



Higher Education
Quality Council
of Ontario

An agency of the Government of Ontario

Public Policy on Public Policy Schools

Mel Cappe, School of Public Policy
and Governance, University of
Toronto



Published by

The Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario

1 Yonge Street, Suite 2402
Toronto, ON Canada, M5E 1E5

Phone: (416) 212-3893
Fax: (416) 212-3899
Web: www.heqco.ca
E-mail: info@heqco.ca

Cite this publication in the following format:

Cappe, M. (2015). *Public Policy on Public Policy Schools*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.



The opinions expressed in this research document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views or official policies of the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario or other agencies or organizations that may have provided support, financial or otherwise, for this project.
© Queens Printer for Ontario, 2015

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Harvey Weingarten, President of HEQCO, and Fiona Deller, Executive Director, Policy and Partnerships at HEQCO, for initiating the original conversation on the subject of the proliferation of public policy schools. In addition, I would like to thank all the faculty members and administrators of so many Ontario universities for the time and insight they provided in the background preparation of this report. In particular, I would like to thank Lauren Hudak and Sophie Borwein, researchers at HEQCO, for their encouragement, research and all around support during the preparation of this report. In particular, their comments on earlier drafts improved the paper. In addition, I wish to thank Nicholas Dion for able editing and being a positive challenge. All remaining errors are the fault of my word processor.

Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary	5
II.	Introduction.....	7
	A. Origin of the Study	7
	B. Questions Addressed and Methodology.....	7
	C. What is Covered and What is not	8
	D. Defining Terms: Public Administration, Public Policy and Other Master’s Degrees.....	9
II.	State of Public Policy Schools.....	11
	A. The Evolution of Public Administration as a Discipline	11
	B. Ontario vs. Canada vs. Rest of the World	12
	C. The Array of Public Policy Schools in Ontario	14
	1. <i>Historical Development</i>	14
	2. <i>Location</i>	14
	3. <i>Parts of a Whole</i>	15
	4. <i>Filling Gaps</i>	15
	5. <i>International Specialization</i>	15
	6. <i>Internships</i>	16
	7. <i>Research Institutes</i>	16
	8. <i>Breadth or Focus</i>	16
	9. <i>Status of Faculty</i>	16
	10. <i>Competition or Rivalry?</i>	18
	11. <i>Internal Reporting Relationships</i>	18
	12. <i>Policy vs. Administration</i>	19
	13. <i>Administration and Policy or Government</i>	19
	14. <i>Curriculum</i>	20
	15. <i>Degrees Granted</i>	21
	16. <i>Program Length</i>	21
III.	Public Policy on Public Policy Schools:	22
	A. What would a Public Policy on Public Policy Schools look like?	22
	B. For Whom?	23
	C. By Whom?	25
	D. Differentiation	26
	E. Promoting Differences	28

F.	Disclosing Differences	28
G.	Where do Graduates go?	28
H.	The Optimal Constellation of Schools.....	28
IV.	Conclusions	29
A.	Proliferation can be a good thing	29
B.	Differentiation makes the Ontario offerings useful.....	30
C.	Differences should be promoted.....	30
D.	Differences should be transparently disclosed	31
E.	There should be a standard for core learnings.....	31
F.	There should be accreditation for granting policy degrees.....	32
G.	Review the schools again in ten years	33

List of Tables

Table 1: List of Selected Ontario Graduate Public Policy Programs	10
Table 2: Public Policy School Models	17

I. Executive Summary

In recent years, the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) has launched several studies that analyze and conceptualize the differentiation of the Ontario postsecondary education system (Weingarten & Deller, 2010; Hicks, Weingarten, Jonker & Liu, 2013; Weingarten, Hicks, Jonker & Liu, 2013). Similarly, in the summer of 2012, the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) initiated several projects to identify ways to drive innovation and improve the productivity of the postsecondary sector.

Within this context, in June 2013 HEQCO began to look at what it called ‘the proliferation of public policy schools.’ Anecdotally, there has been much discussion about the rise of public policy programs. Findings from a preliminary scan of existing graduate public policy programs and their establishment dates demonstrated that there has been a proliferation in the number of public policy programs in Canada, starting with Carleton University in 1953 and ending with the University of Calgary in 2011. In roughly the past decade, there has been a one-third increase in the number of such graduate programs. This trend mirrors what has happened elsewhere, in particular in the United States.

Through an internet-based environmental scan of the core components of public policy programs across Canada, a literature review pertaining to the analysis and development of such programs, and interviews with university administrators and with directors of programs and schools of public policy or administration in Ontario, this report addresses the following questions:

1. Why has this growth in the number of public policy graduate programs taken place?
2. Is this ‘proliferation’ desirable?
3. What should be done to ensure that any future growth in Ontario is effective?

Ancillary issues addressed in the report include whether concentration of specializations should be encouraged in public policy programs; whether the differences between programs are apparent to both prospective students and employers; and whether there are standards of quality evident in Ontario public policy programs.

While public policy is a long-standing area of research and practice, thereby lending itself to several areas of commonality, public policy programs in Ontario nevertheless differ on several key dimensions. These include tenure of faculty, areas of program specialization, program structure and institutional form, reporting relations, support to students and program duration. Another key difference is the distinction between public policy and public administration programs. Some programs have maintained their emphasis on the study of public administration as opposed to public policy. These programs emphasize more practical elements of administration such as program delivery, human resource management, accounting and financial management. Others focus more closely on public policy, discussing processes of decision-making, public engagement, economics and policy analysis.

When looking towards the future of public policy programs in Ontario, it would be useful to answer a few normative questions. Is it desirable for there to be variety and differentiation in public policy programs? How common and consistent should the different programs be? How evident, clear and transparent should differences be? How much discretion should be available to the student to design their own program? How might the postsecondary sector benefit from a policy to encourage the differentiation of public policy offerings and how would we ultimately measure its success?

This report finds that the proliferation of public policy programs can be a good thing, especially as long as

program offerings continue to differ in important ways. These differences, however, should be communicated clearly to prospective students and to employers. The differences in Ontario university public policy programs are subtle but significant. They need to be elaborated and emphasized. The degrees should be indicative of these differences. There should not be uncontrolled duplication.

At the same time, there should be a core set of learnings in all public policy programs. This issue is greatly discussed in the literature. And there should be some measure of accreditation, most likely by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. Since the field is in constant flux and evolution, a review of public policy offerings in the province every ten years or so is essential. As the discipline evolves and the programs grow and mature, there will undoubtedly be new issues to be assessed.

II. Introduction

A. Origin of the Study

Over the past few years, the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) has embarked on several studies that begin to analyze and conceptualize the differentiation of the Ontario postsecondary education system (Weingarten & Deller, 2010; Hicks, Weingarten, Jonker & Liu, 2013; Weingarten, Hicks, Jonker & Liu, 2013). Similarly, in the summer of 2012, the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) initiated several projects to identify ways to drive innovation and improve the productivity of the higher education sector. One of these initiatives, the Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) process, asked each institution to submit a document identifying its mandate statement and three institutional priority objectives. MTCU “instructed the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) to establish a peer review panel to evaluate... mandate submissions... for their ability to achieve significant improvements in productivity, quality and affordability through both innovation and differentiation.”¹ Indeed, some universities (Ottawa and Toronto) have made their public policy programs priorities in their SMAs. The SMA Expert Panel noted that its greatest value was to extract recurring and dominant themes from the SMAs and to provide high-level advice to government based on those themes (HEQCO, 2013).

Within this differentiation context, in June 2013 HEQCO began to look at what it called ‘the proliferation of public policy schools.’ Anecdotally, there has been much discussion about the rise of public policy programs. HEQCO conducted a preliminary scan of existing public policy schools and programs to get a sense of how many exist and when they were created. The findings, starting with Carleton in 1953 and ending with the University of Calgary in 2011, showed that over the decade beginning in 2002, Canada experienced an increase of about one-third in the number of programs in public policy or public administration (Appendix A).²

Public policy programs, it seems, are not alone in this regard. Entrepreneurship opportunities within Ontario postsecondary institutions, ranging from for-credit programs or credentials to business incubators and accelerators, have also increased substantially in recent years (Sá, Kretz & Sigurdson, 2014). This trend is also evidenced at the national level (Menzies, 2009). Although this report focuses on public policy programs, it is interesting to note the proliferation of certain programs over the past decade and to understand the rationale for these decisions.

B. Questions Addressed and Methodology

Following up on these initial observations, HEQCO commissioned Mel Cappe, Professor in the School of Public Policy and Governance at the University of Toronto, to address the following questions:

4. Why has this growth in the number of public policy graduate programs taken place?
5. Is this ‘proliferation’ desirable?
6. What should be done to ensure that any future growth in Ontario is effective?

Ancillary issues to be addressed would include whether concentration of specializations should be encouraged; whether the differences between programs are apparent to both prospective students and

¹ June 27 letter from Glen Murray, former Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities, to presidents and executive heads.

² These dates were generated from a web-based search of institutional websites. As they were only meant to serve as a preliminary analysis, they were not confirmed with each institution.

prospective employers; and whether there are standards of quality evident in Ontario public policy programs.

In order to conceptualize how the aforementioned research questions should be addressed, a compendium³ of all public policy programs in Canada was compiled based on the websites of Canadian universities (Appendix B). Basic program information was collected to get a pan-Canadian understanding of existing programs and how they differ from one another. This information includes the credential offered, program duration, required courses, language of instruction, whether joint programs are offered, whether part-time studies are allowed, whether some form of work-integrated learning is offered and/or required and whether a thesis and/or major research paper is offered and/or required. Although this information paints a descriptive picture of the Canadian public policy programs context, it is limited in addressing deeper issues about why such programs were created and who they serve.

Additionally, the literature pertaining to the analysis and development of public policy and public administration and their teaching was reviewed. Most of the relevant scholarly literature pertains to North American public policy schools, particularly in the American context. This report may make reference to other Canadian and American as well as European or Asian schools, but only insofar as they illustrate a point about Ontario schools. In addition, the majority of the existing literature, particularly in the Canadian context, involves descriptive comparisons drawn from a compendium of public policy programs. It is again limited in its ability to address deeper issues about why such programs were created and who they serve.

In order to contribute further to existing work, interviews, conducted by Cappe, were held with the directors of programs and schools of public policy or public administration in Ontario.⁴ Interviews were also held with administrators in Ontario universities to understand how these programs were seen and valued from the centre of their institutions. Interviews were seen as the best way to delve deeper into the information collected through the environmental scan of Canadian public policy programs and to better address the three research questions. The statements and conclusions presented throughout the report draw on these interviews and flow from the author's attempts to abstract from them, interpret them and draw useful conclusions from them.

The paper then addresses what a public policy on public policy schools might look like for Ontario. It discusses to whom programs should be targeted and by whom, and deals with specialization, differentiation, transparency and optimality. The paper concludes with some recommendations for improving public policy graduate education in Ontario.

C. What is Covered and What is not

This report presents a review grounded in the supply side perspectives of faculty members and university administrators and not the demand side perspectives of students and employers. Such an addition would be desirable but lies beyond the scope of this work.

From the outset interesting boundary questions arose about what lay inside and what was outside the scope of the study. Public policy and public administration are quite elastic categories. To avoid any difficulties this lack of clarity might produce, any school that called itself a school of public policy or of public administration was included.

³ The timeframe for this information was June 2013 to April 2014. There may be small discrepancies if the websites were updated after that date. This does not impact the overall findings of the study.

⁴ Due to time constraints, interviews were only held at Ontario institutions. As such, any recommendations and conclusions in this report are held within the Ontario context and are not necessarily generalizable at the national level.

The review focuses on master's-level graduate education in Ontario and only tangentially mentions doctoral and undergraduate degrees. It does not explicitly address colleges and any relevant programs they might offer.

Even though other departments, such as economics, sociology and political science, might regularly offer courses with the words 'public policy' in the title, these were not included in the study, even though strengths in these areas may constitute the foundation upon which a university might choose to specialize in public policy. These traditional departments were not in themselves included in the review unless they offered a dedicated graduate degree program in public policy (McMaster⁵).

Schools of international or global affairs were expressly excluded. Several universities have schools of public and international affairs (e.g., York's Glendon College and the University of Ottawa) that were included in the study as they focus primarily on public administration. However, where the subject matter was purely international (e.g., Toronto's Munk School of Global Affairs, Carleton's Norman Patterson School of International Affairs and the University of Waterloo's Balsillie School of International Affairs), the school was excluded. These schools have a significant focus on international relations and policy and are often an important adjunct to the academic course of inquiry and teaching of public policy in the university. Similarly, schools of social work and public health, among others, teach courses in public policy. Nevertheless, they do not focus on public policy as such and thus were not included as a subject of this review.

There are courses available to Ontarians online that deal directly or indirectly with public policy and these were excluded as well. Moreover, there are several programs in public administration that are offered as continuing education or executive education. These were generally not included, with the exception of York's Master's of Public Policy, Administration and Law, which grew out of the Atkinson College of Continuing Education but which grants a unique master's degree to its graduates. Several of the programs have part-time options for those working in the field and some offer supplementary executive education programs that were not explicitly included in this review.

This careful circumscription of the boundaries of the report allowed for a focus on graduate schools and graduate programs that specialize in professional master's degrees in public policy and/or public administration.

D. Defining Terms: Public Administration, Public Policy and Other Master's Degrees

For the balance of the report, 'public administration', 'public policy' and 'public management' will be used interchangeably except when used in juxtaposition to emphasize a distinction. The study of public administration was traditionally focused on addressing the question of *how* governments do things, whereas public policy has traditionally focused on the *what* and *why* governments do things. Public policy has tended to consider the interaction of politics, economics and administration. In contrast to the previous two terms, public management is a more recent phenomenon that takes public administration and adds elements of leadership and creative managerial problem solving. While the literature is replete with arcane analyses of the distinctions, the universities in Ontario have often tended to conflate the terms in practice.

The best characterization of the differences among a Master of Arts (MA), a Master of Public Administration (MPA) and a Master of Public Policy (MPP) came from one interviewee who suggested that the role of a MA

⁵ The bracketed universities are identified only as examples and are not intended to be comprehensive or complete lists. There are often several universities that might have been used as examples. Inclusion or exclusion from the example is not a comment on that program. McMaster actually offers a joint public policy program with the University of Guelph.

in political science is to critique the Prince; of the MPP is to whisper in his ear; and of the MPA is to implement what he decides. Not a bad distinction. Another such distinction was made by an interviewee who suggested that an MPA was like an expert in wheat, while an MPP knew how to bake a pie. A better analogy might link the ability to bake a pie to the MPA and the ability to design the recipe to the MPP. However, analogies will take us only so far.

To point out some of the confusion between these terms, it is worth looking at the names of schools and programs in contrast to the degrees they grant, listed in Table 1.

Table 1: List of Selected Ontario Graduate Public Policy Programs

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Administrative Hub</u>	<u>Credential</u>
Carleton University	School of Public Policy and Administration	Master of Arts in Public Administration
Queen's University	School of Policy Studies	Master in Public Administration
Western University	Department of Political Science	Master of Public Administration
McMaster University and University of Guelph (collaborative program)	Department of Political Science	Master in Public Policy and Administration
Ryerson University	Department of Politics and Public Administration	Master of Arts in Public Policy and Administration
University of Toronto	School of Public Policy and Governance	Master of Public Policy
University of Ottawa	Graduate School of Public and International Affairs	Master of Arts in Public and International Affairs
Glendon College at York University	School of Public and International Affairs	Master of Public and International Affairs
University of Waterloo	Faculty of Arts	Master of Public Service

Some administrators and program directors were not even aware of the degree they granted. There are also several universities (including those listed above) that grant a MA in political science with emphases on institutions that prepare graduates with, to some extent, similar skills.

Again, this report uses MPP and MPA interchangeably, unless the juxtaposition is made explicit. Henceforth, I shall address the field as public administration, intending to conflate it with public policy. Moreover, where reference is made to programs or schools, it is intended to capture the other as well, except where the distinction is explicitly made with reference to institutional form.

II. State of Public Policy Schools

A. The Evolution of Public Administration as a Discipline

The discipline of public administration can be traced back to Woodrow Wilson – Professor Wilson, that is, before the White House and before Princeton, while he was at Bryn Mawr College – who wrote and published his seminal “The Study of Administration” in 1887 (Wilson, 1887). Wilson asks why the “science of administration,” as he calls it, is so late in coming. He goes on: “There is scarcely a single duty of government which was once simple and is not now more complex.” The science of administration should “straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike.” Apparently it was ever thus.

Wilson went on to separate “politics” from “administration” and in so doing gave birth to an academic area of inquiry that has since become more structured and more disciplined in its approach. To that point, the American Political Science Association set up a committee on public service training in 1912.

The literature tends to identify the publication of Harold Lasswell’s foundational “The Policy Sciences” in 1951 as the next milestone (Lasswell, 1951). For Lasswell, “a policy orientation has been developing that cuts across the existing specializations.” He went on to describe that “the policy orientation is focused upon the scientific study of policy.” While he noted that “the expression ‘policy sciences’ is not in general use in the United States”, he concludes by noting that this science will “improve the practice of democracy.” This is the social sciences applied to government and governing.

The point is not to trace in detail the evolution of the discipline but rather to note that it has a long and distinguished history in the academic literature. There should not be any doubt as to its seriousness or legitimacy.

Moreover, the evolution from administration to policy and on to public management can be traced alongside the evolution of government and its role in society. Allison (2008) notes that government accounted for 1% of GDP in the US until 1920, a value that had tripled by 1930. Over the next two decades it rose to 15%. And that is for the US!

The practice of government and administration professionalized in the US and shortly thereafter in Canada due to the remarkable growth in government spending after the war. In the US, the growth of military spending induced the Kennedy government (1961-1963) to take a more scientific approach to the analysis of government. Robert McNamara as Defence Secretary introduced planning, programming and budgeting systems and the Ford Foundation under McGeorge Bundy promoted professional training for prospective public servants. A key element in this growth was the shift from public administration to public policy, moving from how to what and why (Allison, 2008; Gow & Sutherland, 2004).

This growth of practice in the US was mirrored in institutional development. The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University opened in 1924. In 1930 Princeton established the School of Public and International Affairs, later to become the Woodrow Wilson School. The Harvard Kennedy School has been in operation under one name or another since 1936. (The establishment of the Kennedy School to commemorate President Kennedy, endowed by his family, took place in 1966). The Columbia School of International and Public Affairs was opened in 1946. The Goldman School of Public Policy at Berkeley was established in 1969. The University of Chicago’s Harris School of Public Policy was established in 1988. There is, indeed, a long history to the US schools of public administration and policy.

In Canada, the advent of the Trudeau Government in the 1960s and the Prime Minister's penchant for analysis and scientific policy discourse led to the growth of this professionalization in Canada (Geva-May & Maslove, 2006).

In response to the demand from governments for highly trained and creative officials, the universities focused on the production of sophisticated and competent PhDs and masters in the social sciences to be hired by governments (at least at the federal level and in some provinces, including Ontario). This gave a premium that might not otherwise have existed to public policy graduates. The universities had to adapt. Appendices A and B provide a bit of the history of Canadian schools and their evolution is detailed in the next section.

Finally, the professionalization of the discipline can be viewed through the evolution of the institutions of professional association. In 1939, the American Society of Administration broke off from the American Political Science Association to develop its own organization, journals and literature. This later became the Association for Public Policy and Management. The Council of Graduate Education in Public Administration began in the 1960s and was transformed into the National Association of Schools of Public Administration of America (NASPAA). This is now the professional body for American schools of public administration, which publishes the Journal of Public Affairs Education. Moreover, the NASPAA accredits the schools and "ensures excellence in education and training for public service" (www.naspaa.org). It benchmarks graduate schools and programs according to five essential domains against standards of clarity and verity in public disclosure and adequacy in achievement of learning objectives.

In Canada, the Institute of Public Administration Canada dates to 1947 and was created to conduct research, to liaise internationally and to provide professional development opportunities. In 1958 it established the journal Canadian Public Administration, which continues to be a reasonably serious, peer-reviewed scholarly journal. In 1990 IPAC also launched Public Sector Management as a professional magazine.

The Canadian Association of Programs in Public Administration (CAPP) was created from the Committee of Schools and Programs in Public Administration and the Association of Graduate Programs in Public Administration. These date to the early 1970s. CAPP's mission is to improve the quality of teaching and research in public administration but its most important function is to accredit programs in public administration. However, membership in CAPP is very difficult to discern from its website. Memberships have arguably declined from 35 programs in 2006-2007 to 28 in 2007-2008 and then only seven in 2008-2009 (www.cappa.ca). Its website notes nine member programs. In any case, if the accreditation process is to be of any use, the organization doing the accreditation has to be seen as credible by the students, the institutions and the employers of their graduates.

Public policy and public administration are well established and acknowledged disciplines in the social sciences, bringing together interdisciplinary study and application of the tools of, *inter alia*, economics and political science to the study of problems faced by society. The key to understanding this area is often the recognition of its interdisciplinary nature. While there are indeed doctorates awarded in public administration and policy studies (Carleton and Ryerson), institutions identify them as interdisciplinary in nature. There was a time when 'interdisciplinary' meant 'no discipline'. Now 'multidisciplinary' usually points to groupings of diverse scholars each deep in their discipline.

B. Ontario vs. Canada vs. Rest of the World

The sections above have dealt briefly with the United States and its intellectual leadership role in public administration education. However, it is worth noting the evolution of the discipline in Europe. Although it began in the economics and political science departments of universities, as in the US and Canada, we have

seen a particular focus on public administration in Western Europe in light of the larger roles of government. As one moves east, one observes increasing preponderance of legitimacy in the role of government as the rationale for studying public administration. The democratization and liberalization movements in Eastern Europe have resulted in an increasing emphasis on the role of government and thus on its efficiency. Therefore, public administration has seen a significant emergence in the last 25 years in Eastern Europe and moving into Central Europe, to such an extent that government in Estonia has essentially leapfrogged certain technologies of government and become the poster child for the IT revolution applied to government, public administration and the teaching of public administration.

In the UK, the study of the role of government and thus of public administration and public policy has always been slightly ahead in practice, although not necessarily in academic rigour. Moreover, the development of specified schools of public administration or government in the UK is a wholly recent phenomenon. Most have arisen in the past decade.

The growth of schools of public administration and public policy has similarly proceeded apace around the world. Singapore, Germany, France, the UK and hosts of other countries have had their universities develop professional schools of public administration. The École nationale d'administration and Sciences Po in France, Hertie School of Government in Berlin, Blavatnik School of Government at Oxford and Lee Kwan Yew School of Public Policy in Singapore are only examples of this development, the latter three having all been created in the last few decades. By contrast, the ÉNA has a long history dating back to 1945 and, until recently, trained over 90% of French presidents (www.ena.fr). The European Association for Public Administration Accreditation performs the quality control function, validating and certifying the programs for the 34 member institutions, ranging from Russia and Kazakhstan to Turkey, the Netherlands and Germany.

Studies of the growth of Canadian public administration programs have noted trends similar to Ontario's across the country. Geva-May and Maslove (2006) identify three models for the study of public administration. The first involves programs in departments of political science and sometimes in economics (i.e., Concordia, Manitoba and Laval). The second model includes those programs located in schools of business (i.e., York, Ottawa until the last decade). This has all but disappeared. There is an exception in the case of Queen's, where the separate School of Policy Studies has recently been moved to the business school for reporting as well as care and feeding, but is to retain its independence. And the new trend and third model includes a group of stand-alone schools of public administration (i.e., Simon Fraser, Glendon, Toronto, Ottawa and Dalhousie).

As one would expect, l'École nationale d'administration publique in Quebec is a special (perhaps 'distinct' or 'unique') case. It was founded in 1969 and is a dedicated graduate university with two campuses (in Montreal and Quebec City) entirely devoted to producing public administration specialists. It is technically one of ten universities in the Université du Québec system.

Moreover, the timing of the evolution of these schools across Canada has followed much the same schedule as in Ontario. While programs of the first model began in the 1960s and 1970s, they often evolved into the second or ultimately the third model as stand-alone schools. The Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, jointly at Regina/Saskatoon, Simon Fraser in Vancouver and Dalhousie in Halifax (School of Public Administration in the Faculty of Management) all now have stand-alone schools from their long traditions of specialization in administration typically in the political science department, with contributions from economics departments.

C. The Array of Public Policy Schools in Ontario

The following is a putative taxonomy of programs. It is based on an analysis of the interviews identified in Appendix C and the array of schools and programs identified in Appendix B. There are many dimensions distinguishing each of these programs and we will deal with several of them below. This is not a comprehensive list but rather represents the author's sense of the categories into which the programs fit.

One can look at the evolution of public policy schools according to different characteristics. Several schools have evolved from public administration to public policy, from programs housed within departments to stand-alone schools, and from afterthoughts to forethoughts.

Programs vary across several dimensions, such as their organization and status within the university (program, school or part thereof). They use different models of faculty status, with some being cross-appointed, others hired directly into the school and others still hybrids of both. Some focus on public administration while others focus on public policy. Some have a practical administrative focus while others focus on abstract policy thinking. They differ in duration at the master's level from 10 months to 20 months. Some permit joint degrees with programs of longer duration while others only allow MPAs or MPPs. Some institutions offer several graduate degrees across different schools within the institution. For example, York offers at least three graduate degrees in public administration (School of Public Policy and Administration MPPAL, Schulich Business MPA and Glendon GSPIA MPA). Some require internships, others offer them and some ignore them entirely. Some require and others offer major research papers or mini-theses, while others do not. Some give significant amounts of money to their students while others offer very little. Some have stepped up from the master's level to offer a PhD, while others have gone down to the undergraduate level to offer BAs with majors in public administration or public policy. Some programs emphasize an international perspective while others are only domestic. The following sections break these characteristics down into component parts.

1. Historical Development

Early public administration schools in Ontario included Ryerson Polytechnic and Carleton College. Both institutions went on to become important universities in Ontario but began in more humble circumstances. In both cases, the predecessor institutions broke new ground by exploring the education of prospective public sector employees. They each had a focus on the governments of proximity – Carleton on the federal government and Ryerson on Queen's Park and the City of Toronto. Continuing education and executive education were particularly important elements in their early years.

Upon becoming full-fledged degree-granting universities, they transformed their programs of public administration into departments and schools of public administration. Over the course of time they became intellectual and especially practical leaders in advancing the study and practice of public administration. It is no wonder that the administrations of both schools place importance of their public policy schools that is disproportionate to the actual size of the programs. As one senior administrator put it, "The public policy and administration program matters to the university. It is a flagship program. It is the embodiment of our mission."

2. Location

Carleton and the University of Ottawa market themselves as having access to officials in Ottawa. Queen's also plays on its links to former officials, as well as its former links to officials (O. D. Skelton et al.) (Granatstein, 1982). Ryerson and the University of Toronto build on their strengths of being in

downtown Toronto. The University of Waterloo hosts its program in a separate building off campus, which both isolates it from other students and influences but at the same time promotes a sense of community and belonging among the students. Western's master's in local government distinguishes itself by appealing to administrators of cities and towns of all sizes.

3. Parts of a Whole

Some programs have been built on the strengths of their universities. Toronto emphasizes its links to its public health, law, medical and engineering faculties. York emphasizes its links to its business and law schools. Glendon College at York and the University of Ottawa emphasize their bilingual nature by requiring students to take courses in both official languages. In each of these cases, the strengths of the university have led to the building of an interdisciplinary and robust program in public administration.

4. Filling Gaps

Other programs have tried to use public administration to fill gaps. The Schulich School of Business at York complements its programming for business with courses on public administration. When the York Faculty of Administration was converted into the School of Business, the public administration program stayed behind as a remnant. Students with specializations in public administration at Schulich can choose to leave with a MBA or a MPA. And while most of those students choose the MBA because of the labour market opportunities this signal attracts, every two or three years there is a student who chooses a MPA.

In the case of the University of Ottawa, the public administration program began in the Faculty of Administration and then continued as the Faculty of Management. It was then forced out by the requirements of the business school accreditation process and thus began the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs. This is not unlike the experience in several American universities whose public administration programs also evolved from their business or management schools. However, Queen's University's School of Policy Studies has retained its independence but reports to the dean of the business school instead of the provost or dean of arts and sciences. In each of these cases, the public administration program complements the other programs and fills gaps that might otherwise exist.

5. International Specialization

Both Glendon College and the University of Ottawa call their school the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs. However, by their own admission, 'international' may mean different things in each context. At Glendon, 'international' primarily denotes international comparative analysis, while at Ottawa, 'international' signals a specialty in international relations via the faculty itself and the Centre for International Policy Studies within the school. Other programs differ in their treatment of international relations in the curriculum. McMaster deliberately does not include it, while Toronto includes it in international development and international relations courses offered directly in and by the school, as well as electives available through the Munk School of Global Affairs.

The University of Waterloo builds on the strength of the Balsillie School of International Affairs (BSIA), which is a joint venture between Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier. While the program in public administration is based at Waterloo, students have access to courses at BSIA and may have instructors from Laurier. While students at Carleton benefit from having access to faculty from the Norman Patterson School of International Affairs and University of Toronto students from the Munk School of Global Affairs, the students at the University of Ottawa (and, to a lesser extent, Glendon College) benefit from having an

integrated public and international affairs program.

6. Internships

Some programs require for-credit internships (Toronto) and help their students find placements. Others offer internships (Ryerson) but do not require them. Yet others do not deal with practical experience (McMaster/Guelph). In the case of Ryerson, internships are not required but the university helps students find employment in the field for the summer. Similarly, at Glendon, many students are placed in real, for-credit jobs at Canadian missions abroad for the summer between their first and second year, but students can opt out of this by completing an extra course. In addition, some programs offer a co-op option (Waterloo, Ottawa), providing the student with an opportunity to fund their education while gaining significant on-the-job learning.

The coop nature of the program at Waterloo is an important distinguishing element. Students generally do not get scholarship money as they are expected to earn sufficient funds to cover tuition and living expenses during their placements. Moreover, the coop placement office at Waterloo is a finely tuned machine and helps students find positions after graduation.

7. Research Institutes

Several of the public administration schools are associated with research institutes or centres of policy. These are often based on faculty interest and expertise and provide an additional boost to academic offerings. For instance, the Mowat Centre for Policy Innovation is affiliated with the School of Public Policy and Governance at the University of Toronto, Queen's School of Policy Studies until recently included programs in industrial relations, and Glendon College has a Centre for Global Challenges. The Crossroads research program at the University of Ottawa is an attempt to focus the research efforts of several faculty members on a specific policy area for a period of a few years and then move on to a new coordinated policy and research challenge. Several interviewees noted that their public policy program offered additional attractions for drawing excellent faculty members to departments like economics, political science, international affairs and public health.

8. Breadth or Focus

Most of the schools emphasize that public administration requires an interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary program (Glendon, Toronto). Others focus their program in the political studies department (McMaster/Guelph, Waterloo). While the University of Waterloo bases its Master's of Public Service program in the political science department, it calls itself interdisciplinary despite the obvious foundation in political science. Some programs noted that the multidisciplinary nature of the program required a separate institutional form in order to deal with disciplinary rivalries. As a result, a school rather than just a program was deemed to be necessary (Ottawa). Moreover, a separate school could exercise more discretion in hiring practitioners, often as fellows, than a traditional disciplinary department.

9. Status of Faculty

Some programs or schools use adjunct faculty or sessional instructors. The proportion of each varies significantly from one program to the next. The institutional interviews reflected that, in some cases, the adjunct and sessional lecturers may take up to 60% of program teaching duties, while in others it is 20%.

Some schools expect an adjunct to be more integrated and involved in the school than a sessional

lecturer. Moreover, other schools appoint fellows, who may be current and/or former public servants, politicians, officers of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and other professionals (lawyers, consultants, journalists, etc.), to play these supplementary roles. Several programs also have visiting fellows, who are public servants on leave (Ottawa, Ryerson, Toronto).

The specialties of faculty members are important determinants of the focus of the program. Western University has at least four senior faculty members in its politics department who specialize in urban issues. This has led to their offering a MPA with a specialty in local government.

With respect to the issue of faculty tenure, the schools use one of three models, as illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Public Policy School Models

<u>Model</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Canadian Examples</u>
Harvard Kennedy School model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty hired directly into the school • Faculty tenure decisions made by school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Ottawa – Graduate School of Public and International Affairs • Glendon College – School of Public and International Affairs • Queen’s University – School of Policy Studies
Princeton Woodrow Wilson School model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty hired into separate departments and cross-appointed into school • Faculty decisions made by departments with input from the school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Toronto School of Public Policy and Governance
Hybrid of the two		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Toronto School of Public Policy and Governance

The GSPIA programs at both Glendon College and the University of Ottawa are modeled on the Kennedy School, with full-time faculty members hired in the school. Few faculty members from outside the school teach students in these programs, although students may take courses in other departments. McMaster bases its program around faculty from the politics departments at McMaster and Guelph. Toronto’s School of Public Policy and Governance is a hybrid based on the Princeton model but with several faculty members hired into the school directly, especially but not confined to

former practitioners (e.g., the author). The Queen's School of Policy Studies seems to be in transition from the Kennedy model to the Wilson model. The key issue is where the promotion and tenure decisions are made. In the Kennedy-style schools, the tenure decision has to be made among interdisciplinary faculty with a hard vocational edge among disciplinary peers. In the Wilson model, the tenure decision is made in the discipline department and the school provides input. There is no evidence that one is preferable to the other, although the interdisciplinary nature of a department could pose a problem in cases where a small number of faculty members is involved in tenure decisions (e.g., political scientists making tenure decisions for economists and judging the quality of their journal publications, and vice versa).

10. Competition or Rivalry?

The self-conceived rivalries among some public administration schools are also interesting. While the five Toronto-based programs all saw their geographical location in Toronto as an asset and a defining element of their programming, they did not see themselves as being in direct competition as much as one might expect. Each institution saw its program as sufficiently distinct and specialized that it was appealing to a different niche student. By contrast, because of their proximity to each other and to governments as well as their history, the University of Ottawa and Carleton saw themselves as rivals. Yet they try (with some degree of success) to distinguish themselves and their programs each from the other, as demonstrated by each program's branded tag-line. Ottawa is 'Canada's University' while Carleton is 'Canada's Capital University', with all their double entendre and ambiguity. While the international dimension might, in the eyes of some, distinguish the Ottawa GSPIA from the Carleton MA in Public Administration, the Norman Patterson School of International Affairs at Carleton is accessible to public administration students and is a rival of the Centre for International Policy Studies at GSPIA at Ottawa.

While these distinctions as viewed from within the administrations make each institution appealing to different niche students, it is unclear whether the students perceive these differences. Moreover, prospective employers and academics would be hard-pressed to understand the subtle differences between the schools.

11. Internal Reporting Relationships

One should also consider to whom the head of program reports. The accountability regime is important in determining the program's degree of autonomy and potentially its degree of specialization and focus. In some cases, it reports to a dean of faculty (arts and sciences, Toronto, Queen's (but that is changing); business, Schulich; arts, Ryerson; public affairs, Carleton; principal, Glendon; and graduate studies, all), in others to a department head (Waterloo, Western, McMaster). In the case of Queen's the School of Policy Studies has retained its independence but now reports to the dean of business where it used to report to the dean of arts and sciences and the provost.

The University of Waterloo's program, based in the political science department, exemplifies a challenge some schools face if they are to remain interdisciplinary. The director of the program reports to the chair of the political science department. While the institution characterizes the program as multidisciplinary, with courses offered by the economics department, it acknowledges that if a future director of the program were to be appointed from the economics department, it is not clear what would happen in terms of accountability. On the other hand the McMaster program is explicitly and deliberately based in the political science department and makes little pretense of being interdisciplinary.

When the reporting goes outside the normal departmental structure, the program seems to have a higher likelihood of being interdisciplinary and mobilizing the assets of the university. For instance, the Ottawa/Carleton rivalry on international affairs noted above has CIPS inside the school at Ottawa, while NPSIA is separate from the program at Carleton. In the case of the University of Toronto, the administration suggests that the Dalla Lana School of Public Health and the School of Public Policy and Governance can work together as separate institutions more easily than they could had they been in separate departments or, even worse, in separate faculties.

12. Policy vs. Administration

Some of the programs have a clear focus on public administration, with only a soupçon of public policy (York). Others focus on public policy with a hint of public administration (Toronto). Yet others purport to be specialists in both (Ryerson offers a MA in public policy and administration).

When presented with the question of why they chose to offer a MPP or why a MPA, it was clear that the MPP schools, which were created more recently, thought that they offered more of an emphasis on policy and quantitative analysis and less on the operations of government (Glendon, Toronto). But some of the MPA-granting institutions could easily explain why they offered MPAs (e.g., Queen's) based on historical practice and built up value of their degree. Some of the MPA-granting institutions saw their degrees as targeting a more practice-oriented student – often mid-career students (Western) – and taught more about the operations of large institutions.

Some programs have maintained their emphasis on the study of public administration as opposed to public policy. These programs emphasize more practical elements of administration like program delivery, human resource management, accounting and financial management (York's MPPAL, Ryerson). Others focus more closely on public policy, discussing processes of decision-making, public engagement, economics and policy analysis (Toronto, Ottawa). To a greater or lesser degree all other programs are essentially a hybrid of these two approaches (Queen's, Western, Carleton, Ryerson).

U.S. studies of the differences in both the curricula of the programs and students going into MPA and MPP programs showed modest differences (Infeld & Adams, 2011; DeSoto et al., 1999), with the primary differences as noted above. And, like the Canadian context, some of the program choices and titles were inexplicable.

13. Administration and Policy or Government

The University of Ottawa has indicated publicly its intention to move towards the creation of a school of government, as has Western. Even if both institutions were to do so, their preliminary conceptions seem to be quite different, with Western's being grounded less on the practice of politics than Ottawa's might be and more on sub-national levels of government. The notion of a school of government could broaden the scope of the existing programs to look at political, policy, administrative and institutional elements of government from many different perspectives, including those of NGOs, business, advisors and politicians. Or it could narrow the focus away from the policy interests of the private sector or NGOs as prospective hirers of their graduates. In the US, the Harvard Kennedy School of Government has not suffered from this problem because of its size and its offering of different streams. Care would have to be taken to make the streams clear and not to induce an adverse reaction among potential employers. Moreover, distinctions could be made among degrees within these schools, distinguishing MPAs from MPPs from political management from NGO or philanthropic management and from Aboriginal

government management.

14. Curriculum

While a detailed analysis and comparison of curricula across programs is not feasible here, some broad conclusions can still be drawn by referring to Appendix B. It is surprising how distinct the core curriculum is across programs. A brief review of core curriculum is warranted to understand the differences.

In this regard, the table is helpful, the interviews insightful, but the Atlas of Public Policy and Management provides evidence (portal.publicpolicy.utoronto.ca). The Atlas deconstructs the concepts, subjects and courses of public administration. It then looks at the core curriculum and makes some comparisons (Clark & Pal, 2013). The core should be somewhat consistent across programs and, by and large, based on a cursory review, it is. However, it is instructive to note the differences.

Some of the programs require a course in ethics and values (York's MPPAL, Toronto, Ottawa, Waterloo), while others offer them as electives (Glendon). Similarly, some make international affairs a core course (Ottawa, Carleton).

Some programs are proud to emphasize economics as a strong part of their core curriculum and program (Toronto, Carleton), while others are proud that they do not require economics as part of their programming (McMaster). The University of Waterloo does not require economics even though it specializes in government finance. The University of Toronto emphasizes graduate-level microeconomics and macroeconomics as required core courses and thus offers a math 'boot camp' in the summer before the first year to help students prepare for the relatively rigorous requirements of the course.

Similarly, some programs emphasize quantitative methods (Toronto, Carleton) while others offer them as electives or not at all (Waterloo). Others emphasize decision sciences and decision processes. Some emphasize rigour of analysis while others emphasize knowledge of process. Some focus on conceptual skills, leaving knowledge to on-the-job training and experience, while others focus on preparing graduates to hit the ground running with specific knowledge of how government works.

Some programs offer particular specializations, like indigenous policy and administration at Carleton and indigenous policy and governance at Queen's PMPIA, which is presented jointly with Tyendinaga's First Nations Technical Institute. The University of Ottawa offers collaborative programs in women's studies and in environmental sustainability. Carleton offers a specialization in philanthropy and non-profit leadership (MPNL). The degrees offered should be indicative of the skills acquired.

There is also a panoply of sub-specializations available. At Carleton, there is a field of specialization in public management and another in innovation, science and environment. Several programs have sub-specializations in not-for-profit management or in NGO management (Carleton). Still others offer international development as a specialization (Carleton).

Many of the programs use a capstone course to draw together the previous up to five terms of learning (Toronto, Ottawa), while most do not. On the other hand, a faculty-supervised major research paper (MRP) is often used to draw together the learnings of the program. Some, like the University of Toronto, do not offer a major research paper as an option (although special requests for them are often accommodated), while Ottawa makes it clear that a MRP is required. York's MPPAL offers a supervised

MRP option. Some others also offer the option of a major research paper (Ryerson, Glendon, Carleton) or thesis (Ryerson). The MRP typically substitutes for a course requirement and is used to test the student's research, thinking and presentation skills.

While all students seem to want 'tricks of the trade', the program designers aspire to instill critical thinking in their graduates.

15. Degrees Granted

The degree granted can sometimes be confusing. As noted, Queen's grants an MPA but calls itself the School of Policy Studies. Ryerson characterizes its degree as a Master's of Public Policy and Administration but it is taught in the Department of Politics and Public Administration. Carleton grants a Master's of Arts in Public Administration, though the institution also offers a Master's in Political Management that is not related to the public policy and administration department.

York's Master's of Public Policy, Administration and Law allows a designation in law because of the courses taught by faculty from Osgoode Hall Law School, but it is not a law degree. In comparison, the University of Toronto offers a joint MPP/JD program offered by the Faculty of Law and the School of Public Policy and Governance. The two degrees can be completed in four years.

Western University offers a unique MPA program in local government. This is a program that has both administration and government. This is one of those cases where the university built on the strength of the faculty who happened to have developed some considerable capacity on urban issues and turned it into a focus of their MPA program.

Some might argue that the alphabet soup of MPP, MPA, MPPAL, MPS, MA, MPA, MPNL, MA LG, MA PPA and MA PA (Toronto, Queen's, York, Waterloo, McMaster, Glendon, Carleton, Western, Carleton, Ryerson, respectively) only leads to confusion.

The NASPAA website identifies eight different master's degrees in public administration or public policy, and we have at least that many here. But the differentiation offers choice. Prospective students and employers should not be duped by the letters of the degree – if the curricula, program and learnings are made clear and transparent.

16. Program Length

Differences in program length can be considerable, with Queen's School of Policy Studies offering the shortest policy degree at 10 months. Indeed, it has apparently always been that short. Queen's also offers a part-time PMPA over two years. While the common core program can be included in a 10-month graduate degree, it is clear that the 20-month degree from other schools provides a significant amount of further preparation, both in terms of practical experience (internships in some cases) and further course electives and requirements. As noted, Queen's and the University of Toronto both offer a joint JD and MPA over four years.

The question of adequate training for a professional degree in public administration offers no absolute answers. Good arguments can be made for both 10-month and 20-month programs. If a master's in economics or political science can be completed in eight months, a 10- to 20-month professional degree like a MPA or MPPA is justified. Arguably, the longer the better.

III. Public Policy on Public Policy Schools:

The section above has discussed the different dimensions of the public policy programs in Ontario universities. The similarities and differences have been described and, in some cases, the value of the differences identified. The sections that follow address the question of what Ontario might contemplate including in a public policy on public policy schools.

A. What would a public policy on public policy schools look like?

If Ontario were looking for a public policy on public policy schools, it would have to answer a few normative questions. To whom should the policy be directed? By whom should it be designed? Is it desirable for there to be variety and differentiation among such programs? How common and consistent should the different programs be? How evident, clear and transparent should differences be? How much discretion should be available to the student to design their own program? How would we ultimately measure the success of such a policy?

With regards to the success of the policy we would want to have indicators of where students came from (their undergraduate degree and university) and where they went after graduating with their master's. And we would ultimately want to know where they ended up through their life course (income, socioeconomic status, children's income, etc.). What was the value to their career and their personal contribution to Ontario after having studied at an Ontario university and did they use their learnings in their subsequent life? Presumably we would want the marginal value of their education (to themselves and to Ontario) to be equal to the marginal cost of their education (their own and that contributed by the province and the university).

To maximize the prospect of value to their education, it would be important for students to know how each of the programs differ in terms of their core curriculum, their electives, the quality of faculty, the quality of their fellow students and the value of placement after graduation. Presumably these would be evident from the material published in brochures and in mailings from the graduate schools. In particular, it is important that this information be available on the university and program websites. Ideally, the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU), HEQCO or the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) would provide comparisons on their website by linking program data, similarities and differences. Moreover, it would be important to have standard measures across schools so that prospective students could make the comparison, evaluation and judgment themselves. And the core curriculum would be validated by some outside authority as being adequate and sufficient.

In addition, it would be necessary to explore whether the increasingly common option of undergraduate majors in public policy will have an effect on master's-level programs. Are these programs at the undergraduate level going to be complements or substitutes for graduate-level degrees? The answer is not obvious. It may be that the proliferation of undergraduate education in public policy will increase the hireability of graduates and make the marginal value of a graduate degree that much less valuable. On the other hand, and far more likely, it will signal an increasing interest in master's of public policy programs on the part of both undergraduate majors in public policy as well as graduates of economics and political science, among other undergraduate disciplines.

To take this out of the normative and working back from the above, one could design a model of graduate education in public administration that takes the derived demand for policy analysts, political staffers, politicians, administrators and the like as it comes from government bureaucracies, political parties, NGOs and corporations and marries it to the production function of a graduate in public policy. In finding the

equilibrium and then considering dynamic adjustments over time, as well as the determinants of each, one could determine the optimal policy on policy schools. Identifying the policy instruments that could affect this market by influencing those determinants would then give policy makers the opportunity to design interventions to optimize social welfare. Such a policy process requires good data and evidence. This would begin with more information on where graduates go and what employers of MPAs want. Consultations with stakeholders (a broad and diverse array of prospective employers) would be a worthwhile exercise to fill in the evidentiary gaps if one wanted to build such a policy.

These steps are not taken here. Rather, this section presents a heuristic analysis of the market and derives insights from the interviews and the literature to examine the issues below as determinants of the optimization calculus identified above.

B. For Whom?

The first question to address for policy makers would be for whom is this policy being designed. For and to whom are these programs in public administration being offered? Unfortunately the data on this are haphazard, anecdotal and not collected systematically.

It seems from the interviews that people who major in political science or economics and want to go to graduate school tend to specialize further by doing graduate studies in those disciplines. In programs like McMaster/Guelph's there is a tendency to attract only students from political science, but this is an anomaly. Most other programs attract students from a wide array of backgrounds. Moreover, public policy tends to attract people who may already have a graduate degree in another discipline. So, at the University of Toronto, we find that about 20% of the incoming students have a master's or another graduate or professional degree in a field like law, medicine, biology or urban planning. At the University of Toronto, only 20 to 50% of incoming students enter with majors in political science or economics. While this is confirmed anecdotally for other institutions from some of the interviews, it is not corroborated for others. The evidence is sporadic at best.

When looking at the demand for such programs it is instructive to review the queue for places in the programs. The only program in which applications were sporadic was the Schulich School's MPA program; all the others experienced consistent and to some extent growing numbers of applications. Toronto, Ryerson, York's MPPAL and Ottawa's program all had ratios of applications to places on the order of eight or ten to one. And no program described any concern about quality of applicants or numbers in the interviews. Most of the applicants to these programs were from Ontario. In some cases (i.e., Queen's, Toronto, Ottawa), the programs were attracting students from across Canada. Most of the programs identified one or two students from abroad each year but to date none of the schools were attracting significant numbers of international students.

One could make the case that if the diversity and quality of students is part of what makes the experience rewarding, then more international students would improve the quality of student outcomes. This is largely going to be driven by funding formulae and flexibilities from MTCU and other sources.

In addition, one must note that to some extent public administration is a program of abstraction with universal appeal and to some extent it is particular to the politics, culture and institutions of a given country like Canada. The exchange students at the University of Toronto from Hertie in Berlin and those Toronto students studying for a term at Sciences Po in Paris learn much about the abstractions of public policy. However, they also learn about the particulars of Canadian or French policy, administration and politics.

Many of the students have extensive work experience. However, in some programs (McMaster/Guelph), almost all the students come directly from undergraduate degree programs. In others (i.e., Toronto, Western, Queen's) many of the students have returned for this master's degree after having worked in Canada or abroad, in government, NGOs or in the private sector. This provides an enriching experience for the other students who may have come directly from their undergraduate degree.

Many of the students draw on their life experience in dealing with public policy issues in the programs. For instance, each year several students at the University of Toronto are parents and are using public services that make them wiser and more experienced in their analyses of public policy issues, further enriching the experience of their colleagues.

When considering for whom public policy programs are designed, one must consider the ultimate employers of these graduates. To the extent that public policy is an area of academic and intellectual endeavour, the students themselves are the clients and this may be sufficient to justify the programs' existence. However, to the extent to which these are professional programs, the natural place to start in considering demand is within government bureaucracy. Most of the University of Toronto's graduates get jobs in the Ontario Public Service (OPS), other provincial bureaucracies, municipal governments and the federal government. One or two students secure jobs abroad each year. Similarly, Ryerson's graduates largely get jobs in the OPS, in Toronto and in the surrounding municipalities. And Glendon's GSPIA prides itself in placing many of its graduates in the OPS and other provincial public services.

The former Secretary to Cabinet in the OPS has commented that the existence of public policy schools is good for the professionalization of the service and had become an increasing source of hiring. It is unclear to what extent graduates of the various programs across the province are substitutable in the eyes of other employers.

Each year, new hires in the federal service include many policy school graduates. Indeed, several of these new hires (e.g., a few University of Toronto grads) get into what have been called the 'elite recruitment programs' like the Accelerated Economist Training Program and Recruitment of Policy Leaders.

Similarly, large private-sector corporations have increasingly been hiring graduates of public policy programs. While some get hired in business/government relations positions and succeed in their jobs, this is not necessarily their best use nor is it what they have been specially trained to do. MBAs tend to take courses in business/government relations, while MPAs tend not to be prepared for such jobs. Rather, MPAs often get applied to public policy jobs as opposed to business/government relations jobs. For instance, Ed Clark, a former deputy minister in the federal government and former president of TD Financial Group, has said that TD may sometimes hire policy graduates for its business/government relations departments but that they are usually recruited to complete policy research with TD Economics rather than to represent the bank to government. Similar stories have been heard from other regulated financial institutions. Having policy-savvy graduates working in the private sector can improve business' understanding of government policy- and decision-making.

According to those interviewed, more and more policy graduates are getting hired by NGOs. Whether it is Care Canada, the Canadian Association of Retired Persons or international NGOs like the International Red Cross, CUSO International or Plan International, these graduates are finding positions in program delivery and in policy and program analysis.

Graduates are also increasingly going to work for ministers' offices in both the provincial and federal governments. Many of the incoming students have their sights set on elected office and want to apply their learnings to politics. Ontario Premier Kathleen Wynne has MPPs in her office, as do several of her ministers.

Greg Selinger, Premier of Manitoba, is himself a graduate of Queen's School of Policy Studies. So is Karen Stintz, former Toronto city councillor and former mayoral candidate. Many interviewees anticipated that, given the interests and predilections of these students and graduates, more and more of them will go into politics. Having politicians trained in policy is not a bad thing and is consistent with the long tradition of professionalization in France.

Finally, one has to take into account university administrators and their motivation and incentives to create, run and expand programs. Depending on the funding models used by MTCU, it might be in the interest of university administrators (provosts and presidents) to add policy programs and/or schools. Moreover, in considering strategically the panoply of programs offered by a university, there may be an incentive to ensure that the university is offering the full range. This may also occur with other professional programs like medicine, law or engineering. University administrators seem to want to ensure that their institution has a full-service offering. In one case the administrator felt that the university had a 'duty' to play a world-class role in society on public policy.

Moreover, the administrator may well want to build on the diverse strengths of the university to position it strategically within the sector and it is often an easy add-on to do public policy based on the strengths of the university in law, public health, business, etc. In some cases, the president or provost saw such programs not so much building on existing strengths as filling gaps in programming. Sometimes the administrator saw creating or expanding such a program as a vehicle to position the university for the future in an area of growing academic or labour market expansion. Once again, many interviews disclosed some measure of each of these strategies.

To design a public policy on public policy schools one has to decide for whom such a set of programs is offered. The demand for policy graduates is revealed anecdotally to come from governments, political parties, NGOs and the private sector. Moreover, the demand from graduating undergraduates to enter these master's programs similarly justifies their existence.

C. By Whom?

This question may seem obvious to some, in that the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities should be responsible for setting such policy. Nevertheless, we need to think through exactly who should be doing this.

We could imagine not having a policy at all. As far as one can tell, there are no jurisdictions with explicit policies on whether to allow the creation of new public administration programs. There is no crisis in public policy education in Ontario. One could leave each university to define its own program, let them develop willy-nilly and let the market of students decide whether the range of offerings and the quality of programs are adequate. If there is no demand for a program, then it will not exist. If a program can be seen as a vehicle for expansion and funding, then it will be expanded. If the model described in the previous section has any merit, it is credible to let the market work without MTCU interference. Besides, this is how the area has functioned for many decades now.

Alternatively, one could recognize the need for such a policy but leave its creation to the Council of Ontario Universities. As a largely self-regulating organization, it could coordinate, promote collaboration and induce its members to devise and comply with such a policy. This already happens to some extent through the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS). The OCGS has functioned as a council of deans of graduate schools assembled under the auspices of COU that strives to ensure quality graduate education and research across Ontario. The quality assurance role has now been devolved to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (OUCQA), which has established a quality assurance framework and requested that each

university establish an institutional quality assurance process. Within the OUCQA there is an appraisal committee and an audit committee to implement the quality assurance program. The OUCQA has a purview so broad that it is unlikely to bring particular subject matter expertise on graduate programs in public policy to bear on the assessments.

Of course, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) could also carry out similar functions. However, it has never purported to play an accreditation role.

The Canadian Association of Programs in Public Administration (CAPPA), by contrast, has a clear focus on public administration programs at the university level and has the benefit of being pan-Canadian. Its accreditation program provides consistent, pre-determined standards against which to measure quality. Accreditation, of course, is merely to measure programs against a minimum standard and does not require grading or ranking the quality of programs. No accreditation program is lauded unanimously by all but, on balance, this is an accreditation service that is highly respected by university administrators and program directors. The interviews produced one critique of a CAPPA assessment related to the problems of placing policy graduates, but it was in a year when the OPS had stopped hiring. Some administrators noted that accreditation added little to their ability to attract good students.

The natural place to position responsibility for designing and delivering a policy on public policy schools would be MTCU. The policy could simply include the articulation of a minimum core curriculum. The MTCU could encourage compliance with standards of duration and rigour. It could impose requirements for accreditation by others like CAPPA or OUCQA.

Several degrees of coercion could be employed to implement such a policy. Compliance could be required to receive funding or degree-granting authority. It could be a model for application. It could be a suggestion. The legislation already creates the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB) to advise the Minister on degree-granting. However, within the degrees permitted, there is significant scope for discretion on specializations.

While the willy-nilly policy approach has its appeal, in light of the opaqueness of program descriptions, the possibility of confusion among prospective students and employers, and the possibility of unnecessary duplication, a more demanding role for MTCU in authorizing programs in public policy may well make sense.

D. Differentiation

As can be seen from the discussion above, a wide array of programs exists. While the differences may appear slight to the uninitiated, in my experience they are actually quite significant to the practitioners hiring and to the people doing policy analysis. Interestingly, each program director began their interview by explaining how their program was unique.

In some cases, the specializations are clear from the program name or degree title. In others, they may be exposed on the program website. However, too often they are obscurely referenced and sometimes inadequately manifest. Some clarity to the terminology and to the titles of the degrees and programs and to their specializations would be useful to prospective entering students.

The differences in curricula, degree and emphasis of the Ontario programs mirror the differences outlined in the U.S. and Canadian studies of policy programs (Geva-May & Maslove, 2006; Gow & Sutherland, 2004; Infeld & Adams, 2011). MPAs tend to focus on practice and management. MPPs tend to emphasize policy analysis and quantitative methods. The NASPAA in the US describes the differences in detail, though one

can find many examples in which the MPA and MPP programs do not conform to the definitions offered.

Internships are another way for programs to distinguish themselves. The University of Toronto requires an internship and Glendon College recommends one and helps students find it. In the absence of an internship, increased course requirements are sometimes requested to compensate.

As noted above, some programs differentiate themselves by offering students the opportunity to do a major research paper instead of a course requirement and use the MRP to tie together the learnings of the program.

Size matters. The numbers of students will contribute to determining the number of faculty members affiliated with the program. The greater the number of faculty members, the easier specialization and thus differentiation becomes. Western University's focus on local government results from the fact that four of the senior faculty members in the political science department belong to the program and their research interests and renown have made it a centre of excellence on municipal issues. Similarly, the growth of the University of Toronto's program has allowed the administration to involve more faculty members from other faculties, schools and departments.

York's MPPAL has grown to a size that allows it play a significant role in the Faculty of Graduate Studies, but the Schulich School of Business program leading to an MPA remains so small that it does not allow for diversification of faculty members. While the program possesses a tremendous skill set with the two faculty members involved, this size does not allow for much diversification. On the other hand, being in a large, diversified, urban university, York's Schulich can mobilize first-class faculty members from the business program to teach accounting, economics, finance and operations management in the MPA program.

International exchanges are another important distinguishing feature for some programs. Glendon College offers a double master's with the University of Strasbourg. The University of Toronto offers a one-term exchange with the Lee Kwan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore, Hertie School of Governance in Berlin or Sciences Po in Paris.

Finally, programs differ on the basis of the funding they provide to students. In some cases, no scholarship money is offered as the coop program allows students to earn money for school (Waterloo). In others, a university may offer as little as \$1,000 to each student, while in others still the student gets up to \$16,000 plus tuition. Within each of these universities student funding may vary by as much as \$10,000 to \$12,000. This can have a significant effect on students' choice of program. As noted above, the role of internships in funding also differs by program.

MTCU has enunciated a draft policy on differentiation (Ontario MTCU, 2013). The policy framework addresses several components, including access, quality research and education, fiscal sustainability and pathways for students. As MTCU notes:

The government has opted for differentiation as a primary policy driver for the system. Our overriding goal is to build on and help focus the well-established strengths of institutions, enable them to operate together as complementary parts of a whole, and give students affordable access to the full continuum of vocational and academic educational opportunities that are required to prosper in our contemporary world.

The variety and differentiation proposed in this paper is consistent with MTCU's draft policy. The system proposed here would benefit from specializations and differentiations, transparently exposed and divulged, and enforced by authorizations from MTCU.

E. Promoting Differences

It is to the advantage of prospective students to have many policy degree options available to them, each with their own degree of specialization. This variety offers students the chance to explore their interests and to engage in serious academic discourse related to them. Moreover, it allows universities to exploit their different strengths.

From the perspective of prospective employers it is desirable to have specializations from which to choose students with a wide array of different talents.

However, for this differentiation to be effective for both students and employers, the information costs of uncovering and understanding the differences should be low and the distinctions clear. As will be seen below, to some extent, neither is currently the case.

F. Disclosing Differences

After word-of-mouth, websites are the primary instrument that prospective students use to determine their desired program. Websites are notoriously opaque and sometimes haphazardly structured. Many programs sound the same even when their differences are significant. Moreover, websites quickly become outdated and require continuous management and updating.

In some cases, of course, the differences are clearly spelled out. Western's local government MPA is unique and the special nature of the teachings comes out clearly from examining the website. Similarly, the emphasis on financial management and legal issues comes through on the York MPPAL site. But it seems that most of the schools' websites neither distinguish administration from policy nor disclose the differences among the programs.

Nevertheless, Queen's, with the only 10-month MPA, makes the distinct duration of its program clear.

G. Where do Graduates go?

Anecdotal evidence suggests that students are placed in a wide array of jobs, from government bureaucracy to politics, NGOs and the private sector. Unfortunately there is no comprehensive or even defensible survey of graduates on which to base an answer to this question. Some programs collect data and have specific information on their own grads.

Unfortunately, the above information is based on general answers from interviewees and anecdotes of who went where. A systematic review of placement would be a very desirable area for further work. It would be useful to develop evidence to help administrators design programs and faculty to teach courses.

However, if the ratio of applications to places and the number of applications is any indication, there is an unfulfilled demand for graduate education in public administration. If the anecdotal evidence of demand from employers is any indication, then the graduates are not having difficulty finding quality jobs in most years.

H. The Optimal Constellation of Schools

It would be presumptuous for this paper to define what an optimal constellation of programs across the array of public administration and public policy schools might look like. However, it may be useful to lay out a possible ideal.

There would be a whole array of programs. These would include programs based on the practical knowledge of how large organizations work, how decisions are made and how organizations function. It would include programs based on courses of abstract, conceptual, theoretical design on what the role of the state might be and ought to be. It would include courses on how abstract analytic approaches to economics and politics can help elucidate the problems of society. It would have programs specializing on different levels of government and some programs with a focus on the third sector and others with focus on private sector and public policy. There would be some programs emphasizing quantitative methods and others on qualitative analysis. Some programs would offer joint degrees of MPA/MPP and Master of Arts or Sciences in environment, aboriginal organizations, law, social work and public health, along with other specializations within public administration or public policy.

To some degree, this is what we have now. As a result of the proliferation of public policy schools, Ontario is blessed with an array of public policy programs that may be sorted along these dimensions. The problems seem not be related to the constellation of programs offered. Rather, the problems seem to be much more about making the distinctions clear and divulging and emphasizing the differences. If we want prospective students and prospective employers to understand the products being sold, we should expect more clarity and more openness on websites.

IV. Conclusions

The noted proliferation of public policy schools raises a number of questions. Is this proliferation desirable or should policy study be concentrated within a smaller number of institutions? Are the differences between programs evident to both students and prospective employers? Notwithstanding the differences, are there consistencies in programming that should be emphasized? How should we maintain standards for the variety of programs? Once endorsed, is this proliferation good for all time in some steady state?

The differences in program and curriculum emphasis are a good thing if they are clear to both prospective students and prospective employers. The differences in Ontario university public policy programs are subtle but significant. They need to be elaborated and emphasized. The degrees should be indicative of these differences. There should not be uncontrolled duplication. MTCU should authorize changes in the constellation of programs.

A. Proliferation can be a good thing

This proliferation can be either good or bad. If it results in the availability of cloned programs with no differences, then why not have centres of excellence based at a few universities? But if differences exist along several key dimensions, then the proliferation can be a good thing. Moreover, if the field is growing, with employers searching for more trained public administration or public policy experts, then proliferation can indeed be a good thing.

The growth in the numbers of students engaged in learning public policy and the fact that they find internships and employment at reasonable salaries are strong indications of the adequate capacity of the system. Based on the interviews and given the apparently high placement rates of graduates, there has been no indication that there is an excess of supply of MPA grads.

With the differences across programs there is no indication that a concentration of programming in a few centres of excellence would improve output. Rather, the experimentation in program design and the continuing evolution of the discipline would argue for more, not fewer, schools and programs.

Thus, proliferation can be a good thing.

B. Differentiation makes the Ontario offerings useful

While subtle and sometimes small, the differences between public policy programs are significant. Ontario students have choice and choice is a good thing. They can choose to emphasize public administration and focus on delivery, organization, process and decision-making, or they can focus on public policy with an emphasis on health, law, quantitative analysis, political processes or economic analysis.

Differences in program length, design, subject matter specialization and work experience all offer Ontario students a rich array of varied programs to choose from. They mirror some of the best programs in American and European universities.

Moreover, employers can develop deep knowledge of the differences in program quality for their needs and areas of interest, although in some cases a single manager hires sporadically and infrequently and thus does not build up these insights. However, some employers that hire MPAs or MPPs regularly, like governments, will develop an understanding of these differences over time and the market will work better for that information. Employers who dabble in the market infrequently, however, will often find the differences confusing and the websites of the programs opaque.

Even the differences among the various degrees would seem to be a good thing for Ontarians. The MPP emphasizes a policy-oriented degree and the MPA focuses on administration. Easy. However, the best distinction among these is found on the NASPAA website, which juxtaposes the two degrees as having a focus on quantitative methods and evaluation policy process in the MPP and management, institutions and implementation for the MPA. These distinctions blur in the programs offered in Ontario. MPAs tend to emphasize financial management while MPPs tend to emphasize economics. But even this is obscured in some program information.

Some might argue that the alphabet soup of MPP, MPA, MPPAL, MPS, MA, MPIA, MPNL, MA LG, MA PPA, and MA PA (Toronto, Queen's, York, Waterloo, McMaster, Glendon, Carleton, Western, Carleton and Ryerson, respectively) leads to confusion. While it might seem confusing to have so many different degrees essentially covering similar essential learnings, the differences are themselves important and allowing the institutions to distinguish themselves by the nature of the degree granted is valuable.

Thus, differentiation makes the Ontario offerings useful.

C. Differences should be promoted

Given that different employers are searching for particular skill sets, it is desirable for different programs to emphasize different learnings. Moreover, it is desirable to have these differences made clear. The programs and schools should promote the points of convergence and divergence among them. Organizations like IPAC, COU, CAPP and MTCU should explicate the differences and promote a common terminological and conceptual understanding of the various strengths and weaknesses of each program. Moreover, employer groups can play a role in promoting these differences as well.

Thus, differences should be promoted.

D. Differences should be transparently disclosed

At present, one of the greatest problems is the opacity of program websites. cursory review of the websites shows most programs extolling their virtues using similar if not the same words, phrases and concepts.

Neither students nor employers will be able to understand the differences between MPS, MPPAL and a joint MPP-JD program. All programs might be able to say that they aim “to equip students with the knowledge, skills and experience to effectively design and implement policies and deliver services to Canadians, at all levels of government” or that they offer a program that is “highly interdisciplinary, bridging the spheres of domestic policy and international or global policy,” “a solid preparation for leadership positions within governmental organizations at the federal, provincial, and local levels; non-governmental organizations; public affairs journalism; and business-government relations.” Or a program that “through the core and elective courses, strengthens the analytical and conceptual skills that address the political, economic, organizational, and normative aspects of public policy issues.” Or where the program objective is to “provide students with leading-edge theoretical and conceptual knowledge to enable them to understand and analyze public administration, as well as equipping them with the know-how and skills necessary for success in a constantly changing organizational environment.” Or where the program is a “multi-disciplinary MPA program focused on policy analysis, development and implementation, preparing new and experienced professionals for careers in the public and non-profit sectors” (Waterloo, Toronto, Glendon, Carleton, Ottawa and Queen’s, respectively).

For some of the websites, the specialization and focus of the program is quite well articulated. The deeper the specialization, the more likely this is to be the case. For the York MPPAL, there is a clear emphasis on management, law and social justice. For the Western MPA in local government the website is quite clear that it is focused on select job markets, with an emphasis on municipal government issues.

Some of the programs vaunt the accreditation they have received from OCGS and CAPP (Ryerson). Others ignore their rating (Carleton). There should be some standard of disclosure so that both students and employers can choose among the different programs with an understanding of what those differences are.

Thus differences should be transparently disclosed.

E. There should be a standard for core learnings

The issue of core curriculum is much discussed in the literature. The following is not a comprehensive review of core curricula but merely a treetop discussion of what a core might look like. Typically, a core curriculum, whether delivered in dedicated courses or blended into other courses, would cover the following topics: the role of the state, governance and institutions, research methods, concepts in public administration, concepts in public policy, macroeconomics, microeconomics, public management, policy process and ethics.

Each program contains a variation of these themes. Some require ethics and moral behaviour courses. Others require a more general economics course that focuses on public policy or, in some cases, no economics at all. Some require quantitative methods and others do not.

Setting the curriculum is clearly the role of the director of the program or school. It is this person who sees all the moving parts and understands where the various competencies might be acquired across the array of courses and extracurricular activities. The director plays an important role in integrating the elements of the program. As one interviewee put it, the director is the motivator-in-chief of the faculty and the students. In another’s eyes, the director of a school has the most complicated role because it requires managing up to deans and provosts and out to department chairs and the directors of other schools.

It would be much more reasonable to break down the desired learnings for an ideal program and thus regroup them in baskets of competencies that should be inherent in a teaching program. Clark and Pal have done this to some extent in their paper for CAPP (Clark & Pal, 2011) and in the Atlas (Clark & Pal, 2013). There is no consistent view among administrators as to the composition of an essential core. Rather, as noted above, some require students to complete variations on such core courses and others do not.

When considering program length, it is clear that any university would have difficulty altering the time taken to get a master's degree. The established base of graduates, all of whom have been trading on their degree from Queen's or wherever, would have a keen interest in the maintenance of the credibility of the degree. To change the time taken would imply two tiers of degrees, the old and the new. This is not desirable.

Moreover, MAs in economics and political science typically last one year and the comparability with an MPA is not unreasonable to maintain. As the standard shifts and other universities continue to offer two-year policy degrees, the pressure will mount on Queen's to follow suit and change. The key question is whether the prospective students and employers will be duped into not understanding the difference. There is no evidence that this is or will be the case, although some competitor institutions did critique Queen's for its ten-month program. The adequacy of the program's length will be addressed indirectly if there is to be a standard of core learnings covered and a commonality in standard of degree obtained.

There should be a standard for core learnings in all programs.

F. There should be accreditation for granting policy degrees

Of course, Ontario universities set their own curriculum and standards of performance. Each university has its own affirmation process for establishing a new program and for establishing standards for their teaching, marking, curriculum and degrees.

Both NASPAA and CAPP as well as OCGS offer or impose accreditation on graduate public administration programs. As noted above, some programs use their accreditation as a way of promoting their brand. Others do not, probably because the accreditation process is inaccessible or incomprehensible to the uninitiated.

To this point, the employers and the prospective students both presume that if an Ontario university offers a program and grants a degree, then it must meet some minimum standard – and this is probably true. However, there is no public or common comprehension of what that minimum is.

While the variety of programs as described above under Specialization and Differentiation is desirable, it is worth noting that it is also confusing. It might be even more desirable if the distinctions were clearly defined and well understood. Moreover, if standards are to be set, they should be available publicly and applied consistently. This is particularly so if the granters of this degree purport to be granting a professional degree.

Benchmarking programs would be desirable for determining relativities. Of course, program directors look to other universities' programs for comparison and to get ideas. However, OUCQA aside, there is very little objective benchmarking going on among comparable programs. Benchmarking could be done through a more formal accreditation process.

It is not an obvious point that accreditation would improve the clearing of the market in incoming students or placements for outgoing graduates in Ontario. To some extent, the marginal value of the information is captured by those who invest in it. Is there a suboptimal clearing because the information is a public good but

known only to some? Probably. Thus if one body were able to rate and accredit all such programs and hold them to a consistent standard, then students would be able to choose among them and employers choose among the graduates with lower marginal information costs.

Presumably, accreditation would establish that some core learnings based on a generally accepted minimum requirement for a master's degree in public administration or public policy would have to be present in the program. Moreover, it would establish that the degree gave graduating students a professional preparation that achieved some minimum standard of accomplishment.

In addition, standardization of degree appellations would also reduce information costs to both prospective students and employers of graduates of these programs. This does not speak to the standardization of programming but rather ensuring that the nomenclature of degrees reflects specializations and differentiations that are offered.

After considering the modest literature on accreditation, it would seem that the lack of accreditation, in particular of a degree that aspires to be a professional degree, imposes unnecessary information costs on prospective students and employers.

Thus, there should be accreditation for granting such degrees and it should be done by MTCU.

G. Review the schools again in ten years

This has been a review of the proliferation of public policy and public administration degrees. The field is in constant flux and evolution. In particular, each program noted that its enrolment was remaining constant or was growing. As the discipline evolves and the programs grow and mature, there will undoubtedly be new issues to be addressed. If the recommendations above were implemented, it would still be worthwhile to review the field again in a decade. By then, perhaps there will be a public policy on public policy schools.

In conclusion, the proliferation of public policy schools is a good thing. Their differentiation makes them more useful for Ontarians. The differences should be promoted and transparently disclosed. There should be a standard of core learnings across all programs. These programs should be accredited, probably by MTCU. The public policy schools should be reviewed again in ten years.



Higher Education
Quality Council
of Ontario

An agency of the Government of Ontario