Scott Cummings

The evolution of graduate education in urban and public affairs within U.S. metropolitan universities is critically analyzed and evaluated. The problems preventing successful development of high quality graduate programs in this field are described, and several policy recommendations for more succesful organization and implementation of graduate education in urban and public affairs are identified.

Graduate Programs in Urban and Public Affairs:

The Missing Component of the Urban Mission

Introduction

For the past two decades, administrators of metropolitan universities have claimed a special niche in the higher education marketplace. Partly in response to intense competition with flagship schools for public funds and recognition as research institutions, metropolitan university spokespersons maintain they have a special educational mission. This "urban mission" is partially articulated in the "Declaration of Metropolitan Universities" printed in most issues of this journal. It is a statement defining the values and principles of these institutions.

Despite administrative proclamations about commitment to a unique set of educational objectives, the relationship between academic program development and the principles articulated in declarations about a special urban mission is not always apparent. The gap between popular claims about a special mission and academic program development at metropolitan universities is best illustrated through analysis of the current state of graduate education in the field of urban and public affairs. This field appears to embody fully the principles articulated in the special educational mission of urban universities. Yet, few urban universities have developed high quality graduate programs in this important field of study.

For the past two decades, I have been actively involved in the field of urban and public affairs at two urban universities, the University of Texas at Arlington and the University of Louisville. I have consulted with several ur-

ban universities about the reorganization of existing graduate programs in urban affairs, public policy, and urban planning, or about the creation of new degree programs in these areas. And as the Editor of the *Journal of Urban Affairs* for the past eight years, I have had the opportunity to remain close to faculty working in urban affairs programs throughout the nation, and to monitor important innovations and intellectual developments in the field.

I would like to share several observations about the current state of graduate education in urban and public affairs offered at U.S. urban universities. Despite the fact that graduate education in this field could be central to an urban institution's educational mission, numerous obstacles render these programs ineffective and underdeveloped within many metropolitan university settings. While the tone of the article is at times critical, my analysis will focus upon what appears to be a common set of institutional problems shared by many urban universities. My intention is to derive positive solutions to problems from critical analysis.

In some instances, administrative inability to align and reorganize existing resources with the objectives of a high quality graduate degree in this field undermines program development. Protection of established programmatic interests by faculty often prevents the reallocation of resources required for a high quality degree. Philosophical disagreements over the appropriate interface among applied research and teaching, and the provision of service to local government and business, sometimes create costly managerial problems for metropolitan university administrators.

Faculty affiliated with urban affairs programs are often caught between competing and at times contradictory administrative expectations. While proffering the urban mission to external constituents, some administrators make inflated claims about the university's commitment to community service and applied research. Faculty, however, are not always enthusiastic about modifying their traditional teaching, research, and service activities, and tend to be oriented toward national rather than local issues. Faculty in conventional social science programs often regard the field of urban and public affairs as less rigorous than established disciplines, and are reluctant to support the reallocation of funds into this type of degree.

Despite opposition from established disciplines within their own institutional settings, urban university administrators are often compelled to support programmatic expansion in urban and public affairs at the graduate level for pragmatic reasons. Unless they are already approved, it is seldom possible for urban universities to acquire authorization from state agencies to offer doctoral degrees in conventional social science disciplines. Additionally, the lobbying power of most flagship institutions is directed toward retention of their monopoly over graduate (especially doctoral) education within their statewide educational markets. Urban universities have been able, however, to expand graduate offerings in selected professional school markets: law, medicine, dentistry, nursing, engineering, and business. Most importantly, they have also been successful in expanding doctoral education in urban and public affairs, and related fields such as urban planning, public administration, and social work. Expansion in these fields is consistent with the principles embodied in statements about a unique urban mission.

However, despite possibilities for expansion in this field, internal obstacles within urban universities have prevented graduate programs in urban and public affairs from achieving the educational potential within their grasp. Some of the obstacles are produced by the way in which urban programs are organized. Certain administrative models are routinely ineffective. My critical analysis will explain

why these organizational strategies consistently fail. Other obstacles are produced by failure to develop a strong academic identity for the urban graduate programs — one which strikes an appropriate balance between the practical needs of local constituencies and the need to compete with flagship institutions for recognition as a nationally prominent research institution.

A brief review of the origins of the field, and analysis of existing graduate programs in urban and public affairs, will illustrate how these obstacles can undermine pursuit of the urban mission. After explaining how and why these obstacles operate, I will offer several suggestions about how to best organize a high quality graduate degree in this field.

The Field and The Programs

While the field of urban and public affairs is relatively new, the study of cities has been a central component of most established social science disciplines for decades. Despite its recent appearance within the academy, no field of study better reflects the special educational mission of metropolitan universities than urban and public affairs. Having origins in the problems of cities and the public policies that emerged during the War on Poverty era, urban and public affairs entered the academic arena with considerable fanfare in the late 1960s. Initially supported by substantial grants from the Ford Foundation, education in this field proliferated during the early 1970s.

Partially modelled after the agricultural experiment stations located at land grant universities, it was initially thought that programs combining practical teaching, applied research, and the provision of technical services to local government could help alleviate pressing urban problems. The forerunner to contemporary expressions of the urban mission, the urban studies programs of the early 1970s sought to align metropolitan universities with their host communities in a manner that emphasized practical immersion in real world problems.

As an academic discipline, urban and public affairs programs sought to draw from the social sciences practical knowledge, theories and research methodologies that might ameliorate the increasingly serious problems of cities. Initially the field was heavily influenced by sociology and political science. Later, it drew more extensively from economics, history, geography, and planning. The philosophical premise of urban and public affairs as a field of study was that no single social science discipline was capable of addressing the systemic causes of urban problems. By assembling in a single academic program, an interdisciplinary faculty committed to the study of cities, it was thought that knowledge about urban problems could be produced more efficiently. It was also thought that the labor of this interdisciplinary faculty could be focussed upon applied and funded research, and the provision of service to local governments and communities.

Through establishment of a special public service and applied research mission, it was assumed that academic programs in urban and public affairs could assist public officials in the same manner that rural extension programs had assisted the growth and development of American agriculture. Rich and Warren (1980) and Brownell (1993) point out that while many metropolitan university administrators oversold the capabilities of their urban programs, intellectual development in the field lagged far behind the inflated expectations accompanying its emergence as a separate area of study. The problems of cities proved intractable and were way beyond the capabilities of metropolitan universities to resolve, despite commitment to a special "urban mission."

Despite the eventual withdrawal of the Ford Foundation's financial support of early urban affairs programs in the mid 1970s, the field has remained relatively stable over the past two decades. It has evolved far beyond its initial focus upon the sociology of urban problems or the politics of urban governmental institutions. Most contemporary programs focus upon urban policy analysis and evaluation, planning and urban economic development, public finance and administration, environment and the urban infrastructure. Rich and Warren (1980) estimated that over 200 academic programs in urban and public affairs were in operation in the early 1980s. More recently, Raymond (1989) reported that over 350 programs existed by early 1990.

These statistics, however, require clarification. The largest category of academic programs in urban and public affairs is found at the undergraduate level. Undergraduate degrees in urban and public affairs are often organized as interdisciplinary programs and are not implemented through a separate faculty in a free-standing department. Courses are typically drawn from existing social science offerings, and no effort is made to establish a separate research and service mission for the program or the faculty affiliated with it. Further, undergraduate programs in urban and public affairs often suffer serious problems of intellectual legitimacy within the academy.

Because they are stereotyped as affirmative action academic programs, faculty and counselors sometimes steer minority students to undergraduate curricula in urban studies. Race relations is but one component of a properly developed program in urban and public affairs. And because their primary loyalty is to their home unit and discipline, interdisciplinary faculty seldom identify with the field or its professional associations such as the Urban Affairs Association and the American Planning Association. Because many undergraduate programs in urban studies are placed in a college of arts and sciences, they are seldom able to compete effectively with larger and better established departments of sociology, political science, psychology, and economics. They are chronically underfunded and underdeveloped.

In recent years, higher education has been criticized for failing to reinforce and strengthen the principles of a basic liberal arts education at the undergraduate level. Since urban and public affairs at the graduate level has largely assumed a professional school orientation, undergraduate programs have not been uniformly successful in protecting themselves against university retrenchment, reorganization, and reallocation. Nor have they been successful in drawing large numbers of majors, thus increasing their political vulnerability during periods of programmatic cutbacks. During a fiscal crises or a routine budget cut, undergraduate professional school programs like urban studies and social work, along with other interdisciplinary degrees like African American studies, women's studies, and religious studies, are among the first to be eliminated.

Academic programs in urban and public affairs have achieved greater visibility, legitimacy, and durability at the graduate level. Because of an expanding emphasis upon policy analysis and evaluation, urban economic development, fiscal planning and management, land use planning and environmental analysis, there has been a resurgence of interest in the field, especially at the graduate level. The U.S. Department of Education, partially in response to the initiatives of the Urban Affairs Division of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, recently funded several urban university projects designed to assist development of low income communities (Stukel, 1994). And several metropolitan universities have recently initiated special research and public service projects that embody past and

contemporary expressions of the urban mission (Stukel, 1994). Ironically, many of these "new" initiatives are similar in scope and mission to programs having origins in the 1960s.

Existing Graduate Programs

Despite resurgence of interest in the field, only about thirteen institutions offer doctoral training in urban and public affairs (Strathman, 1992). Four institutions are private and, therefore, appear irrelevant to observations about the principles appearing in the Declaration of Metropolitan Universities: Carnegie Mellon, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Rensselaer, and Syracuse. The other nine programs, however, are located in public institutions, most of which are compatible with the Declaration: University of Akron, Cleveland State University, University of Delaware, University of Louisville, Michigan State University, University of New Orleans, Portland State University, University of Texas at Arlington, and University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee.

Several universities offer masters degrees in urban and public affairs. In addition to many of the institutions offering doctoral training, masters programs are found at Tufts, the New School for Social Research, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, University of New Orleans, St. Louis University, Georgia State, Northeastern Illinois, Maryland, Hunter, Mankato State, Old Dominion, Wright State, District of Columbia, Montclair State, Long Island University, Trinity (San Antonio), Boston University, Southern Connecticut, and Alabama A & M (Strathman, 1992).

Despite the considerable number of graduate programs at public universities, those receiving the highest ratings by faculty in the field and administrators (and according to objective measures based upon frequency of faculty citations) include MIT, Carnegie Mellon, Syracuse, and Delaware (Strathman, 1992). Three of these institutions are private, and, because it is a flagship institution with many characteristics that resemble a private university, Delaware probably does not have a well articulated urban mission.

Based upon various measures of quality, the current status of graduate programs in urban and public affairs found within public universities generally falls well below that found at private institutions. While nearly all public, metropolitan universities face similar fiscal problems, serve comparable constituencies, and encounter analogous internal conflicts, very few have made major investments in comprehensive graduate programs in urban and public affairs. This fact partially reflects the numerous organizational and administrative obstacles identified at the outset of this article, and can be illustrated through closer examination of existing programs.

Private universities with strong graduate programs in urban and public affairs not only have numerous financial advantages over public institutions, they are also not constrained by the need to articulate and pursue a unique "urban mission." Graduate students enrolled in private universities tend to be drawn from a full-time, younger constituency. On the other hand, graduate students enrolled in urban doctoral programs at public, metropolitan universities usually pursue an advanced degree on a part-time basis and comprise older, practicing professionals and agency administrators. As a result, graduate education in urban and public affairs at public universities must tailor their programmatic options to meet the practical needs of a local educational market.

While meeting local market needs is consistent with the mandates of a special urban mission, the intellectual identity and academic objectives of the program

are often compromised in the process. It is not always clear, for example, if part-time, professional students are being trained for careers in university teaching, public service, or policy research. Research expectations are often poorly articulated, and standards for analytical rigor in classroom achievement, doctoral dissertation creativity, and comprehensive examination performance are ambiguous. These problems are partly derived from the interdisciplinary nature of urban and public affairs, reinforced by the way in which the field has evolved over time. These problems also reflect the inability of many urban universities to achieve legitimacy as bona fide research institutions, and mirror the constraints inherent in serving local, as opposed to regional and national, markets. These observations can be illustrated further through case studies of the experiences of selected urban institutions offering graduate training in urban and public affairs.

Organizational Models

Those urban institutions, public or private, with higher quality graduate programs in urban and public affairs tend to be organized within a separate college or school of Urban and Public Affairs (e.g., University of Delaware, MIT, Carnegie Mellon, University of New Orleans, Portland State University, Cleveland State University, University of Texas at Arlington). They are typically staffed by a full-time, interdisciplinary faculty. The full-time faculty holds primary appointments within the separate school or college. While the numerical mix of disciplines varies between programs, there is typically strong faculty representation from sociology, political science, economics, geography, public administration, and urban planning.

Institutions with high quality academic programs, both public and private, have made significant investments in a well published, interdisciplinary faculty. In addition, this faculty usually has a strong record of funded research and public service. Most institutions with a separate college or school of urban and public affairs report full-time faculties ranging from 23 to 30 in total number (Urban Affairs Association, 1994). Nearly all have major grants and contracts operations affiliated with their academic programs, with various centers being administered by the research faculty. Graduate students are fully integrated with the research activities of faculty, either directly through assistantships or through employment on a funded project. In addition to urban and public affairs, most established programs also offer masters degrees in public administration, urban planning, and policy analysis and management. Programs have a well articulated urban mission, and the research, teaching, and service activities of the faculty are directed toward pursuit of that mission.

Other institutions offer graduate training in urban and public affairs through a university-wide faculty. Some institutions implement programs through a coordinating or steering committee. Others offer the degree through a small department of urban affairs, typically located within a college of arts and sciences. Small departmental faculties are usually supplemented by a larger, university-wide group. Development of these programs, more often than not, is heavily burdened by internal problems and obstacles. The university-wide organizational model is problematic, an observation corroborated by the fact that universities using it have not produced highly regarded programs.

The experiences of two of these institutions can be analyzed in more detail: Michigan State University and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. Administrators in charge of the doctoral program in urban and public affairs at these insti-

tutions coordinate courses and faculty many of whom are housed within home departments.

The doctoral program at Michigan State initially evolved with a heavy emphasis on race relations and minority affairs, and has retained a significant emphasis in this area. While program emphasis has greatly expanded, courses are drawn primarily from existing social science units, as are areas of specialization within the degree. The program, therefore, does not retain administrative control over its intellectual identity, and does not have the ability to focus the public service or research activities of its university-wide faculty. Additionally, the program has had to struggle in order to justify pursuit of an urban mission within the context of a traditional land grant institution.

Based upon frequency of faculty citations (Strathman, 1992), the doctoral program at Milwaukee ranks much higher than that at Michigan State. Nonetheless, the program is administratively problematic for several reasons. Milwaukee's doctoral program in urban and public affairs is heavily dominated by sociology and history, the two departments from which much of the coursework in the degree is drawn. The head of the program is a historian; the Ph.D. coordinator is a sociologist. Both have primary appointments in their respective departments. Additionally, nearly all of the Milwaukee scholars frequently cited in the Strathman study have full-time appointments in either the Department of Sociology or the Department of History.

Interviews with the head of the Milwaukee program and the coordinator of the Ph.D. degree establish that the dispersion of faculty across several units presents numerous managerial, financial, and developmental problems. The placement of two urban research centers in other units also makes it difficult to involve doctoral students in the grants and contracts process in a coordinated manner. Therefore, it is not clear exactly what type of careers or toward what sectors of the labor market students are being directed. While both administrators would prefer a dedicated faculty assigned to a single unit, the absence of resources, departmental control of existing courses and scheduling, external control of research centers, and protection of existing academic turf, render this administrative option unlikely.

The university-wide approach is inexpensive because it entails hiring a limited number of fulltime faculty to implement the degree. The bulk of coursework is obtained through existing courses and departments. Numerous departments are asked to identify appropriate "urban courses" in which doctoral students can enroll. For universities that do not have easy access to doctoral degree expansion (as is the case for most urban institutions), the university-wide model often leads to peculiar disciplinary amalgamations and alliances. Units attempt to broker participation in a limited number of doctoral programs, or capture a track or series of core courses. The long term consequence of this dynamic is gradual transformation of the urban affairs program into something other than what was originally intended. This organizational model also contributes minimally toward clarification of the intellectual and career objectives of the program.

In addition to internal management problems and confusion over mission, a university-wide approach to program development does not always create a systematic and productive relationship with a major grants and contracts operation. A high quality doctoral program entails cultivation of a major research and grants agenda. Consistent with established urban colleges and schools around the nation, and the public service mission of a metropolitan university, this research agenda should focus on applied policy analysis and service to local government and business. A

university-wide approach to program implementation does not promote focus of faculty labor, nor does it facilitate participation of doctoral students in the grants and contracts operation. It also contributes minimally to the cultivation of strong research and policy evaluation skills among the graduate student body.

The Louisville Experience

One way to overcome some of the deficiencies of the university-wide approach is to consolidate and centralize existing programs in a single school or college. The experiences of the University of Louisville, however, illustrate the difficulty of creating a sound doctoral degree in urban and public affairs through the process of reorganization and consolidation of existing programs. The doctoral degree in urban and public affairs at the University of Louisville has a history involving competition between units for control and development of the degree. During the 1970s, the College of Arts and Sciences tried unsuccessfully to establish a doctoral program in urban and public affairs. A contract research entity, however, was established (the Urban Studies Center) and was eventually placed within the Graduate School. The center attempted to draw faculty participation from a university-wide base, but was never successful in creating an appropriate set of incentives to entice widespread participation. A popular masters program in Community Development was established in the 1970s, and also placed within the Graduate School.

The early 1980s saw minor progress toward establishment of a doctoral degree in urban and public affairs. It took a new president, committed to the university's pursuit of its special educational mission, to breathe life into a comprehensive academic, research, and public service program in urban and public affairs. With the creation of a new and separate College of Urban and Public Affairs (CUPA) in 1983, the University attempted to consolidate what it considered a series of "urban-related" programs.

After extensive planning and negotiations among various colleges and departments within the University, a doctoral degree in urban and public affairs was approved by Kentucky's Council on Higher Education in 1988. It was placed in the new urban college, a unit that by 1988 already housed a master of science in community development, and masters of science in systems science, a school of social work, an urban research center, a bachelors and masters program in criminal justice, and an assortment of continuing education centers.

The intellectual content of the Ph.D. program was initially designed by faculty and departments located within the College of Arts and Sciences, where most of the individuals with credentials and expertise in the field of urban and public affairs held primary appointments. The placement of the degree in the new urban college isolated many A & S faculty from participation in the program. Neither the new college nor the University as a whole developed effective policies enabling faculty from other units to participate in the degree. At the same time, faculty could never agree upon an appropriate mission and identity for the program.

The new urban college was created in a manner that simply consolidated existing programs considered by the administration to be "urban related." The educational missions of these programs were not consistent with established urban colleges around the nation, as was pointed out to the university by several external consultants. The new college's unique mixture of previously independent schools and academic programs created management problems of significant magnitude. The Ph.D. degree, only one of three graduate programs in the School of Urban

Policy, created as one component of the new college, was never given primary attention within the peculiar mix of programs located there (health administration, systems science, labor relations, and community development). And the school itself was never very successful in competing against other programs and departments in the new college for resources and recognition.

Despite the fact that the doctoral degree was the only academic endeavor in the new college actually representing the field of urban and public affairs, competition among established units and an absence of new funds made it difficult to build or sustain a high quality program. The administration of the new college responded to this managerial dilemma by attempting to create tracks within the doctoral program consistent with the disciplines already represented in the college: social work, justice administration, community development, and health systems administration. This political solution threatened the intellectual focus of the degree, and alienated faculty with credentials in the field of urban and public affairs, many of whom were located in the college of arts and sciences. The intellectual mission of the program, therefore, seemed compromised at the outset.

Similar disagreements over the intellectual and academic mission of a graduate program in urban and public affairs have emerged at other institutions such as Michigan State and Wisconsin at Milwaukee. If various disciplines are asked to offer a track in the program (or acquire a track through negotiations), participating units inevitably use the urban degree to piggyback a traditional specialty within their own field. This arrangement typically leads to departmental ownership of tracks, and prompts radical shifts in the intellectual content of the urban affairs degree. At Louisville, for example, an informal agreement was brokered with the engineering college that enabled them to offer doctoral training in civil engineering through the urban affairs program. The agreement has broken down because engineering students are poorly trained in the social sciences, and vice versa. Additionally, the urban affairs and engineering faculty hold very different ideas about doctoral education, research rigor, and programmatic mission.

While a core faculty of four was eventually hired to help implement the doctoral degree at Louisville, that group proved insufficient to cover the courses and various tracks comprising the Ph.D. program, or to service student demand for dissertations and advising. Much of their time was diverted into efforts to protect the intellectual integrity of the degree against external intrusion or to mediate competing faculty and administrative interests. The university-wide faculty was never successfully mobilized to remedy staffing shortages. The combined lobbying power of established programs within the new college often prevented reallocation of resources to build the urban doctoral program, the administration of these programs being understandably more interested in building their own departments and budgets.

Creation of a separate urban affairs college or school to pursue the special educational mission of a metropolitan university through consolidation of existing programs appears to be a good idea on paper. However, this strategy is fraught with administrative and managerial complications and does not always produce the intended results. While it should be obvious that a special graduate entity created to pursue the urban mission should be premised on shared intellectual and philosophical objectives, achievement of these objectives is not an easy task. Ultimately, faculty dissension over mission, conflict with the administration over an appropriate vision for the unit, and administrative inability to resolve competing educational and programmatic agendas all contributed to the eventual demise of Louisville's urban college in 1992.

An inappropriate mixture of competing programs under the title urban and public affairs is not peculiar to the Louisville experience. Similar problems have emerged at other metropolitan universities. The most peculiar amalgamation of programs is found at Georgia State University. At that institution, public administration, labor studies, aviation administration, hospitality administration, applied linguistics, criminal justice, and urban studies have been combined under a single college of urban and public affairs. Not surprisingly, differences of opinions among faculty and programs are the rule rather than the exception, and development of consensus over the intellectual and academic mission of the programs housed in the college has been difficult.

After disestablishing the College of Urban and Public Affairs in 1992, the university administration wisely did not abandon its public commitment to a special effort in the area of urban and public affairs. However, because of the durability of this commitment, the dismantling of the urban college was accompanied by considerable infighting over acquisition of existing budgets and programs. Three units competed for inheritance of the urban and public affairs mantle and its budgets: arts and sciences, business, and the graduate school.

The business school eventually acquired possession of all the urban programs. Proffering itself as a professional school with strong ties to the local business community, the school was successful in convincing the central administration that it was the logical choice to continue implementation of the urban mission.

This surprising decision — no other graduate or undergraduate program in urban affairs is currently located in a school of business — has created a new set of problems. Schools of business have not historically aligned themselves with the public sector in a manner comparable to programs in urban and public affairs, urban planning, or public administration. Nor have they pursued public service and practical immersion in community and neighborhood affairs in a manner consistent with graduate programs in urban and public affairs. As a result, confusion and debate over the intellectual and philosophical mission of the urban affairs academic and research programs have continued. After formally acquiring the programs in 1993, the School of Business changed its name to the College of Business and Public Administration (CBPA). It was thought that this name change would more accurately reflect to the external world the expanded mission of school. It also telegraphed forthcoming changes in the intellectual mission and scope of the program itself.

After acquiring the urban degrees, the administration of CBPA internally reallocated the financial assets of the programs transferred to them. The budgetary lines of the urban affairs faculty were transferred to existing departments (e.g., economics, management), as were travel funds, secretarial lines, etc. A governance arrangement was created comprised exclusively of faculty from the CBPA, thereby disenfranchising most of the faculty formerly affiliated with the program. Since urban and public affairs does not currently have departmental status within the CBPA, it is not capable of pursuing, defining, or protecting its own interests in a manner comparable to existing programs. In this sense, the program now more closely resembles those housed at Michigan State and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. They also mirror the programmatic concerns expressed by NASPAA officials.

More and more courses are being staffed by faculty from marketing, economics, management, and other departments within CBPA, thereby creating de facto changes in course content and program focus. Numerous curriculum changes have

been made that move the urban degree closer and closer to the research and theoretical paradigms that predominate in a traditional school of business. Additionally, the program has become more locally oriented and tailored to the needs of part-time students. The total number of hours for the doctoral degree has been reduced, as have the requirements for research methods and statistics. Many faculty think these changes are incompatible with national academic standards and contradict the goals of major research institutions.

Not surprisingly, considerable disagreement has emerged over the course of action taken by the business school. The ensuing discussion and dialogue has created more managerial costs for the central administration and made it more difficult for all parties to retain credibility when promoting the special urban mission of the university to the external community. Faculty outside the CBPA are angry about no longer being able to participate in the program. The established faculty and students fear the program will become less and less recognizable as a doctoral degree in urban and public affairs. Both faculty and administrators continue to be uncertain about research standards for the program, its overall intellectual mission, or the type of jobs for which students are being prepared.

It is not my intention to dwell upon a series of problems that have emerged at various urban institutions around the nation, in particular those within my own university. My purpose is to identify and describe the critical obstacles preventing the emergence of a high quality graduate program in urban and public affairs. By sharing thoughts about the origins of these problems, it is possible to make more informed policy choices and select a better course of action for other institutions encountering similar difficulties. At Louisville, we remain positive that a high quality, nationally prominent program can and will be created.

Overcoming Obstacles: Costs and Benefits

It is important to reiterate the idea that graduate programs in urban and public affairs can be organized in a manner that effectively promotes and pursues the urban mission of metropolitan universities. The policy choices leading to creation of an effective graduate program in urban and public affairs, however, must be made deliberately and with the full participation of the faculty involved. Let me summarize the characteristics of the better programs.

Based on the experiences of the programs considered to be most stable and productive within the field, it seems apparent that a high quality graduate program in urban and public affairs should be implemented through a separate college or school. The entity should be administered by a dean or director, and be staffed by a dedicated, full-time faculty. This faculty should be interdisciplinary, and composed of no fewer than a dozen highly productive specialists in the various subfields comprising the discipline. As stated earlier, several programs currently fit this ideal: Cleveland State University, Portland State University, University of Delaware, University of Texas at Arlington, and the University of New Orleans. Programs at three private universities are also considered excellent: M.I.T., Syracuse, and Carnegie Mellon.

The doctoral degree should be supplemented by two or more masters programs, each serving as a feeder to the Ph.D., or established as terminal degrees. Most prominent among the masters degrees found within established urban programs are Public Administration, Urban and Public Affairs, and City and Regional Planning. All of the above institutions offer the configuration of degrees just described. While criminal justice can sometimes complement a graduate program in

urban and public affairs, their educational mission has been primarily at the undergraduate level.

A haphazard mixture of graduate and undergraduate degrees, and an incompatible amalgamation of philosophical perspectives accompanying these degrees, can undermine the special mission of an urban college, and lead to unproductive disputes between and among the various disciplines represented. These disputes always include differences of opinion over the allocation of funds, differential teaching loads, conflicting research and service expectations. More importantly, consensus over program mission, standards, and purpose is seldom achieved under these circumstances. Debatably, the most important philosophical and intellectual premise upon which to build a graduate program in urban and public affairs must include commitment to public policy analysis, administration, and implementation. And a high quality graduate program at metropolitan universities must reflect the research and publication standards of national research institutions.

While special graduate programs in urban and public affairs can be created through reorganization and consolidation of existing resources, a strategic plan of action must be created and deliberately pursued. The experiences of various universities are also pertinent here. At the University of Texas at Arlington, the program in criminal justice was eventually transferred from the urban college to arts and sciences. The masters degree in city and regional planning was ultimately transferred from architecture to the urban college. Both decisions proved to be good ones, as the largely undergraduate mission of criminal justice was more compatible with arts and sciences, and city planning complemented the programs already housed in the urban college.

The experiences of Louisville and Georgia State, two institutions that created urban programs through reorganization and consolidation, show that more attention should have been given to the ways in which other universities organized their special urban initiatives. During the course of each institution's organizational history, considerable investments of time, money, and administrative effort were made in fields not normally affiliated with urban and public affairs: social work, systems science, health administration, labor relations, aviation administration, linguistics, and hospitality studies. While each of these fields has an important place within the academy, it is debatably not within a graduate program in urban and public affairs.

Doctoral students should be fully involved in the research activities of a major grants and contracts operation. The research operation should be administratively housed within the urban school or college. Senior faculty should be fully engaged in research and contract activities, either through special projects or through the administration of a substantive grants and contracts center or institute. These characteristics describe the best urban affairs programs around the nation. They represent the ideal organizational structure.

New Initiatives

In light of these issues, some new initiatives currently taking place at metropolitan universities will be interesting to monitor. For the past two years, Baruch College of the City University of New York has been planning to organize a new college of urban and public policy. The new college will be created through a combination of new funds, reorganization, and consolidation of existing programs and resources. Attempting to avoid the mistakes of other metropolitan universities, the urban programs will be administered through a separate college with a free-standing

faculty. Focussing on policy analysis and evaluation, Baruch has wisely decided to build on existing strengths: economic development, finance and administration, health and educational policy, and public-private partnerships.

At the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis, a substantial grant from the Lilly Foundation has made possible the creation of a major research and public service center. The mission of the center is applied policy research and evaluation. Leadership within the school envisions development and integration of its academic programs around the applied research activities of the public policy center. And at Rutgers University, a major reorganization of existing academic programs and research centers under a new School of Planning and Public Policy has been underway for the past three years.

If successful, the programs at Baruch College may establish important new models showing how effective urban programs can be created through systematically planned reorganization and consolidation of existing resources. The Indianapolis model will underscore the importance of creating a major research center to sustain and nourish the academic programs. And if successful, the Rutgers experience may illustrate how to consolidate previously independent academic programs and research centers in a positive and productive manner.

In light of the problems and obstacles identified in this article, it is surely important to ask if creation of a separate college or school of urban and public affairs is worth the investment. The school or college model is expensive. In order to promote the ideal situation, a university must be prepared to purchase the services of a highly productive, dedicated faculty. This choice has clearly been made by a limited number of public and private universities. And, based on the recent experiences of IUPU at Indianapolis, Baruch College, and Rutgers University, many metropolitan universities continue to move in the direction of creating a special set of graduate programs to pursue their urban mission.

There are several reasons why the benefits of creating a special urban college outweigh the costs. Creation of a separate set of graduate programs in urban and public affairs enable metropolitan universities to seek excellence in a unique subfield within the social sciences. While program development at the graduate level is often blocked within the more traditional social science fields, urban and public affairs (and the related fields of public administration and urban planning) are consistent with the professional school orientation considered appropriate for metropolitan universities. For pragmatic reasons, a strong case can be made for expansion of graduate programs in urban and public affairs by metropolitan university administrators.

Perhaps most importantly, the teaching, research, and public service objectives of urban affairs programs directly mirror the central components of the urban mission. Formal training in urban and public affairs, city planning, and public administration meet important labor market needs within the regional economies in which metropolitan universities are located. These include careers in economic development, planning, research, and administration. Established programs in urban and public affairs also provide a wide array of continuing education programs, seminars, workshops, and conferences for local community and neighborhood leaders, and public officials.

Most established programs in urban and public affairs also promote the kinds of public service considered invaluable to local officials and community leaders. Most significant in this area are assistance with grants and contracts, proposal

development, and evaluation design and data management. An established program in urban and public affairs will also enable metropolitan universities to be more effective in pursuing grants and contracts in the social sciences, especially in tandem with local and state government.

While dollars for pure research in the social sciences have declined in recent years, a considerable amount of funds are available for applied research, program development and demonstration projects. Because of their applied policy orientation, many faculty within established graduate programs in urban and public affairs are extremely capable of designing and implementing demonstration projects. Additionally, nearly every federal grant to cities now requires an evaluation component. Established graduate programs in urban and public affairs typically have strong capabilities in program evaluation and impact analysis. This enables them to respond effectively to this growing research market. Properly organized graduate programs in urban and public affairs can become centers of teaching, research, and service excellence for metropolitan universities.

Assuming that the Declaration of Principles is a statement of goals for metropolitan universities, creation of a special set of graduate programs in urban and public affairs can be considered a strategic plan of action required to pursue their unique educational mission. In order to maximize the effectiveness of these programs, however, it will be necessary to make wise policy choices during the process of organizing and administering them.

Suggested Reading

Brownell, B. A. (1993, Winter). "Metropolitan Universities: past, present, and future." *Metropolitan Universities*, 4(3), pp. 13–21.

Raymond, C. (1989, December 6). "Once criticized as failing to solve problems of cities, urban studies receive renewed attention." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A4–6, A9.

Rich, D. & Warren, R. (1980, April). "The intellectual future of urban affairs: theoretical, normative, and organizational options." *Social Science Journal*, pp. 53–66.

Strathman, J. G. (1992). "A ranking of US graduate programs on urban studies and urban affairs." *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 14(1), pp. 79–92.

Stuckel, J. J. (1994, October). "The urban university attacks real urban issues." *Government Finance Review*, pp. 19–21.

Urban Affairs Association, *University Urban Programs*. Newark, DE: Urban Affairs Association, 1994.