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I. PURPOSE

South Carolina is one of 13 states which operates under a non-cabinet form of government. This "plural executive" organization provides no direct chain of command from the Governor to the other members of the executive branch. As such, executive control is shared among the Governor and other elected officials.

Also, in a "plural" sense, state government in South Carolina operates as a network of agencies that is individually governed by a number of boards and commissions. In addition to their responsibilities in the roles of policy-making and budgeting, these boards/commissions are accountable for insuring that agencies are properly administered and controlled.

Inasmuch as these 111 boards and commissions are charged with the execution of agency responsibility, their performance and input is critical to the governmental process. This comprehensive study of the organizational structure of government in South Carolina assesses six basic areas relative to the board/commission system:

A. Selective Process: The study addresses the various methods by which a board/commission member are appointed or elected. Additionally, participants are asked to comment on constituency makeup;

B. Governance of Agencies: The board/commission is the entity charged with the responsibility of governing the overall operation of the agency. Thus, participants respond to the frequency and manner in which they conduct business and their overall effectiveness in dealing with agency responsibility;

C. Execution of Legal Mission: The effectiveness by which an agency carries out its legal mission is directly dependent upon the board/commission's familiarity with the statutes
and regulations which delegate this responsibility. Participants are asked to comment on their knowledge of these statutes and how the statutes relate to the actual operation of the agency;

D. Relationship with Constituents: Inasmuch as agencies are charged with performing certain functions or services, frequently for a specific segment of the citizenry, the relationship between board/commission members and those citizens whom they serve should be identified. Participants are asked to indicate the manner in which constituent needs are revealed as well as the frequency of interaction between the two groups;

E. Accountability to Appointing Bodies: Members of boards and commissions provide a vital link between agencies, elected officials and the electorate by influencing the means by which agencies respond to public need. As policymakers, participants are asked to comment on their relationship with their appointed bodies and the manner in which these entities share information;

F. Funding and Budgetary Process: Board/Commission members have responsibilities in both budget development and budget execution. This component examines the extent to which these members are involved in the process as well as the role played by staff in preparing and administering the agency budget.

The data in this report was obtained through the use of survey instruments and personal interviews. These components were designed to secure the necessary information to identify and describe the six areas of the study.
The purpose of this study is to deliver a comprehensive review of the present board/commission system. None of the instruments was structured to solicit recommendations or suggest possible changes in the system. The observations contained herein represent a cumulative response by board/commission members and agency directors as to their roles and responsibilities in the governmental process.
II. METHODOLOGY

FOCUS GROUPS:

The focus group was composed of 13 participants representing nine separate boards and commissions and were selected by a random computer sample.

BOARD/COMMISSION QUESTIONNAIRE:

A total of 703 survey instruments was mailed to 111 boards and commissions. A total of 430 responses was recorded reflecting a 61 percent return.

AGENCY DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE:

A total of 63 survey instruments was mailed to 63 agencies. Only those agencies which maintain a full-time staff were included. A total of 45 responses was recorded reflecting a 71 percent return.

BOARD/COMMISSION AND AGENCY DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS:

A total of 17 individuals from each group was interviewed. These participants were selected at random. The availability and willingness to participate were also factors.
III. FOCUS GROUP SUMMARY

The comments of the participants in the focus group indicate that, overall, they are satisfied the board/commission system is working efficiently and properly. They feel they have struck the proper balance in their relationship with the agency and are fulfilling their roles as overseers of the agency. They are convinced of the competence and reliability of the agencies' staffs and rely on them to maintain the day-to-day operation of the agency. They also rely on the information provided by the staff and feel it is accurate and complete enough for them to make sound judgments on policy.

In general, their remarks indicate that their roles are limited by the very nature of the system. Since they function on a part-time basis, many say they cannot always know enough about the agency's business to address routine concerns. On the other hand, to devote more time to the agency's operation would, in essence, make board/commission members part of the staff, a responsibility many feel would not only be impracticable, but improper as well.

The participants are also generally satisfied that the selection process that placed them in their position is appropriate and effective. Most feel that other methods would be counterproductive, and none made any comments to suggest that pressure had been applied to take a specific action from the appointive bodies.

Few participants say they have any extensive contact with the constituency of the agency, and the contacts that are mentioned are largely the result of an appeal process or a need to solve a particular problem with the agency.

While these participants feel they are doing their job well, not all say they have a good understanding of the legal mission of the agency, and many would like to receive more complete orientation or training for their position.
III. THE FOCUS GROUP: ANALYSIS OF COMPONENTS

A two-hour session was held with 13 board/commission members representing nine state agencies for the purpose of identifying areas to be addressed by the survey instruments. Mr. Frank Brown, who served as an independent moderator from Metromark Market Research, conducted the session. Mr. Brown received thorough briefings from the consultants as well as from the staff of the State Reorganization Commission. In addition to directing questions relative to the six basic components of the study, participants were encouraged to comment on any subject matter concerning their service as board/commission members. Although it is important to note that the following analysis in this section is limited to only 13 participants, the responses from the focus group proved to be fairly representative of the cumulative findings revealed by the board/commission questionnaire.

SELECTION PROCESS:

Focus group members reached their positions through a variety of processes. In general, all participants felt the present methods of appointment or selection are proper for their particular position. Most of the members had been involved in various levels of government for some years before their board/commission service and through this involvement had contacts with the decision-makers in state government.

Several of the participants praised the present methods of selection for their board/commission. Some indicated that if the positions presently filled by appointment were filled instead by election by the public or the legislature, they would be unwilling to undertake the time and expense of offering for service. In conclusion, focus group members tended to support the method in which they, personally, were appointed or selected to serve on a board/commission.
GOVERNANCE OF AGENCIES:

For the most part, focus group members did not see themselves in a governing or administrative role. Their comments indicate that most boards/commissions meet frequently, and they feel the number of meetings is appropriate. Moreover, they say they are well-briefed before the meetings and feel the information they are provided is accurate and complete.

These participants rely on the staff of the agency to provide board/commission members with the information needed to make policy or make decision about specific issues. Most members feel the agencies are too complex for them to try to make decisions about detailed matters. For the most part, they tend to approve recommendations from the staff and to trust the staff's administrative competence.

Despite this trust, many of the participants emphasize they are not reluctant to exert their authority when they think it necessary and most comment that they study recommendations and review budget material carefully before taking official action.

None of the participants expressed a desire for greater control over the agency. They tend, rather, to feel the amount of authority they presently exercise is appropriate and that the staff does a good job of handling the agency's general operations. A few expressed a need for greater control over specific problems, but these comments were directed at external issues not related to their control over the agency in general.

EXECUTION OF LEGAL MISSION:

Many of the participants have a somewhat vague understanding of the legal mission of the agency and of the board/commission appointed to oversee it. Their remarks suggest that all do not have a clear sense of
details of the legal mission. As mentioned previously, they rely heavily on the staff to administer the agency properly and within the bounds of its legal mission.

Many comment that when they first came to their positions, there was either no orientation or the orientation was inadequate. A need for further training was expressed by a majority. Several indicate that there are professional seminars and conventions which could provide valuable training but the state does not provide sufficient funds for participation. It is suggested by the group that the state make provisions for the continued training of its board/commission members.

Despite this perception, most of the participants feel that after working on the board/commission for a while they learn how to do the job well and none of the participants suggests he or she is unable to function properly because of a lack of training or orientation.

**RELATIONSHIP WITH CONSTITUENCIES:**

Few focus group members indicate that they have extensive contacts with the constituents of their agencies. While a strong concern for the constituent is apparent in their comments about such matters as funding, for the most part, their contacts with constituents seem to be limited to dealing with individuals on specific problems or through an appeals process.

Some of the participants comment that the public has a poor understanding of their board/commission and of the agency's proper function. While some feel the appeals process on individual problems related to the agency should be shifted to the agency staff due to increasing demands on their time, others feel that the board/commission is properly charged with the responsibility to review appeals.
ACCOUNTABILITY TO APPOINTING BODIES:

Accountability is not an issue that these board/commission members see as a problem. While few mention any accountability to the constituents of their agencies, their concern for both the constituents and the citizens in general are clearly implicit in their comments about their relationships with their agencies. For example, saving taxpayers' money during the budget process is deemed an important role of the board/commission.

None of the participants indicates he or she feels any pressure from the appointive bodies. Rather, their comments indicate that their relationships with these bodies are cooperative and focus on doing the job effectively. Neither do participants indicate they have ever been pressured to take a certain action by those responsible for their selection to the board/commission. A few mention that they have been requested to deal with a problem involving the agency by members of the appointive bodies, but do not suggest that they were pressured in any way to take specific action.

FUNDING AND BUDGETING PROCESS:

Comments relative to the budget process were limited mainly to relations between the board/commission and the agency. Few comments were made about the legislature's involvement in the process. Many of the board/commission members do, however, make remarks indicating their concern over proper funding for the agency.

Again, these members rely heavily on the staff when it comes to working out the budget. They comment that budgets are very complicated and often involve so many facets that it is impractical to expect
board/commission members to know enough about each work program to make
detailed judgements. Nonetheless, they take the responsibility for
review seriously and most say they examine the budget carefully and
occasionally veto proposals by staff for particular programs.

The focus group demonstrates a concern for the proper funding of
their agencies, but their remarks about their roles in the funding
process are limited to comments about the system of reviewing a budget
set up by staff and normally approving it largely as written. They
emphasize strongly, however, that their review of the budget is thorough
and that is not a "rubber stamp" procedure.

Based upon this information, the following survey instruments
were developed and submitted to all members of boards and commissions
within the state government system.
IV. SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

A survey instrument addressing issues relative to the six components of the study was mailed to 703 board and commission members. The survey questions were designed to gain board/commission members' familiarity with their agencies' operation. Additionally, all full-time agency directors were asked to complete a survey similar in format to the instrument submitted to board/commission members. Questions relative to those components of the study in which agency directors are not involved are omitted. Therefore, there is no analysis of the selection process, relationship with constituents, nor accountability to appointing bodies.

It is important to note that the directors' survey is designed to gain insight from the staff's point of view. Although actual and perceptual differences are worthy of observation, the directors' survey is not an exercise designed for the express purpose of comparing or confirming information gained from board/commission members.

This section offers an analysis of each component of the study. The analysis is based solely upon the responses from board/commission members and agency directors. Each component analysis is preceded by a summary of the findings contained therein. The summaries and analyses represent a consensus of those responding to the survey instruments as differing opinions are obviously indicated throughout the questionnaires. Most importantly, no assumptions or opinions are drawn.

A. SELECTION PROCESS:

Board/commission members are supportive of the method in which they, personally, were appointed or selected to serve. However, when asked the most effective method or appointment, a slight majority favor appointment by the Governor with advice and consent of some other authority.
Methods involving election by the General Assembly or other bodies is the least favored.

BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBER ANALYSIS—

Although the Governor has no direct control over the governance of state agencies, his authority to appoint a substantial number of board/commission members gives him considerable input into the agency network. In fact, 40.1 percent of those responding to the questionnaire were appointed exclusively by the Governor with an additional 35.5 percent appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of some other authority, usually the Senate (this compares to an actual 38 percent and 28 percent respectively).

Over 90 percent of the respondents agree with the manner in which they were elected/selected. Although multiple responses were given in reference to the question concerning the most effective way to elect/selected board/commission members, appointment by the Governor with advice and consent was clearly preferred by 47.1 percent. Methods involving election by the General Assembly and other bodies faired poorly in the survey thereby supporting the observation by the focus group that the election method can be costly and time-consuming.

When given the opportunity to offer general comments at the conclusion of the survey, the issue of limiting the number of terms for board/commission members was addressed frequently. A slight majority, 58 percent, are in favor of limiting the number of terms. Of that group, 55.1 percent suggest limiting service to a maximum of two terms. While an overwhelming majority (87.7 percent) are willing to serve another term, only 31.7 percent originally volunteered to serve on a board/commission.

Agency directors were not asked to respond to questions concerning the selection process.
B. GOVERNANCE OF AGENCIES:

Responses from board/commission members and agency directors indicate a strong attendance rate at meetings. Board/commission members tend to be well-briefed by the staff prior to these meetings.

The day-to-day functions of the agency are delegated to the agency head as board/commission members do not feel they are completely familiar with every aspect of administrative matters. Additionally, personnel matters are generally delegated to the agency head.

Board/commission members see themselves as policymakers and overseers of the agency. They also see themselves as responsible for the agency's overall performance.

The relationship between board/commission members and agency heads is generally informal. Less than one-fourth of the agencies undertake a structured evaluation of their directors. Contractual agreements between board/commission and directors are practically non-existent.

It should be noted that throughout the study, most members are very supportive of the board/commission system and no one suggests an alternative form of government.

BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBER ANALYSIS--

For the most part, agencies conduct regularly scheduled meetings which enjoy an impressive attendance by members. Over 90 percent of the agencies have regularly scheduled board/commission meetings with an attendance rate between 75 and 100 percent being met over 90 percent of the time. Also, board/commission members received support material from the staff prior to attending the meeting (only 0.8 percent seldom or never receive advance material).

The responses indicate that the board/commission chairman and the agency head normally prepare the agenda which, 75.1 percent of the time, takes longer than two hours to cover.
While only 23.5 percent of board/commission members feel they are completely familiar with the day-to-day operation of the agency, at least 55 percent indicate they are substantially familiar with routine operations. Less than 2 percent indicate they are not at all familiar to this extent.

Board/commission members' relationships with agency heads are generally informal. In fact, of the 62.7 percent of agencies which have a process by which to evaluate the agency head, only 23.9 percent exercise a formal process. Yearly evaluations occur for 52.3 percent of the agency heads, while others occur at the discretion of the chairman or the full board/commission.

AGENCY DIRECTOR ANALYSIS--

Agency directors indicate that they are pleased with the attendance record shown by board/commission members. Board/commission members with a 75 to 100 percent attendance record rate 87 percent. An overwhelming 98 percent of the staffs prepare support material in advance of board meetings and 98 percent of the board/commission members frequently or occasionally review this information prior to attending.

Personnel decisions are made exclusively by 77 percent of the agency directors. Only 15 percent of the directors feel outside political influence plays a role in the hiring and firing of personnel within the agency.

Aside from regular meetings, directors say 79 percent of board/commission members are in weekly contact with the agency. Although board/commission members feel they refer constituents' requests to the director only 43.3 percent of the time, agency directors indicate they handle 85 percent of these referrals.
C. EXECUTION OF LEGAL MISSION:

Although a clear majority of board/commission members are aware of the existence of statutes relative to their agencies' responsibilities, they feel the board/commission chairman and the agency head share the responsibility to comply with these statutes. Only one-half of board/commission members and agency directors believe statutes should remain in the present form. Others support changes or have no opinions.

One out of five board/commission members is completely unaware of the agency's legal mission. A substantial number of board/commission members indicate they received little or no training prior to accepting their responsibilities. A strong majority feel they would benefit from more professional training on a regular basis.

BOARD/COMMISSION ANALYSIS--

A 97.2 percent majority of board/commission members indicate that they are aware of state laws or statutes which describe the mission of the agency. There is, however, some disagreement as to whether current agency programs are in accord with these statutes. At least 24 percent do not feel the statutes accurately reflect the activities and responsibilities of the agency and 28 percent suggest changes within the statutes to correct those differences. The majority of respondents indicates the board/commission chairman and the agency head share the responsibility for monitoring the agency's compliance with these statutes.

There is, however, indication that some board/commission members are not thoroughly familiar with all aspects of the agency's legal mission. When asked if statutes should be changed or altered, 28.5 percent have no opinion. While
11.3 percent indicate their agencies have no process to monitor statute compliance, 18 percent are unaware of a process and do not know if such exist.

It is evident that board/commission members desire more on-going training and a more complete orientation program. At least 36.2 percent indicate they received little or no orientation prior to accepting their responsibilities while 46.4 percent seldom or never attend training sessions or seminars. A 72.2 percent majority feel they would benefit from more training on a regular basis.

AGENCY DIRECTOR ANALYSIS--

Agency directors tend to give their board/commission members high marks regarding their exposure to statutes relative to agency responsibility. At least 87 percent indicate that board/commission members are familiar with these statutes. The remaining 13 percent indicate their members are only partially familiar. Additionally, only 23 percent of the directors feel their statutes fail or partially fail to reflect the current activities of the agency. Subsequently, only 35 percent recommend changes or alterations to the statutes.

The directors see board/commission compliance with these statutes as a responsibility to be shared by the full board/commission and the agency director. In a multiple response, 66 percent charge the agency director, 55 percent cite the full board/commission and 34 percent give responsibility to the board/commission chairman. The majority of the directors (72 percent) cite agency statutes as the authority which delegates responsibility to the agency director.

D. RELATIONSHIP WITH CONSTITUENTS:

Unlike the focus group, a majority of those responding
to the questionnaire indicate frequent contact with constituents. The responses, however, indicate a misconception as to how constituents' needs are handled. While a substantial number of board/commission members indicate personal attention to those requests, a strong majority of agency directors maintain these matters are referred to staff for processing. Also, one-third of board/commission members indicate that their agency is without a mechanism to measure effectiveness in dealing with constituency needs.

BOARD/COMMISSION ANALYSIS--

The majority of board/commission members learn of constituency needs through personal contacts with the public and through priority recommendations by the agency head. Only 21 percent are seldom or never contacted to perform a specific request by constituents. Board/commission members personally handle constituents' requests 46 percent of the time.

The majority of agencies (83.6 percent) frequently or occasionally promote the services offered to constituents. However, only 63.8 percent maintain a mechanism to measure the effectiveness of the agency in dealing with constituency needs.

In terms of board/commission members' reaction to external influence from constituents, it is clear that members are mindful of their needs and advice, yet 98 percent take this under advisement and vote their own convictions.

Agency directors were not asked to respond to this component.

E. ACCOUNTABILITY TO APPOINTING BODIES:

Board/commission members and agency directors have slightly more contact with the General Assembly than with
the Governor's office. Interaction from other governmental entities is, however, deemed beneficial by both board/commission members and agency directors. The influence of external political pressure relative to personnel matters is not seen as a problem by either group of respondents.

BOARD/COMMISSION ANALYSIS—

Although the Governor appoints the majority of board/commission members, the survey indicates that members receive more contact from the General Assembly than from the Governor's office (65.2 percent of members frequently or occasionally have interaction with the General Assembly compared to 54.6 percent with the Governor's office). In both cases, these contacts normally take the form of briefings on or reactions to a specific proposal.

More than 90 percent of board/commission members find this interaction frequently or occasionally positive. Furthermore, 80.5 percent seldom or never feel outside political pressure influences the hiring or firing of agency personnel. Again, agency directors were not asked to respond to this particular component.

F. FUNDING AND BUDGETING PROCESS:

When dealing with budgetary matters, board/commission members are extremely dependent on the agency staff. The agency director and staff serve as the only source of budget information available to the board/commission. Board/commission involvement in the early stages of the budget process is minimal. In most cases, budget documents are already in draft form when presented the board/commission. There is also strong indication that board/commission members
seldom deviate, to any substantial degree, from staff recommendations. This practice is further evidenced by agency directors, the majority of whom indicate that changes in board/commission membership seldom bring about any change in agency policy.

Nonetheless, board/commission members, as well as agency directors, are satisfied with their role in the budget process. Both groups agree that board/commission members cannot be totally knowledgeable about all aspects of the agency budget. Therefore, the agency director and agency staff are the logical resources to provide guidance through the process.

Board/commission members tend to review the budget to insure its accordance with established policy. Once adopted, these members delegate budget execution to the agency director. In executing the budget, the agency head prefers more discretion in the overall management of the budget. In conclusion, the role of board/commission members in the budget process is generally supervisory in nature.

BOARD/COMMISSION ANALYSIS--

The dependency of board/commission members on the reliability of the agency staff is most acute in dealing with budget matters. The respondents strongly indicate that preparation of budget documents begin with the agency head and agency staff. Moreover, only 10.4 percent of board commissions come into contact with budget documents during their initial preparation.

Although board/commission members rely heavily on staff preparation, 83 percent indicate that they frequently or occasionally analyze line items within the budget. In the final analysis, however, members frequently or occasionally rely on staff recommendations 94.8 percent of the time.
Board/commission members clearly see the agency head and the finance officer as having primary responsibility for budget execution (64.8 percent and 20.5 respectively). The majority of members are apprised of budget execution through financial reports and official audits. Financial reports are frequently or occasionally received by 85.9 percent of the members; audits are frequently or occasionally received by 82.6 percent of the members.

When asked if agency statutes address budget policy, 56 percent indicated yes while 22.6 percent indicated no. Those remaining, 21.4 percent, indicated "do not know" which supports a previous finding that some members are unfamiliar with their agencies' statutes.

AGENCY DIRECTOR ANALYSIS--

The responses indicate the agency director and staff are responsible for initiating the budget process. According to 81 percent of the directors, budget documents are in preliminary or final form when reviewed by the board/commission. In judging the extent to which board/commission members rely on the director's guidance during the process, 30 percent of the directors indicate complete reliance while 76 percent indicate substantial reliance.

Responses indicate the confidence board/commission members have in the ability of the staff to submit an acceptable budget for the agency. Directors see minimal deviation by board/commission members from staff recommendations. In fact, 74 percent of the directors indicate board/commission members seldom or never deviate from staff recommendations. The extent to which board/commission members alter staff recommendations is also minimal. Sixty-five percent of these deviations amount to less than 5 percent; 31 percent of the deviations fall between 5 percent and 15 percent; 4 percent reflect deviations between 15 percent and
25 percent. None of the deviations represents changes over 25 percent.

Budget execution is normally the responsibility of the agency head. Eighty-three percent of the directors charge themselves with responsibility for budget execution. The remaining 17 percent indicate the agency's finance officer executes the budget.

Few directors believe there is sufficient flexibility to allow for changes within the budget after its adoption. More than 80 percent cite marginal or little, if any, flexibility in dealing with subsequent changes. At least 74 percent of the directors would like to be given more discretion in the overall management of the budget.
V. PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

As a follow-up to the survey instruments, the consultant conducted individual interviews with 17 board/commission members and 17 agency directors. Although several uniform questions were asked of each group, the interviews prove to be less structured than the surveys and do not lend themselves to concrete analysis.

Responses from both groups were fairly consistent and the cumulative effect substantiates the findings of the previous instruments.

BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBER INTERVIEWS:

Board/commission members see their policymaking role as the most important responsibility to the agency. Several participants refer to themselves as "lay people" and "generalist" who do not have nor desire to have all the information necessary to administer the agency on a daily basis. All board/commission participants are pleased with the competence of the agency director and staff. Two interviews reveal only marginal concern about the ability of the staff to execute agency business. These participants are also impressed with the dedication and calibre of their fellow board/commission members.

In respect to the budget, 13 out of 17 indicate they review a draft form of the agency budget and tend to review these documents in general terms. Four board/commission members participate in the preparation of preliminary documents and follow the process until adoption. Throughout the interviews, members consistently state
their reliance on the agency staff to provide the information necessary to adopt and approve the budget. As one participant indicated, "...the budget process is so complex, we must rely on the professional guidance of the staff to educate us of the agency's needs."

None of the 17 board/commission members has participated in the evaluation of an agency director. Many feel their continuing contact with the director, coupled the many opportunities to witness daily performance, is sufficient to evaluate job performance.

A clear majority of the participants are supportive of training sessions for new and experienced board/commission members. Only one member had participated in an orientation session prior to serving on the board/commission.

AGENCY DIRECTORS INTERVIEW:

Agency directors feel it is their responsibility to provide board/commission members with as much information as possible. Several directors feel they are saving members' time by handling routine affairs. This practice, according to directors, leaves more opportunity for board/commission members to address policy.

Agency directors are pleased with the board/commission members' involvement in the budget process. Many feel it is unrealistic to expect board/commission members to analyze and debate every item in the budget. Directors tend to view the board/commission's responsibility to the budget process as being one which insures that the agencies' goals and objectives are reflected in the overall financial plan and that priorities are funded in a manner that will realize those goals and objectives.
Three participants have been formerly evaluated by their boards and commissions and are supportive of the practice. The remaining 14 agree with board/commission members in that daily performance is the "true test" of the director's ability and serves as sufficient evaluation.

All participants agree that the primary role of board/commissions should be in policymaking, followed by supervision of administrative matters and a general review of the agency's budget. These directors conclude by saying their board/commission is capable and qualified to execute the responsibilities of the agency.
VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS:

Responses to the survey instruments and interviews indicate wide-spread support for the board/commission system. For the most part, board/commission members and agency directors feel that the responsibilities shared between members and directors afford the proper checks and balances necessary to supervise and administer the agency.

At least three-fourths of the board/commission members are willing to serve another term. An even greater number finds their work gratifying. It is important to note that, based upon the responses board/commission members do not perceive themselves as administrators nor do they undertake a decisive role in the development and execution of the agency budget.

The instruments reveal the fact that the agency staff is primarily charged with preparation of budget documents. Furthermore, review by the board/commission seldom results in any substantial deviations from the staffs' original recommendations.

Board/commission members tend to perceive their most important role as policymakers and overseers of the agency's general operation. Many feel that the very nature of the system—that is, one which is composed of part-time participants—prohibits board/commission members' involvement on a day-to-day basis thus increasing their dependence on the agency staff.

A thorough knowledge of agency statutes is also in question. At least one out of five board/commission members is not exposed to the statutes and is subsequently unclear of the agency's legal mission. Both groups indicate a need for on-going training sessions and an improved method of orientation.
VII. STATISTICAL RESULTS:

THE BOARD/COMMISSION SURVEY INSTRUMENT
I. GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. How long have you served on this board/commission?
   
   10.7% A) less than one year;
   49.7% B) one to four years;
   23.5% C) five to eight years;
   7.7% D) nine to twelve years;
   8.4% E) thirteen years or over.

2. Please indicate the board/commission size on which you serve.
   
   37.3% A) 1 to 7 membership;
   31.9% B) 8 to 13 membership;
   28.3% C) 14 to 21 membership;
   2.6% D) over 22 membership.

3. Please indicate the size of your agency's total budget.
   
   46.1% A) 0 - $5,000,000;
   29.3% B) $5,000,000 to $100,000,000;
   24.6% C) $100,000,000 and above.

4. In addition to your service on a board/commission, are you:
   
   75.2% A) employed full time;
   5.9% B) employed part-time;
   10.5% C) retired;
   8.4% D) not employed.

II. BACKGROUND: THE BOARD/COMMISSION ON WHICH YOU SERVE

1. In what manner were you appointed/elected to your board/commission?
   
   40.1% A) appointed by Governor;
   35.5% B) appointed by Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate, General Assembly or legislative delegation;
   13.9% C) elected by the General Assembly;
   4.1% D) elected by majority of congressional district's General Assembly members or judicial circuit members;
   1.8% E) elected by legislative delegation of a respective county.
   4.6% F) other

2. On your board/commission, do you represent:

   65.2% A) the general public;
   22.7% B) a designated profession;
   18.6% C) other (please explain)

* Indicates multiple responses
3. In what manner did you come to serve on a board/commission?
   
   31.7% A) did you volunteer to serve on a board/commission; or
   68.3% B) were your services solicited by an individual or group?

4. If you volunteered your services, was this appointment your first choice?
   
   88.4% A) yes;
   11.6% B) no.

5. Aside from board/commission meetings, how much of your personal time do you devote to the board/commission?
   
   22.6% A) more than 20 hours per month;
   12.3% B) 15 to 20 hours per month;
   14.0% C) 10 to 15 hours per month;
   20.0% D) 5 to 10 hours per month;
   20.3% E) less than 5 hours per month.

6. When are you most likely to allocate this time?
   
   79.3% A) business hours;
   33.9% B) evening hours;
   16.0% C) weekends.

7. What motivated you to offer your personal time to a public agency?
   
   58.9% A) specific interest in the work of the agency;
   * 47.7% B) a sense of responsibility to the general public;
   18.1% C) a desire to be part of the governmental process.

8. How do you feel about the manner in which you were elected/selected?
   
   91.0% A) agree;
   5.7% B) indifferent;
   3.4% C) disagree.

9. Which method do you feel is the most effective way to elect/select board/commission members?
   
   34.3% A) appointment by Governor;
   47.1% B) appointment by Governor with advice and consent of Senate General Assembly, or legislative delegation;
   * 14.4% C) elected by the General Assembly;
   4.9% D) elected by the majority of congressional district's General Assembly members or judicial circuit members;
   5.2% E) elected by legislative delegation of a respective county

10. Do you think board/commission members should be limited in the number of terms which they serve?
    
    58.0% A) yes — (check number of terms) 6, 7, 12, 22, 26, 3, 4, 94
    42.0% B) no.
III. THE BOARD/COMMISSION MEETING

1. Does your agency have regularly scheduled meetings?

   93.4% A) yes - If so, how often?  46.1% meet monthly
   6.6% B) no.  53.9% meet at various times

2. Do you believe board/commission meetings are frequent enough?

   63.6% A) very much so;
   25.9% B) to some extent;
   9.2% C) not frequent enough;
   1.3% D) no opinion.

3. How long do your board/commission meetings normally last?

   1.5% A) one hour;
   23.3% B) one to two hours;
   75.1% C) longer than two hours.

4. Who prepares the meeting's agenda?

   48.2% A) the board/commission chairman;
   50.0% B) the agency head;
   25.5% C) the agency staff;
   2.3% D) do not know.

5. How would you categorize board/commission members attendance at the meetings?

   91.6% A) 75-100 percent;
   8.2% B) 50-75 percent;
   0.3% C) less than 50 percent.

6. Have meetings been cancelled due to lack of attendance?

   89.3% A) never;
   9.2% B) seldom;
   1.5% C) occasionally;
   0.6% D) frequently.

7. Does the agency staff prepare support material in advance of a board/commission meeting?

   96.2% A) frequently;
   3.1% B) occasionally;
   0.3% C) seldom;
   0.5% D) never.

8. If yes, do you have the opportunity to review this material prior to the meeting?

   75.5% A) always
   22.7% B) occasionally;
   1.8% C) never.
IV. BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBERS AND THEIR CONSTITUENCY:

1. Do you feel that there is a clearly defined segment of the population served by your agency?
   
   89.7% A) yes;
   10.3% B) no.

2. Is your constituency limited to a certain group or concern?
   
   22.0% A) yes - because of a particular profession;
   37.0% B) yes - because of a particular service or need;
   41.1% C) no.

3. What is the main process through which you learn of constituency needs?
   
   56.7% A) through personal contacts with the public;
   49.9% B) through priority recommendations by agency head;
   22.7% C) through citizen's advisory committees or other ad hoc groups;
   15.0% D) other (please explain) ____________________________

4. Does your board/commission have a mechanism to measure the effectiveness of the agency in dealing with constituency needs?
   
   63.8% A) yes;
   22.2% B) no;
   14.0% C) do not know.

5. Does your agency actively, through specific campaigns, identify the services it offers?
   
   61.4% A) frequently;
   22.2% B) occasionally;
   8.4% C) seldom;
   8.1% D) never.

6. How often are you contacted by the constituents of your agency to handle a specific request?
   
   40.3% A) frequently;
   38.0% B) occasionally;
   18.9% C) seldom;
   2.8% D) never.

7. How do you react to external influence from the constituents of your agency on policy issues?
   
   A. Honor their advice and vote accordingly
   
   24.9% A) frequently;
   51.3% B) occasionally;
   13.4% C) seldom;
   10.4% D) never.
13. Do you feel outside political influence plays a role in the
  hiring and firing of personnel within your agency?

  5.6% A) frequently;
  13.3% B) occasionally;
  33.6% C) seldom;
  46.9% D) never.

V. BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBERS AND THEIR AGENCY:

1. Aside from regular meetings, how often are you in contact with
   your agency's staff?

  7.2% A) daily;
  45.5% B) weekly;
  30.2% C) monthly;
  17.1% D) less than once a month.

2. In what form are these contacts made?

  88.6% A) telephone calls;
  65.9% B) mailings;
  39.3% C) personal visits;
  3.4% D) other (please indicate)

3. When making inquiries on behalf of constituents, how do you
   generally handle them?

  46.5% A) personally;
  43.4% B) refer them to the agency head;
  37.5% C) refer them directly to the appropriate staff person involved

4. Do you feel that there are established channels for communication
   within your agency?

  82.1% A) yes;
  4.2% B) yes - but seldom used;
  4.4% C) there is no particular policy;
  2.3% D) do not know.

5. In the formation of agency policy, how are issues initiated?

   A. By the board/commission chairman -
      46.4% A) frequently;
      40.5% B) occasionally;
      10.4% C) seldom;
      2.7% D) never.

   B. By the board/commission only -
      44.1% A) frequently;
      43.8% B) occasionally;
      11.8% C) seldom;
      0.3% D) never.
7. (Continued)

B. Take under advisement and vote own conviction?

86.1% A) frequently;
12.0% B) occasionally;
1.1% C) seldom;
0.8% D) never.

8. Is there interaction between you, as a board/commission member, and the Governor's office?

16.8% A) frequently;
37.8% B) occasionally;
27.2% C) seldom;
18.1% D) never.

9. If yes, in what form does this exchange take?

16.3% A) board/commission members are asked for support on a particular issue;
41.8% B) board/commission members are asked to brief the Governor's office on a specific topic or event;
44.0% C) board/commission members are asked by the Governor's office to respond/react to a particular proposal;
22.3% D) other (please explain)

10. Is there interaction between you, as a board/commission member, and members of the General Assembly?

24.5% A) frequently;
40.7% B) occasionally;
21.7% C) seldom;
13.1% D) never.

11. If yes, in what form does this exchange take?

21.9% A) board/commission members are asked for support on a particular issue;
45.4% B) board/commission members are asked to brief a legislator on a specific topic or event;
38.7% C) board/commission members are asked by a legislator to respond/react to a particular proposal;
34.9% D) board/commission meets with a legislative committee;
14.6% E) other (please explain)

12. Do you think this interaction provides for a positive exchange of information?

57.5% A) frequently;
34.3% B) occasionally;
5.4% C) seldom;
2.7% D) never.
3. If yes, how were you made aware of them?

57.4% A) through personal examination of agency documents;
34.7% B) through the agency head;
19.9% C) through other board/commission members;
37.8% D) through a formal orientation process.

4. Do you think that the statutes accurately and completely reflect the current activities of your agency?

73.6% A) yes;
20.8% B) partially;
3.2% C) no;
2.4% D) do not know.

Should the statutes be changed or altered?

28.0%A) yes;
28.5%B) no opinion;
43.5%C) no.

5. Has there been a board/commission attempt to revamp, overhaul or alter the legal mission of your agency within the past five years?

33.2% A) yes;
48.5% B) no;
18.3% C) unaware.

Has there been a legislative attempt to revamp, overhaul or alter the legal mission of your agency within the past five years?

38.4% A) yes;
42.9% B) no;
18.8% C) unaware.

If yes, to what extent did you involve yourself in the attempt?

53.2% A) was supportive of change;
28.8% B) was opposed to change;
5.3% C) was indifferent to change;
12.2% D) was not a member at the time.

To what extent did other board/commission members have influence over the attempt or change?

55.6% A) substantial;
25.4% B) marginal;
19.0% C) little, if any.

6. Is there a process whereby the board/commission can monitor the agency's compliance/noncompliance with these statutes?

70.7% A) yes;
11.3% B) no;
18.0% C) do not know.
5. (Continued)
   C. By the agency head
      54.1% A) frequently;
      34.7% B) occasionally;
      7.4% C) seldom;
      3.8% D) never.
   D. other (please explain)

6. Do you feel that you are familiar with the day-to-day operation of your agency?
   23.5% A) yes - completely;
   55.4% B) yes - substantially;
   19.6% C) somewhat;
   1.5% D) not at all.

7. Is there an established process by which the board/commission evaluates the performance of the agency head?
   23.9% A) yes - a formal process;
   38.3% B) yes - an informal process;
   22.6% C) no;
   14.7% D) do not know.

8. If yes, how often does this evaluation take place?
   52.3% A) yearly;
   4.1% B) every six months;
   14.9% C) at the discretion of the chairman;
   22.0% D) at the discretion of the full board/commission;
   6.6% E) other (please explain)

VI. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE BOARD/COMMISSION:

1. Are there state laws or statutes which specifically describe the mission of your agency?
   97.2% A) yes;
   1.5% B) no;
   1.3% C) do not know.

2. If yes, within those statutes are the duties and responsibilities of the board/commission also clearly defined?
   92.3% A) yes;
   6.1% B) no;
   1.6% C) do not know.
7. If yes, who is responsible for the monitoring?

( 
48.6% A) the board/commission chairman;  
28.9% B) a subcommittee of the board/commission;  
37.5% C) the agency head;  
20.1% D) the legal counsel for the agency.

8. Do you feel you had adequate orientation prior to accepting the responsibilities of your board/commission?

63.8% A) yes;  
22.0% B) partially;  
14.2% C) no.

9. Who conducted your orientation?

( 
28.7% A) board/commission chairman;  
25.3% B) board/commission members;  
55.6% C) agency director;  
16.8% D) other (please indicate) ____________________________

10. How often do you receive training (seminars, conventions, etc.) as a board/commission member?

12.6% A) frequently;  
41.1% B) occasionally;  
26.1% C) seldom;  
20.3% D) never.

11. Do you feel that more training on a regular basis would be a useful experience for you as a board/commission member?

20.5% A) very much so;  
51.7% B) to some extent;  
21.3% C) not at all;  
6.6% D) no opinion.

VII. BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBERS AND THE AGENCY BUDGET:

1. At what level does the budget preparation begin?

66.1% A) staff level;  
28.0% B) agency head;  
10.2% C) finance subcommittee of the board/commission;  
4.0% D) full board/commission.

2. At what point does the full board/commission come into contact with budget documents?

10.4% A) from its inception;  
50.5% B) preliminary form submitted by staff;  
34.7% C) final form submitted by agency head;  
4.4% D) other (please explain) ____________________________
3. In reviewing the agency's budget, do you:

A. Analyze line items -
   55.7% A) frequently;
   27.3% B) occasionally;
   10.3% C) seldom;
   6.8% D) never.

B. Review major subtotals for glaring errors -
   52.2% A) frequently;
   25.1% B) occasionally;
   15.4% C) seldom;
   7.3% D) never.

C. Give specific attention to those projects that interest you -
   61.3% A) frequently;
   26.1% B) occasionally;
   7.4% C) seldom;
   5.2% D) never.

D. Rely on staff recommendations -
   68.0% A) frequently;
   26.8% B) occasionally;
   3.6% C) seldom;
   1.6% D) never.

4. Who represents your board/commission's budgetary concerns before legislative committees? (check more than one if applicable)

53.7% A) board/commission members;
81.0% B) agency head;
31.8% C) agency staff;
3.7% D) constituents;
3.7% E) do not know.

5. After adoption of the budget, how are you apprised of its execution?

* 19.0% A) through personal examination of agency expenditures;
  77.2% B) through financial reports issued by staff;
  28.5% C) through official audits of the agency;
  6.0% D) rarely advised of budget status;
  2.7% E) never apprised.

6. Within your agency, who has primary responsibility for budget execution?

* 13.6% A) board/commission chairman;
  17.9% B) entire board/commission;
  64.3% C) agency head;
  20.5% D) finance officer.

7. Do you receive copies of audits conducted on your agency?

61.5% A) frequently;
21.1% B) occasionally;
6.2% C) seldom;
10.8% D) never.
.3% E) do not know
8. Do you receive financial reports from your staff?

63.6% A) frequently;
22.3% B) occasionally;
6.3% C) seldom;
7.9% D) never.

9. Do your agency statutes address budget policy?

56.0% A) yes;
22.6% B) no;
21.4% C) do not know.

10. With respect to making transfers between the agency's budget categories, do you think the agency head has:

16.7% A) too little authority to make changes;
3.8% B) too much authority to make changes;
69.1% C) sufficient authority;
10.5% D) do not know.

VIII. IN CONCLUSION: AN OVERVIEW

1. How do you perceive your board/commission's role in the following areas?

A. Policy making -
61.3% A) strong;
30.9% B) adequate;
7.9% C) weak.

B. Administrative matters -
39.9% A) strong;
50.1% B) adequate;
9.9% C) weak.

C. Development and execution of budget -
32.7% A) strong;
52.2% B) adequate;
15.1% C) weak.

2. In your opinion, how important should the role of your board/commission be in the following areas?

A. Policy making -
76.5% A) extremely important;
16.4% B) very important;
6.3% C) important;
0.8% D) not very important

B. Administrative matters -
25.0% A) extremely important;
34.0% B) very important;
31.6% C) important;
9.3% D) not very important
2. (Continued)

C. Development and execution of budget -
   39.6% A) extremely important;
   29.1% B) very important;
   27.5% C) important;
   3.8% D) not very important.

3. How do you perceive the board/commission's ability to execute
   the agency's mission?

   64.7% A) strong and positive;
   29.4% B) adequate and sufficient;
   6.0% C) weak and passive.

4. Do you find your work on the board/commission gratifying?

   81.4% A) frequently;
   16.8% B) occasionally;
   1.6% C) seldom;
   0.3% D) never.

5. Would you be willing to serve another term on your board/commission?

   81.7% A) yes;
   8.5% B) no;
   9.7% C) undecided.

6. Please take this opportunity to share any thoughts you might
   have on our boards/commissions system. Feel free to elaborate
   on questions previously posed or any new topic that is of
   interest or concern to you.

   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
VII. STATISTICAL RESULTS (CONTINUED)

THE DIRECTORS SURVEY INSTRUMENT
I. GENERAL INFORMATION:

1. How long have you served as director of your board/commission?

   8%   A) less than one year;
   25%  B) one to four years;
   30%  C) five to eight years;
   11%  D) nine to twelve years;
   26%  E) thirteen years or longer.

2. Please indicate the size of your board/commission.

   48%  A) 1 to 7 membership;
   43%  B) 8 to 13 membership;
   9%   C) 14 to 21 membership;
   0%   D) over 22 membership.

3. Please indicate the size of your agency's budget.

   58%  A) 0 - $5,000,000;
   23%  B) $5,000,000 to $100,000,000;
   19%  C) $100,000,000 and above.

4. Approximately how many employees work within your agency?

   65%  A) less than 50;
   7%   B) 50 to 100;
   9%   C) 100 to 500;
   4%   D) 500 to 1,000;
   15%  E) over 1,000.

II. THE BOARD/COMMISSION MEETING:

1. Does your agency have regularly scheduled meetings?

   91%  A) yes; If yes, how often? ________________________
   9%   B) no.

2. Do you believe that your board/commission meets frequently enough?

   80%  A) very much so;
   14%  B) to some extent;
   6%   C) not frequent enough;
   0%   D) no opinion.
3. How long do your board/commission meetings normally last?
   - 0% A) one hour;
   - 22% B) one to two hours;
   - 78% C) longer than two hours.

4. Who prepares the meeting's agenda?
   - 25% A) the board/commission chairman;
   - 35% B) the agency director;
   - 17% C) the agency staff;
   - 0% D) do not know.

5. How would you categorize board/commission members attendance at the meetings?
   - 87% A) 75-100 percent;
   - 13% B) 50-75 percent;
   - 0% C) less than 50 percent.

6. Have meetings been cancelled due to lack of attendance?
   - 87% A) never.
   - 11% B) seldom;
   - 2% C) occasionally;
   - 0% D) frequently.

7. Does the agency staff prepare support material in advance of board/commission meeting?
   - 98% A) frequently;
   - 2% B) occasionally;
   - 0% C) seldom;
   - 0% D) never.

8. If yes, do board/commission members review this material prior to the meeting?
   - 72% A) frequently;
   - 26% B) occasionally;
   - 2% C) seldom;
   - 0% D) never.

III. YOU AND YOUR BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBER

1. How often is the Governor's office in contact with your agency?
   - 49% A) frequently;
   - 34% B) occasionally;
   - 17% C) seldom;
   - 0% D) never.
2. How often is the General Assembly in contact with your agency?

53% A) frequently;
32% B) occasionally;
15% C) seldom;
0% D) never.

3. Do you feel outside political influence plays a role in the hiring and firing of personnel within your agency?

2% A) frequently;
13% B) occasionally;
32% C) seldom;
53% D) never.

4. To what extent do you, as agency director, have control over the firing and hiring of personnel within your agency?

77% A) complete control
17% B) marginal (board/commission requires consent)
4% C) recommends only;
2% D) board/commission has total control.

5. Aside from regular meetings, how often are board/commission members in contact with the agency?

18% A) daily;
61% B) weekly
9% C) monthly;
12% D) less than once a month.

6. In what form are these contacts made?

96% A) telephone calls
86% B) mailings;
53% C) personal visits;
6% D) other (please explain)

7. When making inquiries on behalf of constituents, do board/commission members generally:

3% A) handle them personally;
85% B) refer them to the agency director;
6% C) refer them directly to the appropriate staff involved.

8. Do you feel there are established channels for communication within your agency?

98% A) yes;
2% B) yes – but seldom used;
C% C) there is no particular policy;
D% D) do not know.
9. By what authority is responsibility delegated to the agency director?
   - 72% A) by statute;
   - 36% B) by board/commission bylaws;
   - 38% C) by official agency policy;
   - 21% D) by informal agreements.

10. How do you determine what matters are brought to the attention of the board/commission?
    - 43% A) staff decision;
    - 72% B) confer with board/commission chairman;
    - 34% C) case-by-case basis

11. Are board/commission members familiar with the day-to-day operations of the agency?
    - 15% A) yes, completely;
    - 52% B) yes, substantially;
    - 32% C) somewhat;
    - 0% D) not at all.

12. Do you feel that board/commission members are familiar with the statutes regarding agency responsibility?
    - 87% A) yes;
    - 13% B) partially;
    - 0% C) no.

13. Do you, as agency director, feel that these statutes accurately and completely reflect the current activities of your agency?
    - 77% A) yes;
    - 19% B) partially;
    - 4% C) no;
    - 0% D) do not know.

14. Should these statutes be changed or altered?
    - 35% A) yes;
    - 50% B) no;
    - 15% C) no opinion.

15. Who monitors the board/commission's compliance with these statutes?
    - 34% A) board/commission chairman;
    - 55% B) full board/commission;
    - 66% C) agency director;
    - 0% D) no one.
IV. BOARD/COMMISSION MEMBERS AND THE AGENCY BUDGET:

1. At what level does the budget preparation begin?

81%  A) staff level;
19%  B) agency director;
0%  C) finance subcommittee of the board/commission;
0%  D) full board/commission.

2. At what point does the full board/commission come into contact with budget documents?

6%  A) from its inception;
51%  B) preliminary form submitted by staff;
30%  C) final form submitted by staff;
13%  D) other (please explain) ____________________________

3. To what extent do board/commission members rely on your guidance during the budget process?

30%  A) completely;
67%  B) substantially;
3%  C) marginally;
0%  D) not at all.

4. How often do board/commission members deviate from staff recommendations concerning the budget?

0%  A) frequently;
28%  B) occasionally;
60%  C) seldom;
14%  D) never.

5. Please indicate the extent to which board/commission members alter staff recommendations:

65%  A) 0% to 5%;
31%  B) 5% to 15%;
4%  C) 15% to 25%;
0%  D) over 25%.

6. Who represents your board/commission's budgetary concerns before legislative committees?

60%  A) board/commission members;
91%  B) agency director;
36%  C) agency staff;
11%  D) agency constituents;

7. Within the agency, who has primary responsibility for budget execution?

0%  A) board/commission chairman;
0%  B) entire board/commission;
83%  C) agency director;
17%  D) finance officer.
8. How are board/commission members apprised of budget execution?

   A) through financial reports issued by staff;  
   B) through informal briefings at board/commission meetings;  
   C) through official audits of the agency;  
   D) board/commission members are seldom apprised of budget status.

M 64%  
   60%  
   45%  
   0%  

9. During the fiscal year, how much flexibility does your agency have in changing the adopted budget?

   A) substantial;  
   B) marginal;  
   C) little, if any.

M 18%  
   47%  
   35%  

10. Do you feel there is sufficient flexibility to allow for changes within the budget?

   A) yes;  
   B) no.

M 51%  
   49%  

11. Should the agency itself be given more discretion in transferring items across budget categories?

   A) yes;  
   B) no.

M 89%  
   11%  

12. Should the agency director be given more discretion in the overall management of the budget?

   A) yes;  
   B) no.

M 74%  
   26%  

13. With regard to the budgeting process, do you feel that the agency would benefit from including more accurate and meaningful programmatic information into the budget format?

   A) yes;  
   B) no.

M 31%  
   69%  

14. Would the inclusion of accurate and meaningful workload data and program performance information be beneficial?

   A) yes;  
   B) no.

M 41%  
   59%  

15. How often are audits conducted on your agency?

   A) every month;  
   B) every three months  
   C) twice a year;  
   D) once a year.

M 2%  
   0%  
   5%  
   93%
16. Please indicate the type of audits conducted on your agency:

   38% A) internal;
   94% B) state;
   47% C) federal;
   9% D) other (please explain) ________________________________

17. Are these audits referred to the board/commission?

   93% A) yes;
   7% B) occasionally;
   0% C) no.

18. If yes, who on the board/commission reviews the results?

   13% A) board/commission chairman;
   80% B) entire board/commission;
   7% C) subcommittee of board/commission.

19. In cases where audits are performed at the federal and state level, do you see a need for closer coordination of these audits?

   6% A) yes; If yes, in what way? ________________________________
   94% B) no.

20. Are directives from your board/commission ever in conflict with policy established by the Budget and Control Board?

   0% A) frequently;
   11% B) occasionally;
   26% C) seldom;
   63% D) never.

V. YOUR POSITION WITH THE AGENCY:

1. Please indicate which of the following applies to your particular situation as agency director:

   85% A) serve strictly at the pleasure of the board/commission;
   0% B) have a specified contractural relationship;
   15% C) other (please explain) ________________________________

2. Is there a specific document which outlines the duties and responsibilities of the agency director?

   62% A) yes - If yes, please explain ________________________________
   38% B) no.
3. Do you have a written contract with your board/commission?

2% A) yes;
98% B) no.

4. If yes, when is your contract renewable?

0% A) every year;
0% B) every two years
100% C) other (please indicate) __________

5. Is there an established process by which the board/commission evaluates the agency director?

15% A) yes — a formal process;
41% B) yes — an informal process;
44% C) no.

6. In what form does this evaluation take?

27% A) oral discussion with board/commission chairman;
50% B) oral discussion with full board/commission;
10% C) written assessment;
13% D) other (please explain) ____________________________

7. How often does this evaluation take place?

42% A) yearly;
3% B) every six months;
23% C) at the discretion of the chairman;
32% D) at the discretion of the full board/commission.

8. Should the agency director's position become vacant, does the board/commission have an established selection process?

19% A) yes — a formal process;
33% B) yes — an informal process;
48% C) no.

9. How extensive is the recruitment by the board/commission in filling a vacancy?

32% A) seek applications nationwide;
30% B) seek applications statewide;
28% C) generally promote from within agency.
10% D) other.

10. Do changes in board/commission makeup reflect changes in agency policy?

2% A) frequently;
36% B) occasionally;
41% C) seldom;
21% D) never.
VI. IN CONCLUSION: AN OVERVIEW

1. How do you perceive the role of board/commission members in the following areas?

   A. Policy making -
      89% A) strong;
      20% B) adequate;
      2% C) weak.

   B. Administrative matters -
      18% A) strong;
      64% B) adequate;
      18% C) weak.

   C. Development and execution of budget -
      9% A) strong;
      78% B) adequate;
      13% C) weak.

2. In your opinion, as agency director, how important should the role of board/commission members be in these areas?

   A. Policy making -
      85% A) extremely important;
      15% B) very important;
      0% C) important;
      0% D) not very important.

   B. Administrative matters -
      2% A) extremely important;
      15% B) very important;
      60% C) important;
      23% D) not very important.

   C. Development and execution of budget -
      7% A) extremely important
      21% B) very important;
      67% C) important;
      5% D) not very important.

3. How do you perceive the board/commission's ability to execute the agency's mission?

   63% A) strong and positive;
   37% B) adequate and sufficient;
   0% C) weak and passive.
4. Please take this opportunity to share any thoughts you might have on our board/commission system. Feel free to elaborate on questions previously posed or any new topic that is of interest or concern to you.