

On Being a Professional School of Government

Mark Harrison Moore

January, 1989

Introduction

A little more than a decade ago, Graham Allison, the newly installed Dean of the Kennedy School of Government, reminded the Kennedy School's faculty of the canonical goal that Derek Bok, President of the University, had set for the Kennedy School:

To become an outstanding professional school of government, doing for its profession what Harvard's Schools of Law, Business and Medicine do for their respective professions.

At the time, the aim to become an outstanding professional school of government was quite ambiguous for none then existed. The allusion to Harvard's other professional schools was thus a convenient device to render more concrete

and feasible what otherwise seemed too abstract and uncertain a goal. If Harvard could create intellectually distinguished and practically useful professional schools of law, business, and medicine, why not a school of government? If the path to this goal seemed obscure, why not be guided by the experience of these other schools?

The canonical objective, ambiguous as it was, has stood the school in good stead for over a decade. It has guided the school to such important changes in its organization and operations as the following:

- 1) The creation of "problem-solving research centers" designed to bring intellectual effort to bear on important public policy issues;
- 2) The establishment of "executive programs" to produce an immediate impact on the practice of government, and to create a market for our degree students;
- 3) The expansion of the MPP and MPA degree programs to insure that the school reached a scale sufficient to have an impact on the profession;
- 4) Changes in the criteria for appointment to the faculty that emphasized intellectual range and

professional accomplishments as well as traditional measures of scholarly achievement;

5) Experiments in curriculum and pedagogy designed to incorporate ethics, history, and leadership into the curriculum, and to develop students' judgment, creativity and character as well as their knowledge and analytic ability.

Gradually, this cumulative experience has taught us what it means to be a professional school of government. As a result, we can now say what it means without having to allude to the example of the other professional schools. Without trying to be definitive (for additional experience will surely teach us more) it is useful at this stage of our development to set out some of the characteristics that distinguish professional schools from graduate academic departments, and a professional school of government from other professional schools.

What it Means to be a Professional School

To be part of a university is to be committed to the intellectual enterprises of teaching and research. To be a professional school within a university is to aim at improving the practice of a given profession through these processes. Much that is distinctive about being a

professional school begins with this basic orientation to improving the practice of a given profession.

Of course, in one important sense, all graduate training in a university can be seen as professional training. Graduate students seeking advanced degrees in academic disciplines are being trained for a profession - the profession of academic research. To become accomplished in that profession they master the current literature of their field, discover the unsolved issues at the frontiers of their disciplines, and practice with the methods that are now being used to address the unsolved questions.

They also practice the arts and operational skills associated with being a good academic researcher. They learn how to access the relevant literature, how to gather data and conduct experiments, how to get useful criticism, and how to present their results. They even learn a great deal about the values of their chosen profession and the proper ways to behave when one is acting like an academic. In short, graduate students in academic departments are apprentices in a craft no less than students in professional schools.

This point is important because it reminds us that the crucial difference between graduate departments training people for academic careers and professional schools

training people for careers within practical professions is not in the kinds of things that are taught. Both enterprises not only impart the knowledge that has accumulated within their fields, but also successfully teach skills, influence values, and affect temperament in ways that advantage their students in their chosen professions. It is not true, then, that academic departments teach knowledge and the methods for acquiring it and professional schools teach skills. They both teach both knowledge and skills. The crucial difference is that one teaches the particular knowledge, methods, skills, and values that are appropriate to the profession of academic, while the other teaches the particular knowledge, methods, skills and values that are valuable within the profession it seeks to improve.

Still, if one compares a professional school to a graduate department of an academic discipline there are some profound differences. They appear in the organization of research, in the character of the research that is done, in the importance of research relative to teaching, and in the status of practitioners in the intellectual enterprise of the school.

1) The Organization and Character of Research

In a professional school the intellectual agenda is set by the practical problems being faced by the profession - not the immanent logic of a disciplinary field. What "disciplines" intellectual work is the demand for practical utility in identifying and resolving the problems faced by the profession.

Now, this doesn't mean that knowledge developed within academic disciplines is irrelevant to a professional school. Indeed, a crucial function of professional schools is constantly to review developments within academic disciplines to discover the new methods or knowledge that can be put to use in resolving the problems now faced by the profession. This is particularly important for those professional schools whose work can be well supported by closely related academic disciplines such as medicine and biology, law and philosophy, engineering and physics, government and economics and political science.

Nor does it mean that a professional school is uninterested in methodological developments. A professional school must be interested in developing those methods that are particularly useful to its profession.

Nor, finally, does it mean that a professional school must take the intellectual agenda from the profession as the profession now sees it. An important part of being a

professional school is challenging the profession's current understanding of its own problems.

What it does mean, however, is that the distinctive task of the professional school is to face and resolve the issues facing the profession - not those of an academic discipline. Success is reckoned in terms of the improved knowledge, methodological capacity, and performance of the profession - not simply in the advance of scientific wisdom.

Research in a professional school is commonly focused on what should be done to deal with a specific problem faced by the profession: e.g., what law and justice require in confronting specific classes of disputes, how best to treat certain kinds of illnesses, what corporate strategy will maximize the wealth of a given company's shareholders. It follows, then, that the value of the work depends as much on its practical utility as its generality or accuracy. In short, while academic research seeks to establish powerful general descriptions of how the world operates, research in a professional school emphasizes the development of particular prescriptions to deal with a class of professional problems.

The intellectual differences between the tasks of general description on the one hand, and particular prescription on the other are enormous. The move to the

particular from the general, for example, means that the researcher must confront and accommodate a host of particular concrete conditions that would typically be abstracted away by an academic researcher. It also means that the conclusions reached are less general and timeless, for they are tied to the particular conditions and knowledge available at the time the professional researcher did his work.

The shift from description to prescription is also significant. The researcher must identify the important values at stake in his proposed resolution of problems, and take responsibility for judging the weight of their claims. Such normative judgments are often ruled out of strictly scientific enterprises.

The practical orientation of research in a professional school also implies that the research products of a professional school are less conclusive and more vulnerable to criticism than the work carried on in academic departments. Most practical decisions are most usefully approached through several different methodologies - not just one. Consequently, the research product has a rougher surface than one produced through the application of a single methodology. The conclusions are not universal, but are particular. All this makes the research products look different than those commonly produced wholly within academic disciplines.

One of the easiest ways to understand this distinction is to consider the standard form of an article that appears in a disciplinary based journal, and to contrast that with what would appear in a thoughtful recommendation for action by the government in dealing with a particular policy problem. A typical journal article begins with an intellectual problem about some causal mechanism in the world. The past literature addressing this issue is discussed. The author's own theory is then advanced as a new, or more powerfully integrative theory. The theory is then tested against a set of data. The character of the data, including its limitations and what has been done to adjust for the limitations is discussed in detail. The methods for analyzing the data are also explained. The results are reported. A discussion of the ways in which the results are vulnerable is offered. Then, finally in the last paragraph, the author offers some ideas about the "policy implications" of the findings.

What is interesting to someone who is interested in offering policy advice about such an article is the stark contrast between the care that is shown in reviewing the literature, developing the descriptive theory, and testing it on one hand, and the casualness with which the policy implications are derived on the other. To derive a judgment about what the government should do from a tentative

observation about the way the world now works is an enormously complex undertaking. One has to keep in mind and defend the normative purposes the government is pursuing. One has to have an idea about who could take action. One has to test one's beliefs about causes with what is known about what kinds of interventions have been effective in the past. And so on. It is as though the social scientists have done much less than half the intellectual work necessary to get through to a conclusion about what government should do. Even worse, the methods for getting from social science generalizations to particular recommendations for governmental actions are by no means clear. We may not even have much craft knowledge in this area, let alone well worked out logical methods.

2) The Relative Importance of Teaching and Research

In a professional school, the relative importance of research and teaching shifts compared to academic disciplines. Academic departments make their mark in research universities by turning out research that is recognized by their disciplines as cutting edge research. Students are important primarily to help in the production of the research, and to serve as apprentices to the professors who teach them how to be academics. In this world, only a few students are needed.

In a professional school that seeks to change the practice of its profession, the students are far more important products of the school. Consequently, the design of pedagogy and curriculum become much more important activities. The scale of the enterprise also changes. Some of the intellectual energies of a professional school are thus drawn off into teaching rather than research.

3) The Status of Practitioners

Finally, a professional school is more prepared to admit that it might learn from its practitioners than an academic department. The knowledge, intuitions and experiences of practitioners are important to professional schools as clues indicating the problems that the field faces, and as the basis for hypotheses about where the solutions lie. Consequently, a professional school seeks a close relationship with its practicing professionals. It studies their conduct. It invites them to join the faculty.

Exactly how far a professional school moves from its related academic disciplines toward a different kind of research, toward a greater commitment to teaching, and toward a different kind of engagement with practicing professionals can vary a great deal. The best professional schools maintain close links to related academic

disciplines, maintain a commitment to research, and seek to challenge their professions from this academic base. The worst are drawn into too cozy a relationship with the profession and lose their capacity to challenge and assist their related profession intellectually.

What is similar between an academic department and a first rate professional school, then, is the commitment to objectivity, breadth of perspective, and intellectual quality. That is what qualifies a professional school to be part of a university. What is different is to develop a point of view that is sympathetic, if not identical, to the perspective of the profession to which the school is attached. It must be of the profession rather than about the profession or it risks irrelevance. Yet, it cannot be so tightly integrated into the profession that it loses the objectivity and breadth of perspective that allows it to usefully challenge the profession.

How to Operate as a Professional School of Government

To be a professional school of government, then, is to seek to improve the practice of government through teaching and research. The important question, of course, is who is in the profession of governing, and in what can they usefully be instructed by the research and teaching of a university-based professional school?

Who Is to Be Trained by a Professional School of Government?

The closest competitors to the Kennedy School at the time it committed itself to becoming a professional school of government were the nation's schools of public administration. They had an answer to these questions. They thought that the "professionals" in government were the neutrally competent government managers: the senior civil service at the federal level, those who staffed the offices of administration and management at the state level, the professional city managers at the local level. What these officials needed to learn were the techniques of management that would allow them to operate efficient and accountable government organizations. The intellectual emphasis was on learning the best methods of organizational design, accounting and budgeting, and personnel management. If a single institutional unit could be singled out as the place to which graduates of schools of public administration went, and from which they exercised their influence, one would have to point to the offices of administration and management in government agencies - especially the budget bureaus.

From the outset, the Kennedy School had a different answer to these basic questions of who was to be seen as the

profession of governing, and in what subjects they were to be trained. The key difference was signalled by the school's interest in public policy rather than public administration. The focus on policy meant that the school was interested in thinking about the ends of government as well as the means, and was interested in talking to those who defined the purposes of government as well as those who devised the means for achieving the ends.

Over time, the answer became even more different as the school embraced a concern for public management as well as public policy and public administration. From the perspective of those who were interested in public policy what was significant about the shift to public management was that it meant that the school began to take responsibility for training people to organize processes of policy deliberation and implementation that would breathe life into policy ideas as well as simply develop the ideas. From the perspective of those interested in public administration what was significant about the shift to public management was that the techniques of political management were added to the techniques of administrative management as important parts of the job of public managers.

The Kennedy School's initial vision of the profession of governing included many others than professional government managers. It focused particularly

on those who seemed to be importantly involved in policy-making. That included academics who became expert in particular substantive areas such as macro-economic policy, defense policy, international trade policy, energy policy, health policy, welfare policy, local economic development policy, even criminal justice policy. It also included academics particularly skilled in the developing new methodologies of benefit cost analysis, program evaluation, and social experimentation that seemed to promise improved capacities to reckon the value of governmental activities. It included those who worked in consulting firms and think tanks. And it included those "in-and-outers" who entered the government through political appointment based on a reputation for substantive expertise. This was natural for a school interested in policy as distinct from administration for it was these groups who were predominantly concerned with the grand debates over what policy should be.

In What Should They Be Trained?

Its initial view of how such people should be trained was also consistent with the school's interest in policy over administration. The school was interested in training people in the newly developing analytic techniques of benefit cost analysis, program evaluation, computer simulations, and social experimentation that promised

greater precision in identifying areas where the government could make value creating contributions to social life. It also helped cement the school's commitment to this curriculum that the material was intellectually challenging, that the founding fathers of the institution were particularly skills in these techniques, and that mastery of these techniques seemed to give young analysts significant leverage over those in government whose claims to authoritative knowledge were rooted in lengthy substantive or managerial experience. If there were a single institutional home base for this view of the Kennedy School's mission, it would have been offices of planning and evaluation or the think tanks and consulting firms that were then arising to help advise the government on matters of policy.

Challenges to the Initial Assumptions

While this initial focus on public policy served the important purpose of energizing the school intellectually, over time, the Kennedy School realized the narrowness of these aspirations. It was not enough to improve the thoughtfulness of some segments of the government if that thoughtfulness could not be translated into authoritative decisions of the government, and successfully implemented. One could not reasonably claim to be improving the practice of government if some of the most important elements of ..

government such as government managers and politicians were left out of the conversations.

As a first step in including them in its vision of the profession of governing, then, the Kennedy School began talking about the importance of training public managers and leaders in government. The concrete embodiment of this commitment was the decision to develop executive programs that went directly at senior government managers at all levels of government, and across a wide variety of substantive fields.

The inclusion of senior government executives responsible for the political work of forging new policy agreements within the executive branch, and between the executive and legislative branches, and for the organizational work of adapting their organizations to be able to carry out new policies naturally began to change the school's ideas of what should be taught. The school was loath to give up its concern with policy, and with the question of whether the government was or was not creating something of value. It wanted the discipline of that question to invigorate and challenge public sector managers and politicians. Moreover, it did not want to give up its belief in the power of analytic techniques for offering useful guidance on the question of whether government policies were valuable and effective. So these remained

important parts of the school's conception of what should be taught.

At the same time, the school had to recognize that the concerns of senior public executives were different than those of the policy analysts who worked for them. They viewed politics not only as an important constraint on choices they could make, but also as an important source of guidance about the values that the society thought were at stake in the choices they were making, and as an important element in legitimating and giving impetus to decisions they made. For them, the question of how best to organize a process of policy-making was a key issue, and the techniques of negotiation that were often involved in this process were terribly important skills to develop and use.

Similarly, they viewed organizations not only as constraints on feasible actions, but as powerful devices for accomplishing purposes if they could be organized and challenged in useful ways. Exactly how to use available, administrative instruments to implement new programs, or generally reposition their organizations in a shifting political environment were also burning questions. It is partly these questions that the school began to try to answer in developing the field of public management.

Much of this development occurred within the crucible of the school's executive programs in which faculty members had to confront experienced public executives and talk to them usefully about the problems they faced. For a long time, the faculty learned more from these encounters than the students. Recently, however, the faculty, now tutored by years of governmental experience, and having had the time to reflect and criticize some of that experience, is beginning to be able to give something useful back to the public executives. That curriculum is also beginning to be felt in the school's degree programs - particularly the school's MPA program.

On the horizon are additional groups and topics that might be fitted into a professional school of government. The school should do much more than it is now doing in training people for elected careers, or for staffing those who hold elective office in legislatures or the executive branch. It can do a great deal more to help those parts of the government that are in routine contact with the press. It might even find a way to help the press make a more positive contribution to the process of democratic governance. Finally, it might begin to include those in the not for profit sector who do much of the public's work - the hospitals, the charitable organizations, the public interest lobbying groups, and so on. In short, the Kennedy School is increasingly seeing itself as a school of governance rather

than simply government, and is admitting a wider variety of students, and addressing a wider variety of subjects than it did when it was focused on training policy analysts.

The important point is that the Kennedy School's image of who was included in the profession of governing gradually widened, and with that, its ideas about what was important to research and teach also changed. It became important to learn about the techniques of management and politics as well as policy analysis.

The Issue of Parochialism

Before examining in detail the implications of these shifts in the conception of who is in the profession of governing, and how they might usefully be informed and taught by the research and teaching activities of the school, it is worth noting the extent to which the conception of a professional school of government is contingent on a particular governmental setting, in a particular country, at a particular moment of time. The profession of governing is neither universal nor static. It changes as one moves from one country to another, and from one moment of time to another. The school must be knowledgeable about the differences and changes in context, and work out the implications for teaching and research.

This is particularly important in the Kennedy School for increasingly our students are drawn from foreign countries. So far, we have not invested enough in understanding the differences in the governmental settings, and their implications for the successful practice of government in those settings. It is a challenge that must be addressed if we are to become not only a professional school of government for the United States, but also for the foreign countries that are now sending both students and faculty to the Kennedy School to learn our ideas and methods.

Implications for Research

If the central task of a professional school of government is to improve the practice of governing, then the research undertaken by the school should support that goal. There is, of course, a great deal of research conducted in other academic domains such as economics, political science, sociology, social psychology, psychology, anthropology and history that is importantly related to the practice of governing. Other professional schools, particularly those interested in law, business administration, public health, city planning, social work, and education also contribute a great deal for their methods and interests often overlap significantly with those of a professional school of government.

The distinctive focus of a professional school of government, however, the intellectual work that it uniquely performs, must be research that helps the profession do its job more successfully. Thus, its research is guided by a vision of what that job is. For our purposes, we have found it useful to define the task of governing as helping to define and create public value; that is, to help the society recognize what is in its collective interest to do, and to figure out how the tasks so defined are to be carried out.

Broadly speaking, the research to support this mission falls into two categories; methodological research designed to develop the general methods that allow those who have the responsibility for defining and creating public value to do that job more successfully, and applied research which uses these techniques to give plausibly useful answers to specific questions that government officials face.

(There might also be a category that consists of establishing basic facts or estimating functional relationships that are relevant to policy choices, but are not, strictly speaking, policy recommendations themselves.)

Methodological Research in a Professional School of Government

The methodological research also falls into two categories; the development of analytic methods that help public officials recognize where public value lies, and the development of diagnostic and intervention techniques that instruct public officials in how they ought to manage policy-making and policy-implementation processes. The techniques of welfare economics, operations research, decision analysis, benefit/cost analysis, program evaluation, survey design, etc. are relevant to the first. The techniques of institutional analysis, organizational design, management control, human resource management, political management, and organizational strategy and development are related to the second.

The intellectual challenge in developing and using these techniques in the context of a professional school of government are slightly different as a result of their different current levels of development. The challenge in using the extensive literature on analytics is to select and adapt from this field those ideas and techniques that are particularly useful in public sector applications. Program evaluation would seem to be a particularly important subject, as would risk estimation and Bayesian statistics.

The challenge in the area of institutional analysis and management is more fundamental. There, one can, to a degree adapt ideas and findings from political science and

business administration for use in the public sector. But the larger portion of the job lies in doing the basic research that defines the tasks, develops ideas about diagnostic and intervention techniques, and then tests to see whether those work in actual use.

Applied Research in a Professional School of Government

The applied research also falls into two categories. One part has to do with figuring out the answer to specific substantive policy questions that the government faces - such as whether to build the star wars system, or add a work requirement to the welfare program, or set limitations on medicare reimbursements for physicians' services. The other part has to do with solving particular institutional design or managerial questions such as whether to subsidize national elections, or reform the congressional budget process, or command the U. S. military to assist with the drug control efforts of the United States Customs Service.

The substantive research is often carried out the research centers at the school, and draws heavily on analytic techniques conditioned by judgments of political and administrative feasibility of the proposals they make. The managerial applied research is typically carried out through the research centers that take more of an

institutional focus (such as the Center for Press and Government, or the Institute of Politics, or the Center for Business and Government), or through individual consulting arrangements. Perhaps as the substantive research centers become more deeply involved with the institutions that are handling the substantive problems, they, too, will begin to address institutional and managerial issues as well as substantive policy questions.

The applied research is in an important sense more fundamental to the intellectual life of a professional school than the methodological research. True, it is crucially important to develop the methods. But the real test of the methods comes in applications. If they cannot be used to help the profession face and resolve the practical problems it is asked to handle, then the methods, by definition, are not appropriate. Moreover, it is often the practical problems that indicate what methods must be developed.

In a professional school, the task shapes the method rather than the other way around. It is the difficulty of establishing the public value of a governmental enterprise that animates the development of the techniques of benefit cost analysis and program evaluation. It is the fact that public officials face the task of shaping policy mandates that makes political management an important set of techniques to develop for public managers.

Moreover, the applied research (both substantive and managerial) is a uniquely challenging form of research because it seeks to give advice about what should be done by specific officials with specific responsibilities to advance the public interest. This is the sort of research that seeks to produce particular prescriptions, and thereby runs into the particular problems associated with these endeavors; e.g., the uncertainty about the basis for the normative judgments that ultimately drive the prescription, the necessity of having to give a plausible answer when many crucial facts are unknown, the requirement that the answer be suited to the particular time and place that the problem arises, and to the institutions that will have to decide what to do and actually carry out the policy, and so on.

Because the problems are difficult, even the most successful research efforts do not uncontested answers. Thus, the standards by which academic research is usually judged (definitiveness and reproducibility of the results) must be adjusted. The new standard might be the combination of "plausible efficacy of the proposed solution" and "responsible use of available, relevant evidence and reasoning in reaching the conclusion."

Of necessity, the organization of research activities also changes. In a professional school,

isolation from the real world is not a virtue. It becomes important to get as close to the consumers of research as possible, for it is their concerns that can usefully focus the attention of the professional school, and their use of the results that vindicates the value of the research. This does not mean that the school surrenders its intellectual integrity and objectivity. It must retain that if it is to accomplish first rate intellectual work. It does mean, however, that the organization must be in very close touch with its consumers. This is done naturally in an academic discipline where oneself and one's academic peers are the consumers of the research. It is a little harder to do in an professional school where the researcher must cross an organizational, professional, and cultural boundary.

It is also probably true that the research becomes less individual and more collaborative. This is a necessary consequence of the scale and difficulty of carrying out applied research. It is also the natural result of the necessity of approaching the issues through a variety of disciplines.

All this has been facilitated by the development of the research centers at the Kennedy School. What has not yet occurred, however, is an effort to seriously examine that experience for the more general methodological lessons we have learned as we have for a decade addressed complex

policy problems in search of plausibly effective solutions. That means that we remain as uncertain about the special methods associated with doing poliicy analysis as we do about the special methods that must be used in designing and managing governmental institutions. And is these things that must be the frontiers of our methodological research.

Implications for Teaching

The aim of imporving the practice of government also has important implications for the status and character of teaching in a professional school. the most obvious and important implication is that the importance of teaching as an activity must increase. While methodological and applied research are important contribuitons to the world of government, they are not particularly valuable until many people in the profession begin to make use of them. That is when the profession is improved. The most direct way to increase the capacity of the profession to use the methodologies, spot opportunities for their application, and use the applications in sophisticated ways is to teach those currently within the profession to do so. Thus, teaching becomes relatively more important to a professional school.

This same line of reasoning leads one to the conclusion that executive and mid-career programs are particularly valuable educational programs. One reason is

that the executives and mid-career students are already influential, practicing professionals in the field. One does not have to wait for them to reach positions of influence. Nor does one have to accept the attrition to other professions that occurs among pre-career students. The impact is direct and significant. A second reason these programs are valuable is that the students provide immediate, powerful tests of the value of the ideas that are being communicated. If they cannot use the ideas with a reasonable amount of training and effort, then, by definition, the ideas are not yet appropriate.

A further point about teaching in a professional school is that it is not enough to simply teach the knowledge or the methods that have accumulated. One must create opportunities for students to practice in using the knowledges and methods to solve particular problems. In effect, there must be an opportunity to work in labs and clinical settings as well as in the lecture hall and library. There is a special responsibility to coach students in their efforts to use the methods, and critique their particular applications, for simple mastery of the facts and methods is not enough to insure that the students can make intelligent use of the methods in their professional practice. There must be exercises designed to stimulate creativity and improvisation as well as to test the students' abilities to reproduce the knowledge of the faculty.

Finally, to the extent that success in the profession depends on the development of operational skills, and the cultivation of appropriate values, teaching must be designed to accomplish these purposes as well. This means practice in writing, in role playing, and so on. It may also include studying the biographies of those who have succeeded in the profession.

If all this is true about teaching in a professional school, then an obvious implication is that a great deal of investment must be made in the curricular materials and the pedagogic methods. The school must be prepared to develop the materials that allow the students to apply the methods. Cases must be added to text books and scholarly articles as the materials to be provided. Teachers must learn how to stimulate thought and creativity as well as communicate clearly to the students what is known. Room must be created in courses for exercises that allow students to practice skills in realistic settings. All this has been done to some degree in the current Kennedy School curriculum, but it has been done at a large (and largely unrecognized) cost. Curriculum and pedagogical design are inevitably a large part of the intellectual effort of a professional school, and should rank along with methodological and substantive research as a major form of intellectual capital that is produced.

Implications for the Faculty

If what has been said so far about professional schools, research and teaching is correct, then it is clear that there are very important implications for the character and management of the faculty. Perhaps the most important is that they must understand the different character of a professional school. They must retain their absolute commitment to objectivity and intellectual integrity, but they must also accept the challenge of lending the weight of their intellects and skills to the practical problems confronting the professionals who are now governing. They must understand that accepting this challenge carries them into intellectually dangerous territory where values are as important as facts, where hypotheses must stand for established facts, and where good questions are often more important than definitive answers. They have to maintain their intellectual poise and discrimination in the face of enormous pressures to become irrelevant on the one hand, and to be used by special interests on the other.

A related point is that the faculty of a professional school of government must have a reasonable amount of practical experience. This is important to develop respect for the problems facing the profession, for self-confidence in confronting the profession, and for a prima

facie legitimacy in the eyes of the professional community. The experience can be gained through actual employment, or through consulting, or even vicariously through extensive teaching of experienced professionals. However acquired, practical experience is crucial as well as academic experience.

If the research carried out in a professional school is different than the research carried out in academic disciplines, if curriculum design and teaching are particularly important in professional schools, and if practical experience is important, then it is clear that the processes of selecting, developing and evaluating faculty members must be quite different in a professional school than in a traditional academic department. To the extent that junior faculty members come from academic disciplines, they must be challenged to learn what others in the school have learned about the professional practice of government, and about teaching professional students. They must also be given the time to respond to this challenge in creating an academic record. To the extent that faculty is drawn from the profession, they, too, must be challenged to learn what the school has learned, and to conduct their own research. There is a much greater need for continued investment in faculty development.

This challenge, too, has been partially accommodated by the Kennedy School. We have changed our criteria for appointment to reflect the special nature of our research effort, and the importance of both teaching and professional experience. We have made it possible to appoint people whose distinctions lie in professional experience rather than in academic careers. And we have created an Academic Dean whose responsibility is principally to be concerned about the intellectual development and productivity of the faculty.

What has not yet been accomplished, however, is the invention of a method for externally judging the quality of research in fields that do not have well defined, high prestige academic communities associated with them such as public management, or substantive fields such as transportation, housing, or criminal justice. Nor have we really learned how to assess the quality of a faculty member's curriculum development and teaching efforts. As a result, our ability to reward faculty members who make the key investments required to carry the school expeditiously toward the goal of becoming a first rate professional school is still quite limited. This is perhaps our greatest problem and challenge.

Conclusion

I believe that those associated with the Kennedy School have been have a set of intellectually significant experiences over the last decade and a half. We have been learning how to use and apply techniques of social science to produce accurate representations of policy problems, and the options available to policy-makers for dealing with them. We have also been learning how to make these analyses count in policy deliberations. We have also been learning how to manage public sector enterprises -- not just the implementation of policies, but also the organization of policy debates, and the re-positioning of organizations. We have been facing up to the challenge of teaching people with different levels of analytic ability and professional experience. All this makes us, the faculty of the Kennedy School, quite different from a graduate department of a single discipline; or, for that matter, a simple summation of several graduate departments.

Despite this fact, these experiences remain largely invisible, unrecognized, and undiscussed. We have no way of recording our progress as a faculty in addressing these challenges. We lack forums to discuss what we have learned. More precisely, it is in the one forum in which the senior faculty meets to decide on who shall join the faculty, that these concerns are the most distant. It is in FACA that we think and act most like an academic department. It is in our routine business that we think and act most like a professional school.

The gap between these two different perspectives is weakening the school, and slowing the pace of our intellectual development. We must think in FACA as though we were a professional school, or we must develop other fora in which the key investments and activities that are necessary to our future development can be our principal concern. To help shape that vision of a professional school is the reason I have produced these notes.