revenues from sponsorships beyond government agencies to a wider array of institutions including Congress, foundations, and businesses.

There was broad agreement within the Academy that the investment reserve was key to achieving long-term financial stability and some degree of greater program independence, and that fund rose fairly steadily over the first forty years to a peak of close to \$11 million in the mid-2000s. The investment reserve dropped sharply in the Financial Crisis of 2008, recovered a substantial part of that loss, and then began a steady decline that leveled off at about \$2 million toward the end of the Academy's first fifty years. The status of the investment reserve would probably constitute one of the greatest disappointments for Dean and his earlier generation of Academy Fellows, although it did prove essential to securing the survival of the Academy through turbulent times, and their advice undoubtedly would be for the Academy to work diligently to rebuild that financial base.

The Essence of the Academy

Summing up this retrospective, the following appear to have been the enduring assets, values, and traits that have played essential roles in the Academy's success over its first fifty years.

Congressional Charter and Mission

The congressional charter is obviously a core asset in its own right, and combined with the Academy's mission as defined in the charter, it is the vital link between the Academy, America's government and its citizens. The United States has never needed a National Academy of Public Administration more than it does in these challenging times to provide trusted advice in support of the nation's governance system.

The Fellowship

The Fellowship of the Academy, its members elected on the basis of demonstrated career achievement, is the source of knowledge and experience that justifies the existence of an academy capable of addressing the nation's governance challenges. The scope, diversity and quality of the membership permits the Academy to assemble the expert project panels required to address specific problems of governance, public administration and public management at all levels of government. And as a reflection and microcosm of the American governance system the membership is well constituted to engage, challenge and integrate the diversity of experiences and perspectives that bear on the many complex, intergovernmental, inter-sectoral, and interdisciplinary problems the country faces.

Core Values

The Academy's deepest core values from its inception have been to serve with impartiality, competence and integrity as the foundation for its trusted advice.

Vision of Governance

The congressional charter charges the Academy to address questions of governance (linking public purposes to institutional roles, performance capacities, and change strategies), which requires drawing on a wide range of relevant knowledge and experience in public administration, public management and generic management, public affairs, public policy and other relevant disciplines in the social sciences and beyond, in order to address each new generation of challenges.

Integration of Academy Functions

The Academy's organizational structure embodies three basic functions: 1) membership; 2) professional and thought leadership; and 3) advice and services to sponsors. The Academy is at its best when each of these three functions is fully developed, integrated and mutually reinforcing.

Governance Structure and Operational Capacity

The Academy has developed core governance structures and operational capacities best suited to achieve its mission, while continually experimenting with options that include various combinations of conferences, workshops, consortia, design labs, web networks, communities of practice, information dissemination, promoting dialogue, and acting as convener.

Academy history suggests financial stability is best achieved by a balance of demand-driven project sponsorships and growing the investment reserves.

Strategic Outlook

Putting all these elements together in a package that honors and draws on the strengths of each has been key to the Academy's overall success. The Academy's mission, values and governance vision offer neither an agenda nor a strategy, but do suggest direction, guideposts and a conceptual map. Each Academy President, in collaboration with the Academy's Board of Directors, must develop a strategy to channel the knowledge and experience of Fellows in a manner that pragmatically addresses sponsors' needs, while generating the revenues required to finance the Academy's ongoing operations, provide a measure of program independence, and support thought leadership to address urgent and emerging challenges to the nation's governance systems. With a strategic outlook based on learning from the past, continually looking into the future, and acting pragmatically and effectively in the present to address concrete problems, the Academy has shown flexibility and adaptability in adjusting to change, and resilience in addressing institutional challenges and adversities.

As the Past Becomes the Future

Alan Dean completed his assessment of the Academy's first twenty-five years confident that "[t]his Academy should be around as long as this nation functions as a democracy." Dean was quite aware at the time he wrote those words that Americans' trust in the federal government had been in a long-term slide, but he was optimistic that it would rebound if appropriate actions were taken. Today that trust level again hovers around its all-time lows. What's

more, there are clear signs that Americans' faith in democracy itself has been declining, especially among younger generations of Americans.⁴

Making democracy work is the well-spring of the Academy's inherited traditions. The Citizens Union of New York, founded in 1897 to bring "honest and efficient" government to the city in its fight against a half-century of Tammany Hall corruption, took as its motto "Making Democracy Work for all New Yorkers." To give teeth to its cause, the Citizens Union created the Bureau of Municipal Research,⁵ the first sustained program of government research and improvement in the United States.

The Bureau later became the National Institute of Public Administration, whose President, Luther Gulick, transferred its Training School for Public Service to Syracuse University's new Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, established in 1924 with the vision of closely linking democratic citizenship to the professional organization and management of government.

The League of Women Voters (LWV), founded in 1920 to help women take a larger role in public affairs as they won the right to vote by way of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, took as its motto "Making Democracy Work."

In 1937, in the midst of the Great Depression, which was testing the viability of democracy in the United States even as totalitarian regimes were toppling democracies around the world, President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the President's Committee on Administrative Management, composed of Chairman Louis Brownlow*, Charles Merriam, and Luther Gulick, to assess the general organizational structure and management capacity of the U.S. federal government. In presenting its report to the President and Congress, the Brownlow Committee concluded that there was

but one “grand” purpose animating reform: “to make democracy work today in our National Government.”⁶

Brownlow and Gulick would become founding members of the National Academy of Public Administration. Gulick remained active in civic affairs well into his nineties, and died in 1993 at the age of 100 just as NAPA was beginning its second quarter-century. Lyle C. Fitch* entitled his biography of Luther Gulick, *Making Democracy Work: The Life and Letters of Luther Halsey Gulick*.⁷ In that same year, political scientist Robert D. Putnam* reconfirmed the civic roots of government performance in his book, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*.⁸

In 2002, when the University of Virginia’s Miller Center for Public Affairs prepared a paper to help the nation’s decision-makers fashion a new federal organization for homeland security in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the authors took a cue from the Brownlow Committee and entitled it “Making Democracy Work: A Brief History of Twentieth-Century Federal Executive Reorganization.”⁹

NAPA emerged from an American tradition that viewed trust in government and the capacity of government to work for everyone as an essential ingredient in making democracy work. As the Academy was established a half-century ago, trust in the federal government had recently peaked and begun a long-term decline. That rate of decline has fluctuated over time, including short periods when trust was restored, but it remains at historic lows today, even as faith in democracy itself has faltered. For half-a-century, the National Academy of Public Administration has been providing trusted advice to help improve the operations and performance of American governance, an essential part of rebuilding trust in government, and for the enduring purpose of making democracy work.

Prospects for the future at the end of the first fifty years remain what they had been at the end of the first twenty-five: This Academy should be around as long as this nation functions as a democracy.

¹ Alan L. Dean, with the assistance of Herbert N. Jasper, *The First 25 Years: A History of the National Academy of Public Administration*, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration, 1997).

² The types of reports that Academy produces, and the processes used to undertake project research and deliberation and produce reports, is explained in greater detail in Chapter .

³ As discussed in Chapter 2, Section 17 of NAPA’s Congressional charter, “Service to the Government of the United States,” states: “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 purpose.” United States Congress. 1984. “Charter of the National Academy of Public Administration.” Public Law 98-257, 98th Congress, signed by President Ronald Reagan April 10, 1984. The language of the Academy’s congressional charter was modeled on that of the similar congressional charter for the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), including the charge to respond to federal government requests for studies and reports funded by the government. NAS historically has relied principally on government contracts to finance most of its operations and programs, supplemented by private financial sources and its own investment reserves of several hundred million dollars, which provide annual revenue for NAS’s ongoing operations and selected projects.

⁴ Roberto Stefan Foa, and Yascha Mounk, “The Danger of Deconcentration: The Democratic Disconnect,” *Journal of Democracy*, 27, Issue 3, (July 2007): 5-17.

⁵ Luther Gulick, *The National Institute of Public Administration: A Progress Report*, (New York: National Institute of Public Administration, 1928), cited in Lyle C. Fitch, *Making Democracy Work: The Life and Letters of Luther Halsey Gulick, 1892-1993*, (Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, University of California, Berkeley, 1996): 52.

⁶ President’s Committee on Administrative Management, *Administrative Management in the Government of the United States: Report with Special Studies*, (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1937), President’s Committee on Administrative Management: Louis Brownlow, Chairman,

Luther H. Gulick and Charles E. Merriam. Cited in Brian Balogh, Joanna Grisinger and Philip Zelikow, "Making Democracy Work: A Brief History of Twentieth-Century Federal Executive Reorganization," (2002). In Consultation with: Peri Arnold, Melvyn Leffler, Ernest May, Patrick McGuinn, Paul Milazzo, Sidney Milkis, Edmund Russell, Charles Wise, Julian Zelizer. Miller Center, *Working Paper in American Political Development*, (University of Virginia, July 22, 2002): 13.

⁷ Lyle C. Fitch, *Making Democracy Work: The Life and Letters of Luther Halsey Gulick, 1892-1993*, (Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, University of California, Berkeley, 1996).

⁸ Robert D. Putnam, Robert Leonardi and Raffaella Nanetti, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

⁹ Balogh et al., *Op cit*.

Appendix A

List of Chairs, Executive Directors, and Presidents

Chairs of the Board (1967-Present)

1967-1972	John Millet
1973	James Norton
1974-1977	Frederic Cleaveland
1978-1981	Alan Dean
1982-1985	Phillip Hughes
1985	Elmer Staats
1986-1987	Mark Keane
1988-1992	Joseph Fisher
1992-1993	Astrid Merget
1994-1995	Alfred Zuck
1996-1997	Peter Szanton
1998-1999	Jonathan Howes
2000-2001	David S.C. Chu
2001	Jane G. Pisano
2002	Mortimer Downey
2003-2004	Carl Stenberg
2004-2006	Valerie A. Lemmie
2007-2008	J. Christopher Mihm
2009-2010	Kenneth Apfel'

2011-2012	Diane M. Disney
2013-2014	Robert Shea
2015	Paul L. Posner
2016-current	Reginald L. Robinson

Executive Directors and Presidents
(1967-Present)

1967-1973	George Graham (Executive Director)
1973-1976	Roy Crawley (Executive Director)
1976-1982	George Esser (President)
1982-1985	J. Jackson Walter
1985-1991	Ray Kline
1991-1999	R. Scott Fosler
2000-2002	Robert J. O'Neill Jr.
2002-2003	Philip Burgess
2003	Howard Messner
2003-2006	C. Morgan Kinghorn (CEO added)
2006-2007	Howard Messner
2007-2010	Jennifer L. Dorn
2011	Kristine Marcy
2011-2016	Dan G. Blair
2017-Present	Teresa W. Gerton

Appendix B

List of All Current Fellows

Aberbach, Joel	Arvizu, Dan
Abramson, Alan	Atteberry, Darin
Abramson, Mark	Atwood, J.
Adler, Joseph	Azmi, Zalmi
Agarwal, P.K.	Baines, Tyrone
Agranoff, Robert	Bair, Sheila
Agrawal, Shantanu	Baity, William
Ahern, F. Daniel	Balanoff, Howard
Akukwe, Chinua	Balutis, Alan
Allen, Melissa	Ban, Carolyn
Allen, Thad	Banovetz, James
Allison, Graham	Barnes, A. James
Alloway, Robert	Barnes, Kay
Altshuler, Alan	Barnes, William
Ammons, David	Barnett, Camille
Amsler, Lisa	Barnow, Burt
Anderson, Barry	Baron, Jon
Anderson, Eric	Barquin, Ramon
Andrews, Richard	Barr, Stephen
Anthony, Clarence	Barrett, Katherine
Antonelli, Angela	Barron, Michael
Apfel, Kenneth	Bartle, John
App, Steve	Basham, W. Ralph
Archibald, Sandra	Bass, Gary
Aristigueta, Maria	Basso, Peter
Arnold, Peri	Beals, Alan

Beaumont, Enid
Becker, Christine
Beebe, Cora
Beggs, James
Behn, Robert
Benavides, Teodoro
Benest, Frank
Benjamin, Georges
Benninghoven, Don
Berenson, Robert
Bergrud, Erik
Berry, Frances
Berry, Mary Frances
Berteau, David
Bertelli, Anthony
Bertini, Catherine Ann
Bertsch, Dale
Betts, Virginia
Bilmes, Linda
Bingman, Charles
Birdsell, David
Bitterman, Mary
Black, Jan Hart
Blackwell, J. Kenneth
Blair, Anita
Blair, Dan
Blakely, Edward
Bland, Robert
Blandin, Nanette
Bledsoe, Ralph
Bloch, Julia
Blockwood, James-Christian
Blodgett, Terrell
Blum, James
Blumenthal, Marjory
Bobb, Robert
Bock, Edwin
Bonaparte, Norton

Bonser, Charles
Borras, Rafael
Borrone, Lillian
Borut, Donald
Bostic, Raphael
Bostrom, Carl
Bouckaert, Geert
Boufford, Jo
Bovbjerg, Barbara
Bovens, Mark
Bowman, Ann
Bowsher, Charles
Bozeman, Barry
Branscomb, Lewis
Brant, David
Bretschneider, Stuart
Breul, Jonathan
Brinkerhoff, Derick
Brinkerhoff, Jennifer
Brintnall, Michael
Briseno, Alexander
Broadnax, Walter
Brook, Douglas
Broom, Cheryl
Brown, Dustin
Brown, Ellen
Brown, June Gibbs
Brown, Trevor
Bryson, John
Bucella, Donna
Burel, William
Burgess, Philip
Burke, Sheila
Burke, Yvonne
Burman, Allan
Burton, LaVarne
Burton, Robert
Buss, Terry

Byrne, Larry
Callahan, John
Cameron, Scott
Campbell, E. Colin
Cannon, Jonathan
Cannon, Mark
Carvalho, George
Carlee, Ron
Carlson, Norman
Carlucci, Frank
Carpenter, Daniel
Carroll, James
Carson, Emmett
Carter, Steven
Chater, Shirley
Chelimsky, Eleanor
Chellino, Frank
Chenok, Daniel
Cho, Yong Hyo
Christopher, Gail
Christopherson, Gary
Chu, David
Chung-Kil, Chung
Churchill, R. Leon
Cigler, Beverly
Cisneros, Henry
Clark, Timothy
Clarke, Harold
Clayton, T. Ross
Clinger, William
Coffey, Matthew
Cohen, Sheldon
Cohen, Steven
Coles, Julius
Coloretti, Nani
Colvard, James
Colvin, Carolyn
Comfort, Louise

Comrie, Keith
Condrey, Stephen
Conduff, Michael
Conlan, Timothy
Conley, Sheila
Cooley, Lawrence
Cooper, Phillip
Cooper, Terry
Cope, Glen Hahn
Cordes, Joseph
Crenshaw, Lewis
Crippen, Dan
Criscitello, Douglas
Crow, Michael
Cunningham, Gary
Cunningham, George
Czerwinski, Stanley
Daley, Edwin
Dalton, Patricia
Danzig, Richard
Darwin, Henry
Davidson, Roger
Davis, Thomas
Dawes, Sharon
De Souza Briggs, Xavier
DeBolske, John
Deese, Manuel
Dellums, Ronald
DeMarco, Edward
Denhardt, Janet
Denhardt, Robert
Denslow, Suzette
DeSeve, G. Edward
Destler, I. Mac
Deutch, John
Devaney, Earl
Dever, John
Devereaux, Gregory

Dickerson, Horace
DiIulio, John
Disney, Diane
Dodaro, Gene
Dodge, William
Dominguez, Michael
Donahue, Amy
Donahue, Kevin
Donahue, Thomas
Dong, Norman
Dorn, Edwin
Dorris, Martha
Douglas, Judith
Downey, Mortimer
Downs, Anthony
Downs, Thomas
Drayton, William
Dubnick, Melvin
Dudley, Susan
Duke, Elizabeth
Dunn, William
Durant, Robert
Dyer, John
Dyer, Joseph
Ebdon, Carol
Ebel, Robert
Edgar, Jim
Edley, Christopher
Eggers, William
Eizenstat, Stuart
Ellis, James
Ellwood, David
Emerson, Kirk
Emmert, Mark
England Joseph, Judy
England, Mary Jane
Eoyang, Carson
Espy, Alphonso

Evans, Angela
Evans, Daniel
Evans, Karen
Faga, Martin
Fairbanks, Frank
Farber, Stephen
Fearnside, John
Feder, Judith
Feiock, Richard
Feldman, Daniel
Ferris, James
Fiechter, Jonathan
Field, Lesley
Fields, Arnold
Finger, Harold
Fiorino, Daniel
Fischbach, John
Fitzpatrick, Michael
Flateau, John
Fleishman, Joel
Florestano, Patricia
Flournoy, Michele
Flynn, Edward
Fogarty, Andrew
Fogel, Richard
Forsythe, Dall
Fosler, R. Scott
Fountain, Jane
Fox, Claude
Frederickson, H. George
Freedman, Elisha
Fretwell, Elizabeth
Friesen, Ernest
Fritschler, A. Lee
Frye, Alton
Fujioka, William
Funkhouser, Mark
Gade, Mary

Gadsby, J. William
Gaebler, Ted
Gaffney, Susan
Gallagher, Matthew
Galloway, Gerald
Gambaccini, Louis
Gandhi, Natwar
Gansler, Jacques
Garcia, David
Gardner, David
Gardner, Henry
Garrison, David
Garthwaite, Thomas
Gates, Christopher
Gates, Robert
Geier, Rita
George, J.
Gerberding, Julie
Gilman, Stuart
Gilmartin, Daniel
Gimson, William
Giugale, Marcelo
Glackin, Mary
Glaeser, Edward
Glendening, Parris
Glickman, Gary
Glover, Ellen
Glover, Renee
Glynn, Thomas
Godwin, Beverly
Goering, John
Goerl, Vincette
Golden, Olivia
Goldenberg, Edie
Goldmark, Peter
Goldsmith, Stephen
Goldstein, Ira
Gooden, Susan

Goodman, George
Goodsell, Charles
Goodyear, Marilu
Gordon, Lisa
Gorham, William
Gormley, William
Goss, Kay
Gotbaum, Joshua
Gould, W. Scott
Gr, Kirsten
Graddy, Elizabeth
Graham, Carolyn
Graham, John
Grams, W. Todd
Grasmick, Nancy
Graves, Don
Greenberg, Sally
Greene, Richard
Greenwalt, William
Griffin, Anthony
Gurule, Jimmy
Guttman, Daniel
Guy, Mary Ellen
Habermann, Hermann
Hackbart, Merl
Hagerty, Stephen
Hale, Janet
Hale, Robert
Hallman, Howard
Hamilton, Billy
Hamilton, Edward
Hamilton, Lee
Hamilton, Mary
Hamm, William
Hammond, Donald
Hancock, Scott
Hanson, Royce
Hardy, Dorcas

Hardy, George
Harkness, Peter
Harper, Edwin
Harper, Sallyanne
Hatry, Harry
Hausser, Doris
Haynes, Kingsley
Haze, Pamela
Healy, Patricia
Hearn, James
Heinrich, Carolyn
Helmke, W. Paul
Henderson, Lenneal
Henderson, William
Henry, Charles
Henry, Laurin
Henry, Nicholas
Hepner, Allen
Herbert, Adam
Herbst, Ellen
Hess, Stephen
Hildreth, W. Bartley
Hill, Elizabeth
Hillenbrand, Bernard
Hillsman, Sally
Hinchman, James
Hirschhorn, Eric
Hoagland, G. William
Hobby, William
Hoene, Christopher
Hoffman, Richard
Holden, Matthew
Holzer, Marc
Honey, Stephen
Hood, Christopher
Hood, Glenda
Hope, Mary Ann
Houston, Robert

Houstoun, Feather O'Connor
Huckaby, Henry
Hughes, Jennifer
Hunter, Mattie
Huse, James
Hutchinson, Peter
Hylton, Stacia
Ingraham, Patricia
Ink, Dwight
Inman, Bobby
Irving, Susan
Jacobs, Susan
Jagggar, Sarah
James, Kay Coles
Janssen, David
Jennings, Edward
John, DeWitt
Johnson, Clay
Johnson, Curtis
Johnson, Geneva
Johnson, Justin
Johnson, Norman
Johnson, Randall
Johnson, Tobe
Joseph, James
Joyce, Mary Ellen
Joyce, Philip
Jun, Jong
Kamarck, Elaine
Kamensky, John
Kane, Thomas
Kaplan, Sidney
Kasputys, Joseph
Katzen, Sally
Keeler, John
Keene, James
Keevey, Richard
Kellar, Elizabeth

Kellough, J. Edward
Kelman, Steven
Kennedy, Patrick
Kerr, Lou
Kerr, T. Michael
Kersh, Rogan
Kershbaum, Sharon
Kerwin, Cornelius
Kettl, Donald
Khademian, Anne
Kichak, Nancy
Kim, Pan Suk
Kim, Soonhee
Kincaid, John
King, Norman
Kinghorn, C. Morgan
Kingsbury, Nancy
Kingsley Vertenten, Dorothea
Kipp, Robert
Kirlin, John
Kizer, Kenneth
Kliman, Albert
Klingner, Donald
Knott, Jack
Kohli, Jitinder
Konig, Klaus
Koppell, Jonathan
Korb, Lawrence
Koskinen, John
Kravchuk, Robert
Kumar, Martha
Lachance, Janice
Lamb, Robert
Lambert, Gilda
Lambright, W. Henry
Langley, Nanci
Lashutka, Gregory
Latimer, George

Laurent, Anne
Lauth, Thomas
Lavigna, Robert
Lawrence, Paul
Lazar, Ellen
Lebryk, David
Lee, Clarence
Lee, Deidre
Leighty, William
Lemmie, Valerie
Lenkowsky, Leslie
Leong-Hong, Belkis
Leshner, Alan
Lewis, David
Lewis, Gregory
Liddell, L. Frances
Light, Paul
Limardi, David
Lindsey, Greg
Liou, Kuotsai
Lipsky, Michael
Locke, Hubert
Lockwood, Christopher
Lovelace, Gail
Loveridge, Ronald
Lowenstein, Ronnie
Loy, James
Lugar, Richard
Lukensmeyer, Carolyn
Lundy, J.
Lyles, Alan
Lyman, Princeton
Lynn, Laurence
Lynn, Naomi
Maccoby, Michael
MacGuineas, Maya
Mackenzie, G. Calvin
Mader, David

Mallett, Robert
Mann, Thomas
Marcy, Kristine
Marshall, Byron
Marshall, Dale Rogers
Marshall, Peter
Martel, Patricia
Martin, Bernard
Masch, Michael
Massiah, Michael
Mathews, Audrey
Mathews, David
Mathiasen, David
Matlack, Larry
Matson, Robert
May, Randolph
Maynard-Moody, Steven
McAllister, Singleton
McCabe, Kimberly
McCann, S. Anthony
McClure, David
McConnell, Bruce
McGinnis, Patricia
McGrath, Elizabeth
McGuire, Michael
McKenzie, Christopher
Mecham, L. Ralph
Mechling, Jerry
Medina, David
Meese, Edwin
Meier, Kenneth
Meissner, Doris
Metcalf, Daniel
Metzenbaum, Shelley
Meyers, Roy
Micone, Vincent
Mihm, J. Christopher
Miller, Gerald

Miller, Karen
Miller, William
Milward, H. Brinton
Minarik, Joseph
Mineta, Norman
Minter, Steven
Mok, Samuel
Monteilh, Richard
Montgomery, Edward
Moon, M. Jae
Mora, David
Moritsugu, Kenneth
Morrill, William
Moskow, Michael
Mossberger, Karen
Mossinghoff, Gerald
Moynihan, Donald
Muehlenbeck, Thomas
Mulrooney, Keith
Murley, James
Murphy, Thomas
Murray, Robert
Murray, Sylvester
Myers, Phyllis
Myers, Samuel
Naake, Larry
Nabatchi, Tina
Nakamura, Akira
Nalbandian, John
Nash, Bob
Nathan, Richard
Neal, Jeffrey
Nelson, Elmer
Nemfakos, Charles
Newcomer, Kathryn
Newland, Chester
Newman, Meredith
Nightingale, Demetra

Nollenberger, Karl
O'Carroll, Patrick
O'Connor, Sandra Day
Odeen, Philip
Offutt, Susan
O'Keefe, Sean
O'Leary, Rosemary
Olsen, John
O'Neill, Molly
O'Neill, Paul
O'Neill, Robert
Osborne, David
Ospina, Sonia
O'Toole, Laurence
Owens, William
Pacheco, Manuel
Pagano, Michael A.
Page, Richard
Pak, Chong
Palguta, John
Palmer, John
Pandey, Sanjay
Pane, Gregg
Parham, Gregory
Parron, Delores
Pasquarella, Robin
Patashnik, Eric
Patterson, Bradley
Patterson, Jane
Pattison, Scott
Payton, Sallyanne
Peacock, Marcus
Peake, James
Peirce, Neal
Penner, Rudolph
Perkins, Edward
Perkins, Jan
Peroff, Kathleen

Perry, Egbert
Perry, James
Perry, Jan
Pffiffner, James
Phaup, Marvin
Phillips, William
Pica, Karen
Pisano, Jane
Pisano, Mark
Podger, Andrew
Pollitt, Christopher
Porter, Elsa
Porter, Roger
Potok, Nancy
Powell, Colin
Quehl, Scott
Quinlan, J. Michael
Raadschelders, Jos
Rabe, Barry
Rabinovitz, Francine
Radin, Beryl
Rainey, Hal
Raub, William
Redburn, F. Stevens
Reed, B.J.
Reed, Ingrid
Reeder, Franklin
Regan, Priscilla
Reid, Gary
Reilly, Thomas
Reischauer, Robert
Rejeski, Dave
Remy, Ray
Retsinas, Nicolas
Rhinesmith, Alan
Ricucci, Norma
Rice, Donald
Rice, Mitchell

Rice, Norman
Richman, Estelle
Ridgway, Rozanne
Rivlin, Alice
Robbins, Mark
Roberson, Jessie
Roberts, Alasdair
Roberts, Barbara
Robinson, Douglas
Robinson, Elizabeth
Robinson, Reginald
Rockman, Bert
Rogers, Jacqueline
Rogers, Michael
Roman, Nan
Romer, Bruce
Romzek, Barbara
Rosenbaum, Allan
Rosenbloom, David
Ross, Catherine
Rostker, Bernard
Rubenstein, Ross
Rubin, Marilyn
Rubin, Philip
Rubio-Cortes, Gloria
Ruckelshaus, William
Rumsfeld, Donald
Rung, Anne
Runnels, Al
Ryder, Kenneth
Sabol, Barbara
Salamone, John
Sale, Myrta
Samuel, Antoinette
Sander, David
Sanders, Ronald
Saunders, John
Savage, James

Sayles-Belton, Sharon
Scarlett, Lynn
Schall, Ellen
Scheppach, Raymond
Schexnider, Alvin
Schlosser, Lisa
Schmoke, Kurt
Schrader, George
Schwab, Susan
Schwartz, Eric
Scott, Jewel
Sculley, Sheryl
Selden, Sally
Shalala, Donna
Sharfstein, Joshua
Shark, Alan
Sharkansky, Ira
Shea, Robert
Shear, William
Sheppard, Catherine
Sherman, Gordon
Sherman, Max
Sherwood, Frank
Shields, William
Shiplett, Myra
Shirey, John
Shoop, Tom
Shultz, George
Siciliano, Rocco
Siggerud, Katherine
Simpson, John
Sirianni, Carmen
Sistare, Hannah
Skoler, Daniel
Slater, Rodney
Slaughter, Anne-Marie
Smith, Christopher
Smith, Curtis

Smith, David
Smith, Dennis
Smith, J.T.
Smith, Steven
Smolensky, Eugene
Snyder, Anna Michelle
Sofaer, Shoshanna
Soloway, Stan
Spiers, Ronald
Spriggs, William
Springer, Christine Gibbs
Springer, Linda
Stack, Kathryn
Stanley, Ellis
Stanton, Thomas
Steinberg, Harold
Steinhoff, Jeffrey
Stenberg, Carl
Stevenson, Charles
Stewart, Donald
Stewart, John
Stewart, Richard
Stier, Max
Stillman, Richard
Stivers, Camilla
Strauss, Robert
Straussman, Jeffrey
Sung, Tina
Svara, James
Sweet, David
Syfert, Pamela
Takai, Teresa
Takamura, Jeanette
Tang, Shui-Yan
Tangherlini, Dan
Tansey, Charles
Tarver, Leon
Tate, Nancy

Taub, Robert
Terrell, Robert
Tetlock, Philip
Thomas, John
Thomas, Lee
Thompson, Anita Favors
Thompson, Frank
Thompson, Fred
Thompson, Joseph
Thornburgh, Dick
Thurber, James
Tobias, Robert
Toregas, Costis
Trachtenberg, Robert
Trachtenberg, Stephen
Tranter, Revan
Truman, Edwin
Tschinkel, Victoria
Tunstall, Ellen
Urahn, Susan
Valdez, Joel
Van Horn, Carl
Van Lare, Barry
Van Milligen, Michael
Van Slyke, David
Vanyur, John
Verkuil, Paul
Volcker, Paul
Wagner, G.
Walker, David
Wallerstein, Mitchel
Walters, Ronald
Wamsley, Barbara
Wamsley, Gary
Warm, David
Warren, Thomas
Wartell, Sarah
Washington, Charles

Webster, Douglas
Wechsler, Barton
Wegman, Richard
Weil, Frank
Weimer, David
Weissert, Carol
Wellford, W. Harrison
Wells, Reginald
Wennergren, David
Werfel, Danny
West, Harry
White, Barry
White, Harvey
White, Jesse
Whitford, Andrew
Wholey, Joe
Widner, Ralph
Wilder, L. Douglas
Williams, Anthony
Williams, Cindy
Williams, Eddie
Williams, Ethel
Williams-Gates, Regina
Willoughby, Katherine
Wilson, Ernest
Wilson, Joyce
Winter, William
Wise, Charles
Wolf, Dona
Wolf, Frank
Wolman, Harold
Wooldridge, Blue
Worley, D.
Wortman, Don
Wray, Lyle
Wright, Bradley
Wyrsh, Mary Ann
Yackee, Susan
Yang, Kaifeng
Yinger, John
Young, Rashad
Youngman, Judith
Zafra, Victor
Zavada, David
Zuck, Alfred

Appendix C

Congressional Charter

CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER

PUBLIC LAW 98-257

APRIL 10, 1984

98th Congress

AN ACT

To charter the National Academy of Public Administration. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHARTER.

The National Academy of Public Administration, organized and incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a charter.

SECTION 2. POWERS.

The National Academy of Public Administration hereinafter referred to as the Academy" shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

SECTION 3. OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION.

The objects and purposes for which the Academy is organized shall be those provided in its articles of incorporation and shall include:

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 practical approaches to their resolution;
3. assessing the effectiveness, structure, administration, and implications for governance of present or proposed public programs, policies, and processes, 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.

SECTION 4. SERVICE OF PROCESS.

With respect to service of process, the Academy shall comply with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated and the State or States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

SECTION 5. MEMBERSHIP.

Eligibility for membership in the Academy and the rights and privileges of members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

SECTION 6. BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES.

The Board of Directors of the Academy and the responsibilities thereof shall be is provided in the articles of incorporation of the Academy and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

SECTION 7. OFFICERS OF CORPORATION.

The officers of the Academy and the election of such officers shall be as is provided in the articles of incorporation of the Academy and in conformity with the laws of the State or States wherein it is incorporated.

SECTION 8. RESTRICTIONS.

- No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the Academy or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers and members of the Academy or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the Board of Directors.
- The Academy shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.
- The Academy and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support, or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.
- The Academy shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

- The Academy shall not claim congressional approval or federal government authority for any of its activities, other than by mutual agreement.
- The Academy shall retain and maintain its status as a corporation, organized and incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia.

SECTION 9. LIABILITY.

The Academy shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

SECTION 10. BOOKS AND RECORDS INSPECTION.

The Academy shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the Academy involving any of its members, the Board of Directors, or any committee having authority under the Board of Directors. The Academy shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right of vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

SECTION 11. AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.

The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under federal law" approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "(61) National Academy of Public Administration."

SECTION 12. ANNUAL REPORT.

The Academy shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit require by section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

SECTION 13. RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved to the Congress.

SECTION 14. DEFINITION OF "STATE".

For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

SECTION 15. TAX-EXEMPT STATUS.

The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code. If the corporation fails to maintain such status, the charter granted hereby shall expire.

SECTION 16. TERMINATION.

If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act the charter granted hereby shall expire.

SECTION 17. SERVICE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

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 purpose. Approved April 10, 1984.

Appendix D

Articles of Incorporation

We, the undersigned, desiring to associate ourselves as a Corporation for the purposes hereafter stated, pursuant to the provisions of Title 29, Chapter 10, of the District of Columbia Code, 1967 Edition, known as the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, do hereby certify as follows:

1. The name of the Corporation is THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, hereafter referred to as “the Corporation.”
2. The Corporation is to have perpetual existence.
3. The purposes for which the Corporation is organized are as follows:
 - To operate exclusively for charitable, educational and scientific purposes, including the improvement of the policies, processes, personal and institutions of public administration;
 - To promote scholarly inquiry and discussion concerning public administration;
 - To sponsor and stimulate research on matters relating to public administration;
 - To sponsor national or regional in-service training and other special conferences or similar educational programs; and
 - To provide advice, analyses and information on public administration problems and issues, upon request, to

governmental units, as defined by Section 170(c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (hereinafter referred to as the “Code”), or to any nonprofit organization with an interest in public administration and related issues.

4. The corporation may exercise all power or authority granted to it under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act or otherwise, including: but not limited to, the power to accept donations or money or property, whether real or personal, or any interest therein, wherever situated.

5. The Corporation shall issue no capital stock.

6. The Corporation shall be a membership corporation. Each member shall be entitled to one vote in person at all meetings of the members or by mail ballot on matters referred by the Board do Trustees. The membership of the Corporation shall consist of all persons as shall be elected to membership as provided in the Bylaws.

7. The affair of the Corporation shall be managed by a Board of Trustees, hereafter referred to for all purposes as “the Board.” Qualifications for membership on the Board shall be prescribed in the Bylaws. The number of members of the Board shall be fixed by the Bylaws, but in no event shall be less than three, and may be increased from time to time as provided in the Bylaws. Each member of the Board shall be elected or appointed in the manner and for the term provided in the Bylaws, and shall hold office for the term for which he is elected or appointed and until his successor is elected or appointed and qualified. The Board my, by resolution adopted by a majority of the Board members in office, designate and appoint an Executive Committee, consisting of two or more members of the Board. To the extent provided in such resolution, any such Executive Committee may have and exercise the authority of the Board in the management of the Corporation.

8. At all times, and notwithstanding merger, consolidation, reorganization, termination, dissolution, or winding up of this Corporation, voluntary or involuntary or by operation of law, or any other provisions hereof:

A. This Corporation shall not possess or exercise any power or authority either expressly, by interpretation, or by operation of law that will or might prevent it at any time from qualifying, and continuing to qualify, as a corporation described in Section 501(c)(3) of the code, contributions to which are deductible for Federal income tax purposes; nor shall it engage directly or indirectly in any activity which might cause the loss of such qualification.

B. No part of the assets or net earnings of this Corporation shall ever be used, nor shall this Corporation ever be organized or operated, for purposes that are not exclusively charitable, scientific, or educational within the meaning of Section 501(c)(3) of the code.

C. This Corporation shall never be operated for the primary purpose of carrying on a trade or business for profit.

D. No substantial part of the activities of this Corporation shall consist of carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation; nor shall it participate or intervene in any manner, or to any extent, in any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office, whether by publishing or distributing statements, or otherwise.

E. at no time shall this Corporation engage in any activities which are unlawful under the laws of the United States of America, the district of Columbia, or any other jurisdiction where its activities are carried on; nor shall it engage in any transaction defined at the time as prohibited under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

F. No compensation, loan or other payment shall be paid or made to any officer, Board member, Executive Committee member, creator, or organization of this Corporation or substantial contributor to it, unless such payment is permissible under paragraph H of this Section 8 of these Articles and except as reasonable compensation for services rendered and/or as a reasonable allowance for authorized expenditures incurred on

behalf of this Corporation; and no part of the assets or net earnings, current or accumulated of this Corporation shall ever be distributed to or divided among any such person, or inure, be used for, accrue to or benefit any such person or private individual (pursuant to the prohibition contained in Section 501(c) (3) of the Code).

G. No solicitation of contributions to this Corporation shall be made, and no gift, bequest or devise to this Corporation shall be accepted, upon any condition or limitation which, in the opinion of the Corporation, may cause the Corporation to lose its federal income tax exemption.

H. Notwithstanding any other provision of these Articles, if at any time or times the Corporation shall be a “private foundation: as defined in Section 509 of the Code, then during such time or times the Corporation shall distribute its income for each taxable year at such time and in such manner as not to subject the Corporation to tax under Section 4942 of the Code; shall not engage in any act of self-dealing, as defined in Section 4941(d) of the Code: shall not retain any excess business holdings, as defined in Section 4943(c) of the Code; shall not make any investment in any manner as to subject the Corporation to tax under Section 4944 of the Code; and shall not make any taxable expenditure, as defined in Section 4945(d) of the Code.

9. Upon the termination, dissolution or winding up of this Corporation in any manner or for any reason, its assets, if any, remaining after payment (or provision for payment) of all liabilities of the Corporation, shall be distributed to, and only to, one or more organizations described in Section 501(c)(3) of the Code.

10. Any references herein to any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall be deemed to mean such provision as now or hereafter existing, amended, supplemented, or superseded, as the case may be.

11. The private property of the officers, Board members or Executive Committee members of the Corporation shall not be subject to payment of Corporate debts to any extent whatever.

12. The Corporation's initial registered agent and the address of its initial registered office are as follows:

George A. Graham

1225 Connecticut Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20036

13. The number of members of the initial Board of Trustees of the Corporation shall be seven. The names and address of the members of the initial Board are as follows:

John D. Millett, Chairman
88 East Board Street, Room 770
Columbia, Ohio 43215

Ferrel Heady
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

Matthias E. Lukens
The Port of New York Authority
111 Eighth Avenue at 15th Street
New York, New York 10011

Rufus E. Miles, Jr.
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
William Parsons
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90404

John A. Perkins
P.O. Box 1668

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

York Willbern
Woodburn Hall 227
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

13. The name and address of each incorporator is as follows:

James M. Mitchell
5410 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20015

James E. Webb
2800 - 36th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007

Roy W. Crawley
2718 - 27th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008

Appendix E

Bylaws of the Academy (2017)

Article I. NAME

The name of the corporation is THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (hereafter referred to as “the Corporation”).

Article II. PURPOSE

The Corporation has been organized as a nonprofit corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (hereafter “Nonprofit Corporation Act”) to operate exclusively for charitable, educational and scientific purposes, as more fully set forth in its Articles of Incorporation.

Article III. OFFICES AND REGISTERED AGENT

1. The principal office of the Corporation, and such other offices as it may establish, shall be located at such place or places, either within or without the District of Columbia, as may be designated by the Board of Directors (hereafter “the Board,” or “Directors”).
2. The Corporation shall continuously maintain within the District of Columbia a registered agent and registered office in compliance with the Nonprofit Corporation Act.

Article IV. MEMBERSHIP

1. Categories of Academy Membership.

(a) Fellows. Members of the Corporation shall be called “Fellows.” Criteria for election as a Fellow of the Corporation shall be; (1) significant administrative experience with evidence of sufficiently broad interests and reflective nature to interpret experience in a meaningful way, or (2) substantial scholarly contributions to public administration, or (3) other significant experience in the field of public affairs accompanied by a special interest in, and understanding of, the field of public administration, and (4) demonstrated concern for the advancement of public administration and evidence of capacity and desire to contribute to it, (5) adherence to the highest ethical standards; and (6) willingness and ability to participate in and contribute to the work of the Corporation.

(b) Senior Fellows. A Fellow who shall have reached the age of 65 years, and who by personal definition is retired from regular employment, upon written request shall be enrolled as a Senior Fellow. A Fellow who reaches the age of 75 shall automatically become a Senior Fellow. Senior Fellows do not have an obligation to pay dues. Senior Fellows shall enjoy all the rights and privileges of full membership including the right to vote, notwithstanding any other provisions of the Bylaws. Senior Fellows shall retain a lifetime membership in the Corporation. Hereafter in these Bylaws, the terms “Fellow” and “Fellows” shall include Senior Fellows unless expressly indicated to the contrary.

(c) Honorary Fellows. In addition to such persons as may be Honorary Fellows of the Corporation at the time of adoption of these Bylaws, the Board is authorized, upon its own motion adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the entire Board, to elect as Honorary Fellows persons who have distinguished themselves in public administration or through outstanding contributions to the objectives and purposes of the Academy. No more than five persons shall be so elected as Honorary Fellows in

any one year. Honorary Fellows have the right to receive notice of and attend and participate in all membership meetings but do not possess voting rights and may not serve as Directors of the Corporation.

2. Election of Fellows.

(a) The number of Fellows, exclusive of Senior Fellows, shall not exceed six hundred. The maximum number of new Fellows to be elected by the membership each year shall be determined annually by the Board. In determining that number the Board shall insure that progress toward the limit on the number of Fellows will be accomplished in an orderly fashion.

(b) Nominations for new Fellows shall be made annually by a Fellow Nominating Committee appointed pursuant to Article VI, Section 1(d) of these Bylaws. Any Fellow may submit in writing, in such form and with such supporting material as the Fellow Nominating Committee may prescribe, not more than five proposed nominations for new Fellows in any one year. The Fellow Nominating Committee shall fix the closing date for receipt of proposed nominations and may consider other names proposed by members of the Fellow Nominating Committee. Thereafter, the Fellow Nominating Committee shall list on a ballot the nominations of a number of persons which may exceed by fifty percent the number of persons to be elected by the Fellows into Academy membership in any one year, provided that such persons have expressed their willingness to participate in and contribute to the work of the Corporation.

(c) The Board or a committee thereof shall prescribe the form of the ballot, the rules for its distribution to the membership and for tabulation of returns. Each Fellow may vote for as many persons as are to be elected in each year. Thirty-five percent of the Fellows must participate in the voting for a valid election. Those nominees who receive the highest number of votes shall become Fellows-Elect, provided that they receive at least 35% of the votes cast. Fellows-Elect shall become Fellows upon their participation in an annual or special meeting of the

membership, or in a Standing Panel or study project or other official activity of the Academy, provided that such participation occurs within three years of their election.

(d) In tabulating the votes for nominees, persons shall be declared elected in the descending order of the number of votes received; and if two or more such persons receive the same number of votes for the last place to be filled, the Board shall designate which of such persons shall become a Fellow-Elect.

(e) The Board is authorized to elect each year from the regular ballot of nominees, after the annual election, not more than five additional new Fellows-Elect.

3. Meetings.

(a) Annual Meeting. Annual meetings of the membership shall be held at such time and place as shall be determined by the Board. At the annual meeting, the membership may transact any business within the powers of the Corporation. Any such business may be transacted at the annual meeting without being specifically designated in the notice, except such business as is specifically required by statute to be stated in the notice.

(b) Special Meetings. Special meetings of the membership may be held at any time in the interval between annual meetings at such time and place as the Board may determine.

(c) Notice for Membership Meetings. Not less than ten or more than ninety days before the date of every meeting, the Secretary shall cause to be given to each Fellow entitled to vote at such meeting written notice stating the time and place of the meeting and, in the case of a special meeting, the purpose or purposes for which the meeting is called, either personally or by mail. If mailed, such notice shall be deemed to be given when deposited in the United States mail addressed to the Fellow at the

postal address as it appears on the records of the Corporation, with postage prepaid. Business transacted at any special meeting of the membership shall be limited to the purposes stated in the notice.

(d) Quorum for Meetings. At any meetings of the membership, the presence in person of one-fourth of the Fellows shall constitute a quorum. If, however, such quorum shall not be present at any meeting of the membership, the Fellows entitled to vote, present in person, shall have power to adjourn the meeting from time to time, without notice other than announcement at the meeting, until a quorum shall be present. At such adjourned meeting at which a quorum shall later come to be present any business may be transacted which might have been transacted at the meeting as originally noticed.

(e) Decisions by the Membership. A majority of the votes of Fellows cast at a meeting of the membership, duly called and at which a quorum is present, shall be sufficient to take or authorize action upon any matter which may properly come before the meeting, unless more than a majority of the votes cast is required by the statute or by the Bylaws.

4. Vote of the Membership.

(a) Authority to Vote. Each Fellow shall be entitled to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote of the membership except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws.

(b) Method of Vote. Fellows may not vote by proxy. Any vote may be conducted by mail, telephone call, telegram, cablegram, electronic mail, or any other means of electronic or telephonic transmission provided that the Fellow shall state, or submit information from which it can be determined, that the method of voting chosen was authorized by the Fellow. Any vote conducted by such a mechanism shall constitute a "meeting" for purposes of the requirements of these Bylaws. Any or all of the Fellows may participate in a meeting of the Fellows by means of conference telephone or similar communications equipment by means of

which all persons participating in the meeting can hear each other at the same time, and such participation shall constitute presence in person at the meeting.

5. General Ethical Standards. Fellows, as members or supporters of the public service, are expected to: (1) adhere to the highest standards of personal integrity, honesty, and decent human behavior; (2) avoid situations in which personal gain appears to be in conflict with official or professional duties; (3) support, promote, and practice respectful and nondiscriminatory treatment of other persons; (4) comply with generally accepted high standards of valid, honest, and responsible scholarship; (5) respect and protect privileged information; and (6) comply fully with all laws, rules and standards relevant to the occupation concerned.

6. Removal of Fellows for Cause. The Board has authority to remove from membership Fellows found by it to have violated the Academy's ethical standards. Information concerning an alleged violation by a Fellow may be submitted by another Fellow to the Board for its consideration. The Fellow under investigation shall be given a fair hearing. After consideration of all facts, the Board shall take action and notify the Fellow concerned.

7. Nonpayment of Dues. The Treasurer shall report to the Board annually the names of any Fellows (not including Senior Fellows) who have failed to pay their dues for a period of three years, and who fail after appropriate notice to meet the dues-paying obligation. The Board shall consider the removal of such Fellows.

Article V. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. General Powers. Management and conduct of the affairs of the Corporation shall be vested in and controlled by its Board. The members of the Board shall be referred to as "Directors." The President of the Corporation shall be a non-voting member of the Board but shall not participate in matters dealing with his or her employment, compensation,

and/or performance evaluation. The Board shall possess, and may exercise, any and all powers granted to the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act and under its Articles of Incorporation, subject, however, to the limitations set forth in said Articles and these Bylaws.

2. Number. The number of Directors on the Board eligible to vote shall be eighteen. The Board shall insure that the process for nomination and election of Board members shall be accomplished in an orderly fashion. Such number may be increased or decreased from time to time by amendment to these Bylaws, provided, however, that the number of Directors comprising the Board shall never be reduced to less than seven and provided, further, that no reduction in the number of Directors shall have the effect of shortening the term of any Directors in office at the time such amendment becomes effective. In the event the number of Directors is increased or decreased, the number of Directors to be elected in each of the next three years shall be as nearly equal as possible.

3. Qualifications. Directors shall be Fellows, but need not be residents of the District of Columbia.

4. Election and Term. Each year the Fellows shall elect Directors to replace those whose terms then expire, and such Directors shall hold office for three years or until successors are elected and qualified. The Board Nominating Committee, appointed pursuant to Article VI, Section 1(e) of these Bylaws, shall make nominations for the Directors. The Board Nominating Committee shall select the number of nominees equal to the forthcoming vacancies on the Board. The slate of nominees shall be mailed to the membership not less than 90 days before the ballot closing date fixed by the Board with a biographical statement of each nominee. Fellows may nominate one or more candidates for election to the Board by petition. Each such petition shall be signed by at least ten Fellows and forwarded to the President no later than 60 days in advance of the ballot closing date. Whether or not additional nominees are

submitted by petition, a mail ballot shall be sent no later than 30 days in advance of the ballot closing date to the membership including biographical information on all nominees. Each Fellow may vote for no more candidates than the number of Board seats that are open. Ballots shall be returned to the President by the ballot closing date. The nominees receiving the most votes up to the vacant number of positions shall be declared elected. No Fellow shall be elected as a Director for more than two consecutive terms.

5. Resignation and Removal; Election of a Successor.

(a) Resignation. Resignations of Board Members are effective upon the date indicated in a written notification to the Chair, Secretary, President, or other officer.

(b) Removal. One or more Directors may be removed at a meeting of the Board called for that purpose, with or without cause, by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Directors then in office, provided that notice of the proposed removal is included in the notice of the meeting.

(c) Election of a Successor or Replacement Director. Upon the termination of office of any Director by resignation, or removal, or death, a successor shall be elected by majority vote of the Board to serve for the remaining term of the predecessor. Election of a replacement Director for such a partial term shall not count as one of the two consecutive terms permitted to any Director. In the event the number of Directors is increased by amendment to these Bylaws, the additional Directors shall be elected by the membership in the manner provided in these Bylaws.

6. Decisions by Board: Quorum for Meetings. A majority of the entire membership of the Board then in office shall constitute a quorum in order to permit the transaction of any business. In the absence of a quorum, a majority of those Directors present may adjourn the meeting. The affirmative vote of a majority of the Directors present and voting at

a Board meeting at which a quorum is present shall be necessary and sufficient for a vote to be valid, except:

- (a) as a larger vote may at any time be otherwise specifically required by these Bylaws, and
- (b) as the vote of a greater number or proportion of the Board is, or may at any time be, required by the Nonprofit Corporation Act for taking a specific action. Decisions made in accord with the above provisions shall be the act of the Board for any and all purposes.

7. Meetings.

- (a) Regular Meetings. Except as otherwise provided in these Bylaws, decisions of the Board of Directors shall be made at duly-constituted meetings. Regular meetings may be held either within or without the District of Columbia, and shall be held at such times and in such places as the Board may by resolution determine in advance.
- (b) Special Meetings. Special meetings shall be convened at the request of the Chair of the Board or through a petition of a majority of the Board then in office and shall be held at the time and place (either within or without the District of Columbia) and for such purpose as shall be specified in such request.
- (c) Participation in Meetings. Any or all Directors may participate in a meeting of the Board or a committee by means of conference telephone or any other means of communication that allows all persons participating to hear one another, and such participation shall constitute presence in person at the meeting.
- (d) Notice. Not less than five or more than thirty days before the date of every Board meeting, each Director shall be given written notice stating the date, time, and place of the meeting, either personally or by mail. If mailed, such notice shall be deemed to be given when deposited

in the United States mail addressed to the Director at the postal address as it appears on the records of the Corporation, with postage prepaid. Whenever notice is required to be given to any Director under any provision of law, the Articles of Incorporation or these Bylaws, a waiver in writing signed by the Director entitled to such notice, whether before or after the time stated therein, shall be the equivalent to the giving of such notice. The presence of any Director at a meeting, in person, by conference telephone, without objection to the lack of notice of the meeting, shall also waive notice by such Director.

(e) Action Without a Meeting. Any action or decision required or permitted to be taken at a regular or special meeting of the Board may be taken or made without convening a formal meeting, provided all Directors of the Board so consent by telephone or in writing, including by facsimile or electronic mail, and a written record is made of each Director's consent to the action or decision taken or made. Such consent and writing shall have the same force and effect as a unanimous vote, and may be described as such in any document executed by the Corporation.

(f) Minutes of Each Meeting. Minutes of each meeting, reflecting all actions taken, shall be promptly distributed to all Directors.

8. Compensation. Directors of the Corporation shall receive no compensation for their services as Directors but, by resolution of the Board, may be reimbursed for expenses paid while acting on behalf of the Corporation and may be paid reasonable compensation for special services furnished the Corporation in connection with its projects.

Article VI. COMMITTEES

The Corporation shall have Standing Committees consisting of an Executive Committee, an Audit Committee, a Finance Committee, a Fellow Nominating Committee, a Board Nominating Committee, an Officer Nominating Committee, as well as Ad Hoc Committees. All

Committees shall have a Chair who, except for the Finance Committee Chair, shall be selected from among their number by the Board Chair.

1. Standing Committees.

(a) Executive Committee. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary, and Treasurer and two additional members. Such additional members shall be recommended and appointed by the Chair with majority approval of the Board members then in office. The President shall serve as a non-voting member of the Executive Committee except in matters dealing with his or her employment, compensation, and/or performance evaluation. To the extent provided in a Board resolution, the Committee shall exercise the authority of the Board at such time as it is not in session, when prompt action is required and when it is not practicable to call the Board into session. The Committee's meetings shall be open to attendance by all Fellows except for any portion determined by unanimous vote to require an executive session. The Secretary shall prepare a summary of any actions taken and promptly distribute them to each Director. Executive Committee members shall serve for a one-year term.

(b) Audit Committee. The Audit Committee shall consist of at least seven members. The Board Chair shall recommend and appoint, upon a vote of a majority of the Board members then in office, members to the Audit Committee. Members of the Audit Committee must have financial and/or accounting expertise, five of whom shall be Fellows, at least one of whom must be a Director, one of whom must be accredited as a certified public accountant or possess another related certification demonstrating expertise in financial reporting and management, and one of whom shall not be an Academy member or employee. Members of the committee shall serve for a three-year term and may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

(c) Finance Committee. The Finance Committee shall consist of at least ten members. The Board Chair shall recommend and appoint, upon

a vote of a majority of the Board members then in office, members to the Finance Committee. At least one member of the Finance Committee shall be a Director. The Chair of the Finance Committee shall be the Treasurer. Members of the committee shall serve for a two-year term and may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

(d) Fellow Nominating Committee. The Fellow Nominating Committee shall consist of at least ten members. The Board Chair shall recommend and appoint, upon a vote of a majority of the Board members then in office, members to the Fellow Nominating Committee. All members of the Fellow Nominating Committee shall be Fellows but none is required to be Board members. Members of the committee shall serve for a two-year term and may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

(e) Board Nominating Committee. The Board Nominating Committee shall consist of at least ten members. The Board Chair shall recommend and appoint, upon a vote of a majority of the Board members then in office, members to the Board Nominating Committee. All of the members of the Board Nominating Committee shall be Fellows but none are required to be Board members. Members of the committee shall serve for a two-year term and may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

(f) Officer Nominating Committee. The Officer Nominating Committee shall consist of up to five Board members. The Board Chair shall recommend and appoint, upon a vote of a majority of the Board members then in office, members to the Officer Nominating Committee. Members of the Officer Nominating Committee shall serve for a one-year term.

2. Ad Hoc Committees. Other Committees may be established from time to time as needed by the Board. The Chair shall recommend and appoint, upon a vote of a majority of the Board members then in office, members to Ad Hoc Committees. Ad Hoc Committee members shall serve for one-year terms unless a different term is provided in the resolution establishing the committee.

Article VII. OFFICERS

1. The officers of the Corporation shall be a Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, President, and such other officers as the Board may from time to time appoint. The Chair may appoint assistant officers from time to time.

(a) The Board shall elect from among Directors at the meeting at which newly-elected Directors take office one as Chair, one as Vice Chair, one as Treasurer and one as Secretary. One or more nominations for each of these officers shall be proposed by the Officer Nominating Committee, with the advice and concurrence of the Directors and Directors-elect who will serve on the Board at the time of the elections. The Officer Nominating Committee shall be appointed pursuant to Article VI, Section 1(f) of these Bylaws. In developing its proposals, the committee shall consult with those Directors and Directors-elect.

(b) The President shall be selected and appointed by the Board for any term, at such salary, and on such other terms and conditions of employment as the Board shall specify.

(c) The Board shall have power to fill any vacancy caused by the resignation, death, inability to serve, or removal from office of any officer or assistant officer during the term for which appointed.

2. Officers other than the Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer and Secretary need not be Directors or Fellows.

3. Duties.

(a) Chair. The Chair, or in the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair, shall preside at all meetings of the Board. The Chair shall direct and execute, on behalf of the Corporation, all decisions of or programs adopted by the Board or Executive Committee. The Chair shall appoint the chairs of committees; recommend and appoint members of committees, upon a

vote of a majority of the Board members then in office; appoint consultative panels, as well as the chairs of standing panels or committees; and appoint a Parliamentarian to serve as an advisor to the Chair. The Chair shall also act as the chief representative of the Corporation. In so acting, however, the Chair shall be subject to the direction of the Board or the Executive Committee. Except as the Chair may from time to time otherwise delegate to another officer, the foregoing duties shall include, but not be limited to, the execution of any contract or other instrument on behalf of the Corporation, the signing of checks, drafts or other evidences of indebtedness, and the leasing or renting of office space for the Corporation.

(b) President. With due respect for the independence of Academy Panels and their work, the President shall be the chief executive officer of the Corporation and shall have such other duties as the Board, the Chair, or the Executive Committee may assign.

(c) Secretary. The Secretary shall keep the minutes of all meetings of the Board or the Executive Committee; keep all documents and records pertaining to the operation and activities of the Corporation; issue notices of all meetings; file all reports required pursuant to state or federal law; and perform such other duties as the Board or the Chair may direct. The Secretary may delegate any of the foregoing duties to an Assistant Secretary appointed in accordance with these Bylaws, or may carry out any of these duties through such staff or other agents as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(d) Treasurer. The Treasurer shall have responsibility for the following duties: taking custody of all funds, gifts received and other assets of the Corporation; placing them in accounts in the name of the Corporation in such banks or depositories as the Board may direct; disbursing such funds or other assets upon direction from the Board or Chair; keeping and maintaining accurate and complete financial records of the assets, receipts and disbursements of the Corporation; collecting all monies due

the Corporation; paying routine bills and expenses of the Corporation; and performing such other duties as the Board or Chair may direct. The Treasurer may delegate any of the foregoing duties to an Assistant Treasurer appointed in accordance with these Bylaws, or may carry out any of these duties through such staff or other agents as the Treasurer deems appropriate

4. The Board may, in its discretion, require the Treasurer or any other officer to furnish a bond of a kind, and in an amount, required and approved by the Board.

5. Inspection of Books. The Chair, the Secretary, the Treasurer and the President shall permit any Director or Fellow or a duly authorized attorney to inspect all books and records of the Corporation for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

Article VIII. ACCOUNTING PERIOD

The fiscal year of the Corporation shall begin on the first day of October and end on the last day of September of the following year.

Article IX. AMENDMENTS

The Board shall, on its own initiative, or upon the written request of at least twenty-five percent of the Fellows, submit to the membership for its approval any resolution to alter, amend, repeal, or add to any of the Bylaws of the Corporation, and to adopt new Bylaws in the place of any provisions deleted. Such resolution shall be adopted and effective if voted on by at least half of the Fellows and approved by at least sixty percent of the Fellows voting upon it.

Appendix F

Links to Academy Reports and History of First Twenty-Five Years

To access this document, Alan Dean's history of the first twenty-five years, and a full list of Academy reports online, please visit our website at www.napawash.org/history.