

Table 1
American State Administrators: Background Characteristics

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

- ✓ **The average age of state administrators has increased to age 55.**
- ✓ **A majority of agency heads are between the ages of 50 to 60.**
- ✓ **The proportion of women state administrators has increased to 26% in 2004, 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.**

**1998 and 2004 numbers reflect responses from the full range of approximately 100 different agency types. The earlier years reflect responses from the 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
N=(approx)	850	725	750	525	450	550	412	1175	806
	(percentages)								
IMMEDIATE PRIOR POSITION									
Subordinate-Same									
Agency	28	27	36	43	40	33	36	43	43
Another Agency-									
Same State	22	19	18	17	23	21	18	19	18
Local Government									
National	11	10	9	7	5	8	7	6	5
Government									
Another State	6	4	3	3	4	2	2	3	3
Other	2	4	4	6	4	6	5	6	6
	31	36	3	23	24	30	32	24	24
POSITION(S) IN NUMBER OF STATE AGENCIES									
One	54	54	58	54	49	48	37	53	20
Two or Three	39	41	35	38	40	42	49	38	21
Four or More	7	5	7	8	11	10	15	9	3
POSITION(S) IN OTHER STATES									
Yes	8	11	14	16	15	14	15	16	14
No	92	89	86	84	85	85	85	84	86
YEARS (AVG) IN:									
State Government	14	14	13	12	12	13	15	16	17
Present Agency	NA	11	10	10	9	9	10	12	13
Present Position	NA	6	5	5	5	5	5	6	5
Immediate(ly) Prior Position	NA	NA	8	7	7	7	9	9	10

- ✓ Most state administrators continue to advance from previous positions held in the same agency.
- ✓ 14% of agency heads formerly held positions in other states, a slight decrease from the 1990s.
- ✓ The average years in state government for state administrators continues to increase to 17 years in 2004.
- ✓ 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
N=(approx)	850	725	750	525	450	550	412	1175	929
HOURS WORKED (PER WEEK)									
Mean	NA	NA	52	53	51	53	53	52	52
PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT ON:									
Internal Management	53	50	49	56	51	51	50	49	50
Policy Development	27	29	29	23	25	26	25	25	25
Public Support	19	21	21	21	24	22	21	26	25
Percent Administrators Reporting DAILY OR WEEKLY CONTACT WITH:									
Governor	-	-	29	30	24	24	26	15	13
Governor's Staff	-	-	NA	55	44	63	57	45	44
Legislators	-	-	61	55	44	54	52	38	33
Legislative Staff	-	-	NA	49	45	49	46	37	30
Personnel from Other Agencies	-	-	89	81	80	80	75	71	76
Clientele Groups	-	-	89	83	76	86	65	66	59
Citizens	-	-	87	77	65	77	66	72	54
FEDERAL AID: RECEIPT AND DEPENDENCY (percentages of administrators in each category)									
% of Agencies									
Receiving Federal Aid	33	48	57	69	60	58	61	74	79
Federal Aid is 50 Percent or More of Budget									
	9	13	13	14	12	13	13	26	28

- ✓ Administrators spend about half of their time at work on internal management.
- ✓ State administrators work an average of 52 hours per week.
- ✓ Legislative contact continues to exceed the amount of contact administrators have with the governor.
- ✓ Over ¾ of administrators have regular contact with other agencies, suggesting strong inter-agency coordination.
- ✓ State agency head contact with clientele and citizens continues to decrease.
- ✓ About ¾ of state agencies received federal aid in the last decade, up dramatically from the three previous decades.
- ✓ A full third of the agencies in the last decade receive a majority of their funds from federal aid. *This does reflect an expanded number of agencies surveyed in the later years (100 different agencies compared to about 35 in the previous years.)*

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

2004

N=(approx) 871		(percentages)		
Percent Administrators Reporting:	Governor	Legislature	Each the Same	
1. Who exercises greater control over your agency?	45	30	25	
2. Who exercises a more detailed review of your budget requests?	34	28	38	
3. Who has the greater tendency to reduce your budget requests?	32	41	27	
4. Who is more supportive of agency purposes?	64	34	2	
5. Who should exercise greater control?	34	17	NA	
Percent Administrators Reporting High to Moderate Levels of Influence on:	Total Agency Budget Level	Specific Program Budgets	Major Policy Changes	
Governor	88	82	82	
Legislature	92	86	83	
State Courts	9	8	23	
Clientele Groups	34	34	44	
Professional Associations	18	18	27	

- ✓ **Close to half of all administrators responding to the survey believe the governor exercises greater control over their state agency. About 1/3 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..**
- ✓ **86% report that the legislature influences specific program budgets.**
- ✓ **State courts, 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**

2004

N=(approx) 870

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?	30	70	51	18
Should your agency's specific programs and services be expanded and increased?	24	76	52	24
LAST YEAR'S BUDGET PROCESS:	Decrease	No Change	Increase	% Favoring 5% or more increase
Considering your initial request did you propose a:	11	31	58	76
Did the governor recommend a:	30	35	35	63
Did the legislature appropriate a:	28	31	40	57
Considering next year's budget, will you propose a:	8	27	65	77
PROGRAM PRIORITIES:	None	Minor	Moderate	Major
Within the past four years what shifts have occurred in the ordering of priorities among your programs?	3	26	45	26
SOURCES OF CHANGE IN PRIORITIES: (percentage administrators reporting each actor as source of priority change)				
Legislature	60	Local Officials	10	
Governor	60	National Officials	26	
Agency Staff	56	Other Groups	11	
Clientele Group	21	State Courts	8	

✓ **70% believe overall state programs, services and expenditure should be increased.**

✓ **76% responded that their own agency's programs should be expanded; both statistics have increased since 1998.**

✓ **58% proposed an increase to their initial budget request, a decline from 74% in 1998, perhaps reflecting changing constraints in state fiscal outlooks and budgets.**

✓ **More administrators are considering a budget increase for the coming year's budget – 65%.**

✓ **A plurality (45%) of administrators answered that moderate shifts occurred in program priorities.**

Table 6
American State Administrators: Intergovernmental Relationships and Opinions
2004

N=(approx) 895

(percentages)

HAS FEDERAL AID:

Yes

Led to National interference in affairs that are the appropriate domain of the state?

43

Unbalanced or skewed the overall character of your state's programs?

41

Made agencies subject to less supervision by the governor and the legislature in federally financed activities that in activities financed by State funds?

45

	Increased	Decreased	No Effect
Increased, decreased, or had no effect on the overall level of funds raised by your state?	53	20	28

FEDERAL AID RECIPIENT AGENCIES (79% of all agencies)

Percent acknowledging receipt of:

Formula Grants	68	Loans	4
Block Grants	38	Non-matching	19
Project Grants	71	Contracts	22

Number of federal department/agencies providing aid:

One	28	Four	12
Two	24	Five	7
Three	21	Six	2

Without categorical "strings" how differently would federal funds be allocated:

Slight	16	Substantial	20
Moderate	62	Radical	2

Should federal aid be expanded for:

Yes

Existing Programs	80
New Programs	78

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	14	38	36	11
Mandates	12	46	31	11
Statutory Preemptions	23	33	41	3
Federal Court Decisions	20	29	44	7

- ✓ **The impacts of federal aid on agencies have decreased since 1998 to less than 50%: interference (43%), skewing (41%), and less supervision (45%).**
- ✓ **Among agencies receiving federal aid most received project grants (71%), many also receive formula grants (68%).**
- ✓ **Continuing a trend from the past, a majority of state agencies receive federal aid from only one or two national agencies.**
 - ✓ **62% would allocate federal funds without strings differently.**
- ✓ **80% believe federal aid should be expanded for existing programs, 78% for new programs.**
- ✓ **National legal/regulatory actions that impact state agencies are still rated more negatively than positively.**

**Table 7
American State Administrators: Homeland Security and Disaster Preparedness**

2004

N=(approx) 880

DEVOLUTION AND 9-11 IMPACTS

Regarding your *state*, have any of the following relationships altered in the past four years?

	Increase	No Change	Decrease
State discretion in program/policy choices	21	52	28
Federal regulations	51	41	8
Federal unfunded mandates	52	44	4
Discretion in use of federal funds	22	50	28

Regarding your *agency*, have any of the following relationships altered in the past four years?

	Increase	No Change	Decrease
State discretion in program/policy choices	19	57	24
Federal regulations	43	52	5
Federal unfunded mandates	35	62	3
Discretion in use of federal funds	19	59	22

In response to 9-11 initiatives, how has your state or agency changed...

	Increase	No Change	Decrease
Your agency's preparedness	79	21	-
Your agency's ability to pursue its mission	33	59	8
Coordination among state agencies	73	27	-
State funding for preparedness	50	47	3
State-local coordination for preparedness	75	25	-
State funding to localities for preparedness	42	56	2
State unfunded mandates for preparedness	34	65	1

	No	Yes, slight	Yes, moderate	Yes, major
Has your state reorganized or shifted functions among state agencies to improve emergency preparedness?	19	42	29	10

- ✓ **In the past four years, a bare majority of agency heads report that federal regulations and mandates have increased; however, half also report that state discretion on use of funds and policy choices have not changed.**
- ✓ **Over half of administrators believe that the relationships between the federal government and their state agencies majority have not changed.**
- ✓ **Agency preparedness, coordination among state agencies and state-local coordination for post 9-11 preparedness has increased in about ¾ (73%-79%) of state agencies.**
- ✓ **42% of state administrators responded that their agency has pursued moderate or major reorganization to improve emergency preparedness.**