

PERSONAL STATEMENT

JOHN A. HIRD

24 November 2004

Both before and after becoming Director of the Center for Public Policy and Administration in 1998, my research, teaching, and service as a faculty member in political science and public policy has been united by a focus on improving the relationship of expertise to policymaking. This manifests itself in my research most centrally, as nearly all of my work touches in some fashion on expertise and policymaking; through my teaching by encouraging students to appreciate the importance of and prepare for careers as “experts” in public service; and through many of my service activities designed to improve linkages between expertise and policymaking, including helping to establish a new Center and Master’s Program for Public Policy and Administration on campus.

RESEARCH

Oddly enough, a slab of steel, Richard Serra’s *Tilted Arc*, provided an initial inspiration for my research agenda when the controversy over its installation hit the news in 1981. At 120 feet long and 12 feet high, *Tilted Arc* was the curving wall of steel bisecting Federal Plaza in downtown Manhattan, which the U.S. General Services Administration had commissioned as public art. (Two photos of it are below.¹) Many federal employees, who had to circumvent the enormous wall when entering or leaving the building, were outraged, leading to a letter-writing campaign protesting the visual and physical impairments, the potential for terrorists to use it as a bomb blasting wall, and the likelihood of attracting graffiti and rats. A public hearing in 1985 ensued, with employees demanding its removal and Serra claiming the wall was commissioned site-specific art and therefore could not be relocated. After much political and legal wrangling, one night four years later *Tilted Arc* was cut into three pieces and scrapped.



The primary issues reported through media accounts were the purposes of public art and whether popularity is an appropriate criterion for judging art, with Serra fanning the fires, in his typically provocative manner, by saying, “Art is not democratic. It is not for the people.” For me, the controversy spoke to important questions of politics and public policy: How are people identified in public discourse as experts? Recognizing its contingent nature, what role should expertise play in policymaking? How should policy decisions be made when the experts disagree? When experts and the public disagree? Finally, what is the relationship between expertise and political power, and how can experts better represent those with legitimate claims who cannot afford expertise? Should Serra, the “expert,” or those who use the public plaza decide what belongs in an area where people spend time talking, eating lunch, and traversing to and from work? Looked at another way, does the public understand the way that art

¹ Photos and Serra quote from http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/cultureshock/flashpoints/visualarts/tiltedarc_a.html.

and architecture – the built environment – affect them, and can they understand and therefore be poised to judge whether this form of artwork will improve their well-being after the initial shock of its presence has passed?

A related and persistent concern is that an elite form of expertise will dominate democratic policymaking, leading to a political process dominated by technical analysis that the public cannot engage and to outcomes detrimental to the public interest. My earlier work examined a prototypical controversy involving experts and the public: abandoned hazardous waste sites. The issue was catapulted to national attention after reports that Hooker Chemical Company's had for years dumped hazardous wastes near a school and neighborhood in Love Canal, New York coupled with the recognition that similar wastes could be in others' "backyards."² This and similar events led to the hasty passage of the Superfund program. My work examined how the problem was framed by experts in a way that both precluded public involvement and, though "science," systematically understated site risks. Scientific experts – mostly epidemiologists and toxicologists – submitted that site risks were vastly overstated. In contrast, citizens saw the problem as dangers that corporations imposed on their communities and came to believe that waste sites could be discovered almost anywhere. The discrepancy was startling: while experts cautioned policymakers that site risks were minimal, based on a narrow albeit scientific interpretation of risk (focusing almost exclusively on carcinogenicity), policymakers were confronted with irate constituents descending on their Washington offices, EPA officials taken hostage at Love Canal, and an "outrage factor" that confounded risk experts. Policymakers had to do something, for reasons quite apart from the technical dimensions of risk that were the focus of scientific experts. My work illuminated and engaged these issues by challenging the expertise of risk experts' claims, examining distributional and economic dimensions of the existing program, and proposing elements of an improved program. Ultimately, the book recommended the establishment of a National Environmental Restoration Fund to remediate Superfund other localized concentrations of high-risk contamination, funded nationally but administered by citizens and other relevant stakeholders at the local/regional level. This work was published in book form (*Superfund: The Political Economy of Environmental Risk*, Johns Hopkins University Press) and in several journal articles ("Superfund Expenditures and Cleanup Priorities: Distributive Politics or the Public Interest?" *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*; "Congressional Voting on Superfund: Self-Interest or Ideology?" *Public Choice*.) While the book had obvious public policy implications, the theoretical motivation was the relationship of technical expertise to policymaking.

Another theme throughout much of my work is procedural and outcome-based equity. One manifestation of this interest is my work related to the distribution of federal spending, which examined the allocation of flood control projects by the Army Corps of Engineers ("The Political Economy of Pork: Project Selection at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers," *American Political Science Review*). Political theories of distribution, based solely on a public choice orientation to electoral politics, had assumed away other potential explanations (including equity) for the distribution of federal resources. This study showed that other factors were more important in explaining the distribution of federal resources, including traditional "public interest" measures of distributive equity and efficiency. Furthermore, the actual distribution of federal water resources spending was found to be relatively efficient in comparison with other possible resource distributions, such as those based purely on distributive politics. Because the Army Corps is notorious for distributive politics, these findings broadened the theoretical conception of distributive politics and question whether the political distribution of resources exacts high social costs in terms of efficiency and equity, as many allege.

² Coincidentally, the hazardous waste problem emerged around the same time as the installation of *Tilted Arc*.

In the mid to late 1990s I took up questions of environmental justice, or the spatial distribution of environmental pollutants in relation to population sub-groups. While that empirical work was based on the fairly coarse-grained data available at the time – subsequent improvements have allowed comparisons of finer geographic resolution and more sophisticated measures of risk – it has been amply cited as part of the burgeoning literature in environmental justice.³ One article examined the national distribution of Superfund sites, and the other the distribution of multiple air- and water-borne pollutants. This work was published mainly in two articles (“Environmental Policy and Equity: The Case of Superfund,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*; “The Distribution of Environmental Quality: An Empirical Analysis” *Social Science Quarterly*).

These publications appeared as I became heavily involved with planning for and ultimately directing the new Center and Masters Program in Public Policy and Administration. (More on this later.) Not surprisingly, as a quick glance at my CV will confirm, my research productivity declined during this period. A sabbatical in Spring 2003 allowed me to devote largely uninterrupted time to my research, in particular to completing a book project aimed at better understanding the role of expertise in policymaking.

Since much of public policymaking hinges on advice of one form or another, the relationship of expertise to politics is central to political science and public policy. Much of my research has focused on the understanding technical expertise in policymaking. The older, rational model of expertise was “speaking truth to power,” where experts looking out for the public interest present the best available options and analysis to a monolithic decision-maker. The analyst had one “client,” and the decision-maker was presumed to base most of his (then, it was “his”) decision on the analyst’s recommendation, which at its best accounted for economic, organizational, political, and other pertinent considerations. It created a lofty if politically un-tethered role for analysts – power without responsibility – yet it was also largely fiction: expertise is ambiguous, experts have multiple clients, and multiple decisionmakers coexist in any policy realm. Contemporary accounts of policy analysis emphasize a different conceptualization of the relationship of knowledge to power, one recognizing that policy analysts⁴ are necessarily biased, have no particular claim to “truth,” have multiple clients, and are best understood as contributors to policymaking rather than determinant. Early scholarly work attempting to link expertise with policymaking followed the older model of policymaking, seeking to identify whether policymakers’ decisions were consistent with, if not explicitly based on, social science recommendations; with few exceptions, social science research was found to have little or no direct impact on decisionmaking. Many explanations were proffered, which pointed fingers at both policymakers (out of touch, concerned only with electoral consequences, unable to understand research, etc.) and scholars (also out of touch, producing work that is badly written, off-target, poorly communicated, lacking in concrete policy recommendations, pedantic, ignorant of politics, etc.) The short-hand account said that “two communities” (scholars/scientists and policymakers) existed, and only under the most unusual circumstances did the former help the latter. Consistent with changes in understanding the role of policy analysis, later research broadened the concept of “use” to include agenda-setting, enlightenment, and tactical and political uses of research and analysis. This broader definition of use yielded observable connections between expertise and policymaking.

³ A review of citations to articles in *Journal of Public Policy and Management* (JPAM) conducted by the last editor, Peter Reuter, in 2003 showed that my article on “Environmental Policy and Equity” was among the most widely cited articles ever published by JPAM. JPAM is, according to the Social Science Citation Index, the leading publication in the “public administration” category.

⁴ I use the term “policy analyst” in its broadest sense, including all interest group, think tank, university, and related lobbying and advocacy research.

My recent research focuses on one class of experts, policy analysts, found in government agencies, legislatures, nonprofit organizations, private interest groups, think tanks, and virtually every other organization that seeks to influence the nature and conduct of public policy in the United States. The proliferation of policy analysis in all levels of governance over the past 25 years begs a number of important questions that have scarcely been addressed, all related to the relationship of expertise to power: What impact does policy analysis have on the policymaking process? And what impact does the social-political-economic environment have on the conduct of policy analysis? What types of policy analysis are useful to decisionmakers? Does policy expertise promote democratic decisionmaking, vest power in an unelected and unaccountable elite, or become co-opted by political actors and exigencies? Equally important is the distribution of expertise. It is apparent that moneyed interests can afford more expertise than others, but do policy analysts in government democratize the policymaking process by providing critical perspectives and representing the broad “public interest”?

My forthcoming book – *Power, Knowledge, and Politics: Policy Analysis in the States* – examines the relationship of expertise to politics by comparing the impacts of nonpartisan policy research organizations (NPROs) in U.S. state legislatures.⁵ While the book’s theoretical focus involves expertise, not state politics, states provide a nearly ideal venue for comparing the differential application of expertise to politics because of significant variation in how state legislatures deploy policy analysis yet retain similar political structures, language, etc. The book employs both qualitative and quantitative methods, including quantitative analysis of primary data from two written surveys (one of more than 750 state legislators, and another of directors of nonpartisan policy research organizations serving state legislatures in all 50 states) as well as qualitative research through interviews with officials in every state. *Power, Knowledge, and Politics* engages the relationship of expertise to policymaking in conceptually unique ways by: comparing the impacts of policy analysis institutions systematically across different political environments; assessing the use of policy analysis by examining institutional influence rather than individual studies;⁶ evaluating comparatively the “success” of policy analysis with reference to policymakers’ assessments; and evaluating the reciprocal impacts of policy analysis on policymaking as well as the impact of politics on policy analysis institutions. That politics and institutions affect one another may be obvious to political scientists; nonetheless, this relationship is seldom explored in studies of policy expertise, as the impact of expertise on public policy is nearly always viewed as uni-directional.

Scholars have for years underscored the difficulty of providing “neutral competence” in highly political environments like legislatures. In contrast, the results of *Power, Knowledge, and Politics* demonstrate the wide proliferation of nonpartisan policy research organizations (NPROs) in states, suggesting that neutral (nonpartisan) policy analysis is valued in small states and large, in professional and citizen legislatures, and in states wealthy and poor. However, the research also finds that much that passes for “policy analysis” is, in fact, basic information provision and other descriptive tasks, although this information is highly valued by their legislative clients. Moreover, policy analysis in general is not considered influential in the policymaking process compared with other interests, although larger and more analytical NPROs have greater impacts than smaller/descriptive NPROs. Policymakers see nonpartisan policy analysis institutions as playing an important role, yet NPROs are found to be decidedly ineffectual in bringing new ideas and perspectives to state policymaking. Furthermore, the results indicate that

⁵ The book is due out in April 2005 with Georgetown University Press’s *American Governance and Public Policy* series, edited by Barry Rabe.

⁶ Rather than studying the impact of individual policy reports or studies, or even focusing exclusively on written material at all, I examine the *institutions* that policymakers create for the express purpose of providing them with policy analysis. By concentrating predominantly on written policy products, scholars have missed the potential for substantial influence of *individuals* and *institutions* quite apart from individual studies. The results indicate that policy analysts *qua* professionals, who develop personal relationships, policy networks, and the trust of policymakers, have greater influence than the analysis of written products suggests.

political institutions affect the nature of policy analysis organizations and, therefore, the nature of policy analysis itself. Policy analysis in state legislatures appears to match the contemporary assertion that policy analysis should be “more a tool of the democratic process than the problem-solving process;” the corollary is that the empirical reality fits rather poorly the traditional conception of policy analysis as disinterested analytical problem solving. While the book’s foundation is the exploration of important theoretical concepts related to expertise and power, I expect it will have an audience among practitioners as well as scholars. The book will be published in both cloth and paper because of the publisher’s anticipation of strong sales among thousands of state legislators and their staffs.

My future research joins my research interests of expertise and equity by studying the distribution of scientific expertise across policy domains. In light of the proliferation of “expertise” in policymaking domestically and internationally, policy expertise is far more diffuse than in the past. Recognizing a current imbalance of expertise, are there conditions under which expertise is more equally distributed across different policy arenas? Are there policy measures that can encourage expertise for under-represented interests? (One hypothesis: the more technical the level of expertise, the greater the likelihood for imbalanced representation of interests.) This work will be comparative, across policy domains and possibly cross-national, and will focus on scientific advice in particular. A concurrent research project examines different forms of expertise (e.g., economists and scientists) and their differential impact on policymaking. Related work challenges the persistent theme in scientific circles that policymakers do not pay sufficient attention to scientists. My paper (in preparation) “Science Advice for Public Policy: Two Cultures or Two Questions?” addresses these themes and argues that policymakers heed science advice at least proportion to its useful contributions to public policymaking, which in some cases is considerable and in others less so. The reason has less to do with “two cultures” as with the different questions that scientists and policymakers address. Finally, I am in the initial stages of a book project involving a series of chapters – one by a leading academic and another by a leading practitioner in the same substantive area – in each of several fields that examine the relationship between scholarly research and policymaking from different vantage points. The idea is not to show how little policymakers listen to academics, or vice versa, but to engage both scholars and policymakers in thinking more deeply about different types of “use,” what conditions lead to better connections, and the prospects for the future. My involvement in the College’s science, technology, and society (STS) initiative is creating opportunities to pursue projects in collaboration with colleagues within and outside social and behavioral sciences, such as addressing the policy implications of nanotechnology.

TEACHING

My approach to teaching rests on two simple principles: 1) students learn best when they do the work rather than only being shown how to do the work and, 2) teachers are more effective when they focus on learning rather than teaching. Obviously, one presages the other – students cannot do without being shown how to, and cannot learn without being taught – but the emphasis on students rather than teachers is important. I believe students learn best when they engage the material through their own work, are encouraged to place their own views in a larger context, and when they are supported in learning by being encouraged to make and correct mistakes. In short, I think students learn more and are better motivated to learn theory when they learn inductively.

These approaches are manifest most clearly in my undergraduate political science and master’s level CPPA courses. At the undergraduate level, I have taught mostly introductory public policy courses (Political Science 181 and 280), although I also taught an environmental policy course earlier in my career. There are many ways to structure an introductory course in public policy; it might focus on the philosophical underpinnings of policy perspectives, examine two or three prominent policy issues in

depth, or engage in comparisons of the policy-making process in two or more countries. I have chosen a hybrid approach, starting the term with a brief overview of different “lenses” through which individuals approach policy issues (libertarian, egalitarian, etc.) followed by an introduction to ten or more policy issues through in-class debates and discussion supplemented by lectures.

The debate topics vary; recent examples include welfare reform, Social Security privatization, affirmative action, education standards/testing, suburban sprawl, globalization and inequality, abortion notification, drug legalization, gun control, immigration, and single-payer health care. Students write a one-page memo on each policy issue outlining *their position* in the form of an argument (e.g., opposing Social Security privatization). Students select one or two issues on which they will become members of a 3-4 student team making an in-class presentation. Teams meet prior to class to design the content and means of presenting the material, and during class present their arguments for/against the issue in question. Following the “debate” – it is not a formal debate, but a public presentation of evidence-based arguments – the entire class engages the issue by posing questions, adding new perspectives, challenging information and interpretation, etc. Many of the classes invoke a lively interchange, partly because students are prepared (they have written the one-page memo by the time class starts, so they have thought about the issue in advance) and because their views on the topic are solicited and, I hope they know, valued. Students are lead participants in just one or two debates throughout the semester – and many make in-class presentations for the first time – but write memos on 10-12 topics. In these ways, I am able to emphasize engaging students in many public policy issues and encouraging them to develop and defend their own perspectives. It is not simply learning by doing, but also learning by listening and responding to peers. Details on the course can be found at <http://courses.umass.edu/pubp197>.⁷

Any teaching approach has deficiencies, in this case the loss of depth in attempting to cover so many issues in one semester. While aware of that cost, I continue to teach undergraduate courses in this manner for two main reasons. First, students know frightfully little about public policy issues, and what they learn about public policy more broadly from 10-12 topics in 14 weeks exceeds, in my view, what they would learn from an in-depth focus on one or a few. The deficiencies of a necessarily superficial treatment can be remedied in subsequent courses on health, environment, education, and other policy topics that provide greater depth for those who are sufficiently interested. Second, when students engage other students in debates on public policy issues, they come to understand that reasonable people can disagree about the merits of different policy beliefs. It is far too easy for students to write off political conflict as simply about self-interest or money; the courses do not ignore these factors but demonstrate in a very real way that policymaking is also about ideas and persuasion. Student cynicism about politics can be attenuated by recognizing that ideas and persuasion matter and, accordingly, that they can be involved in changing things they care about.

While developing this course, and to provide a book for it that did not exist, I wrote *Controversies in American Public Policy*,⁸ which provides a 4-5 page introduction of the history and background of 12-15 policy debates and then includes a “pro” and “con” article on each topic written for an educated lay audience that appeared in such publications as *The Nation*, *The Public Interest*, *Brookings Review*, *The American Prospect*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, and *Harpers*. *Controversies* also includes discussion questions and a bibliography and web links for each topic. The book has been successful in providing both some

⁷ Since I have been away from undergraduate teaching for several years until this semester, I have included in my promotion package all copies of a mid-term assessment recently completed by students in the *Controversies in Public Policy* course during the Fall 2004 semester.

⁸ The first edition was single-authored (St. Martins Press, 1995), the second edition was co-authored with a doctoral student in Political Science (John A. Hird and Michael Reese, Bedford/St. Martins, 1999), and the third edition added as a co-author a master’s student in CPPA (John A. Hird, Michael Reese, and Matthew Shilvock, Wadsworth, 2004).

historical background and examples of arguments involving contemporary policymaking controversies, and has achieved sufficient adoption elsewhere to be in its third edition. I enjoy tremendously teaching undergraduates, especially those new to public policy, and was happy to return to undergraduate teaching in fall 2004 after three years away. As well, I would like to return to teaching doctoral seminars in public policy and related fields as time and administrative demands permit.

Most of my teaching since 1998 has been in the Master's Program in Public Policy and Administration, where I have taught Public Policy Analysis, the Workshop, and the Capstone courses, all required core courses. In these professionally-oriented courses, top-down teaching is not only ineffective; it diminishes the significant contributions these talented students offer one another. My attempts to focus on using the most effective tools for learning has led me to encourage them to learn inductively, by offering examples of problems (largely through case studies and hypothetical situations) and then asking them to identify the theoretical origins of issues as a means of motivating further theoretical exploration and development. I also encourage working in groups to best simulate the working style of most policy analysts and leaders. I try to bring a "real world" dimension to their studies by including individual community-based projects as an option for the student policy analyses, working mainly with the City of Holyoke. Holyoke, a former industrial center, provides a rich source of policy issues, a community and government receptive to student projects, and close proximity to campus.

My future teaching interests are many and varied. One is developing a course in public policymaking for scientists on campus (and, perhaps, through an online course for off-campus participants as well.) Through conversations with science and engineering students and faculty, I believe there is substantial interest among masters and doctoral science students in learning how policymaking works. Such a course would help science students develop greater sophistication about policymaking and improve linkages between the College of Social and Behavioral Science and engineering and the natural and biological sciences. I have also started to plan the development of a large team-taught undergraduate course in public policy and management that would engage two or three faculty as well as prominent outside speakers who would serve to connect students directly with the world of policymaking. Undergraduates are so removed from the world of public policy, and have little idea how they can pursue careers in public service, that having them meet "real life" policymakers can have a substantial impact on seeing the kinds of interesting public service careers available to them. Finally, I would like to offer a doctoral course on expertise and public policy, aimed mostly at political science doctoral students but open to other social and natural scientists as well.

I am also planning to teach an online course in Public Policy Analysis; while I have some reservations about the efficacy of online learning, I have heard enough serious faculty describe it as a *more* effective means of teaching in some respects that I am ready to try it. For example, by forcing students to write their comments rather than through extemporaneous speaking, some report that threaded discussions allow for more thoughtful discussion and, I suspect, for including reticent discussion participants more effectively than the social dynamics of the classroom often allow. Online teaching also has the obvious virtue of enabling access by distant populations.

SERVICE

My service load both within the university and beyond began to increase when the planning for CPPA began ten years ago, and expanded when I became the Center's first director in 1998. I have continued my involvement in the Political Science department throughout, having served on the (elected) Personnel Committee five times since attaining tenure in 1995 (1996-7; 1997-8; 2001-2; 2003-4; 2004-5), the Budget and Planning Committee four times, and several tenure and mini-tenure subcommittees. I chaired two departmental searches (in 1996 and 1997), and served on the ad hoc committee on procedures that

substantially revised departmental structures. While the proportion of my service within the Political Science department has been relatively small compared with that to the College, University, and profession, it has nonetheless been substantial.

Within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, most of my work focused on helping to establish the Center and Masters Program in Public Policy and Administration. This began with chairing a small committee in the College in 1995 to develop initial plans for such a Center/Program, which developed into a university-wide committee of 15 participants from several colleges/schools, and many, many meetings later to the establishment of the new Center for Public Policy and Administration and a substantially revised Masters Program in Public Policy and Administration in 1998. The next several years were a period of transitioning from the old program to the new, as well as hiring staff and faculty, lobbying for and improving physical space, and the multitudinous other tasks involved in starting any new institution. The new faculty arrangements were unique at this University, and represented mutual adjustments by both CPPA and the associated departments in hiring faculty desirable to all. The departments and CPPA have been highly successful at this and, at present, CPPA has seven joint faculty across three colleges. (In Social and Behavioral Sciences: Joya Misra, Sociology; Michael Ash, Economics; Brenda Bushouse, Political Science; and Krista Harper, Anthropology. In the College of Natural Resources and the Environment: Jim Murphy, Resource Economics; and Charlie Schweik, Natural Resources Conservation. In the School of Education: Kathryn McDermott, EPRA.) I was heavily involved in each of these hiring processes, and served on several of the search committees. Through the efforts of these faculty and the appeal of teaching CPPA students, a total of 27 faculty – including nine from Political Science – are now “CPPA Faculty” who participate in the research, teaching, and service components of CPPA as well as in their departments. CPPA is now engaged in two joint faculty searches – in Science and Technology (I co-chair this search committee with Doug Anderton), and Law (with the Department of Legal Studies) – and several more are planned in next two years. Many faculty have participated in these searches and have shared with me in the demands and rewards of participating on search committees for both faculty and staff.

As routines have been established and staff assignments clarified, the work involved in directing CPPA’s day-to-day activities has lessened over time. Yet other tasks now require additional time and attention. One is the maintenance and development of CPPA’s Advisory Board, currently nine accomplished individuals that I recruited with much help from Ellen Leuchs and Wendy Varner. The Board has been quite effective in advancing CPPA’s goals by providing important advice, and making financial contributions to support student scholarships and faculty research. (As one example, through Advisory Board contributions CPPA is supporting a faculty research grant program that provides release time to faculty to prepare major grant proposals. Another example: A Board member advocated for the Alumni Association to establish a \$10,000 per year scholarship fund for CPPA students, the first such scholarship for graduate students on this campus.) Second, CPPA has become the focal point in the College for science, technology, and society (STS) initiatives. In addition to being involved with hiring new faculty in STS, this year I coordinate a group of CSBS faculty interested in STS issues and help to coordinate connections to large grant opportunities with faculty in the natural and biological sciences and engineering. (Current examples include nanotechnology, atmospheric sensing, emergency preparedness, Superfund, and dam removal.) Third, CPPA is developing initiatives in undergraduate teaching. Thus far, this has involved an undergraduate certificate that is becoming increasingly popular, and will develop into offering more courses and possibly a minor or major for undergraduates in public policy and administration. Fourth, CPPA is exploring the development of an online certificate in public policy and administration, and possibly others as well. Fifth, CPPA is developing clusters of faculty research expertise in several areas besides science and technology, including health policy, the environment, social policy, and governance. These are evolving into multidisciplinary groups of faculty whose work will

lead to proposals for large-scale institutional support, such as center grants from federal funding agencies. Finally, CPPA will continue to be involved in public events, such as our new "celebration of public service" (Michael Dukakis being the first recipient of CPPA's annual public service award), inviting other speakers to campus, and expanding the University's relevance to the world of public affairs. The development of CPPA has provided me the opportunity to work with many others to help bring outstanding new faculty, staff, and students to the university. CPPA is very much a collective effort, one that I continue to be pleased to be a part of.

Besides directing CPPA, I chair the Faculty Senate University Service, Public Service, and Outreach Council (currently in my third year); as well, I serve on the Faculty Senate's Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, the CSBS Research Council (second year), and coordinate the College's Science, Technology, and Society committee. I have served on the University's Public Service Endowment Committee, the UMass President's Office Outreach Council (workgroup on state agencies), and the Provost's Revenue Development Committee. I have also been involved with every major CPPA initiative, such as initiating the Policy Partnership with the City of Holyoke (which has been highly successful, not least from the Mayor's perspective), the Massachusetts Policy Fellowships (that connect student research with legislator and faculty interests), the gubernatorial debate in 1998, numerous public presentations, etc.

Finally, my service beyond the university has taken several forms. First, I have been heavily involved in professional service to national associations, mostly the research-based Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management (APPAM). I have served on the conference program committee twice (assembling panels in environmental policy), the Vernon Prize committee (selecting the best paper in JPAM, that year awarded to Nancy Shulock), the Nominating Committee (which nominates officers to APPAM), and have served as the Institutional Representative for UMass-Amherst since 1996. I have also served on NASPAA's Policy Issues Committee. I serve on the editorial board for the leading journal in public policy and management – the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* – since 1997 and review numerous manuscripts for it as well as other journals in my field; as well, I served on *Polity's* editorial board from 1993-1999.

Other professional service has included serving on the editorial board of the MA American Society of Public Administration's "Memos to the Governor" project in 2001-02 (the report was published in 2003); serving on scientific advisory review panels for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the National Science Foundation; chair for an Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) review for the University of Massachusetts Boston's Ph.D. Program in Public Policy; and serving on the executive council of the public policy section of the American Political Science Association.

Additional service beyond the University includes coordinating the assessment of the Commonwealth's Tuition Remission Program for the MA Council of Human Service Providers, coordinating a survey of Massachusetts state agency research needs, and serving as a coordinator of the Policy Partnerships Conference, a national conference held on campus that explored the opportunities and challenges of partnerships between cities and universities. I was invited by USIA to deliver nine speeches in six cities over two weeks in Japan about the U.S. experience with deregulation. From 1994-2002, I led a team of graduate students who produced the Economic Information appendix evaluating the health of the state economy, which was included in all state bond issues. Finally, I have worked with more than a dozen agencies through CPPA's Workshop course, in which small teams of graduate students work with public or nonprofit sector clients on issues or problems of mutual interest. Connecting CPPA students with the policy community is not only essential to effective education but enormously gratifying to the students and organizations as well as to me.

SUMMARY

My work in helping to connect the world of expertise to policymaking is motivated by trying to improve upon processes exemplified by the following reflection:

I think it's vital to de-professionalize the public debate on matters that vitally affect the lives of ordinary people. It's time to snatch our futures back from the 'experts'. . . . Frankly, however trenchantly, however angrily, however combatively one puts forward one's case, at the end of the day, I'm only a citizen, one of many, who is demanding public information, asking for a public explanation. I have no axe to grind. I have no professional stakes to protect. I'm prepared to be persuaded. I'm prepared to change my mind. But instead of an argument, or an explanation, or a disputing of facts, one gets insults, invective, legal threats, and the Expert's Anthem: "You're too emotional. You don't understand, and it's too complicated to explain." The subtext, of course, is: Don't worry your little head about it. Go and play with your toys. Leave the real world to us. (Arundhati Roy, *Power Politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2001, pp. 24-5)

Improving the relationship between expertise and policymaking is important not just for better policymaking but for better democracy.