

Table 1
American State Administrators: Background Characteristics

| | 1964 | 1968 | 1974 | 1978 | 1984 | 1988 | 1994 | 1998 | 2004 | 2008 |
|-------------------------------|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| N=(approx) | 850 | 725 | 750 | 525 | 450 | 550 | 412 | 1175 | 903 | 713 |
| | (percentages) | | | | | | | | | |
| Age | | | | | | | | | | |
| Under 40 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 22 | 25 | 22 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 5 |
| 40-49 | 28 | 29 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 48 | 46 | 41 | 23 | 14 |
| 50-59 | 35 | 38 | 33 | 31 | 28 | 28 | 36 | 40 | 53 | 50 |
| 60 and over | 24 | 19 | 19 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 18 | 31 |
| Mean Age (Years) | 52 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 47 | 41 | 49 | 50 | 55 | 56 |
| Median Age (Years) | 53 | 51 | 50 | 49 | 47 | 43 | 49 | 51 | 53 | 56 |
| Gender | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 98 | 95 | 96 | 92 | 89 | 83 | 78 | 78 | 74 | 71 |
| Female | 2 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 17 | 22 | 22 | 26 | 29 |
| Ethnicity | | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 98 | 97 | 96 | 93 | 90 | 91 | 90 | 89 | 88 | 90 |
| Black | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5.5 |
| Asian | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1.5 |
| American Indian | - | - | * | 1 | * | * | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Hispanic | - | - | - | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1.7 |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | |
| High school or less | 14 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Some college | 20 | 18 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| College graduates | 26 | 15 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 18 | 16 | 20 | 17 | 20 |
| Graduate study (or degree) | 40 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 77 | 73 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 75 |

- The average age of state administrators has increased to age 56.

- One out of two agency heads are between the ages of 50 to 60.

- The proportion of female state administrators has increased to 29% in 2008, and has steadily risen since 1964.

- Black minorities are the only ethnicity to show a slight increase in number, but increases in the number of minority agency heads are basically stagnant since 1984.

- The number of administrators possessing graduate degrees or graduate study has also increased since the 1960s. In 2008, 95% of State administrators were college/university graduates.

* Less than .05%

** 1998, 2004, and 2008 numbers reflect responses from the full range of approximately 100 different agency types. The earlier years reflect responses from 35 agencies originally surveyed. Thus, some differences may reflect differences in the sample population.

Table 2
American State Administrators: Career Patterns

| | 1964 | 1968 | 1974 | 1978 | 1984 | 1988 | 1994 | 1998 | 2004 | 2008 |
|--|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| N=(approx) | 850 | 725 | 750 | 525 | 450 | 550 | 412 | 1175 | 903 | 713 |
| | (percentages) | | | | | | | | | |
| Immediate prior position | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subordinate, same agency | 28 | 27 | 36 | 43 | 40 | 33 | 36 | 41 | 43 | 44 |
| Another agency, same state | 22 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 23 | 21 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 16 |
| Local government | 11 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 7 |
| Federal government | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Another state | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Other | 31 | 36 | 3 | 23 | 24 | 30 | 32 | 22 | 24 | 26 |
| Position(s) in number of State Agencies | | | | | | | | | | |
| One | 54 | 54 | 58 | 54 | 49 | 48 | 37 | 53 | 56 | 55 |
| Two or Three | 39 | 41 | 35 | 38 | 40 | 42 | 49 | 38 | 34 | 36 |
| Four or More | 7 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 9 |
| Position in other States | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 8 | 11 | 14 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 14 | 13 |
| No | 92 | 89 | 86 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 85 | 84 | 86 | 87 |
| Years (avg) in: | | | | | | | | | | |
| State Government | 11 | 10 | 13 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 18 |
| Present Agency | NA | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 13 |
| Present Position | NA | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 6 |
| Immediate(ly) Prior Position | NA | NA | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9 |

- Most state administrators continue to advance from previous positions held in the same agency.

- In 2008, 44% of State administrators came from the same agency.

- In 2008, 45% of State agency directors have worked in more than two agencies.

- The average years administrators have worked in their present agency also increased to 13 years.

- Overall, state agency heads are more experienced than ever before.

Table 3
American State Administrators: Agency Actions and Activities

| | 1964 | 1968 | 1974 | 1978 | 1984 | 1988 | 1994 | 1998 | 2004 | 2008 |
|---|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| N=(approx) | 850 | 725 | 750 | 525 | 450 | 550 | 412 | 1175 | 929 | 713 |
| | (percentages) | | | | | | | | | |
| Hours worked weekly (average) | NA | NA | 52 | 53 | 51 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| Percentage of Time Spent on: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Internal Management | 53 | 50 | 49 | 56 | 51 | 51 | 50 | 49 | 50 | 49 |
| Policy Development | 27 | 29 | 29 | 23 | 25 | 26 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 26 |
| Public support | 19 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 22 | 21 | 26 | 21 | 24 |
| Percent Administrators Reporting Daily or Weekly Contact with: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Governor | - | - | 29 | 30 | 24 | 24 | 26 | 15 | 13 | 10 |
| Governor's staff | - | - | | 55 | 44 | 63 | 57 | 45 | 44 | 46 |
| Legislators | - | - | 61 | 55 | 44 | 54 | 52 | 38 | 33 | 29 |
| Legislative staff | - | - | | 49 | 45 | 49 | 46 | 37 | 30 | 32 |
| Personnel from Other | - | - | | | | | | | | |
| Agencies | | | 89 | 81 | 80 | 80 | 75 | 71 | 76 | 66 |
| Clientele Groups | - | - | 89 | 83 | 76 | 86 | 65 | 66 | 59 | 59 |
| Citizens | - | - | 87 | 77 | 65 | 77 | 66 | 72 | 54 | 60 |

- Administrators spend about half of their time at work on internal management. The rest of their time is divided between Policy Development and Public Support.
- State administrators work an average of 52 hours per week.
- Legislative contact continues to exceed the amount of contact administrators have with the governor.
- 2/3 of administrators have regular contact with other agencies, suggesting strong inter-agency coordination.
- Since 1974, State agency directors contacted Clientele Groups, and Citizens more often than Governors, Legislators, and their staff did.

Table 4
American State Administrators: State-Level Relationships and Influence

2008

N=(appr 713)

(percentages)

| Recent Administrators Reporting: | Governor | Legislators | Each the same |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Who exercises greater Control over your agency? | 45 | 33 | 22 |
| 2. Who exercises a more detailed review over your requests | 35 | 37 | 28 |
| 3. Who has the greater tendency to reduce your budget requests? | 36 | 44 | 20 |
| 4. Who is more supportive of agency purposes? | 59 | 37 | 4 |
| 5. Who should exercise greater control? | 53 | 15 | 32 |
| % Administrators Reporting Moderate to High Levels of Influence on these actors: | Total Agency Budget Level | Specific Program Budget | Major Policy Changes |
| Governor | 89 | 84 | 85 |
| Legislature | 92 | 88 | 85 |
| Clientele Groups | 38 | 45 | 58 |
| Professional Associations | 27 | 28 | 41 |

- Close to half of all administrators responding to the survey believe the governor exercises greater control over their state agency. About half of the agency heads believe this state executive should exercise that control.
- The governor is deemed more supportive of state agency purposes than the legislature.
- The governor and legislature continue to exert high levels of influence on agency budget level, program specific budgets, and major policy change.
- 92% of state administrators perceive high influence by the legislature on total agency budgets..
- 88% report that the legislature influences specific program budgets.
- Clientele, and professional associations exert high levels of influence on a much smaller percentage of administrators.

Table 5
American State Administrators: Agency Expansion, Budgets, and Program Priorities
2008

N=(approx) 713

percentages of agency heads responding:

| Program Expansion: | No | Yes | Increase by up to 15% | Increase by 15% or more |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Should your state's overall level of programs services, and expenditures be expanded and increased? | 28 | 72 | 70 | 30 |
| Should your agency's specific programs and services be expanded and increased? | 21 | 79 | 66 | 34 |
| Last Year's Budget Process | Decrease | No Change | Increase | % Requesting 5% or more increase |
| Considering your initial request did you propose a: | 4 | 22 | 74 | 60 |
| Did the governor recommend a: | 17 | 32 | 51 | 42 |
| Did the legislature appropriate a: | 17 | 26 | 57 | 43 |
| Program Priorities | None | Minor | Moderate | Major |
| Within the past four years what shifts have occurred in the ordering of priorities among your programs? | 3 | 27 | 44 | 26 |
| Sources of Change in Priorities (percentage administrators reporting each actor as a source of priority change) | | | | |
| Legislature | 64 | Local Officials | 8 | |
| Governor | 58 | National Officials | 26 | |
| Agency Staff | 63 | Other Groups | 14 | |
| Clientele Group | 28 | | | |

- 72% of administrators supported an increase of the overall level of program services their agency offered. Among these administrators, 70% favored at least a 15% increase of the agency's services.

- 79% of agency heads believe that specific programs and services of their agency should be expanded. 66% of these directors support at least a 15% increase in specific services and programs.

- 74% of administrators asked for a budget increase, 22% asked for no change, while only 4% suggested a decrease in their agency's budget. More than half of the time, Governors and Legislatures agreed with the agency requests for an increased budget.

- 44% of the State administrators reported that moderate shifts have occurred in the ordering of priorities among the agency's programs.

- The actors most important in initiating change of priorities are Legislatures, Governors, and Agency Staff.

Table 6
American State Administrators: Intergovernmental Relationships 2008

N=(approx) 713

(percentages)

Federal Aid:

Receipt and Dependency

(percentages of administrators in each category)

| | 1964 | 1968 | 1974 | 1978 | 1984 | 1988 | 1994 | 1998 | 2004 | 2008 |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| % of Agencies Receiving Federal Aid | 33 | 48 | 57 | 69 | 60 | 58 | 61 | 74 | 79 | 76 |
| Federal Aid is 50% or more of Budget | 9 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 25 | 28 | 34 |

Federal Aid Recipient Agencies (79% of all agencies)

Percent acknowledging receipt of:

| | | | |
|----------------|----|--------------|----|
| Formula Grants | 71 | Loans | 3 |
| Block Grants | 27 | Non-matching | 25 |
| Project Grants | 69 | Contracts | 21 |

Number of federal department/agencies providing aid:

| | | | |
|-------|----|------|----|
| One | 30 | Four | 11 |
| Two | 27 | Five | 5 |
| Three | 22 | Six | 1 |

- About ¾ of state agencies received federal aid in the last decade. In 2008, 34% of state agencies received Federal Aid, which exceeded 50% of the agency's budget.
- Formula Grants and Project Grants seem to be the most popular Federal Aid.
- Administrators also report that most of the Federal Aid derives from less than three federal departments/agencies.
- State agency heads see moderate changes in the Federal funds allocation due to categorical "strings."

**Table 7
American State Administrators: Intergovernmental
Relationships and Opinions 2008**

| N=(approx) 713 | (percentages) | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Has Federal Aid: | Yes | | | |
| Led to National interference in affairs that are the appropriate domain of the state? | 44 | | | |
| Unbalanced or skewed the overall character of your state's programs? | 38 | | | |
| Made agencies subject to less supervision by the governor and the legislature in federally financed activities than in activities financed by State funds? | 36 | | | |
| Increased, decreased, or had no effect on the overall level of funds raised by your state | Increased | Decreased | No effect | |
| | 40 | 16 | 44 | |
| Without categorical "strings" how differently would Federal funds be allocated? | Slight | 16 | Substantial | 22 |
| | Moderate | 60 | Radical | 1 |
| Should federal aid be expanded for: | Yes | No | | |
| Existing Programs | 79 | 21 | | |
| New Programs | 72 | 28 | | |
| National Legal/Regulatory Actions | | | | |
| How do you rate the impact of types of national legal/regulatory actions on your agency? | No Impact | Negative | Neutral | Positive |
| Administrative Regulations | 8 | 46 | 36 | 10 |
| Mandates | 8 | 52 | 29 | 11 |
| Statutory Preemptions | 15 | 42 | 39 | 4 |
| Federal Court Decisions | 15 | 27 | 49 | 9 |

- 44% of administrators reported that Federal Aid has led to National Interference in state affairs.

- 38% believe that Federal Aid impacts the overall character of the state programs.

- 36% of agency heads also believe that Federal Aid has decreased the supervision Governors and Legislatures have over programs funded by the Federal Government.

- 40% of administrators report that Federal Aid has increased their agency's overall funds, 44% sees no effect, while only 16% reports a decrease.

- In addition, the vast majority of agency heads would like to see Federal Aid expanded on both existing and new programs.

- Most of the administrators consider that national legal actions such as Administrative Regulations, Mandates, and Statutory Preemptions have a negative impact on their agencies. However, when it comes to Federal Court Decisions, the majority of administrators see them as neutral.