

RELEASE IN FULL

## MEMORANDUM

TO: S AND CHERYL

FROM: AM

RE: PUBLIC POLICY SCHOOLS

DATE: 5.13.12

I recently flew to Budapest to give a keynote address at a conference called by the new School of Public Policy and International Affairs at Central European University, funded by George Soros, to explore what a 21<sup>st</sup> century public policy school would look like. I'm also advising Notre Dame on creating their new school of public policy. In the last 10 years schools all over the world have established new schools of "public policy (Singapore), government (Oxford), and governance (Hertie School in Berlin). I've thought a lot about what is wrong with current schools and where it should be possible to go. In this memo I outline what a model school might look like from my perspective, offer some thoughts on different approaches to influencing the public policy education landscape, and review a few options in New York. My aim is to provide a point of departure to help you think through some of these issues; obviously I would be delighted to continue the conversation.

A Model Public Policy School for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

In my view, a 21<sup>st</sup> century public policy school ought to erase the divide between domestic and international politics, to require joint degrees, to encourage tri-sector experience, to promote modular and global education, and to insist that all graduates have a deep understanding of connection technologies, networks and the opportunities they create. Your legacy priorities at State provide a great foundation for pursuing some or all of these dimensions of public policy education.

*Erasing the domestic/international divide:* This is an old mantra; everyone argues that with globalization nothing is purely domestic any more. Yet public policy education typically distinguishes between "public policy" (domestic) and "international affairs" (see the name of the Budapest school, or my own Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs; and schools of "government" still offer "domestic" and "international" policy tracks. One of the most important corollaries on a focus on development as much as diplomacy in foreign policy is that "development" is essentially domestic policy in poor countries: health, education, empowerment of women, jobs, infrastructure, anti-corruption, nutrition, sustainable and profitable agriculture etc. All of that applies equally to Newark, Detroit, Camden, parts of NYC, and of course vast swathes of states like Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, etc. (Jim Steinberg was telling me yesterday about the epidemic of obesity in central New York). We somehow think of "development" as something that happens somewhere else, as opposed to thinking about policy that provides all human beings with what they need to flourish and recognizing that all poor, ill-educated, diseased, under-served, violent places in the world need better policy and can learn from each other.

*Requiring joint degrees:* As a law school graduate and professor, one of my biggest frustrations as dean of a public policy school was that "public policy" is not actually a discipline, in the sense of an agreed body of knowledge as well as skills. Law, medicine, business, and advanced education in science, engineering, the social sciences, and the humanities has a corpus of knowledge that is required as well as, at least in the professional disciplines, a set of skills to enable practitioners to

apply that knowledge. Public policy has a set of skills – economic and statistical analysis, an understanding of the differences between good policy and good politics, knowledge of judgment and decision-making, budgeting, organizational management, etc. – but no agreement on the actual corpus of knowledge that these skills are to advance professionally. Instead we offer a smorgasbord of courses in different areas – at WWS they are international relations, development, domestic policy, and economists; other schools have different tracks and certificates – but only a year’s worth and with no ability for a student actually to master a subject area. The result is that Masters of Public Policy students are rarely competitive with Ph.D. students in any discipline or with law, business, or medicine students. A public policy school that educates and produces of the caliber that Yale, Harvard, or Stanford law school does can only do so by designing joint degree programs with top professional schools and Ph.D. programs.

*Tri-Sector Experience:* I hardly need to elaborate on this point to you! Think three legs of the stool, public-private partnerships, CGI, etc. But many public policy schools still treat the private sector as highly suspect. These attitudes flow naturally from selection bias; the split between business schools and public policy schools is a split in many ways between the private and the public sector in the first places, though a growing number of students are starting to get MBA-MPP degrees because they recognize the need for financial acumen and private sector management skills in the NGO sector. But a 21<sup>st</sup> century public policy school should emphasize from the beginning that national and global problems will require collaboration among all three sectors to solve and students should be expected to pursue summer internships and even externships in all three sectors over the course of their education.

*Modular and Global Education:* Top professors around the world from many different countries are already becoming “global professors,” in the sense that they teach modular courses (1 week, 2 week, 3 week, 6 week) at many different universities in the world over the course of a year. Many new programs are deliberately designing courses on this model to be able to take advantage of top faculty. In some cases these courses are continued on line and by video-conference; e.g. two professors will co-teach a 12 week course between, say, the University of Beijing and Princeton and will switch back and forth but teach the entire course in both places linking the classes together via video-conference and shared course websites, chat rooms, etc. Particularly for public policy, the global perspectives and contacts with a global network of students that this emerging model affords is essential. It can also be combined with joint degree programs with other public policy schools (Columbia, LSE, Sciences Po, and the Lee Kwan Yew School have pioneered this approach). Not all courses should be taught this way, and a core of professors with children in school will be considerably less mobile. But for young faculty and older faculty members, particularly those with global reputations, the advantages of creating modular courses and offering them in many different places will be enormous and the school that builds these opportunities into its curriculum will have a major recruiting advantage.

*Connection Technologies and the Networked World:* 21<sup>st</sup> century statecraft understandings of how to use information and connection technologies to connect individuals to one another, to their government, and to the knowledge they need must be built into virtually every course and practical experience that a public policy school offers. It cannot be seen as a specialization for technologists; it is a core part of understanding what can be accomplished in a deeply networked world. I would also create a Center for Social Enterprise, Ashoka style – self-organization, collaborative problem-solving, entrepreneurship, and technology all go together.

### Schools, Institutes, and Consortia

There are a number of different ways that you could have a major impact on public policy education by fostering your distinctive vision of how to make the world a better and more capable place. Here are three possible ways to proceed.

#### *A Clinton School of [Global Public Policy, Governance, Global Affairs, Etc]*

You could found your own school. This allows you the greatest freedom of action and ability to realize a distinctive vision. It is also the hardest and slowest approach, requiring \$100 million endowment and 2-3 years minimum of building a faculty, developing a curriculum, recruiting students, and fighting administrative battles. If you choose to locate your school in anything other than a top flight university, all these problems will be even harder (cf. the Soros experience in Budapest; they created the school two years ago, spent over a year finding a founding dean, now expect to admit first class of students in fall of 2013).

You could rename and endow an existing school. This approach avoids all the founding problems, but the administrative/bureaucratic/political battles to remake an existing school to implement your vision will be fierce.

#### *A Clinton Institute of [Global Public Policy, Governance, Global Affairs, Etc]*

You could create an Institute that was a joint venture between a law school, business school, medical school, and school of public policy at a university that has some or all of those schools. This Institute would have a distinctive curriculum and could develop partnerships with similar institutes abroad (indeed it could possibly create a template that universities around the world and in the U.S. might replicate) in which students in these other professional schools (and also in Ph.D. programs in the natural and social sciences) could earn some kind of certificate or even degree that would qualify them as practitioners able to apply their home discipline to the solution of public problems (formulating and implementing those solutions). I predict that these graduates would quickly command a premium on the government/NGO/consulting and corporate public affairs job markets.

#### *A Clinton Consortium for [Global Public Policy, Governance, Global Affairs, Etc]*

If you wanted to expand your reach beyond any one university, you might be able to design a degree or certificate program and bring together a global consortium of universities willing to create it/integrate it into their existing educational options. You could probably work with governments to support these programs at their national universities, as well as with the U.N. and regional organizations.

### Greater New York Options

The best place to found a school, frankly, would be Yale, which does not have a public policy school (SOM was supposed to combine business and policy, but doesn't really.) Obviously it's not in New York, but it would have the greatest impact in terms of getting the best students and attracting the most attention to the model. You could also do it within the CCNY system, which has political advantages and the appeal of getting an ethnically and economically diverse mix of students, but is likely to take a long time and be a very hard slog in terms of getting the quality of students you want. Another out of the box option would be to approach Cornell and see if they would be interested in

creating a Clinton School on Roosevelt Island – it would bring upstate NY and the city together; Cornell also has growing global reach.

If you wanted to take over a school, your best option would actually be SIPA, the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia. I interviewed to be dean there in 1996 with the idea that they should get a big endowment and name the School as the place to educate the diplomats of the 21<sup>st</sup> century; they preferred to keep it as a cash cow supporting their other programs. Transforming SIPA has many advantages (Columbia is also expanding into Harlem, of course, and this approach would make a lot of sense for the Clinton Foundation), but the political/bureaucratic challenges are of historic proportions. It would only be doable with ironclad guarantees from Lee Bollinger and a very tough dean committed to the job for a decade. You might also take the same approach with SOM at Yale.

The Institute option would make a lot of sense at NYU, which has terrific law, business, and medical schools and a public policy school that is primarily focused on domestic issues. This would be tricky but doable to work out bureaucratically. One concern I would have, however, is the political liability of connecting your name and legacy to a university that is a joint venture partner with the Abu Dhabi and Chinese governments. As much as I appreciate John Sexton's vision, I predict that these connections could quickly become political liabilities. An Institute might also be possible by connecting different professional schools and Ph.D. programs within the CCNY system and connecting it to great municipal/national university systems in other countries (the University of London, University of Paris, University of Tokyo, etc.) This you could do w/ Mayor Bloomberg on the C-40 model.

The Consortium model is best located within the Clinton Foundation, bringing together as many different universities as you want.

These are my thoughts of a Sunday morning, although informed by years of doing and thinking about public policy education. It's a journey I would love to travel with you in some way, other circumstances permitting.

Happy Mother's Day!